

BOG Performance-Based Funding (PBF) Metrics

1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (25,000+) in the U.S. One Year after Graduation
2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year after Graduation
3. Net Cost per Degree for Resident Undergraduates in 120hr Program
4. Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time)
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0)
6. Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis
7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)
8. Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis
9. Percent of Bachelor Degrees Without Excess Hours (FL BOG Choice Metric)
10. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees (USF System BOT Choice Metric)

Revised effective 2017 PBF Model



ATTACHMENT A										MASTER SHEET - USF TAMPA									
										ENROLLMENT & PERFORMANCE PLANNING, 2016-2017									
Metric	PBF	PE	AAU	Metric	2015-2016 Performance			2016-2017 Goal			2016-2017 Progress to Goal - #1								
I. Enrollment																			
1				Lower Level UG FTE	11370			11402			5122								
2				Upper Level UG FTE	16510			16543			6911								
3				GR I Level FTE	5259			5353			2322								
4				GR II Level FTE	2079			2116			974								
5				Total FTE	35217			35415			15328								
II. Online Enrollment																			
6				Lower Level UG SCH/% of total	18.8%			19.4%			19.6%								
7				Upper Level UG SCH/% of total	24.5%			25.2%			28.1%								
8				GR I Level SCH/% of total	24.9%			25.6%			29.7%								
9				GR II Level SCH/% of total	4.6%			4.7%			6.1%								
10				Total Online SCH/% of total	21.6%			22.2%			24.0%								
III. Education Abroad																			
11				Number/% of Unduplicated Student Participation in Education Abroad: by College (Credit experiences ONLY)	TBD			TBD			982								
12				Number/% of Unduplicated Student Participation in Education Abroad: by College (includes non-credit experiences)	1216 (4%)			1492			1184								
IV. Net Tuition																			
13				UG: In-state	\$97,455,686			TBD			\$55,626,276								
14				UG: Out-of--state	\$32,458,161			TBD			\$19,922,036								
15				UG: Total	\$129,913,847			\$132,078,191			\$75,548,312								
16				GR: In-state	\$20,908,895			TBD			\$12,815,336								
17				GR: Out-of-state	\$19,541,607			TBD			\$12,539,537								
18				GR: Total	\$40,450,502			\$41,376,158			\$25,354,872								
19				Grand Total	\$170,364,349			\$173,454,350			\$100,903,184								
V. Performance																			
A. Student Access																			
	*	*		Average GPA and SAT Score for Incoming Freshmen (Fall)	4.10 / 1223			4.00 / 1220			4.08/1226								
		*		Freshmen in Top 10% of High School Graduating Class for Incoming Freshmen (Fall)	0.34			0.35			33								
		*		Freshman Acceptance Rate for Incoming Freshmen (Fall)	44.60%			45.00%			39.92%								
	*			University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)	40.00%			40.00%			39.70%								
	*			Average Cost Per Undergraduate Degree to the Institution* <i>To be modified</i>	Tracked at the USF System Level														
B. Student Success																			
					Academic Retention/Progress Rate			S/F 2014 Cohort			S/F 2015 Cohort								
					n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%							
20				Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			4117			3263 79.3%								
21				Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			4117			3207 77.9%								
22		*	*	Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC): USF	4109	3623 88.2%	4105	3694.5 90.0%	4117	3703	89.9%								
23	*			Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0): USF	4117	3525 85.6%	4121	3564.67 86.5%	4117	3629	88.1%								
					4-year Graduation Rate			S/F 2012 Cohort (n)			S/F 2013 Cohort (n)								
					n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%							
24				4-year Graduation Rate (Full- and Part-time, FTIC): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			3897			416 10.7%								
25				4-year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			3857			415 10.8%								
26		*		4-year Graduation Rate (Full- and Part-time, FTIC): USF	3869	1861 48.1%	3921	2195.76 56.0%	3897	470	12.1%								
27		*		4-Year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC): USF	3805	1840 48.4%	3835	2147.6 56.0%	3857	468	12.1%								
					6-year Graduation Rate			S/F 2010 Cohort (n)			S/F 2011 Cohort (n)								
					n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%							
28				6-year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			3446			1578 45.8%								
29				6-year Graduation Rate (Full- and Part-time, FTIC): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			3473			1581 45.5%								
30		*	*	6-Year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC): USF	4451	2964 66.6%	3432	2402.4 70.0%	3446	2297	66.7%								
31	*			6-year Graduation Rate (Full- and Part-time, FTIC): USF	4517	2988 66.2%	3481	2436.7 70.0%	3473	2303	66.3%								
					2-year Graduation Rate for Transfers			S/F 2014 Cohort (n)			S/F 2015 Cohort (n)								
					n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%							
32				2-year Graduation Rate (AA Transfers): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			1969			9 0.5%								
33				2-year Graduation Rate (Other Transfers): SAME COLLEGE	ONLY REPORTED AT THE USF TAMPA LEVEL			2242			72 3.2%								
34				2-year Graduation Rate (AA Transfers): USF	2014	473 23.5%	1969	1051.85 53.4%	1969	9	0.5%								
35				2-year Graduation Rate (Other Transfers): USF	2117	491 23.2%	2242	1021.46 45.6%	2242	75	3.3%								
Degree Productivity													AY 2016-2017						
36				Bachelors Degrees Awarded	7,700			7,800			1,316								
37				Masters Degrees Awarded	2,933			2,900			418								
38		*	*	Doctoral Degrees Awarded	645			650			103								
39				Total Degrees Awarded	11,278			11,350			1,837								
				Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in STEM and Health	44.3%			45.0%			74.0%								
40	*			Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (%)	57.0%			57.0%			62.0%								
				Percent of Graduate Degrees Awarded in STEM and Health	64.0%			65.0%			82.7%								
41	*			Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (includes STEM) (%)	76.3%			76.3%			78.0%								
	*			Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education 1 Year after Graduation	0.7			0.72			TBD								
	*			Median Average Wages of Undergraduates Employed in Florida 1 Year after Graduation	37500			38000			TBD								
42	*			Percent of Bachelors Degrees Without Excess Hours	67.5%			70.0%			72.6%								
43				Student Awards (ONS)	50			92			3								
C. Value																			
	*			Public University National Ranking (in more than one national ranking)	4			5			TBD								
D. Faculty Excellence																			
44		*	*	National Academy Memberships	8			9			8								
45		*		Faculty Awards	9			10			36								
46	*	*	*	Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	277			285			277								
47				Number of PhDs on Non-Faculty Research Appointments	6			16			6								
				Student-to-Faculty Ratio	24			24			TBD								
48				Number of Full-time Instructional Faculty	1110			1132			1109								
E. Research: Productivity																			
					n	\$	n	\$	n	\$	n	\$							
49				Grant Proposals Submitted: #/\$	1030	\$393,674,031	1102.1	\$421,231,213	211	\$101,353,353									
50				Grant Proposals Awarded: #/\$ (new and continuing)	847	\$120,637,348	889.35	\$126,669,216	241	\$50,061,150									
51		*		Total Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$486			\$501			\$27,677,352								
52				Federal Research Expenditures (\$M) (Sum of Federal Expenditures + Federal Flow Through Expenditures)	\$82,777,800			\$86,118,199			\$20,740,648								
53				Overall F&A Rate (%): College	16.7%			17.3%			15.1%								
		*		Total Annual Research Expenditures (\$M) (Science & Engineering only)	421			427			TBD								
		*		Total Annual Research Expenditures in Diversified Non-Medical Sciences (\$M) (Science & Engineering only)	230			233			TBD								
		*		National Ranking in STEM Research Expenditures (includes public & private institutions)	8			8			TBD								
		*		Total R&D Expenditures per Full-Time Tenured, Tenure Earning Faculty Members	486000			501000			TBD								
		*		Citation Impact	TBD			TBD			TBD								
F. Research: Innovation & Commercialization																			
	*			Patents Awarded (over 3 year period)	273			276			TBD								
54				Invention Disclosures Received	104			TBD			22								
55				U.S. Patents Issued	48			TBD			17								
56				Licenses/Options Executed	120			121			16								
57				Licensing Revenue Received	\$333,683			TBD			\$167,907								
58				Number of Start-up Companies	8			9			1								
G. Philanthropic Support																			
	*			Endowment (\$M)	\$395			\$412			\$395,324								
59				Gifts Received (\$1000s) (total commitment)	\$25,049,951			\$19,450,000			\$45,583								

USF System 2016 Work Plan



University of South Florida System

University Work Plan Presentation

for Board of Governors June 2016 Meeting



INTRODUCTION

The State University System of Florida has developed three tools that aid in guiding the System's future.

