

Comparison of Illinois Performance Funding to Florida

	Illinois	Florida
Funding Allocated	The FY 17 allocation approved by Illinois Board of Higher Education for Performance Funding was \$6.5 million.	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 performance based funding.	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Metrics developed in consultation with public institutions of higher education, state educational agencies, other higher education organizations, associations, interests, and stakeholders. 2. Measures clearly support state foal attainment 3. Measures must be acceptable to educators as well as to the Governor, legislators, and others, balancing institutional autonomy with state-level review and control. 4. Measures and funding formulas will be simple and restricted to the most essential elements 5. Measures selected and funding formulas designed to the extent possible to make it difficult for institutions to “game” the system. 6. Measures will use historical data that is currently available of readily available 7. Measures tailored to recognize and account for the different missions of institutions 8. Measures focus on both quality and quantity indicators. 9. 	<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>Illinois 4-Year Institution Metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Bachelor degrees awarded ❖ Master’s degrees awarded ❖ Doctoral and Professional degrees awarded ❖ Undergraduate degrees per 100 FTE ❖ Research and public services expenditures ❖ Graduation rates 150% of time ❖ Persistence (24 credit hours completed in 1 year) ❖ Cost per credit hour ❖ Cost per Completion <p>Note: 3-year averages used for all metrics</p>	<p>The Florida 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>There are weights in the Illinois model to address mission differentiation and reward excellence with sub-categories: Pell eligible, adult age 25 and older, African America, Hispanic, and STEM & Healthcare</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	Illinois institutions have no control over appropriation levels or choosing metrics for the performance funding model.	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://legacy.ibhe.org/PerformanceFunding/default.htm>

<http://legacy.ibhe.org/PerformanceFunding/PDF/Overview.pdf>

<http://legacy.ibhe.org/PerformanceFunding/Materials/PBFIAIRPresentation.pdf>