

# Board of Governors

## Performance Funding Model Overview – February, 2014

---

The Performance Funding Model includes 10 metrics that evaluate the institutions on a range of issues. Two of the 10 metrics are Choice metrics; one picked by the Board and one by the university boards of trustees. These metrics were chosen after reviewing over 40 metrics identified in the University Work Plans.

The model has four guiding principles: 1) use metrics that align with SUS Strategic Plan goals, 2) reward Excellence or Improvement, 3) have a few clear, simple metrics, and 4) acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

### Key components of the model:

- Institutions will be evaluated on either Excellence or Improvement for each metric.
- Data is based on one-year data.
- The benchmarks for Excellence were based on the Board of Governors 2025 System Strategic Plan goals and analysis of relevant data trends, whereas the benchmarks for Improvement were determined after reviewing data trends for each metric.
- The Board is requesting \$50 million in the 2014-2015 legislative budget request which will be the pilot year of implementation. In addition, a proportional amount to total \$50 million would come from each university's recurring state base appropriation.

### Metrics Common to all Institutions:

Seven metrics apply to all eleven institutions. The eighth metric, graduate degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis (8a), applies to all institutions except New College. The alternative metric for New College (8b) is "freshman in the top 10% of graduating high school class."

Metrics Common to all Institutions	
1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)
2. Average Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates	7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)
3. Cost per Undergraduate Degree	8a. Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (NCF Excluded) 8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (NCF Alternative Metric)
4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)	9. Board of Governors Choice
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	10. Board of Trustees Choice

**Board Choice Metric** - The Board has approved metrics that focuses on areas of improvement and the distinct missions of each university. UF and FSU have a metric measuring faculty awards to represent the research focus of these institutions. New College has "national ranking for institutional and program achievement." The remaining eight institutions all have the "percentage of students graduating without excess hours".

**Board of Trustees Choice Metric** - Each Board of Trustees has chosen a metric from the remaining metrics in the University Work Plans that are applicable to the mission of that university and have not been previously chosen for the model.

# Board of Governors

## Performance Funding Model Overview – February, 2014

---

### How will the funding component of the model work?

To ensure each university is striving to excel and improve on key metrics, there must be a financial incentive. That financial incentive will not only be new state funding, but an equal reallocation of a portion of the base state funding.

### New Funding versus Base Funding:

The amount of new state funding appropriated by the Legislature for performance funding will be matched by an equal amount reallocated from the university system base budget. These “base” funds are the cumulative recurring state appropriations the Legislature has appropriated to each institution. For example, if \$50 M is appropriated, the same amount of recurring base state funds would be reallocated, for a total performance funding allocation of \$100 M. The \$100 M would be allocated as follows:

#### New Funding of \$50 M

1. Each university metric is evaluated based on Excellence or Improvement and has five benchmarks ranging from low to high. The lowest benchmark receives one point, while the highest receives five points. The highest points for Excellence or Improvement are counted in the university’s total score.
2. New funding will be allocated based on points earned, with a maximum of 50 points possible.
3. A university must earn more than 25 points in order to be eligible to receive new funds.
4. A university scoring 25 points or less, or the three lowest scoring universities, would not receive any new funds.
5. A university earning more than 25 points would receive new funds proportional to their existing base funds with the highest scoring universities eligible for additional new funds.

#### Example Distribution of New Funds

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Points	2013-14 Base Funding	Univ. Base % of Total	Allocation of New Funds	Additional Allocation to Top 3	Total New Funds	Total Univ. % of New Funds
Univ A	25	\$75,000,000	7.89%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Univ B	23	\$100,000,000	10.53%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Univ C	38	\$125,000,000	13.16%	\$6,578,947	\$5,809,524	\$12,388,471	24.78%
Univ D	24	\$130,000,000	13.68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Univ E	28	\$60,000,000	6.32%	\$3,157,895	\$0	\$3,157,895	6.32%
Univ F	34	\$180,000,000	18.95%	\$9,473,684	\$5,197,895	\$14,671,679	29.34%
Univ G	33	\$280,000,000	29.47%	\$14,736,842	\$5,045,113	\$19,781,955	39.56%
Total		\$950,000,000	100%	\$33,947,368	\$16,052,632	\$50,000,000	100%

#### Base Funding of \$50 M

1. A prorated amount would be deducted from each university’s base recurring state appropriation and redistributed based on points earned under the 10 metrics.
2. In the first year, a floor would be established so that no university receives more than a 1 percent reduction.
3. A university earning more than 25 points will have their base funding restored and be eligible to receive additional funding proportional to their existing base funds with the highest scoring universities eligible for more.
4. A university scoring 25 points or less would incur a 1 percent reduction.

# Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

## Questions and Answers

---

### **1. Did the Board establish guiding principles in the development of the model?**

- Early in the process the Board established 4 guiding principles that were the basis for the development of the model:
  - i. Use metrics that align with Strategic Plan goals;
  - ii. Reward Excellence and Improvement;
  - iii. Have a few clear, simple metrics; and
  - iv. Acknowledge the unique mission of the different institutions.

