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Building a Better System

2010 - Regulations updated to align with the Governance Agreement
• Provided greater flexibilities to universities over certain fees
• Further clarified roles and responsibilities of Board of Governors and Boards of Trustees

2011 - Regulations updated to align with new legislative authority
• Provided greater flexibilities to universities over market-rate and block tuition options

2012 - Regulations updated to enhance accountability and system collaboration
• Provided greater clarity regarding the opening and closing of campuses
• Created “rules of the road” when universities propose programs in other geographic areas
• Established processes for new degree program vetting to reduce unnecessary duplication and ensure the System is meeting the State’s needs
Three-Part Accountability Framework

**ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT:** Tracks performance on key metrics (past five years)

**SYSTEM-WIDE STRATEGIC PLAN:** Provides a long-range roadmap for the System

**UNIVERSITY WORK PLAN:** Provides a short-term plan of action (next three years)

Accountability Metrics Gathered from Multiple Sources

- Governor • Legislature • Universities • National Accountability Models
- Board of Governors 2025 Strategic Plan
- University Work Plans
- Tuition Differential Decision Matrix
- Performance Funding
Tuition Differential Metrics

Metrics used to evaluate both Excellence and Improvement will guide the Board’s decision on potential tuition differential increases:

STANDARD METRICS:
• Retention Rates
• Graduation Rates
• Post-Graduation Success (Employment, Average Salary, Continued Education)
• Excess Hours
• Bachelor’s Degrees in Areas of Strategic Emphasis
• Access Rate (Financial Aid)

MISSION-DRIVEN METRICS:
• 1 Institution-Specific Metric (Board Choice)
• 1 Institution-Specific Metric (University Choice)
• Performance on All Other Metrics
• Budget & Finance Committee Discretion

As of November 8, 2012

Performance Funding

Metrics used to evaluate both Excellence and Improvement are tied to the goals outlined in each university work plan:

STANDARD METRICS:
• Retention Rates
• Graduation Rates
• Post-Graduation Success (Employment, Average Salary, Continued Education)
• Excess Hours
• Bachelor’s Degrees in Areas of Strategic Emphasis
• Master’s Degrees in Areas of Strategic Emphasis
• Access Rate (Financial Aid)

MISSION-DRIVEN METRICS:
• 2 Institution-Specific Metric (Board Choice)
• 2 Institution-Specific Metric (University Choice)
• Research Expenditures
• Doctoral Degrees in STEM
• Budget & Finance Committee Discretion (e.g. Affordability, ROI)

As of November 8, 2012
## Draft Performance Funding Model (revised January 11, 2013)

### Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>EXCELLENCE (Achieving System Goals)</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT (Recognizing Annual Improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>IMPROVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further</td>
<td>90% 80% 70%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cost per Undergraduate Degree (calculation TBD)</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average Wages of Employed Undergraduates (source of information TBD)</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Six Year Graduation Rate Full-time and Part-time PTIC</td>
<td>70% 65% 60%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0</td>
<td>90% 85% 80%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</td>
<td>50% 40% 30%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University Access Rate Percent of UG with Pell &amp; Percent of Pell Students Whose Gift Aid Exceeds Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>75% 70% 65%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Master’s Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)</td>
<td>50% 40% 30%</td>
<td>3% 2% 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institution-Specific Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>IMPROVING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Board of Governors choice</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. UBOTs choice</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td>TBD TBD TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Steps

- Predictable fund source (New funds or % of base)
- Weights (Should some metrics be a higher priority)
- Metric sources and calculations
- Rubric (What level of success determines Excellence or Improvement. Should Improvement be based on 1 year change or an average of 3 years.)
- Implementation period
- Board discretionary option