Performance Funding Comparison: Pennsylvania and Florida

	Pennsylvania	Florida
Funding Allocated	The Pennsylvania Performance Funding Model allocates 2.4% of the System's total Education & General (E&G) funding.	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	All institutions are eligible for a share of the Performance Funding pool. Institutions are scored on indicators if they meet performance requirements. Results are weighted by institutional base and then divided into the total dollars available.	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	The Pennsylvania Performance Funding program is designed around the following principles: a. The program will be clear, understandable, and replicable b. The primary result is on results or outputs not inputs or throughputs c. There will be transparency and visibility of all data d. University efforts to distinguish themselves on programs, students, locations, and delivery methods will be possible e. The design will reduce inter-institutional competition and support collaboration f. The program will align with System and university strategic directions and System policies, e.g., allocation formula g. The program will align with national accountability efforts, including Middle States accreditation, Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) requirements, and the EdTrust/NASH Access to Success Initiative.	The Florida model has four guiding principles: 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	Mandatory Metrics:	Florida's 10-Metric Model:	
	❖ Degrees conferred ❖ Baccalaureate degrees per FTE UG enrollment ❖ Closing achievement gaps for PELL recipients ❖ Closing access gaps for underrepresented minorities ❖ % FT tenure/tenure track faculty who are non-majority ❖ % FT tenure/tenure-track faculty who are women ❖ Private philanthropic support **Institutions choose 3-5 of the following metrics:** ❖ Third- and fourth-year student persistence ❖ Educational value added (as reflected in senior CLA, CAAP, or ETS Proficiency Profile Scores) ❖ STEM degree recipients (including health degrees) ❖ Faculty career advancement ❖ Staff diversity ❖ Student experience with diversity and inclusion (as reflected in the average for the combined scores on applicable NSSE items) ❖ Facilities investment (as measured by the annual Sightlines Return on Physical Assets study) ❖ Administrative expenditures as percent of the cost of education ❖ FTE student/FTE employee (faculty and staff) productivity	**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	There is no weighting among the performance metrics.	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	Institutions have a standard set of metrics but then can select 3-5 from a predetermined list. Up to two metrics can be institution-specific.	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://www2.mansfield.edu/academic-affairs/upload/PBF-Conceptual-Framework-Document-3-30-12-Final-4.pdf

http://www.insidehighered.com/sites/default/server_files/files/Outcomes-Based%20Funding%20Report%20%28Final%29.pdf