### **2. Universities have numerous metrics that are tracked and reported on in the annual accountability report. Why were only 10 chosen?**

- One of the Board's guiding principles was to have a 'few clear, simple metrics'. This was a common theme when discussing models with systems around the country.
- With approximately 40 metrics included in the annual accountability report, 10 metrics were identified as follows:
  - i. 3 metrics were identified in the 2013 General Appropriations Act.
  - ii. 5 metrics were identified by the Board based on key Strategic Plan initiatives.
  - iii. 2 metrics were 'choice' metrics that were picked by the Board and local boards of trustees. These 2 metrics focused on areas of improvement or the specific mission of the university.

### **3. What is the maximum number of points available?**

- Each of the 10 metrics are weighted the same and the highest point value for each is 5 points. Thus the total number of points available is 50.

### **4. Will any of the metrics be weighted differently?**

- At this time all 10 of the metrics have equal weight.

### **5. Why reward 'Excellence' or 'Improvement'?**

- Due to numerous reasons (university age, student demographics, regional location, funding, etc.) university metrics vary. It was important to recognize those universities that have 'Excellence' metrics, but it was also important to recognize those universities who are making improvements from one year to another.

### **6. How are the scores calculated for Improvement?**

- Improvement is current year performance minus previous year performance. The result is generally a percentage change and is scored 1 point for 1% up to 5 points for 5%. A couple of boards of trustee choice metric have hard improvement numbers instead of percentage change. In the case of all metrics, except Cost per Undergraduate Degree, to earn points there should be positive improvement from the previous year to the current year.

### **7. To be eligible for new funding a university must score higher than 25 points and not be in the bottom three. How were these minimums determined?**

- To make this model truly a performance funding model, then funds should be awarded to the top performing institutions. Since this is the first year of implementing the model it was determined that a university should be able to score 26 points or more to be eligible and not be in the bottom three. These thresholds can be adjusted in the future to make the model more rigorous.

## Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics) Questions and Answers

---

- 8. If the model focuses on excellence and improvement, why are the bottom three institutions always kept out of the money, even if they obtain the minimum score of 26 or higher?**
- The reference eliminating the bottom 3 institutions only refers to new money—not base funding.
- 9. Why are UF and FSU included in the model if they're pre-eminent institutions?**
- This is a system model that measures system performance. In order to determine the health of the SUS as a whole, our highest achieving universities must be a part of the model. They help set the standards for excellence—standards which we believe are also attainable by other universities. The “improvement” scores help provide incentives while institutions are on their way to excellence. For institutions that have already achieved high standards the model recognizes that in the Excellence scoring for those institutions.
- 10. Will the performance-based funding model drag down the pre-eminent institutions and New College, which is considered a top liberal arts college?**
- See the response to #9 above. This is a system model based upon 4 guiding principles. One of those principles states that the model “Rewards excellence as well as improvement.” For example, UF is rated very highly nationally on its graduation rate and received an excellence rating in this metric. Other institutions, although not as high performing, can demonstrate year-over-year improvement.
- 11. How do we prevent the universities from “dumbing down” graduation rates?**
- The model includes metrics that focuses upon both achievement and access. The “University Access Rate” metric has been deliberately included so that institutions that serve a higher percentage of undergraduates with a Pell grant are acknowledged for their commitment to needy students. The model balances the need for achievement, by including 6-year graduation rates and academic progress rates with the need for access, by including the university access rate metric.
- 12. How do current metrics deal with the military, working students, etc.?**
- Students who leave school to serve in the armed forces, have been called up to active duty, who leave to serve with a foreign aid service of the Federal Government, who leave to serve on an official church mission, or who die or become permanently disabled are not included in the graduation rate metric. Among all 11 public universities in the SUS during 2011-12, only 16 full- or part-time students were called to active duty. Among all four categories of exclusions listed above in the 2005-11 six-year cohort of students, only 131 students fell into these categories—and they were excluded from the graduation rate calculations.
  - In addition, only military students who are FTICs (first time in college) are included in the graduation rate. If they began their college career outside an SUS institution, they are excluded from the graduation rate calculation.
  - Military students and working students are just as able to successfully persist and complete college as other groups of students. Although some military students may need longer to complete due to a variety of factors, many are mature, instrumentally motivated adults who know what they want and have a strong work ethic. It is

## Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics) Questions and Answers

---

misleading to say that because a student is working or is a veteran, she or he is less likely to persist and complete college.

### **13. Current funding per full-time equivalent (FTE) student is well below the national average.**

#### **Why implement a performance model when many universities are funded so low?**

- The amount of funding provided by the state and students through the appropriations process and tuition payments should not be an impediment to utilizing funds in a manner that ensures a university is performing at the highest levels. Students and parents expect the best no matter the funding levels. Waiting to implement performance funding until additional resources are provided would be a disservice to our students and other stakeholders.

### **14. Why weren't regional differences taken into account when calculating the metrics?**

- Board staff considered how regional differences in the state of Florida impact various performance metrics. At the request of the Legislature, the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) at the University of Florida produces an annual Florida Price Level Index (FPLI), which measures the cost differences between Florida's counties. The FPLI serves as the basis for the District Cost Differential (DCD) in the Florida Education Finance Program for K-12. For example, the 2012 FPLI reports a 12% difference between Palm Beach and Leon counties. For some of the metrics regional differences would not be appropriate.

