

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics) Questions and Answers

Guiding principles

1. Did the Board establish guiding principles in the development of the model?

- Early in the process the Board established 4 guiding principles that were the basis for the development of the model:
 - i. Use metrics that align with Strategic Plan goals;
 - ii. Reward Excellence and Improvement;
 - iii. Have a few clear, simple metrics; and
 - iv. Acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

2. Universities have numerous metrics that are tracked and reported on in the annual accountability report. Why were only 10 chosen?

- One of the Board's guiding principles was to have a 'few clear, simple metrics'. This was a common theme when discussing models with systems around the country.
- With approximately 40 metrics included in the annual accountability report, 10 metrics were identified as follows:
 - i. 3 metrics were identified in the 2013 General Appropriations Act.
 - ii. 5 metrics were identified by the Board based on key Strategic Plan initiatives.
 - iii. 2 metrics were 'choice' metrics that were picked by the Board and local boards of trustees. These 2 metrics focused on areas of improvement or the specific mission of the university.

3. Why reward 'Excellence' or 'Improvement'?

- Due to numerous reasons (university age, student demographics, regional location, funding, etc.) university metrics vary. It was important to recognize those universities that have 'Excellence' metrics, but it was also important to recognize those universities who are making improvements from one year to another.

4. Current funding per full-time equivalent (FTE) student is well below the national average.

Why implement a performance model when many universities are funded so low?

- The amount of funding provided by the state and students through the appropriations process and tuition payments should not be an impediment to utilizing funds in a manner that ensures a university is performing at the highest levels. Students and parents expect the best no matter the funding levels. Waiting to implement performance funding until additional resources are provided would be a disservice to our students and other stakeholders

Operational topics

5. What is the maximum number of points available?

- Prior to 2016-17, each of the 10 metrics are weighted the same and the highest point value for each was 5 points. Thus the total number of points available was 50.
- Starting in 2016-17, each of the 10 metrics remain weighted the same and the highest point value for each metric is now 10 points. Thus the new total number of points available is 100.

6. Will any of the metrics be weighted differently?

- At this time all 10 of the metrics have equal weight.

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- 7. To be eligible for new funding a university must score higher than 25 points on the 50-point scale or 51 points on the 100-point scale and not be in the bottom three. How were these minimums determined?**
- To make this model truly a performance funding model, then funds should be awarded to the top performing institutions. For the first two years (2014-15 and 2015-16) of implementation of the model it was determined that a university should be able to score 26 points or more to be eligible and not be in the bottom three.
 - Starting in 2016-17, institutions must score 51 points and not be in the bottom three to be eligible for new funding.
- 8. If the model focuses on excellence and improvement, why are the bottom three institutions always kept out of the money, even if they obtain the minimum set score or higher?**
- The reference eliminating the bottom 3 institutions only refers to new money—not base funding.
- 9. Why are UF and FSU included in the model if they're pre-eminent institutions?**
- This is a system model that measures system performance. In order to determine the health of the SUS as a whole, our highest achieving universities must be a part of the model. They help set the standards for excellence—standards which we believe are also attainable by other universities. The “improvement” scores help provide incentives while institutions are on their way to excellence. For institutions that have already achieved high standards the model recognizes that in the Excellence scoring for those institutions.
- 10. Will the performance-based funding model drag down the pre-eminent institutions and New College, which is considered a top liberal arts college?**
- See the response to #9 above. This is a system model based upon 4 guiding principles. One of those principles states that the model “Rewards excellence as well as improvement.” For example, UF is rated very highly nationally on its graduation rate and received an excellence rating in this metric. Other institutions, although not as high performing, can demonstrate year-over-year improvement.
- 11. How do we prevent the universities from “dumbing down” graduation rates?**
- The model includes metrics that focuses upon both achievement and access. The “University Access Rate” metric has been deliberately included so that institutions that serve a higher percentage of undergraduates with a Pell grant are acknowledged for their commitment to students with financial need. The model balances the need for achievement, by including 6-year graduation rates and academic progress rates with the need for access, by including the university access rate metric.
- 12. Were the universities involved in the development of the performance model?**
- The development of the performance funding model began in the fall of 2012. At each Board meeting there has been discussion and updates provided on the status of developing the model. Discussions have been held with universities through phone calls and face-to-face meetings. The final metric, the board of trustee choice metric, involved the universities as their own boards made the recommendation of the metric and benchmarks for Excellence and Improvement.
- 13. How can the universities improve their performance on the metrics?**

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- Universities will need to be strategic in the investment of performance funds to focus on improving metrics. For example, a university could choose to invest in improving internship opportunities within the disciplines that perform the best on these post-graduation metrics, and other career center efforts. For other metrics, there are many initiatives the universities have and can undertake to improve graduation rates, retention rates, degrees awarded, etc.