- 1) The Board of Governors' 2025 System Strategic Plan is driven by goals and associated metrics that stake out where the System is headed;*
- 2) The Board's Annual Accountability Report provides yearly tracking for how the System is progressing toward its goals;*
- 3) Institutional Work Plans connect the two and create an opportunity for greater dialogue relative to how each institution contributes to the System's overall vision.*

These three documents assist the Board with strategic planning and with setting short-, mid- and long-term goals. The Board will use these documents to help advocate for all System institutions and foster even greater coordination with the institutions and their Boards of Trustees.

Longer-term goals will inform future agendas of the Board's Strategic Planning Committee. The Board's acceptance of a work plan does not constitute approval of any particular component, nor does it supersede any necessary approval processes that may be required for each component.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. STRATEGY**
 - a. Mission Statement
 - b. Vision Statement
 - c. Statement of Strategy
 - d. Strengths and Opportunities
 - e. Key Initiatives & Investments
- 2. PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRICS**
- 3. PREEMINENT RESEARCH UNIVERSITY METRICS**
- 4. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**
 - a. Teaching & Learning
 - b. Scholarship, Research and Innovation
 - c. Institution Specific Goals
- 5. ENROLLMENT PLANNING**
- 6. ACADEMIC PROGRAM COORDINATION**
- 7. STUDENT DEBT & NET COST**
- 8. UNIVERSITY REVENUES**
- 9. TUITION, FEES AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS**
- 10. DEFINITIONS**



MISSION STATEMENT (What is your purpose?)

The University of South Florida System, which includes USF (in Tampa), USF St. Petersburg, and USF Sarasota-Manatee, catalyzes and coordinates initiatives that prepare students for successful 21st century careers; advances research, scholarship, and creative endeavors to improve the quality of life; and engages its communities across the Tampa Bay region for mutual benefits.

VISION STATEMENT (What do you aspire to?)

The University of South Florida System will empower and connect its institutions into a distinctive system that is nationally and globally recognized for innovation in teaching and research, for attracting outstanding and diverse scholars, staff and students, and for transforming the communities it serves.

STATEMENT OF STRATEGY (How will you get there?)

Given your mission, vision, strengths and available resources, provide a brief description of your market and your strategy for addressing and leading it.

The institutions of the USF System develop missions and strategic plans that best fit the communities they serve while also working together to achieve synergies and economies of scale. Under the leadership of the USF Board of Trustees the USF System embraces accountability, relying on a detailed dashboard to track key metrics such as graduation rates, retention rates, research support and faculty awards that are also key components of the Board of Governors' Strategic Plan, including performance-based funding metrics. Engaging in partnerships represents another important strategy; USF and USF St. Petersburg are both recognized by the Carnegie Foundation as community engaged universities. Achieving this recognition at USF Sarasota-Manatee is a key goal of its next strategic plan.

USF, in Tampa, is classified by Carnegie as a doctoral research university, highest research activity, attracting students and faculty of the highest caliber from across the world. The institution is working hard to position itself for AAU eligibility and preeminence as it maintains a commitment to student success, entrepreneurship and innovation, and global engagement.

USF St. Petersburg has developed a new strategic plan for 2014-19, which focuses on developing a distinctive identity as a valued member of the USF System, promoting faculty excellence, student success, strategic partnerships, and sustainable funding and infrastructure. The institution is now in the midst of a comprehensive implementation plan, working to bring those goals to life while maintaining positive momentum on key performance-funding metrics.

USF Sarasota-Manatee is also working toward goals as part of its strategic plan for 2015-2020. This plan focuses on enhancing student success, campus life, intentional enrollment management, high-quality teaching, community engagement and building a base of sustainable resources – all goals that will in turn help bolster the USF System's collective strengths. One such example of this is a burgeoning new partnership between USF and USF Sarasota-Manatee in engineering, where USF Sarasota-Manatee students will complete two years of pre-engineering course work on their home campus, complete an AA certificate and then transfer to the USF campus in Tampa to obtain a baccalaureate in engineering.

The USF System will seek out more of these types of programmatic partnerships among its separately accredited member institutions where it makes sense in order to serve workforce needs across the Tampa Bay region without unnecessary duplication.



STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES *(within 3 years)*

What are your core capabilities, opportunities and challenges for improvement?

The core capabilities of the USF System represent the varied strengths of its three complementary member institutions. They include: high-impact scholarship; excellence in teaching and learning; an entrepreneurial spirit, partnerships; a focus on accountability and data-driven decision making; and community engagement. All three institutions are dedicated to student success, and students in the USF System benefit from having an array of course options across Tampa Bay. Programs hosted at one System institution are available to all USF System students.

The challenges for USF include maintaining momentum in student success and institutional quality with limited resources, as the university is working to increase budgetary efficiencies and hold down costs for students. Despite any challenges, the USF System is once again a top performer in the BOG's performance funding model and is looking forward to returning those new funds into key areas that will continue to enhance quality.

USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee pride themselves on offering students an intimate campus experience and a high level of student-faculty interaction. At the same time, they benefit from associations, efficiencies of shared resources and opportunities for collaboration. Both are developing successful STEM programs that address local and statewide workforce needs and play an important role in regional economic development. At USFSP, challenges include growing needs for teaching and laboratory space as STEM programs prosper and enhancing student success to improve graduation and retention rates. For USFSM, the primary challenge is exploring ways to enhance the campus-life experience as it builds its lower-division student population.



KEY INITIATIVES & INVESTMENTS *(within 3 years)*

Describe your top three key initiatives for the next three years that will drive improvement in Academic Quality, Operational Efficiency, and Return on Investment.

1. Continue to enhance student success to maintain momentum as a top performer in the Board of Governors performance-funding model:

Each of the USF System institutions is working toward continuous improvement in graduation and retention rates, as well as connecting students with post-graduation employment opportunities. This goal is fueled by USF System's commitment to undergraduate research and its cultivation of a global curriculum; USFSP's focus on innovative retention strategies; and USFSM's efforts to enhance its campus environment and career prep services.

2. Enhance academic program quality that prepares students for jobs:

Students who graduate from the USF System should not only graduate on time, but also well prepared for leadership jobs in the workforce. Academic quality must go hand-in-hand with all of our student success initiatives. This is being accomplished through strategic hiring of high-quality, productive faculty; support for interdisciplinary programs that expose students to critical problems of today's world and innovative solutions; and development of partnerships across the USF System and in the larger Tampa Bay community – notably in STEM fields.

3. Increase efficiencies and responsible financial practices:

Across the USF System, financial resources are more precious than ever. As a continual top performer in the Board of Governors' performance-funding model, it is vital that we continue to put our investments to good use to further improve in those key metrics. The USF System is now revisiting its own shared services among its three member institutions, with the goal of increasing efficiencies and further streamlining business services. The USF System will also continue to practice transparent budgeting and maintain its commitment to keeping costs down for students as we maximize investments in areas that support their success.



PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRICS

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+) within the U.S. One Year After Graduation	65.3% 2012-13	66.8% 2013-14	66.8% 2014-15	69.9% 2015-16	71.9% 2016-17	74.0% 2017-18
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One-Year After Graduation	\$35,200 2012-13	\$36,300 2013-14	\$36,333 2014-15	\$36,767 2015-16	\$37,400 2016-17	\$37,933 2017-18
Cost per Bachelor's Degree Costs to the University	\$25,490 2010-14	\$26,990 2011-15	\$26,990 2012-16	\$26,990 2013-17	\$26,990 2014-18	\$26,990 2015-19
FTIC 6 year Graduation Rate * for full- and part-time students	66.1% 2008-14	67.8% 2009-15	66.7% 2010-16	69.6% 2011-17	70.9% 2012-18	73.5% 2013-19
Academic Progress Rate * FTIC 2 year Retention Rate with GPA>2	85.3% 2013-14	85.1% 2014-15	85.6% 2015-16	86.9% 2016-17	87.9% 2017-18	89.4% 2018-19
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Within Programs of Strategic Emphasis	51.0% 2013-14	54.6% 2014-15	54.8% 2015-16	54.8% 2016-17	54.9% 2017-18	55.1% 2018-19
University Access Rate Percent of Fall Undergraduates with a Pell grant	42.1% Fall 2013	41.6% Fall 2014	40.0% Fall 2015	40.1% Fall 2016	40.1% Fall 2017	40.1% Fall 2018
Graduate Degrees Awarded Within Programs of Strategic Emphasis	69.0% 2013-14	72.7% 2014-15	74.0% 2015-16	73.8% 2016-17	73.6% 2017-18	73.2% 2018-19
BOG METRIC: Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours	63.9% 2013-14	65.8% 2014-15	68.1% 2015-16	70.6% 2016-17	73.0% 2017-18	75.4% 2018-19
UBOT METRIC: Number of Post-doctoral Appointees	289 Fall 2012	321 Fall 2013	298 Fall 2014	282 Fall 2015	290 Fall 2016	297 Fall 2017

Note: Metrics are defined in appendix. For more information about the PBF model visit: http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php.

*USF System data reflect the swirl among the USF System institutions (USF, USFSP, USFSM)



PREEMINENT RESEARCH UNIVERSITY FUNDING METRICS

USF-TAMPA CAMPUS ONLY

	BENCH-MARKS	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
Average GPA and SAT Score <i>for incoming freshman in Fall semester</i>	4.0 GPA 1200 SAT	4.1 1223 Fall 2015	4.0 1220 Fall 2016	4.05 1222 Fall 2017	4.075 1224 Fall 2018	4.10 1226 Fall 2019
Public University National Ranking <i>in more than one national ranking</i>	Top 50	4 2016	5 2017	5 2018	5 2019	5 2020
Freshman Retention Rate <i>Full-time, FTIC</i>	90%	88% 2014-15	90% 2015-16	91% 2016-17	92% 2017-18	93% 2018-19
6-year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time, FTIC</i>	70%	68% 2009-15	66.5% 2010-16	70.0% 2011-17	72.0% 2012-18	74.0% 2013-19
National Academy Memberships	6	8 2016	9 2017	10 2018	10 2019	10 2020
Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$200 M	\$420 2014-15	\$421 2015-16	\$427 2016-17	\$434 2017-18	\$440 2018-19
Non-Medical Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$150 M	\$229 2014-15	\$230 2015-16	\$233 2016-17	\$237 2017-18	\$241 2018-19
National Ranking in S.T.E.M. Research Expenditures <i>includes public & private institutions</i>	Top 100 in 5 of 8 disciplines	7 2013-14	7 2014-15	8 2015-16	8 2016-17	8 2017-18
Patents Awarded <i>over 3 year period</i>	100	297 2013-15	291 2014-16	273 2015-17	276 2016-18	279 2017-19
Doctoral Degrees Awarded Annually	400	601 2014-15	645 2015-16	650 2016-17	655 2017-18	660 2018-19
Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees	200	289 Fall 2012	321 Fall 2013	298 Fall 2014	277 Fall 2015	285 Fall 2016
Endowment Size (\$M)	\$500 M	\$417 2014-15	\$395 2015-16	\$412 2016-17	\$432 2017-18	\$448 2018-19
NUMBER OF METRICS ABOVE THE BENCHMARK		9	10	11	11	11

Note: Metrics are defined in appendix. For more information about Preeminent state research universities, see 1001.7065 Florida Statutes.



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Teaching & Learning Metrics (from 2025 System Strategic Plan that are not included in PBF or Preeminence)

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
2. Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class	28.0% Fall 2014	30.0% Fall 2015	30.4% Fall 2016	30.6% Fall 2017	31.6% Fall 2018	31.9% Fall 2019
3. Professional Licensure & Certification Exam Pass Rates Above Benchmarks	3 of 5 2013-14	5 of 5 2014-15	6 of 6 2015-16	6 of 6 2016-17	6 of 6 2017-18	6 of 6 2018-19
4. Time to Degree <i>Mean Years for FTICs in 120hr programs</i>	4.7 2013-14	4.5 2014-15	4.5 2015-16	4.3 2016-17	4.3 2017-18	4.2 2018-19
5. Four-Year FTIC Graduation Rates <i>full- and part-time students</i>	43.0% 2010-14	48.0% 2011-15	50.4% 2012-16	53.4% 2013-17	55.8% 2014-18	57.9% 2015-19
8. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded <i>First Majors Only</i>	9,390 2013-14	9,290 2014-15	9,081 2015-16	9,225 2016-17	9,358 2017-18	9,492 2018-19
9. Graduate Degrees Awarded <i>First Majors Only</i>	3,401 2013-14	3,773 2014-15	3,877 2015-16	3,954 2016-17	4,035 2017-18	4,092 2018-19
10. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to African-American & Hispanic Students	27.6% 2013-14	29.5% 2014-15	29.6% 2015-16	29.7% 2016-17	30.0% 2017-18	31.0% 2018-19
11. Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled	24.0% Fall 2013	23.8% Fall 2014	22.9% Fall 2015	22.9% Fall 2016	21.8% Fall 2017	21.6% Fall 2018
12. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Distance Learning Courses	23.0% 2013-14	26.0% 2014-15	27.5% 2015-16	28.2% 2016-17	28.9% 2017-18	29.6% 2018-19
16. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees in STEM & Health	34.0% 2013-14	39.0% 2014-15	40.5% 2015-16	41.3% 2016-17	42.5% 2017-18	43.5% 2018-19
18. Percent of Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health	52.0% 2013-14	57.0% 2014-15	59.6% 2015-16	60.5% 2016-17	61.5% 2017-18	62.5% 2018-19
IMPROVING METRICS		10 of 11	9 of 11	9 of 11	9 of 11	10 of 11



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (continued)

Scholarship, Research and Innovation Metrics (from the 2025 System Strategic Plan)

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
20. Faculty Awards	7 2012	8 2013	7 2014	8 2015	9 2016	10 2017
22. Total Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$497 2013-14	\$494 2014-15	\$495 2015-16	\$510 2016-17	\$525 2017-18	\$541 2018-19
23. Research Expenditures Funded from External Sources	60% 2013-14	55% 2014-15	56% 2015-16	57% 2016-17	58% 2017-18	59% 2018-19
25. Licenses/Options Executed	75 2012-13	91 2013-14	119 2014-15	120 2015-16	121 2016-17	122 2017-18
26. Number of Start-up Companies Created	11 2013-14	11 2014-15	8 2015-16	9 2016-17	10 2017-18	11 2018-19
IMPROVING METRICS		2 of 5	3 of 5	5 of 5	5 of 5	5 of 5

Institution Specific Goals (optional)

To further distinguish the university's distinctive mission, the university may choose to provide additional narrative and metric goals that are based on the university's own strategic plan.