### **15. Were the universities involved in the development of the performance model?**

- The development of the performance funding model began in the fall of 2012. At each Board meeting there has been discussion and updates provided on the status of developing the model. Discussions have been held with universities through phone calls and face-to-face meetings. The final metric, the board of trustee choice metric, involved the universities as their own boards made the recommendation of the metric and benchmarks for Excellence and Improvement.

### **16. Why not use expected graduation rates instead of actual graduation rates?**

- The Board of Governors does not collect data on expected graduation rates. One of the issues with calculating an expected graduation rate is that it is difficult to determine whether differences between estimates and actual data are due to university performance or model error. The performance funding model accounts for student differences at each university by awarding points equally for 'Excellence' and 'Improvement'.
- Actual graduation rates are a standard measure of performance used by IPEDS and other national reporting agencies.

### **17. Why is the data based on one-year and not 2, 3 or 5-year averages?**

- The data used to drive the model is from the annual accountability report which focuses on yearly data. A yearly snap-shot also allows for comparison with other systems and/or states. For some metrics, historical data is not available and in other cases the metric definitions have been revised recently, thus the use of averages would not be appropriate.

# Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

## Questions and Answers

---

**18. Why wasn't the standard deviation used when setting benchmarks?**

- This was considered for each metric but it was decided to set the benchmarks close to the data for Year 1 and therefore ensure that schools were rewarded for reasonable performance above, at, and just below the system average.

**19. How can the universities improve their performance on the metrics?**

- Universities have not been viewed as having much control over several of the post-graduation metrics; however, they do have control over others. Universities will need to be strategic in the investment of performance funds to focus on improving metrics. For example, a university could choose to invest in improving internship opportunities within the disciplines that perform the best on these post-graduation metrics, and other career center efforts. For other metrics, there are many initiatives the universities have and can undertake to improve graduation rates, retention rates, degrees awarded, etc.

**20. Will Florida Polytechnic University (FPU) be included in performance funding?**

- FPU has not enrolled students yet and therefore they need at least two years, possibly more in order to have performance to be evaluated. At that point there will be adequate data available in order to add FPU to the model.

**21. Are there guidelines on how the universities will spend their allocations?**

- This is still undecided but could be included in part of the university work plans.

**22. For Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further metric, why was a different methodology used than what is in FETPIP's standard reports and why were recent graduates used instead of data on graduates three or more years post-graduation? <sup>1</sup>**

- SUS institutions produce graduates with a national scope, yet FETPIP's reports only include data for alumni who are found within Florida – missing about one-quarter of our bachelor's graduates. To get a more complete picture, Board staff have merged FETPIP's Florida data with the National Student Clearinghouse data to include enrollment outside of Florida.
- Board staff is working with FETPIP and the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) to add out-of-state employment information in future years. Florida has recently joined the national Wage and Record Information System (WRIS2) data system that will provide data on whether graduates are employed across state lines.
- In contrast to FETPIP's methodology of only looking at the October-December fiscal quarter for employment data, Board staff recommends that each graduate be given a full year to find employment or re-enroll. A year for each graduate provides a better standard than the October-December fiscal quarter because of the variation among universities regarding

**Percentage of 2010-11 Baccalaureates Found**

UNIV.	FETPIP	BOG
FAMU	73%	90%
FAU	76%	90%
FGCU	77%	91%
FIU	75%	87%
FSU	66%	88%
NCF	40%	72%
UCF	76%	94%
UF	63%	89%
UNF	80%	92%
USF	78%	91%
UWF	73%	86%
<b>SUS</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>90%</b>

<sup>1</sup> The Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) is a data collection and consumer reporting system within the Florida Department of Education that was established to provide follow-up data on former students and program participants who have graduated, exited or completed a public education or training program within the State of Florida.

# Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

## Questions and Answers

when degrees are awarded (year-round or only in May). In addition, by allowing for a full year, students who are sitting for licensure exams (i.e., CPA exam) will have time to take their post-graduation exams and look for work.

- The decision was made to use data from one year out so students (and their parents) will know what their prospects are immediately after graduation. Board staff plans to study longer-term (three to five years) employment data and publish the information in the future.

**23. For Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further metric, what is the impact for institutions that have graduates living and working overseas?**

- Graduates who live and work abroad are not currently included in the data except for a few from New College. The small number of NCF graduates makes it necessary to account for every single graduate or their percentages are disproportionately affected.

**24. For Median Average Wage of Full-time Employed Baccalaureate Graduates in Florida, One Year After Graduation metric, why was a different methodology used than what is in FETPIP's standard reports?**

- Median wage, rather than the mean wage used in FETPIP's standard reports was recommended. Mean wages are potentially skewed by outliers. As an example, the State University System's median wage (of \$33,044) for 2010-11 baccalaureates is lower than the mean wage (of \$35,820) used in FETPIP's reports.
- Each graduate should be given a full year to find employment or re-enroll, which is in contrast to FETPIP's methodology of only looking at the October-December fiscal quarter for employment data. By allowing for a full year, students who are sitting for licensure exams such as the CPA exam will have time to take their post-graduation exams and look for work.

