

Performance Funding Comparison: Missouri and Florida

	Missouri	Florida
Funding Allocated	For FY 2014 the Governor's Budget includes an increase of \$34 million for the performance funding model in addition to \$849.9 in core funding. New funding will be distributed through the performance funding model.	The Florida Performance Funding Model will allocate a total of \$200 million for performance based funding in 2014-2015, which includes \$65 million in base funds. Florida has not provided funding based on enrollments since 2007-2008. Rather, funding is based on initiatives.
Eligibility	Institutions are eligible if they improve over the previous year's performance (a three-year rolling average) or where applicable sustain performance relative to an external benchmark.	Institutions scoring 26 or more points on the metrics are eligible for a share of new funding and have base funding restored. Institutions not scoring at least 26 points do not receive new funds and must submit improvement plans and show progress in order to have base funding restored.
Guiding Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reliance on existing, and externally validated data b) Alignment with established statewide goals c) Straight-forward in nature and easily understood 	<p>The Florida model has four guiding principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use metrics that align with SUS Strategic Plan goals 2. Reward excellence or improvement 3. Have a few clear, simple metrics 4. Acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

Metrics	Metrics for 4-year institutions	Florida's 10-Metric Model:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Student Success & Progress (institutions choose one): a)Freshman to Sophomore Retention or b)First-time, full-time freshmen successfully completing 24 hours in their first academic year ❖ Increased Degree Attainment (institutions choose one): a)Total degrees awarded or b)Six-year cohort graduation rates ❖ Quality of Student Learning (institutions choose one): a)Improvements in assessments of general education, or b)Improvements in assessments in the major field, or c)Improvements on Professional/occupational licensure tests ❖ Financial Responsibility & Efficiency (institutions choose one): a)Percent of total education & general expenditures expended on the core mission (instruction, research, and public service), or b)Increase in education revenue (state appropriations plus net tuition revenue) per full-time equivalent student at or below the increase in the consumer price index ❖ Institution-specific metric chosen by that institution then approved by Board ❖ Institutions must develop a job placement metric to measure student job placement and/or pursuit of graduate degree 	1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further	2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates
		3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree	4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)
		5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)
		7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)	8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)
		8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)	9. Board of Governors Choice
		10. Board of Trustees Choice	

Weighting	Missouri has a special weighting factor for STEM completions for any existing measure where applicable and appropriate. It is recommended that institutions be given the option of having the STEM weighting incorporated into all measures that involve actual degree completions such as completions rate and total degree production.	Presently the Florida 10-Metric Model is not weighted but the Board reserves the option to weight specific metrics such as Cost per Degree, Six Year Graduation Rate, and Academic Progress Rate.
Institutional Control	Missouri's model offers 4-year institutions choice among 2-3 alternatives for 4 out of the 5 metrics. In addition, institutions may choose the fifth metric, which is subject to Board approval. New legislation requires institutions to develop a job placement metric to measure how students are getting jobs at degree level and in field or pursuing graduate study.	Florida institutions also do not have control over appropriation levels and institutions can control performance on outcomes within reason. However, the Florida 10-Metric Model does give institutions some control given that there is a metric chosen by institutional boards as part of the model.

<http://governor.mo.gov/news/archive/gov-nixon-outlines-performance-based-funding-model-higher-education-during-visit>

<http://www.dhe.mo.gov/documents/PerformanceFundingReport.pdf>

<http://www.moga.mo.gov/indexnew.html>