



Note: The Texas model in this comparison is the proposed performance based funding model that is pending approval during the Texas 2015 Legislative Session.

Performance Funding Comparison: Texas and Florida¹

	Texas	Florida
Funding Allocated	The proposed Texas outcomes-based funding methodology recommends creating a \$235 million outcomes-based funding pool. The pool should be outside of and in addition to the enrollment-based formula funding and only should be used if the base formulas are fully funded.	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	The proposed model will be phased-in over three biennia and no institution's percentage of outcomes funding will vary more than 0.5% from the percentage of undergraduate formula funding for the first biennium and no more than 1% for the second biennium. Beyond that there will be no such restrictions.	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) Outcomes funded above the base b) Phase-in of model over three biennia c) Biennial review of model to monitor equity and effectiveness and address unanticipated impacts 	<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

Note: The Texas model in this comparison is the proposed performance based funding model that is pending approval during the Texas 2015 Legislative Session.

<p>Metrics</p>	<p>Outcome metrics will measure the universities on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Total Undergraduate Degrees ❖ Undergraduate degrees adjusted by graduation rate ❖ Undergraduate degrees per 100 undergraduate FTSE ❖ Undergraduate degrees to at-risk students ❖ Retention (30, 60, and 90 SCH). 	<p>The Florida 10-Metric Model:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="917 277 1421 1491"> <tr> <td data-bbox="917 277 1166 506"> <p>1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1170 277 1421 506"> <p>2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="917 512 1166 667"> <p>3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1170 512 1421 667"> <p>4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="917 674 1166 882"> <p>5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1170 674 1421 882"> <p>6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="917 888 1166 1176"> <p>7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1170 888 1421 1176"> <p>8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="917 1182 1166 1390"> <p>8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1170 1182 1421 1390"> <p>9. Board of Governors Choice</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="917 1396 1421 1491"> <p>10. Board of Trustees Choice</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</p>	<p>2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates</p>	<p>3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree</p>	<p>4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)</p>	<p>5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)</p>	<p>6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</p>	<p>7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)</p>	<p>8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)</p>	<p>8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)</p>	<p>9. Board of Governors Choice</p>	<p>10. Board of Trustees Choice</p>	
<p>1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</p>	<p>2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates</p>													
<p>3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree</p>	<p>4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)</p>													
<p>5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)</p>	<p>6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</p>													
<p>7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)</p>	<p>8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded)</p>													
<p>8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)</p>	<p>9. Board of Governors Choice</p>													
<p>10. Board of Trustees Choice</p>														
<p>Weighting</p>	<p>Outcomes metrics are all scaled and then weighted.</p>	<p>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.</p>												
<p>Institutional Control</p>	<p>Texas institutions propose a percentage weight to each metric. Institutions can only assign 0% to 1 metric of their choice. Weights remain in place for three biennia.</p>	<p>Like Texas, Florida institutions also do not have control over appropriation levels and institutions can control performance on outcomes within reason. However, the Florida 10-Metric</p>												

Note: The Texas model in this comparison is the proposed performance based funding model that is pending approval during the Texas 2015 Legislative Session.

		Model does give institutions some control given that there is a metric chosen by institutional boards as part of the model.
--	--	---

ⁱ <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectId=272440BF-9DB4-B039-92D6639563ED3B52&flushcache=1&showDraft=1>