UNIV.	Percent of Baccalaureates Included
FAMU	35%
FAU	48%
FGCU	48%
FIU	43%
FSU	36%
NCF	17%
UCF	48%
UF	28%
UNF	54%
USF	47%
UWF	40%
SUS	42%

**25. Why are only 42% of baccalaureates included in the Median Average Wage?**

- Unemployment insurance wage data does not include individuals who are self-employed, employed out of state, employed by the military or federal government, or those without a valid social security number, or making less than minimum wage. This also does not include students who are continuing their education.

**26. Why was the Cost per Degree Work Group report not utilized for the Cost per Undergraduate Degree metric?**

- The Cost per Degree report completed by the Chancellor's Work Group in June of 2013 calculated the cost per degree to the student, state and institution based on state appropriations and tuition. While this report was considered, it was determined that actual expenditures from the SUS Expenditure Analysis, instead of appropriations, should be used.
- The cost per degree to the institution calculated in the Cost per Degree report and those calculated from the Expenditure Analysis are very similar and the difference between the two for the SUS is only \$334.

## Summary of Performance Funding Allocations

Combined allocation (new funding and base funding)

	Points	\$50 M Allocation of New Funds		Net Increase or Decrease in Base Funds		Total New Funds and Change in Base Funds
FAMU	27	\$2,770,840		\$124,303	0.13%	\$2,895,143
FAU	24			(\$1,394,740)	-1.00%	(\$1,394,740)
FGCU	28	\$1,648,922		\$73,972	0.13%	\$1,722,895
FIU	34	\$6,956,234		\$312,064	0.16%	\$7,268,298
FSU	33	\$8,213,467		\$368,465	0.13%	\$8,581,932
FPU	Will be included once data becomes available					
NCF	25			(\$172,720)	-1.00%	(\$172,720)
UCF	34	\$8,378,896		\$375,887	0.16%	\$8,754,782
UF	42	\$11,226,558		\$503,636	0.15%	\$11,730,194
UNF	28	\$2,255,245		\$101,173	0.13%	\$2,356,418
USF	37	\$8,549,837		\$383,555	0.16%	\$8,933,392
UWF	21			(\$675,595)	-1.00%	(\$675,595)
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$50,000,000</b>		<b>\$0</b>		<b>\$50,000,000</b>

\*Institutions earning 25 points or less out of 50 points possible do not receive any new funds and lose one percent of their base funds.

Summary of Performance Based Funding Allocations							
Detail on allocation of \$50 million in new funding							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
	Points	2013-14 Base Funding	Univ. Base % of Total	Allocation of New Funds	Additional Allocation to Top 4	Total New Funds	Total Univ. % of New Funds
FAMU	27	\$96,369,270	5.54%	\$2,770,840	\$0	\$2,770,840	5.54%
FAU	24	\$139,474,033	8.02%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FGCU	28	\$57,349,182	3.30%	\$1,648,922	\$0	\$1,648,922	3.30%
FIU	34	\$190,056,208	10.93%	\$5,464,558	\$1,491,676	\$6,956,234	13.91%
FSU	33	\$285,662,720	16.43%	\$8,213,467	\$0	\$8,213,467	16.43%
FPU	Will be included once data becomes available						
NCF	25	\$17,272,015	0.99%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
UCF	34	\$239,536,110	13.77%	\$6,887,220	\$1,491,676	\$8,378,896	16.76%
UF	42	\$326,370,128	18.77%	\$9,383,900	\$1,842,659	\$11,226,558	22.45%
UNF	28	\$78,436,970	4.51%	\$2,255,245	\$0	\$2,255,245	4.51%
USF	37	\$240,903,753	13.85%	\$6,926,543	\$1,623,295	\$8,549,837	17.10%
UWF	21	\$67,559,501	3.88%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,738,989,890</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$43,550,694</b>	<b>\$6,449,306</b>	<b>\$50,000,000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Summary of Performance Based Funding Allocations						
Detail on allocation of \$50 million in base funding						
	A	B	C	D		E
	Base Funds to be Allocated	Points	Allocation of Base Funds	Allocation of Remaining Funds		Total Allocation
FAMU	(\$2,770,840)	27	\$2,770,840	\$124,303	5.54%	\$2,895,143
FAU	(\$4,010,203)	24	\$2,615,462	\$0	0.00%	\$2,615,462
FGCU	(\$1,648,922)	28	\$1,648,922	\$73,972	3.30%	\$1,722,895
FIU	(\$5,464,558)	34	\$5,464,558	\$312,064	13.91%	\$5,776,622
FSU	(\$8,213,467)	33	\$8,213,467	\$368,465	16.43%	\$8,581,932
FPU	Will be included once data becomes available					
NCF	(\$496,611)	25	\$323,890	\$0	0.00%	\$323,890
UCF	(\$6,887,220)	34	\$6,887,220	\$375,887	16.76%	\$7,263,106
UF	(\$9,383,900)	42	\$9,383,900	\$503,636	22.45%	\$9,887,535
UNF	(\$2,255,245)	28	\$2,255,245	\$101,173	4.51%	\$2,356,418
USF	(\$6,926,543)	37	\$6,926,543	\$383,555	17.10%	\$7,310,098
UWF	(\$1,942,493)	21	\$1,266,898	\$0	0.00%	\$1,266,898
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$50,000,000)</b>		<b>\$47,756,945</b>	<b>\$2,243,055</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$50,000,000</b>

**Performance Funding Model  
2012-13 Final Metric Score Sheet**

Scores in black are based on Excellence.