See Individual USF Institution Work Plans



ENROLLMENT PLANNING

Planned Headcount Enrollment by Student Type *(for all students at all campuses)*

	FALL 2013 ACTUAL	FALL 2014 ACTUAL	FALL 2015 ACTUAL	FALL 2016 PLAN	FALL 2017 PLAN	FALL 2018 PLAN	FALL 2019 PLAN
UNDERGRADUATE							
FTIC	17,214	17,376	17,703	17,887	18,119	18,379	18,497
AA Transfers ¹	11,056	10,737	10,603	10,559	10,724	10,916	11,134
Other ²	7,738	7,693	7,683	7,934	7,909	7,879	7,776
Subtotal	36,008	35,806	35,989	36,380	36,752	37,173	37,406
GRADUATE³							
Master's	6,806	6,950	7,160	7,253	7,379	7,507	7,639
Research Doctoral	2,294	2,226	2,229	2,232	2,235	2,238	2,241
Professional Doctoral	1,220	1,379	1,309	1,239	1,241	1,244	1,246
Subtotal	10,320	10,555	10,698	10,724	10,855	10,989	11,126
UNCLASSIFIED							
H.S. Dual Enrolled	46	16	25	41	57	80	113
Other ⁴	1,941	2,201	2,272	2,282	2,333	2,385	2,438
Subtotal	1,987	2,217	2,297	2,323	2,390	2,465	2,551
TOTAL	48,315	48,578	48,984	49,426	49,997	50,628	51,083

Notes: This table reports the number of students enrolled at the university by student type categories. The determination for undergraduate, graduate and unclassified is based on the institutional class level values. Unclassified refers to a student who has not yet been formally admitted into a degree program but is enrolled. The student type for undergraduates is based on the Type of Student at Time of Most Recent Admission. The student type for graduates is based on the degree that is sought and the student CIP code. (1) Includes AA Transfers from the Florida College System. (2) Undergraduate – Other includes Post-Baccalaureates who are seeking a degree. (3) Includes Medical students. (4) Unclassified – Other includes Post-Baccalaureates who are not seeking a degree.

Planned FTE Enrollment by Method of Instruction *(for all students at all campuses)*

	2012-13 ACTUAL	2013-14 ACTUAL	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 PLAN	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN
UNDERGRADUATE							
Distance (80-100%)	7,804	7,867	8,745	9,413	9,725	10,047	10,381
Hybrid (50-79%)	670	580	522	235	237	240	242
Traditional (0-50%)	25,807	25,396	24,414	24,520	24,510	24,476	24,441
Subtotal	34,281	33,843	33,680	34,168	34,472	34,763	35,064
GRADUATE							
Distance (80-100%)	1,747	1,825	2,051	2,105	2,171	2,240	2,310
Hybrid (50-79%)	215	233	204	68	69	69	70
Traditional (0-50%)	6,006	6,223	6,301	6,504	6,613	6,718	6,825
Subtotal	7,968	8,282	8,555	8,677	8,853	9,027	9,205

Note: Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the standard national definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30 and graduate credit hours by 24. **Distance Learning** is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.). **Hybrid** is a course where 50% to 79% of the instruction is delivered using some form of technology, when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per SUDS data element 2052). **Traditional** refers to primarily face to face instruction utilizing some form of technology for delivery of supplemental course materials for no more than 49% of instruction (per SUDS data element 2052).



ENROLLMENT PLANNING (continued)

Planned FTE Enrollment Plan by Student Level

	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 ESTIMATE	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN	2019-20 PLAN	2020-21 PLAN	2021-22 PLAN	Planned Annual Growth Rate*
STATE FUNDABLE									
RESIDENT									
LOWER	11,625	11,724	11,824	11,926	12,032	12,141	12,253	12,368	0.9%
UPPER	18,632	18,496	18,665	18,839	19,020	19,206	19,400	19,600	1.0%
GRAD I	4,505	4,371	4,462	4,556	4,652	4,750	4,851	4,954	2.1%
GRAD II	1,258	1,155	1,175	1,196	1,218	1,240	1,262	1,285	1.8%
TOTAL	36,019	35,745	36,126	36,518	36,922	37,337	37,766	38,208	1.1%
NON RESIDENT									
LOWER	1,181	1,424	1,431	1,438	1,444	1,451	1,459	1,466	0.5%
UPPER	1,175	1,460	1,468	1,477	1,486	1,495	1,504	1,514	0.6%
GRAD I	1,226	1,473	1,501	1,529	1,557	1,586	1,615	1,645	1.9%
GRAD II	877	926	942	959	976	994	1,012	1,030	1.8%
TOTAL	4,459	5,283	5,342	5,402	5,463	5,526	5,590	5,655	1.1%
TOTAL									
LOWER	12,806	13,149	13,268	13,390	13,506	13,592	13,711	13,834	0.8%
UPPER	19,806	19,956	20,157	20,341	20,529	20,701	20,904	21,114	0.9%
GRAD I	5,733	5,845	5,964	6,086	6,210	6,337	6,468	6,601	2.0%
GRAD II	2,133	2,079	2,116	2,154	2,193	2,232	2,272	2,313	1.8%
TOTAL	40,478	41,029	41,505	41,971	42,438	42,863	43,356	43,863	1.1%
NOT STATE FUNDABLE									
LOWER	613	631	634	616	609	602	595	588	-1.5%
UPPER	455	433	422	426	429	433	438	441	0.9%
GRAD I	665	693	705	717	731	745	758	772	1.8%
GRAD II	24	58	59	60	61	62	63	65	2.0%
TOTAL	1,757	1,815	1,820	1,818	1,830	1,843	1,854	1,866	0.5%

Note: Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the standard national definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30 and graduate credit hours by 24. Note*: The Planned Annual Growth Rate is a compounded rate based on the following formula: (2021-22 value divided by the 2016-17 value) to the (1/5) exponent minus one.

Medical Student Headcount Enrollments

	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 ESTIMATE	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN	2019-20 PLAN	2020-21 PLAN	2021-22 PLAN	Annual Growth Rate*
MEDICAL DOCTORATES									
RESIDENT	438	430	415	415	413	406	406	406	-0.4%
NON-RESIDENT	53	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	0.0%
TOTAL	491	504	489	489	487	480	480	480	-0.4%



ACADEMIC PROGRAM COORDINATION

New Programs For Consideration by University in AY 2016-17

The S.U.S. Council of Academic Vice Presidents (CAVP) Academic Program Coordination Work Group will review these programs as part of their on-going coordination efforts. The programs listed below are based on the 2015 Work Plan list for programs under consideration for 2016-17.

PROGRAM TITLES	CIP CODE 6-digit	AREA OF STRATEGIC EMPHASIS	OTHER UNIVERSITIES WITH SAME PROGRAM	OFFERED VIA DISTANCE LEARNING IN SYSTEM	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT <i>in 5th year</i>	PROPOSED DATE OF SUBMISSION TO UBOT
BACHELOR'S PROGRAMS						
BS Public Relations, Advertising, And Applied Communications (USF)	09.0900	GAP	FSU	25%	580	Fall 2016

MASTER'S, SPECIALIST AND OTHER ADVANCED MASTER'S PROGRAMS						
MS Public Relations, Advertising, And Applied Communications (USF)	09.0900	GAP	FSU, UNF	0%	68	Spring 2017
MS Conservation Biology (USFSP)	26.1307	STEM	UCF	0%	30	Spring 2017

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS						

New Programs For Consideration by University in 2017-19

These programs will be used in the 2017 Work Plan list for programs under consideration for 2017-18.