14. What would happen if there was a tie, where two or more universities had the same total score?

- Prior to 2016-17, the Board's practice was to address all ties to the benefit, not the detriment, of the institutions in question. No matter where the tie took place in the score rankings, the practice was the same. For example, if two institutions had the same score and this score was the third best then both would be considered part of the "top 3." By the same practice if two universities tied for the score above the "bottom 3," both would be considered eligible for new funds.
- Starting in 2016-17, the following Tiebreaker Policy (approved at the November 2015 Board Meeting) has been established to break all ties:
 - i. Compare the total of Excellence and Improvement scores
 - ii. Give advantage to higher points earned through Excellence
 - iii. Score metric by metric giving a point to the school with the higher score
 - iv. If tied after three levels of tiebreakers, the tie will go to the benefit of the institutions

Data issues

15. How are the scores calculated for Improvement?

- Improvement is current year performance minus previous year performance. The result is generally a percentage change and is scored 1 point for 1% up to 5 points for 5%. A couple of boards of trustee choice metric have hard improvement numbers instead of percentage change. In the case of all metrics, except Cost per Undergraduate Degree, to earn points there should be positive improvement from the previous year to the current year.

How do current metrics deal with the military, working students, etc.?

- Students who leave school to serve in the armed forces, have been called up to active duty, who leave to serve with a foreign aid service of the Federal Government, who leave to serve on an official church mission, or who die or become permanently disabled are not included in the graduation rate metric. Among all 11 public universities in the SUS during 2011-12, only 16 full- or part-time students were called to active duty. Among all four categories of exclusions listed above in the 2005-11 six-year cohort of students, only 131 students fell into these categories—and they were excluded from the graduation rate calculations.
- In addition, only military students who are FTICs (first time in college) are included in the graduation rate. If they began their college career outside an SUS institution, they are excluded from the graduation rate calculation.

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics) Questions and Answers

- Military students and working students are just as able to successfully persist and complete college as other groups of students. Although some military students may need longer to complete due to a variety of factors, many are mature, instrumentally motivated adults who know what they want and have a strong work ethic. It is misleading to say that because a student is working or is a veteran, she or he is less likely to persist and complete college.

16. Why weren't regional differences taken into account when calculating the metrics?

- Board staff considered how regional differences in the state of Florida impact various performance metrics. At the request of the Legislature, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida produces an annual Florida Price Level Index (FPLI), which measures the cost differences between Florida's counties. The FPLI serves as the basis for the District Cost Differential (DCD) in the Florida Education Finance Program for K-12. For example, the 2012 FPLI reports a 12% difference between Palm Beach and Leon counties. For some of the metrics regional differences would not be appropriate and for others the net result of adjusting by region showed no effect.

17. Why not use expected graduation rates instead of actual graduation rates?

- One of the issues with calculating an expected graduation rate is that it is difficult to determine whether differences between estimates and actual data are due to university performance or model error. The performance funding model accounts for student differences at each university by awarding points equally for 'Excellence' and 'Improvement'.
- Actual graduation rates are a standard measure of performance used by IPEDS and other national reporting agencies.

18. Why is the data based on one year and not 2, 3 or 5-year averages?

- The data used to drive the model is from the annual accountability report which focuses on yearly data. A yearly snap-shot also allows for comparison with other systems and/or states. For some metrics, historical data is not available and in other cases the metric definitions have been revised recently, thus the use of averages would not be appropriate.

19. Why wasn't the standard deviation used when setting benchmarks?

- This was considered for each metric but it was decided to set the benchmarks close to the data and therefore ensure that schools were rewarded for reasonable performance above, at, and just below the system average.