Scores in orange are based on Improvement.

Metric	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
1	2	4	4	3	2	0	3	2	3	3	2
2	5	3	3	4	3	1	3	5	4	4	3
3	0	2	2	2	2	0	4	3	1	3	0
4	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	5	1	5	0
5	5	0	1	3	5	1	3	5	0	3	0
6	3	3	2	3	2	5	3	4	1	4	2
7	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
8.a	2	1	5	3	1		4	5	5	5	2
8.b						2					
9.a	0	1	1	3			1		3	0	2
9.b					3			3			
9.c						4					
10.a	5										
10.b		5	5	5							
10.c					5						
10.d						5					
10.e							5				
10.f								5			
10.g									5		
10.h										5	
10.i											5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21</b>

- Metric 1 - Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 Yr after Graduation
- Metric 2 - Median Average Wages of Undergraduates Employed in Florida 1 Yr after Graduation
- Metric 3 - Average Cost per Undergraduate Degree to the Institution
- Metric 4 - Six Year Graduation Rates (Full-time and Part-time FTIC)
- Metric 5 - Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0)
- Metric 6 - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)
- Metric 7 - University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)
- Metric 8a - Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)
- Metric 8b - Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class
- Metric 9 - Board of Governors' Choice (see detailed sheets)
- Metric 10 - Board of Trustees' Choice (see detailed sheets)

## Metrics 1 - 5

			FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
1	Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 Yr after Graduation	Excellence	60%	70%	70%	67%	61%	44%	69%	63%	69%	69%	60%
		Improvement	-3%	0%	0%	-1%	-3%	-5%	0%	0%	-2%	-1%	0%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>		5 (75%), 4 (70%), 3 (65%), 2 (60%), 1 (55%)											
		Excellence Score	2	4	4	3	2	0	3	2	3	3	2
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>		5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
		Improvement Score	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Higher Score	2	4	4	3	2	0	3	2	3	3	2
2	Median Average full-time Wages of Undergraduates Employed in Florida 1 Yr after Graduation	Excellence	\$ 30,000	\$ 34,900	\$ 32,900	\$ 35,100	\$ 30,300	\$ 21,200	\$ 33,700	\$ 33,100	\$ 34,200	\$ 34,600	\$ 31,000
		Improvement	5%	1%	0%	-1%	0%	-1%	1%	6%	4%	4%	0%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>		5 (\$40K), 4 (\$35K), 3 (\$30K), 2 (\$25K), 1 (\$20K)											
		Excellence Score	3	3	3	4	3	1	3	3	3	3	3
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>		5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
		Improvement Score	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	0
		Higher Score	5	3	3	4	3	1	3	5	4	4	3
3	Average Cost per Undergraduate Degree to the Institution	Excellence	\$ 37,950	\$ 32,430	\$ 29,240	\$ 26,730	\$ 25,500	\$ 74,640	\$ 21,060	\$ 24,940	\$ 29,350	\$ 24,340	\$ 31,080
		Improvement	2%	-2%	-2%	0%	2%	0%	4%	0%	3%	4%	1%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>		5 (\$20K), 4 (\$22.5K), 3 (\$25K), 2 (\$27.5K), 1 (\$30K)											
		Excellence Score	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	3	1	3	0
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>		5 (-5%), 4 (-4%), 3 (-3%), 2 (-2%), 1 (-1%)											
		Improvement Score	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Higher Score	0	2	2	2	2	0	4	3	1	3	0
4	Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-Time and Part-Time FTIC)	Excellence	39%	40%	43%	50%	76%	66%	66%	86%	48%	61%	44%
		Improvement	0%	0%	-1%	3%	1%	-3%	1%	1%	1%	7%	-2%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>		5 (70%), 4 (67.5%), 3 (65%), 2 (62.5%), 1 (60%)											
		Excellence Score	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	5	0	1	0
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>		5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
		Improvement Score	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	5	0
		Higher Score	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	5	1	5	0
5	Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	Excellence	72%	70%	72%	78%	90%	81%	86%	96%	76%	87%	63%
		Improvement	7%	-3%	1%	3%	0%	-2%	0%	1%	-2%	2%	0%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>		5 (90%), 4 (87.5%), 3 (85%), 2 (82.5%), 1 (80%)											
		Excellence Score	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	5	0	3	0
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>		5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
		Improvement Score	5	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
		Higher Score	5	0	1	3	5	1	3	5	0	3	0