PROGRAM TITLES	CIP CODE 6-digit	AREA OF STRATEGIC EMPHASIS	OTHER UNIVERSITIES WITH SAME PROGRAM	OFFERED VIA DISTANCE LEARNING IN SYSTEM	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT <i>in 5th year</i>	PROPOSED DATE OF SUBMISSION TO UBOT
BACHELOR'S PROGRAMS						

MASTER'S, SPECIALIST AND OTHER ADVANCED MASTER'S PROGRAMS						

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS						
OTD Occupational Therapy (USF)	51.2306	HEALTH	-	0%	80	TBD
PhD Pharmacy (USF)	51.2099	STEM	FAMU, UF	30%	5	TBD



STUDENT DEBT & NET COST

Student Debt Summary

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Percent of Bachelor's Recipients with Debt	53%	57%	59%	59%	59%
Average Amount of Debt <i>for Bachelor's who have graduated with debt</i>	\$21,780	\$22,620	\$22,720	\$22,610	\$22,650
NSLDS Cohort Year	2008-11	2009-12	2010-13	2011-14	2012-15 Preliminary
Student Loan Cohort Default Rate (3rd Year)	10.1%	9.8%	7.5%	5.4%	5.2%

Cost of Attendance *(for Full-Time Undergraduate Florida Residents in the Fall and Spring of 2015-16)*

See Individual USF Institution Work Plans

Estimated Net Cost by Family Income *(for Full-Time Undergraduate Florida Residents in the Fall and Spring of 2015-16)*

FAMILY INCOME GROUPS	FULL-TIME RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATES HEADCOUNT	PERCENT	AVG. NET COST OF ATTENDANCE	AVG. NET TUITION & FEES	AVG. GIFT AID AMOUNT	AVG. LOAN AMOUNT	
Below \$40,000	6,482	33%	\$11,308	-\$3,050	\$8,832	\$4,012	
\$40,000-\$59,999	2,313	12%	\$13,275	-\$968	\$6,779	\$3,760	
\$60,000-\$79,999	1,769	9%	\$15,448	\$1,416	\$4,507	\$4,458	
\$80,000-\$99,999	1,503	8%	\$16,477	\$2,588	\$3,364	\$4,781	
\$100,000 Above	4,413	22%	\$16,626	\$2,591	\$3,392	\$3,943	
Not Reported	3,103	16%	n/a	\$3,398	\$2,515	\$134	
TOTAL	19,583	100%	AVERAGE	\$13,925*	\$328	\$5,552	\$3,452

Notes: This data only represents Fall and Spring financial aid data and is accurate as of March 31, 2016. Please note that small changes to Spring 2016 awards are possible before the data is finalized. **Family Income Groups** are based on the Total Family Income (including untaxed income) as reported on student FAFSA records. **Full-time Students** is a headcount based on at least 24 credit hours during Fall and Spring terms. **Average Gift Aid** includes all grants and scholarships from Federal, State, University and other private sources administered by the Financial Aid Office. Student waivers are also included in the Gift Aid amount. Gift Aid does not include the parental contribution towards EFC. **Net Cost of Attendance** is the actual average of the total Costs of Attendance (which will vary by income group due to the diversity of students living on- & off- campus) *minus* the average Gift Aid amount. **Net Tuition & Fees** is the actual average of the total costs of tuition and fees (which will vary by income group due to the amount of credit hours students are enrolled) *minus* the average Gift Aid amount (see page 16 for list of fees that are included). **Average Loan Amount** includes Federal (Perkins, Stafford, Ford Direct, and PLUS loans) and all private loans. 'Not Reported' represents the students who did not file a FAFSA. The bottom-line **Total/Average** represents the average of all full-time undergraduate Florida residents (note*: the total Net Cost of Attendance does not include students who did not report their family income data).



UNIVERSITY REVENUES

University Revenues *(in Millions of Dollars)*

EDUCATION & GENERAL	2014-15	2015-16
Main Operations		
State Funds	\$ 278.2	\$ 293.6
Tuition	\$ 193.1	\$ 200.3
Subtotal	\$ 471.2	\$ 493.9
Health-Science Center / Medical Schools		
State Funds	\$ 74.7	\$ 74.2
Tuition	\$ 50.6	\$ 57.7
SUBTOTAL	\$ 125.2	\$ 131.9
E&G TOTAL	\$ 596.5	\$ 625.7
OTHER BUDGET ENTITIES		
Auxiliary Enterprises	\$ 204.2	\$ 246.1
Contracts & Grants	\$ 281.3	\$ 389.2
Local Funds	\$ 435.0	\$ 482.7
Faculty Practice Plans	\$ 229.2	\$ 245.9

Note: State funds include recurring and non-recurring General Revenue funds, Lottery funds appropriated by the Florida Legislature. Actual tuition includes base tuition and tuition differential fee revenues for resident and non-resident undergraduate and graduate students net of waivers. Source: Tables 1A & 1E of the annual Accountability Report.



UNIVERSITY TUITION, FEES AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS

See Individual USF Institution Work Plans



DEFINITIONS

Performance Based Funding

Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+) in the U.S. One Year After Graduation

This metric is based on the percentage of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are enrolled or employed (earning at least \$25,000) somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers and are not found enrolled are excluded. Note: This data now non-Florida employment data. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One Year After Graduation

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. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse.

Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree
Costs to the university

For each of the last four years of data, the annual undergraduate total full expenditures (includes direct and indirect 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. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Expenditure Analysis: Report IV.

Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate

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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 4D).

Academic Progress Rate
2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4B).

University Access Rate
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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 3E).

Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4H).

Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 5C).



BOG Choice Metrics

Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

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.

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, and credit hours earned in military science courses that are part of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) program). Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

BOT Choice Metrics

Number of Postdoctoral Appointees
USF

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.

Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).

Preeminent Research University Funding Metrics

Average GPA and SAT Score

An average weighted grade point average of 4.0 or higher and an average SAT score of 1200 or higher for fall semester incoming freshmen, as reported annually in the admissions data that universities submit to the Board of Governors. This data includes registered FTIC (student type='B','E') with an admission action of admitted or provisionally admitted ('A','P','X').

Public University National Ranking

A top-50 ranking on at least two well-known and highly respected national public university rankings, reflecting national preeminence, using most recent rankings, includes: Princeton Review, Fiske Guide, QS World University Ranking, Times Higher Education World University Ranking, Academic Ranking of World University, US News and World Report National University, US News and World Report National Public University, US News and World Report Liberal Arts Colleges, Forbes, Kiplinger, Washington Monthly Liberal Arts Colleges, Washington Monthly National University, and Center for Measuring University Performance.



Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC)	Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC) as reported annually to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The retention rates that are reported in the Board's annual Accountability report are preliminary because they are based on student enrollment in their second fall term as reported by the 28th calendar day following the first day of class. When the Board of Governors reports final retention rates to IPEDS in the Spring (usually the first week of April), that data is based on the student enrollment data as reported after the Fall semester has been completed. The preliminary and final retention rates are nearly identical when rounded to the nearest whole number.
6-year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC)	Cohorts are based on undergraduate students who enter the institution in the Fall term (or Summer term and continue into the Fall term). Percent Graduated is based on federal rate and does <u>not</u> include students who originally enroll as part-time students, or who transfer into the institution. This metric complies with the requirements of the federal Student Right to Know Act that requires institutions to report the completion status at 150% of normal time (or six years). For more information about how this data is calculated, see: http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/docs/performance_funding/PBF_GRADUATION and RETENTION Methodology FINAL.pdf .
National Academy Memberships	National Academy Memberships held by faculty as reported by the Center for Measuring University Performance in the Top American Research Universities (TARU) annual report.
Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	Science & Engineering Research Expenditures, including federal research expenditures as reported annually to the National Science Foundation (NSF).
Non-Medical Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	Total S&E research expenditures in non-medical sciences as reported to the NSF. This removes medical sciences funds (9F & 12F in HERD survey) from the total S&E amount.
National Ranking in S.T.E.M. Research Expenditures	The NSF identifies 8 broad disciplines within Science & Engineering (Computer Science, Engineering, Environmental Science, Life Science, Mathematical Sciences, Physical Sciences, Psychology, Social Sciences). The rankings by discipline are determined by BOG staff using the NSF WebCaspar database.
Patents Awarded (3 calendar years)	Total patents awarded by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) for the most recent three calendar year period. Due to a year-lag in published reports, Board of Governors staff query the USPTO database with a query that only counts utility patents:"(AN/"University Name" AND ISD/yyyymmdd->yyyymmdd AND APT/1)".
Doctoral Degrees Awarded Annually	Doctoral degrees awarded annually, as reported annually in the Board of Governors Accountability Report.
Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees	The number of Postdoctoral Appointees awarded annually, as reported in the TARU annual report. This data is based on National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).
Endowment Size (\$M)	This data comes from the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and Commonfund Institute's annual report of Market Value of Endowment Assets - which, due to timing, may release the next fiscal year's data after the Board of Governors Accountability report is published.