20. Will Florida Polytechnic University (FPU) be included in performance funding?

- FPU needs at least two years of data on enrolled students, possibly more in order to have performance to be evaluated. At that point there will be adequate data available in order to add FPU to the model.

21. For Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further metric, why was a different methodology used than what is in FETPIP's standard reports and

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics) Questions and Answers

why were recent graduates used instead of data on graduates three or more years post-graduation? ¹

- SUS institutions produce graduates with a national scope, yet FETPIP's reports only include data for alumni who are found within Florida – missing about one-quarter of our bachelor's graduates. To get a more complete picture, Board staff have merged FETPIP's Florida data with the National Student Clearinghouse data to include enrollment outside of Florida.
- Board staff worked with FETPIP and the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) to add graduates employed out-of-state, graduates in the military, and graduates employed with the federal government. Florida has joined the national Wage and Record Information System (WRIS2) data system that provides data on whether graduates are employed across state lines.
- In contrast to FETPIP's methodology of only looking at the October-December fiscal quarter for employment data, Board staff recommends that each graduate be given a full year to find employment or re-enroll. A year for each graduate provides a better standard than the October-December fiscal quarter because of the variation among universities regarding when degrees are awarded (year-round or only in May). In addition, by allowing for a full year, students who are sitting for licensure exams (i.e., CPA exam) will have time to take their post-graduation exams and look for work.
- The decision was made to use data from one year out so students (and their parents) will know what their prospects are immediately after graduation. Board staff plans to study longer-term (three to five years) employment data and publish the information in the future.

UNIV.	FETPIP	BOG
FAMU	73%	90%
FAU	76%	90%
FGCU	77%	91%
FIU	75%	87%
FSU	66%	88%
NCF	40%	72%
UCF	76%	94%
UF	63%	89%
UNF	80%	92%
USF	78%	91%
UWF	73%	86%
SUS	73%	90%

22. For Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further metric, what is the impact for institutions that have graduates living and working overseas?

- Graduates who live and work abroad are not currently included in the data except for a few from New College. The small number of NCF graduates makes it necessary to account for every single graduate or their percentages are disproportionately affected.

23. For Median Average Wage of Full-time Employed Baccalaureate Graduates in Florida, One Year After Graduation metric, why was a different methodology used than what is in FETPIP's standard reports?

UNIV.	Percent of Baccalaureates Included
FAMU	35%
FAU	48%
FGCU	48%

¹ The Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) is a data collection and consumer reporting system within the Florida Department of Education that was established to provide follow-up data on former students and program participants who have graduated, exited or completed a public education or training program within the State of Florida.

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- Median wage, rather than the mean wage used in FETPIP's standard reports was recommended. Mean wages are potentially skewed by outliers. As an example, the State University System's median wage (of \$33,044) for 2010-11 baccalaureates is lower than the mean wage (of \$35,820) used in FETPIP's reports.
- Each graduate should be given a full year to find employment or re-enroll, which is in contrast to FETPIP's methodology of only looking at the October-December fiscal quarter for employment data. By allowing for a full year, students who are sitting for licensure exams such as the CPA exam will have time to take their post-graduation exams and look for work.

FIU	43%
FSU	36%
NCF	17%
UCF	48%
UF	28%
UNF	54%
USF	47%
UWF	40%
SUS	42%

24. Why are only 42% of baccalaureates included in the Median Average Wage?

- Unemployment insurance wage data does not include individuals who are self-employed, employed out of state, employed by the military or federal government, or those without a valid social security number, or making less than minimum wage. This also does not include students who are continuing their education.

25. Why was the Cost per Degree Work Group report not utilized for the Cost per Undergraduate Degree metric?

- The Cost per Degree report completed by the Chancellor's Work Group in June of 2013 calculated the cost per degree to the student, state and institution based on state appropriations and tuition. While this report was considered, it was determined that actual expenditures from the SUS Expenditure Analysis, instead of appropriations, should be used.
- The cost per degree to the institution calculated in the Cost per Degree report and those calculated from the Expenditure Analysis for 2011-12 are very similar and the difference between the two for the SUS is only \$334.