## Metrics 6 - 8

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF	
6	Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)	Excellence	43%	40%	35%	40%	35%	56%	35%	47%	33%	46%	39%
		Improvement	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	6%	3%	1%	1%	4%	2%
Excellence Benchmark	5 (50%), 4 (45%), 3 (40%), 2 (35%), 1 (30%)												
	Excellence Score		3	3	2	3	2	5	2	4	1	4	2
Improvement Benchmark	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score		3	3	2	1	1	5	3	1	1	4	2
	Higher Score		3	3	2	3	2	5	3	4	1	4	2
7	University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)	Excellence	65%	41%	35%	47%	30%	29%	38%	32%	36%	41%	39%
		Improvement	-3%	0%	1%	-2%	-1%	-1%	2%	0%	1%	0%	2%
Excellence Benchmark	5 (30%), 4 (27.5%), 3 (25%), 2 (22.5%), 1 (20%)												
	Excellence Score		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
Improvement Benchmark	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score		0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2
	Higher Score		5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
8.A	Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM)	Excellence	39%	33%	36%	40%	31%		47%	59%	34%	57%	29%
		Improvement	-4%	-2%	5%	1%	0%		-3%	2%	6%	4%	2%
Excellence Benchmark	5 (50%), 4 (45%), 3 (40%), 2 (35%), 1 (30%)												
	Excellence Score		2	1	2	3	1		4	5	1	5	0
Improvement Benchmark	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score		0	0	5	1	0		0	2	5	4	2
	Higher Score		2	1	5	3	1		4	5	5	5	2
8.B	Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class	Excellence							35%				
		Improvement							-8%				
Excellence Benchmark	5 (50%), 4 (45%), 3 (40%), 2 (35%), 1 (30%)												
	Excellence Score							2					
Improvement Benchmark	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score							0					
	Higher Score							2					

**Blank Cells:** Metric is not applicable to the institution

## Board of Governors Choice Metric 9

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF	
9.A	<b>Percent of Bachelor Degrees Without Excess Hours</b>	<b>Excellence</b>	31%	63%	62%	70%		60%		71%	56%	65%	
		<b>Improvement</b>	-	-	-	-		-		-	-	-	
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 (80%), 4 (75%), 3 (70%), 2 (65%), 1 (60%)												
	Excellence Score		0	1	1	3		1		3	0	2	
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
9.B	<b>Faculty Awards</b>	<b>Excellence</b>					11		18				
		<b>Improvement</b>					2		-4				
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	UF: 5 (31), 4 (23), 3 (18), 2 (12), 1 (5) FSU: 5 (25), 4 (15), 3 (11), 2 (7), 1 (4)												
	Excellence Score					3			3				
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (3%), 4 (2.5%), 3 (2%), 2 (1.5%), 1 (1%)												
	Improvement Score					2			0				
9.C	<b>National Ranking for Institutional &amp; Program Achievements</b>	<b>Excellence</b>					4						
		<b>Improvement</b>											
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 (5), 4 (4), 3 (3), 2 (2), 1 (1)												
	Excellence Score						4						
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5), 4 (4), 3 (3), 2 (2), 1 (1)												
	Improvement Score						0						
	Higher Score		0	1	1	3	3	4	1	3	3	0	2

( - ) Unavailable data because improvements were made to the data collection and reporting process beginning with the 2012-13 data, so prior year data is not comparable this year

**Blank Cells:** Metric is not applicable to the institution

**Board of Trustees Choice Metric 10**

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
10.A	<b>Percent of R&amp;D Expenditures Funded from External Sources</b>	Excellence	86%									
		Improvement	-2%									
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (80%), 4 pts (77.5%), 3 pts (75%), 2 pts (72.5), 1 pt (70%)											
	Excellence Score		5									
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
	Improvement Score		0									
	Higher Score		5									
10.B	<b>Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities</b>	Excellence		42%	23%	5,851						
		Improvement		0%	5%	448						
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	<b>FAU:</b> 5 pts (40%), 4 pts (35%), 3 pts (30%), 2 pts (25%), 1 pt (20%). <b>FGCU:</b> 5 pts (20%), 4 pts (17.5%), 3 pts (15%), 2 pts (12.5%), 1 pt (10%). <b>FIU:</b> 5 pts (6,100), 4 pts (6,050), 3 pts (6,000), 2 pts (5,950), 1 pt (5,900)											
	Excellence Score			5	5	5						
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	<b>FAU, FGCU:</b> 5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%); <b>FIU:</b> 5 (200), 4 (175), 3 (150), 2 (125), 1 (100)											
	Improvement Score			0	5	1						
	Higher Score			5	5	5						
10.C	<b>National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on U.S. and World News Report</b>	Excellence					115					
		Improvement					-					
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (75), 4 pts (60), 3 pts (45), 2 pts (30), 1 pt (15)											
	Excellence Score						5					
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
	Improvement Score						-					
	Higher Score						5					
10.D	<b>Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course</b>	Excellence						100%				
		Improvement										
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (100%), 4 pts (99%), 3 pts (98%), 2 pts (97%), 1 pt (96%)											
	Excellence Score							5				
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
	Improvement Score							-				
	Higher Score							5				
10.E	<b>Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded Annually</b>	Excellence							12,321			
		Improvement							7%			
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (12,300), 4 pts (12,250), 3 pts (12,200), 2 pts (12,150), 1 pt (12,100)											
	Excellence Score								5			
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 (5%), 4 (4%), 3 (3%), 2 (2%), 1 (1%)											
	Improvement Score								5			
	Higher Score								5			