Key Performance Indicators	
Teaching & Learning Metrics	
Freshmen in Top 10% of HS Graduating Class	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. As reported by the university to the Common Data Set (C10).
Professional/Licensure Exam First-time Pass Rates	The number of exams with first-time pass rates above and below the national or state average, as reported in the annual Accountability report, including: Nursing, Law, Medicine (3 subtests), Veterinary, Pharmacy, Dental (2 subtests), Physical Therapy, and Occupational Therapy.
Average Time to Degree Mean Years for FTIC in 120hr programs	This metric is the mean number of years between the start date (using date of most recent admission) and the end date (using the last month in the term degree was granted) for a graduating class of first-time, single-major baccalaureates in 120 credit hour programs within a (Summer, Fall, Spring) year.
FTIC Graduation Rates In 4 years (or less)	As reported in the annual Accountability report (table 4D), First-time-in-college (FTIC) cohort is defined as undergraduates entering in fall term (or summer continuing to fall) with fewer than 12 hours earned since high school graduation. The rate is the percentage of the initial cohort that has either graduated from or is still enrolled in the <u>same</u> institution by the fourth academic year. Both full-time and part-time students are used in the calculation. The initial cohort is revised to remove students, who have allowable exclusions as defined by IPEDS, from the cohort.
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded	This is a count of baccalaureate degrees awarded as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 4G).
Graduate Degrees Awarded	This is a count of graduate degrees awarded as reported in the Accountability Report (Table 5B).
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded To African-American and Hispanic Students	Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic do not include students classified as Non-Resident Alien or students with a missing race code – as reported in the Accountability Report (table 4I). Students who earn two distinct degrees in the same term are counted twice – whether their degrees are from the same six-digit CIP code or different CIP codes. Students who earn only one degree are counted once – even if they completed multiple majors or tracks. Percentage of Degrees is based on the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded to non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic students divided by the total degrees awarded - excluding those awarded to non-resident aliens and unreported.
Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled	This metric is based on the age of the student at the time of enrollment (not upon entry). Age acts as a surrogate variable that captures a large, heterogeneous population of adult students who often have family and work responsibilities as well as other life circumstances that can interfere with successful completion of educational objectives.
Percent of Undergraduate FTE Enrolled in Online Courses	Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the US definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30. Distance Learning is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.).
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees in STEM & Health	The percentage of baccalaureate degrees that are classified as STEM by the Board of Governors in the SUS program inventory as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 4H).
Percent of Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health	The percentage of baccalaureate degrees that are classified as STEM by the Board of Governors in the SUS program inventory as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 5C).



Key Performance Indicators (continued)

Scholarship, Research & Innovation Metrics

Faculty Awards	<p>Awards include: American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Fellows, Beckman Young Investigators, Burroughs Wellcome Fund Career Awards, Cottrell Scholars, Fulbright American Scholars, Getty Scholars in Residence, Guggenheim Fellows, Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators, Lasker Medical Research Awards, MacArthur Foundation Fellows, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Distinguished Achievement Awards, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellows, National Humanities Center Fellows, National Institutes of Health (NIH) MERIT, National Medal of Science and National Medal of Technology, NSF CAREER awards (excluding those who are also PECASE winners), Newberry Library Long-term Fellows, Pew Scholars in Biomedicine, Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE), Robert Wood Johnson Policy Fellows, Searle Scholars, Sloan Research Fellows, Woodrow Wilson Fellows. As reported by the Top American Research Universities – see: http://mup.asu.edu/research_data.html.</p>
Total Research Expenditures (\$M)	<p>Total expenditures for all research activities (including non-science and engineering activities) as reported in the National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</p>
Percent of R&D Expenditures funded from External Sources	<p>This metric reports the amount of research expenditures that was funded from federal, private industry and other (non-state and non-institutional) sources. Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</p>
Licenses/Options Executed	<p>Licenses/options executed in the fiscal year for all technologies as reported in the annual Accountability Report (table 6A).</p>
Number of Start-up Companies	<p>The number of start-up companies that were dependent upon the licensing of University technology for initiation as reported in the annual Accountability Report (table 6A).</p>



Student Debt Summary

Percent of Bachelor’s Recipients with Debt

This is the percentage of bachelor’s graduates in a given academic year who entered the university as a first-time-in-college (FTIC) student and who borrowed through any loan programs (institutional, state, Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and unsubsidized, private) that were certified by your institution - excludes parent loans. Source: Common Dataset (H4).

Average Amount of Debt for Bachelor’s who have graduated with debt

This is the average amount of cumulative principal borrowed (from any loan program certified by the institution) for each native, FTIC bachelor’s recipient in a given academic year that graduated with debt – see metric definition above. This average does NOT include students who did not enter a loan program that was certified by the institution. Source: Common Dataset (H5).

Student Loan Cohort Default Rate (3rd Year)

Student loan cohort default rate (CDR) data includes undergraduate and graduate students, and refers to the three federal fiscal year period when the borrower enters repayment and ends on the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the borrower entered repayment. Cohort default rates are based on the number of borrowers who enter repayment, not the number and type of loans that enter repayment. A borrower with multiple loans from the same school whose loans enter repayment during the same cohort fiscal year will be included in the formula only once for that cohort fiscal year. Default rate debt includes: Federal Stafford Loans, and Direct Stafford/Ford Loans – for more information see: <http://ifap.ed.gov/DefaultManagement/CDRGuideMaster.html>.

Three Year CDR			
Cohort Fiscal Year	Year Published	Borrowers in the Numerator Borrowers in the Denominator	3-Yr Time Period (Numerator) 1-Yr Time Period (Denominator)
2009	2012	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2009 and defaulted in 2009, 2010 or 2011 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2009	10/01/2008 to 9/30/2011 10/01/2008 to 9/30/2009
2010	2013	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2010 and defaulted in 2010, 2011 or 2012 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2010	10/01/2009 to 9/30/2012 10/01/2009 to 9/30/2010
2011	2014*	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2011 and defaulted in 2011, 2012 or 2013 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2011	10/01/2010 to 9/30/2013 10/01/2010 to 9/30/2011
2012	2015	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2012 and defaulted in 2012, 2013 or 2014 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2012	10/01/2011 to 9/30/2014 10/01/2011 to 9/30/2012
2013	2016	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2013 and defaulted in 2013, 2014 or 2015 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2013	10/01/2012 to 9/30/2015 10/01/2012 to 9/30/2013
2014	2017	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2014 and defaulted in 2014, 2015 or 2016 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2014	10/01/2013 to 9/30/2016 10/01/2013 to 9/30/2014
2015	2018	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2015 and defaulted in 2015, 2016 or 2017 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2015	10/01/2014 to 9/30/2017 10/01/2014 to 9/30/2015

USF TAMPA 2016 Work Plan



University of South Florida Tampa

University Work Plan Presentation

for Board of Governors June 2016 Meeting

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM of FLORIDA | **Board of Governors**



INTRODUCTION

The State University System of Florida has developed three tools that aid in guiding the System's future.