Determining performance funding allocations

26. Are there guidelines on how the universities will spend their allocations?

- No restrictions or guidance has been provided on the expenditure of performance funds. Universities have discretion, but are encouraged to spend the funds on initiatives that enhance the student's experience and improve performance on the model's metrics.

27. Please give a detailed explanation for how "new funding" is allocated.

- Universities are scored on Excellence and Improvement on each of the ten metrics. The higher score for each metric is summed for a final score. The maximum score was 50 points prior to 2016-17. Starting in 2016-17 each metric is worth 10 points with a maximum score of 100 points.
- Prior to 2016-17, universities were required to earn at least 26 points to receive new funding. Starting in 2016-17, the requirement is now 51 points in order to be eligible for new funding.

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- Eligible universities receive new funding proportional to their existing recurring base funds compared to the total system recurring base funds, excluding IFAS and medical schools.
 - The three highest scoring universities are eligible for distribution of any new funds remaining based on final point total.
- 28. Please explain the impact on a university that scores below the point threshold in terms of the “base” funding at risk.**
- Prior to 2016-17, if a university scores below 26 points and loses a portion of its base budget, the reduction is only for one year. The following year the base budget would be restored (answer provided by Florida Board of Governors Chair, Mori Hosseni, and Vice Chair, Tom Kuntz).
 - Starting in 2016-17, the point threshold is now 51 points but the process remains the same.
- 29. Please explain the sources of funding that make up the “base” funding at risk and if only recurring funding included**
- The base funding at risk includes both Lottery and General Revenue E&G funds. Only recurring funding is included.
- 30. How is the prorated share of base funding at risk for each institution calculated?**
- The calculation uses the startup base for each institution for the year in question. For example, as the legislature prepared the 2016-17 budget, it calculated the beginning base for each institution before adding additional budget issues for 2016-17.
- 31. Are there any other funding sources included in the base such as E&G tuition and fees, Preeminence Program funding, for example?**
- The legislature determines the base for PBF purposes. They made two adjustments to the base; 1) they deducted preeminence funding for UF and FSU, and 2) they deducted the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) from University of West Florida.
- 32. Is the state base for Florida Polytechnic University (General Revenue and Phosphate Trust Fund) included in the base funding calculations?**
- No, funding for Florida Polytechnic University is not included.
- 33. Please describe how the base calculated for the institutions is used when distributing the state investment funding.**
- The base, as determined by the legislature (with the adjustments for preeminence funding and funding for the Florida Virtual Campus) is used to calculate the institution's investment and to calculate the state's investment. The first distribution of the state investment is the percentage of the institution's share of the sum of recurring base dollars multiplied by the amount of state investment.
- 34. Please explain how the Top Three institutions receive extra funds during the distribution of the state investment.**
- The Top Three institutions receive the bonus funding based on points earned compared to the total of points for those three institutions.
 - For example; the school that finished first received 84 points, 2nd was 80 points and 3rd was 78 points. The total is 242. Thus the school that finished first will receive 34.7%

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

(84/242) of the 'bonus' money, the school in second 33.1% (80/242) and the school in 3rd will receive 32.2% (78/242).

Improvement plans

35. Briefly explain how the Improvement Plan process works for institutions scoring below the threshold of 51 points.

- An eligible institution may submit an improvement plan to the Board of Governors for consideration at the June Board Meeting. The Chancellor will withhold the institutional investment funds starting July 1. If the improvement plan has been approved, there are two progress checkpoints in December and May. At each progress checkpoint, the Board of Governors can release up to 50% of the withheld funds.
- If an institution fails to make progress and the full amount of withheld funds are not restored, any remaining funds will be distributed to the institutions earning the most improvement points on the performance based funding metrics.
- Starting July 1, 2016 each of the institutions has the opportunity to use the Improvement Plan process one time in order to have institutional investment funds restored. Institutions that used the process during the 2014-15 Fiscal Year also have one opportunity.

36. If an institution scores below 51 points and has already been through the Improvement Plan process after July 1, 2016, what happens to that institution's institutional investment funds?

- The funds are redistributed based on points earned to the other universities that scored 51 points or more.
- The forfeited institutional investment funding would only be lost to the non-achieving institution for that fiscal year only. Funds will be restored to that institution's base budget at the beginning of the next fiscal year.