Blank Cells: Metric is not applicable to the institution

**Board of Trustees Choice Metric 10**

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
10.F	<b>Total Research Expenditures</b>	<b>Excellence</b>							\$ 697,000,000			
		<b>Improvement</b>										
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (Top 1/3 of AAU), - , 3 pts (Middle 1/3 of AAU), - , 1 pt (Lower 1/3 of AAU)											
	Excellence Score								5			
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 pts (5%), 4 pts (4%), 3 pts (3%), 2 pts (2%), 1 pt (1%)											
	Improvement Score											
	Higher Score								5			
10.G	<b>Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning</b>	<b>Excellence</b>									9%	
		<b>Improvement</b>									2%	
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (7%), 4 pts (6%), 3 pts (5%), 2 pts (4%), 1 pt (3%)											
	Excellence Score									5		
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 pts (5%), 4 pts (4%), 3 pts (3%), 2 pts (2%), 1 pt (1%)											
	Improvement Score									2		
	Higher Score									5		
10.H	<b>Number of Postdoctoral Appointees</b>	<b>Excellence</b>										300
		<b>Improvement</b>										7
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (300), 4 pts (275), 3 pts (250), 2 pts (225), 1 pt (200)											
	Excellence Score										5	
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 pts (5%), 4 pts (4%), 3 pts (3%), 2 pts (2%), 1 pt (1%)											
	Improvement Score										-	
	Higher Score										5	
10.I	<b>Number of Adult (25+) Undergraduates Enrolled (in Fall)</b>	<b>Excellence</b>										32%
		<b>Improvement</b>										-1%
<u>Excellence Benchmark</u>	5 pts (21%), 4 pts (20%), 3 pts (19%), 2 pts (18%), 1 pt (17%)											
	Excellence Score											5
<u>Improvement Benchmark</u>	5 pts (5%), 4 pts (4%), 3 pts (3%), 2 pts (2%), 1 pt (1%)											
	Improvement Score											0
	Higher Score											5

**Blank Cells:** Metric is not applicable to the institution

**Board of Governors**  
**Performance Based Funding Metric Definitions**  
 (as reported in the 2012-13 System Accountability Report)

<b>METRICS COMMON TO ALL UNIVERSITIES</b>		
	<b>METRIC</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
1	<b>Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida or Continuing their Education in the U.S. One Year After Graduation</b>	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are employed full-time in Florida or continuing their education somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers are excluded.</p> <p>Note: Board staff have been in discussions with the Department of Economic Opportunity staff about the possibility of adding non-Florida employment data (from Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) to this metric for future evaluation.</p> <p>Sources: <i>State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education &amp; Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse.</i></p>
2	<b>Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One Year After Graduation</b>	<p>This metric is based on annualized Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage data from the fourth fiscal quarter after graduation for bachelor's recipients. UI wage data does not include individuals who are self-employed, employed out of state, employed by the military or federal government, those without a valid social security number, or making less than minimum wage.</p> <p>Sources: <i>State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education &amp; Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse.</i></p>
3	<b>Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree</b> <i>Instructional costs to the university</i>	<p>For each of the last four years of data, the annual total undergraduate instructional expenditures were divided by the total fundable student credit hours to create a cost per credit hour for each year. This cost per credit hour was then multiplied by 30 credit hours to derive an average annual cost. The average annual cost for each of the four years was summed to provide an average cost per degree for a baccalaureate degree that requires 120 credit hours.</p> <p>Sources: <i>State University Database System (SUDS), Expenditure Analysis: Report IV (2009-10 through 2012-13).</i></p>
4	<b>Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate</b>	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students who started in the Fall (or summer continuing to Fall) term and had graduated from the same institution within six years. Students of degree programs longer than four years (eg, PharmD) are included in the cohorts. Students who are active duty military are not included in the data.</p> <p>Source: <i>State University Database System (SUDS).</i></p>
5	<b>Academic Progress Rate</b> <i>2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0</i>	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of first-time-in-college (FTIC) students who started in the Fall (or summer continuing to Fall) term and were enrolled full-time in their first semester and were still enrolled in the same institution during the Fall term following their first year with had a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 at the end of their first year (Fall, Spring, Summer).</p> <p>Source: <i>State University Database System (SUDS).</i></p>

Board of Governors  
 Performance Based Funding Metric Definitions  
 (as reported in the 2012-13 System Accountability Report)

---

<b>METRICS COMMON TO ALL UNIVERSITIES</b>		
	<b>METRIC</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
6	<b>Bachelor's Degrees Awarded within Programs of Strategic Emphasis</b> <i>(includes STEM)</i>	This metric is based on the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded within the programs designated by the Board of Governors as 'Programs of Strategic Emphasis'. A student who has multiple majors in the subset of targeted Classification of Instruction Program codes will be counted twice (i.e., double-majors are included). <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
7	<b>University Access Rate</b> Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	This metric is based the number of undergraduates, enrolled during the fall term, who received a Pell-grant during the fall term. Unclassified students, who are not eligible for Pell-grants, were excluded from this metric. <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
8a	<b>Graduate Degrees Awarded within Programs of Strategic Emphasis</b> <i>(includes STEM)</i>  <i>Note: NCF does not award graduate degrees.</i>	This metric is based on the number of graduate degrees awarded within the programs designated by the Board of Governors as 'Programs of Strategic Emphasis'. A student who has multiple majors in the subset of targeted Classification of Instruction Program codes will be counted twice (i.e., double-majors are included). <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
8b	<b>Freshmen in Top 10% of High School Class</b> <i>Applies to: NCF</i>	Percent of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school class rank within the top 10% of their graduating high school class. <i>Source: New College of Florida.</i>