- 1) The Board of Governors' 2025 System Strategic Plan is driven by goals and associated metrics that stake out where the System is headed;*
- 2) The Board's Annual Accountability Report provides yearly tracking for how the System is progressing toward its goals;*
- 3) Institutional Work Plans connect the two and create an opportunity for greater dialogue relative to how each institution contributes to the System's overall vision.*

These three documents assist the Board with strategic planning and with setting short-, mid- and long-term goals. The Board will use these documents to help advocate for all System institutions and foster even greater coordination with the institutions and their Boards of Trustees.

Longer-term goals will inform future agendas of the Board's Strategic Planning Committee. The Board's acceptance of a work plan does not constitute approval of any particular component, nor does it supersede any necessary approval processes that may be required for each component.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. STRATEGY**
 - a. Mission Statement
 - b. Vision Statement
 - c. Statement of Strategy
 - d. Strengths and Opportunities
 - e. Key Initiatives & Investments
- 2. PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRICS**
- 3. PREEMINENT RESEARCH UNIVERSITY METRICS**
- 4. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**
 - a. Teaching & Learning
 - b. Scholarship, Research and Innovation
 - c. Institution Specific Goals
- 5. ENROLLMENT PLANNING**
- 6. ACADEMIC PROGRAM COORDINATION**
- 7. STUDENT DEBT & NET COST**
- 8. UNIVERSITY REVENUES**
- 9. TUITION, FEES AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS**
- 10. DEFINITIONS**



MISSION STATEMENT (What is your purpose?)

The University of South Florida's mission is to deliver competitive undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, to generate knowledge, foster intellectual development, and ensure student success in a competitive global market.

VISION STATEMENT (What do you aspire to?)

The University of South Florida is a global research university dedicated to student success and positioned for membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU) and Florida preeminence.

As Florida's leading metropolitan research university, USF is dedicated to:

- Student access, learning, and success through a vibrant, interdisciplinary, and learner-centered research environment, incorporating a global curriculum.
- Research and scientific discovery that strengthens the economy, promotes civic engagement, culture, and the arts, and design, and builds sustainable communities through the generation, dissemination and translation of new knowledge across all academic and health-related disciplines.
- Partnerships that build a significant locally and globally integrated university-community collaborations through sound scholarly and artistic activities and technological innovation.
- A sustainable economic base to support USF's continued academic advancement.

STATEMENT OF STRATEGY (How will you get there?)

Given your mission, vision, strengths and available resources, provide a brief description of your market and your strategy for addressing and leading it.

USF is a Carnegie-classified Doctoral Research University, Highest Research Activity, attracting students and faculty of the highest caliber. As USF moves forward in positioning itself for AAU eligibility and preeminence, it maintains its sharply focused commitment to student success, along with embracing scholarship, research, innovation, community collaboration and economic development at all levels, including USF Health.

The foundation of USF's strategy is accountability, guided by the Board of Governors' Strategic Plan, USF's Strategic Plan and the Board of Governors' performance-funding model. By benchmarking progress to our current and aspirational peer institutions, a clear roadmap guides USF toward further excellence and, ultimately, AAU membership and preeminence.

As part of a regular review process, the USF Board of Trustees and university leadership use a detailed crosswalk to track key metrics for performance-based funding, AAU membership and preeminence. They also review strategies to most effectively expand educational access, including through distance learning. This evaluation guides decision-making for resource allocation to ensure maximum impact.



This past year in particular, there has been a heightened focus on strategic planning for each college and administrative unit at USF – aligning with USF’s Strategic Plan, which aligns with the Strategic Plan for the State University System of Florida. Guided by our Board of Trustees, this intentional thinking has revealed creative new ideas for advancing key metrics. One example can be seen in USF’s efforts to reduce excess hours – which has taken on a multi-pronged approach that includes policy changes to discourage the addition of unnecessary coursework, programs or majors; hiring additional advisers; implementing personalized online tracking systems; and a comprehensive marketing campaign targeting students where they spend time the most, including web portals and social media.

This year we have also leveraged our strength in STEM education and research as part of a new USF System STEM Collaborative aimed at better connecting students in STEM with our region’s workforce, which is hungry for talent. This Collaborative group, made up of representatives from USF, USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee, USF Health and USF Research & Innovation held a STEM Summit in March 2016 to hear from business leaders about their needs and perspectives on STEM education and research. This event kicked off a larger effort to better align educational offerings across the STEM fields with the workforce, staking Florida’s claim as a state on STEM excellence. We hope to expand this effort to include other sister institutions in the SUS in the future.

One key partnership that exemplifies both our strength in collaboration and our leadership in research is the growing National Academy of Inventors. The NAI, founded in 2010 at USF, now includes representation from every Florida SUS institution, in addition to nearly 200 top research universities and nonprofit research institutes across the country.

Another key initiative that will build momentum in the coming months and years is the move of the Morsani College of Medicine and USF Health Heart Institute to downtown Tampa – creating unprecedented synergies and opportunities for collaboration with health professionals throughout Tampa’s metropolitan core and at USF’s main teaching hospital, Tampa General Hospital.



STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES *(within 3 years)*

What are your core capabilities, opportunities and challenges for improvement?

One of USF's key strengths is its agility. We respond quickly to challenges, continually looking for ways to improve, and readily accept new opportunities for growth. This attitude helps us quickly direct focus to those areas that are most important to our students, the Board of Governors and other state leaders.

This is reflected in our steady gains in performance-based funding metrics, the culture of innovation that has made USF one of the most productive research universities in Florida, and our ever-expanding network of business and research partners in the community. It is also evident in our recent recognition as an Emerging Preeminent institution by the Florida Legislature and Governor, pending confirmation by the Board of Governors. We are grateful for the opportunity to present our strategies to work toward the preeminence designation that reflects our research mission while working hard toward those PBF goals that strengthen our undergraduate education.

Our challenge will continue to be maintaining that momentum as we seek further budget efficiencies.

KEY INITIATIVES & INVESTMENTS *(within 3 years)*

Describe your top three key initiatives for the next three years that will drive improvement in Academic Quality, Operational Efficiency, and Return on Investment.

1. Graduate well-educated global citizens through a continued commitment to student success.

USF's No. 1 priority remains to deliver high quality, relevant and globally informed academic programs to prepare graduates for leadership roles and workforce opportunities locally and across the world. This commitment is guided by our efforts to further improve student success through personalized advising, research opportunities at every level, and career-readiness programs. USF's commitment to this global focus through its Quality Enhancement Plan for SACS reaccreditation has gained momentum and engaged faculty, students and staff university-wide. This initiative continues to work to enhance curriculum across USF with global, cross-cultural perspectives and to ensure that every student has an opportunity for a global experience—whether through a technology-enabled global classroom, a study abroad experience, or meaningful interactions with international students and cultures.

2. Produce high-impact research and innovation that will change lives for the better, improve health, and foster positive societal change.

USF has escalated its efforts to recruit and retain research-productive new faculty; intensified its encouragement of undergraduate research that will contribute to an overall positive education experience and enhance student success; supported interdisciplinary initiatives that aim to solve critical problems; provided training to increase external funding; and continued to promote partnerships across the university and within the broader community.



Last year USF was successful in its application to attain status as an Innovation and Economic Prosperity University from the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities – one of only 48 universities to receive this designation nationwide. This designation is only the beginning, however, as USF continues to engage with key community stakeholders to build relationships and improve strategies for economic development.

USF has also just graduated its inaugural class of Innovation Corps (I-Corps) startup companies after being designated as an official I-Corps site by the National Science Foundation. This public-private partnership program trains university entrepreneurs with a targeted curriculum to identify valuable product and startup company opportunities from academic research. It will continue to foster a spirit of productivity across campus as USF innovators discover new applications for their research.

3. Create new partnerships, seek new efficiencies, and cultivate opportunities that will maintain USF's position as a highly effective economic engine for Florida.

USF's partnerships strengthen the Tampa Bay region and Florida as part of the global landscape. USF also continually works to maximize efficiencies and use its resources in the most prudent ways possible – especially given the valued new infusion of performance-based funding investments.

