

Performance Funding Comparison: Pennsylvania and Florida

	Pennsylvania	Florida
Funding Allocated	The State System's Board of Governors allocated \$39.1 million of the general fund appropriation for performance funding in fiscal year 2016-17.	For 2017-2018, the current appropriation of \$520 M includes \$245 M for state investment and \$275 M for institutional investment. Florida has not provided funding based on enrollments since 2007-2008. Rather, funding is based primarily on performance and the allocation of dollars towards special university 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.	Starting in 2016-2017, institutions must score 51 points and not be in the bottom three to be eligible for new funding. For fiscal years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, universities were required to score 26 points or more and not be in the bottom three to be eligible for new funds.
Guiding Principles	<p>The Pennsylvania Performance Funding program is designed around the following principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program will be clear, understandable, and replicable 2. The primary result is on results (outputs rather than inputs/throughputs) 3. There will be transparency and visibility of all data 4. University efforts to distinguish themselves on programs, students, locations, and delivery methods will be possible 5. The design will reduce inter-institutional competition and support collaboration 6. The program will align with System and university strategic directions and System policies, e.g., allocation formula 7. 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. 	<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.

<p>Metrics</p>	<p>Mandatory Metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Degrees conferred ❖ Closing the achievement gaps for first-time freshmen ❖ Closing the access gaps for first-time freshmen ❖ Faculty diversity ❖ Private support (annual amount of private funds raised by university) <p>Institutions choose 3-5 of the following metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Student persistence ❖ Value-added (senior CLA, CAAP or ETS Proficiency Profile Scores) ❖ STEM and Health Profession degree recipients ❖ Closing the achievement gaps for transfer students ❖ Faculty career advancement ❖ Employee diversity ❖ Student Diversity ❖ Closing the access gaps for transfer students ❖ Facilities investments ❖ Support expenditures as percent of cost of education ❖ Instructional productivity ❖ Employee productivity <p>University-Specific Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Universities had the opportunity to create no more than 2 specific metrics 	<p>Florida's 10-Metric Model:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> 1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed (\$25,000+) and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 year after graduation </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> 2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year After Graduation </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 3. Net Tuition and Fees per 120 Credit Hours </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC) </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0) </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant) </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 8a. Master's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded) </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric) </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> 9. Board of Governors Choice </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="padding: 5px;"> 10. Board of Trustees Choice </td> </tr> </table>	1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed (\$25,000+) and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 year after graduation	2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year After Graduation	3. Net Tuition and Fees per 120 Credit Hours	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	
1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed (\$25,000+) and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 year after graduation	2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year After Graduation													
3. Net Tuition and Fees per 120 Credit Hours	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														
<p>Weighting and Improvement Scores</p>	<p>All points are totaled for each university, then weighted by the university's base appropriations funding determined by the allocation formula, exclusive of the small university adjustment factor.</p>	<p>Presently the Florida 10-Metric Model is not weighted but the Board reserves the option to weight specific metrics such as the Six Year Graduation Rates and the Academic Progress Rate.</p> <p>Improvement points are determined after reviewing data trends for each metric. If the improvement score is higher than the excellence score, the improvement points are counted. This can result in a university scoring lowest in one metric but getting the most points for that metric because of their improvement in the metric.</p>												

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.
------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

https://www.esu.edu/faculty_staff/oiepa/research/documents/pdf/PBF_Conceptual_Framework2013.pdf

<http://www.passhe.edu/inside/anf/accounting/Financial%20Statements/Financial%20Statements,%20June%2030,%202017.pdf>

http://www.passhe.edu/inside/anf/Pages/AF_Home.aspx