**Board of Governors**  
**Performance Based Funding Metric Definitions**  
 (as reported in the 2012-13 System Accountability Report)

---

<b>INSTITUTION SPECIFIC METRICS SELECTED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS</b>		
	<b>METRIC</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
9a	<p><b>Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours</b></p> <p><i>Applies to: FAMU, FAU, FIU, FGCU, UCF, UNF, USF, UWF</i></p>	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of baccalaureate degrees awarded within 110% of the credit hours required for a degree based on the Board of Governors Academic Program Inventory.</p> <p>Note: It is important to note that the statutory provisions of the "Excess Hour Surcharge" (1009.286, FS) have been modified several times by the Florida Legislature, resulting in a phased-in approach that has created three different cohorts of students with different requirements. The performance funding metric data is based on the latest statutory requirements that mandates 110% of required hours as the threshold. In accordance with statute, this metric excludes the following types of student credits (ie, accelerated mechanisms, remedial coursework, non-native credit hours that are not used toward the degree, non-native credit hours from failed, incomplete, withdrawn, or repeated courses, credit hours from internship programs, credit hours up to 10 foreign language credit hours for transfer students in Florida, and credit hours earned in military science courses that are part of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program).</p> <p><i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i></p>
9b	<p><b>Number of Faculty Awards</b></p> <p><i>Applies to: UF, FSU</i></p>	<p>This metric is based on the number of awards that faculty have earned in the arts, humanities, science, engineering and health fields as reported in the annual 'Top American Research Universities' report. Twenty-three of the most prominent awards are considered, including: Getty Scholars in Residence, Guggenheim Fellows, Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators, MacArthur Foundation Fellows, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellows, National Medal of Science and National Medal of Technology, Robert Wood Johnson Policy Fellows, Sloan Research Fellows, Woodrow Wilson Fellows, to name a few awards.</p> <p><i>Source: Center for Measuring University Performance, Annual Report of the Top American Research Universities (TARU).</i></p>
9c	<p><b>National Ranking for Institutional &amp; Program Achievements</b></p> <p><i>Applies to: NCF</i></p>	<p>This metric is based on the number of Top 50 university rankings that NCF earned from the following list of publications: US News and World Report, Forbes, Kiplinger, Washington Monthly, Center for Measuring University Performance, Times Higher Education World University Rankings, QS World University Ranking, and the Academic Ranking of World Universities.</p> <p><i>Source: Board of Governors staff review.</i></p>

**Board of Governors**  
**Performance Based Funding Metric Definitions**  
 (as reported in the 2012-13 System Accountability Report)

<b>INSTITUTION SPECIFIC METRICS SELECTED BY EACH UNIVERSITY'S BOARD OF TRUSTEES</b>		
10a	<b>Percent of R&amp;D Expenditures Funded from External Sources</b> <i>Applies to: FAMU</i>	This metric reports the amount of research expenditures that was funded from federal, private industry and other (non-state and non-institutional) sources. <i>Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</i>
10b	<b>Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities</b> <i>Applies to: FAU, FGCU, FIU</i>	This metric is the number, or percentage, of baccalaureate degrees granted in an academic year to Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic students. This metric does not include students classified as Non-Resident Alien or students with a missing race code. <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
10c	<b>National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on U.S. and World News Report</b> <i>Applies to: FSU</i>	This metric is based on the difference between the Financial Resources rank and the overall University rank. U.S. News measures financial resources by using a two-year average spending per student on instruction, research, student services and related educational expenditures - spending on sports, dorms and hospitals doesn't count. <i>Source: US News and World Report's annual National University rankings.</i>
10d	<b>Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course</b> <i>Applies to: NCF</i>	This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduate seniors who participate in a research course during their senior year. <i>Source: New College of Florida.</i>
10e	<b>Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded Annually</b> <i>Applies to: UCF</i>	This metric is the number of baccalaureate degrees granted in an academic year. Students who earned two distinct degrees in the same academic year were counted twice; students who completed multiple majors or tracks were only counted once. <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
10f	<b>Total Research Expenditures</b> <i>Applies to: UF</i>	This metric is the total expenditures (includes non-science & engineering fields) for research & development activities within a given fiscal year. <i>Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</i>
10g	<b>Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning</b> <i>Applies to: UNF</i>	This metric is based on the percentage of course sections classified as having at least 50% of the instruction delivered using some form of technology, when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both. <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
10h	<b>Number of Postdoctoral Appointees</b> <i>Applies to: USF</i>	This metric is based on the number of post-doctoral appointees at the beginning of the academic year. A postdoctoral researcher has recently earned a doctoral (or foreign equivalent) degree and has a temporary paid appointment to focus on specialized research/scholarship under the supervision of a senior scholar. <i>Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).</i>
10i	<b>Percentage of Adult</b>	This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduates (enrolled during the

Board of Governors  
Performance Based Funding Metric Definitions  
(as reported in the 2012-13 System Accountability Report)

---

<b>Undergraduates Enrolled</b> <i>Applies to: UWF</i>	fall term) who are at least 25 years old at the time of admission. This includes undergraduates who are not degree-seeking, or unclassified. <i>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</i>
--	---