May, 2014 -
- Universities will develop an improvement plan based on the March performance funding presentation and outline specific initiatives that will be undertaken during the 2014-2015 fiscal year. Although the goal is to show improvement on the ten performance funding metrics, the gains realized on these metrics will not be available for at least a year, therefore the specific initiatives in the improvement plan must be measurable and verifiable. For example, the initiatives may include hiring of advisors, faculty, purchase of student academic tracking software, percentage of undergraduate students receiving advisement services, development of internships, etc.

June -
- June 9 (Monday) - Universities will submit an improvement plan approved by their respective boards of trustees to the Chancellor.
- June 17-19 - Universities will present the improvement plan as a part of the work plan presentation to the Board. Up to two additional slides may be added to the work plan PowerPoint to explain the improvement plan. In most cases, focus areas addressed in the Work Plan are most likely the same issues that the institution is addressing in its Improvement Plan.
- The Board will consider approval of the Work Plan, along with separate approval of the specific components identified in the improvement plan.

July to December –
- Universities will implement the improvement plan.

December 31 –
- Universities will submit a monitoring report to the Chancellor that documents the progress made on the initiatives identified specifically in the improvement plan.

January 22, 2015 –
- The Board will review the monitoring report and determine if satisfactory progress has been made. If so, no more than 50% of the funds being held will be released to the university.

January to May –
- Universities will continue to implement the improvement plan.

June -
- June 1 (Monday) – Universities will submit the final monitoring report to the Chancellor that documents the progress made on the specific initiatives.
- June 16-18 – the Board will review the final monitoring report and determine if the improvement plan was successfully implemented. If so, then the remaining funds being held by the Board will be released to the university. However, if the improvement plan was not 100 percent successfully implemented, then all or a
portion of the remaining unreleased funds will be distributed to the universities that demonstrate the most improvement on the performance funding metrics for the 2013-2014 year.

**Legislative Proviso:**

From the $200,000,000, which includes $100,000,000 new funding and $100,000,000 redistributed from the base, for State University Performance Based Incentives in Specific Appropriation 143 from the General Revenue Fund, the Board of Governors shall allocate all of such appropriated funds pursuant to the performance funding model approved by the board on January 16, 2014, subject to the following modification:

1. All universities eligible for new funding shall have their base funding, including the performance funds allocated by the Board during 2013-2014, to be restored as provided in the Board of Governors’ model; and

2. All universities that failed to meet the board’s benchmarks for new funding shall submit a plan to the Board of Governors that specifies how their base funding, including the performance funds allocated by the Board during 2013-2014, will be expended to improve upon the metrics that disqualified the universities from receiving new funding.

The Board of Governors shall review the plans, and if approved, shall monitor the universities’ progress on implementing the measures specified in the plans. The universities shall submit monitoring reports to the board no later than December 31, 2014 and May 31, 2015.

A university that is determined by the Board of Governors to be making satisfactory progress on implementing the plan shall receive a pro rata share of its base funding held by the board under the board’s performance funding model. The Chancellor of the State University System shall withhold disbursement of the funds until such time as the monitoring report for each university is approved by the Board of Governors.

Universities that fail to make satisfactory progress shall not have their full base funding restored, and any funds remaining shall be distributed to the three universities that demonstrate the most improvement on the metrics based upon those universities’ proportional share of the new funding allocated under the board’s performance funding model.