USF continues to work closely with its partners in the Florida Consortium of Metropolitan Research Universities – the University of Central Florida and Florida International University. The group has enjoyed great support from national grant-makers, notably the Helios Foundation, the Helmsley Charitable Trust, and the Kresge Foundation. By sharing and developing best practices in predictive analytics, targeted support, high tech pathways, and career readiness, the Consortium will continue to add value to the student success initiative at USF. In the coming months, the Consortium plans to deepen its efforts to transform STEM education and promote internship opportunities for students in the three metropolitan regions.

Meanwhile, USF continues to build upon its own strong research enterprise, which still boasts the most patents, cumulatively over the last three years, of any state university in Florida by providing the tools and training to innovators on campus so that they are best positioned for success in the marketplace. USF continues its expansion of licensing, with 119 licenses in FY 2015 (a 31 percent increase from FY 2014), and a growing product pipeline over the last three years, with 57 USF products currently on the market.



PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRICS

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+) within the U.S. One Year After Graduation	64.9% 2012-13	65.8% 2013-14	66.8% 2014-15	70.0% 2015-16	72.0% 2016-17	74.0% 2017-18
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One-Year After Graduation	\$35,300 2012-13	\$36,500 2013-14	\$37,000 2014-15	\$37,500 2015-16	\$38,000 2016-17	\$38,500 2017-18
Cost per Bachelor's Degree <i>Costs to the University</i>	Data reported at the USF System level only.					
FTIC 6 year Graduation Rate * <i>for full- and part-time students</i>	66.6% ¹ 2008-14	68.1% ² 2009-15	66.3% 2010-16	70.0% 2011-17	72.0% 2012-18	74.0% 2013-19
Academic Progress Rate * <i>FTIC 2 year Retention Rate with GPA>2</i>	86.7% ³ 2013-14	85.6% ⁴ 2014-15	86.5% 2015-16	87.5% 2016-17	88.5% 2017-18	90.0% 2018-19
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Within Programs of Strategic Emphasis	53.5% 2013-14	56.6% 2014-15	57.0% 2015-16	57.0% 2016-17	57.0% 2017-18	57.0% 2018-19
University Access Rate <i>Percent of Fall Undergraduates with a Pell grant</i>	42.5% Fall 2013	41.7% Fall 2014	40.0% Fall 2015	40.0% Fall 2016	40.0% Fall 2017	40.0% Fall 2018
Graduate Degrees Awarded Within Programs of Strategic Emphasis	71.5% 2013-14	76.3% 2014-15	76.3% 2015-16	76.3% 2016-17	76.3% 2017-18	76.3% 2018-19
BOG METRIC: Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours	62.8% 2013-14	65.1% 2014-15	67.5% 2015-16	70.0% 2016-17	72.5% 2017-18	75.0% 2018-19
UBOT METRIC: Number of Post-doctoral Appointees	289 Fall 2012	321 Fall 2013	298 Fall 2014	277 Fall 2015	285 Fall 2016	290 Fall 2017

Note: Metrics are defined in appendix. For more information about the PBF model visit: http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php.

*FTIC retention/academic progress rate and 6-Year graduation rate percentages represent students starting and ending at USF (Tampa).

¹ 67.6% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2008 cohort graduated within the USF System

² 69.1% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2009 cohort graduated within the USF System

³ 86.9% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2013 cohort were retained within the USF System

⁴ 85.9% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2014 cohort were retained within the USF System



PREEMINENT RESEARCH UNIVERSITY FUNDING METRICS

	BENCH- MARKS	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
Average GPA and SAT Score <i>for incoming freshman in Fall semester</i>	4.0 GPA 1200 SAT	4.1 1223 Fall 2015	4.0 1220 Fall 2016	4.05 1222 Fall 2017	4.075 1224 Fall 2018	4.10 1226 Fall 2019
Public University National Ranking <i>in more than one national ranking</i>	Top 50	4 2016	5 2017	5 2018	5 2019	5 2020
Freshman Retention Rate <i>Full-time, FTIC</i>	90%	88% 2014-15	90% 2015-16	91% 2016-17	92% 2017-18	93% 2018-19
6-year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time, FTIC</i>	70%	68% 2009-15	66.5% 2010-16	70.0% 2011-17	72.0% 2012-18	74.0% 2013-19
National Academy Memberships	6	8 2016	9 2017	10 2018	10 2019	10 2020
Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$200 M	\$420 2014-15	\$421 2015-16	\$427 2016-17	\$434 2017-18	\$440 2018-19
Non-Medical Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$150 M	\$229 2014-15	\$230 2015-16	\$233 2016-17	\$237 2017-18	\$241 2018-19
National Ranking in S.T.E.M. Research Expenditures <i>includes public & private institutions</i>	Top 100 in 5 of 8 disciplines	7 2013-14	7 2014-15	8 2015-16	8 2016-17	8 2017-18
Patents Awarded <i>over 3 year period</i>	100	297 2013-15	291 2014-16	273 2015-17	276 2016-18	279 2017-19
Doctoral Degrees Awarded Annually	400	601 2014-15	645 2015-16	650 2016-17	655 2017-18	660 2018-19
Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees	200	289 Fall 2012	321 Fall 2013	298 Fall 2014	277 Fall 2015	285 Fall 2016
Endowment Size (\$M)	\$500 M	\$417 2014-15	\$395 2015-16	\$412 2016-17	\$432 2017-18	\$448 2018-19
NUMBER OF METRICS ABOVE THE BENCHMARK		9	10	11	11	11

Note: Metrics are defined in appendix. For more information about Preeminent state research universities, see 1001.7065 Florida Statutes.



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Teaching & Learning Metrics (from 2025 System Strategic Plan that are not included in PBF or Preeminence)

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
2. Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class	30.0% <small>Fall 2014</small>	34.0% <small>Fall 2015</small>	35.0% <small>Fall 2016</small>	35.0% <small>Fall 2017</small>	36.0% <small>Fall 2018</small>	36.0% <small>Fall 2019</small>
3. Professional Licensure & Certification Exam Pass Rates Above Benchmarks	3 of 5 <small>2013-14</small>	5 of 5 <small>2014-15</small>	6 of 6 <small>2015-16</small>	6 of 6 <small>2016-17</small>	6 of 6 <small>2017-18</small>	6 of 6 <small>2018-19</small>
4. Time to Degree <i>Mean Years for FTICs in 120hr programs</i>	4.9 <small>2013-14</small>	4.8 <small>2014-15</small>	4.7 <small>2015-16</small>	4.5 <small>2016-17</small>	4.3 <small>2017-18</small>	4.1 <small>2018-19</small>
5. Four-Year FTIC Graduation Rates * <i>full- and part-time students</i>	44.0% ¹ <small>2010-14</small>	51.0% ² <small>2011-15</small>	54.0% <small>2012-16</small>	56.0% <small>2013-17</small>	58.0% <small>2014-18</small>	60.0% <small>2015-19</small>
8. Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded <i>First Majors Only</i>	8,079 <small>2013-14</small>	7,991 <small>2014-15</small>	7,700 <small>2015-16</small>	7,800 <small>2016-17</small>	7,900 <small>2017-18</small>	8,000 <small>2018-19</small>
9. Graduate Degrees Awarded <i>First Majors Only</i>	3,179 <small>2013-14</small>	3,501 <small>2014-15</small>	3,600 <small>2015-16</small>	3,675 <small>2016-17</small>	3,750 <small>2017-18</small>	3,800 <small>2018-19</small>
10. Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded to African-American & Hispanic Students	29.0% <small>2013-14</small>	31.0% <small>2014-15</small>	31.0% <small>2015-16</small>	31.0% <small>2016-17</small>	31.0% <small>2017-18</small>	32.0% <small>2018-19</small>
11. Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled	21.0% <small>Fall 2013</small>	21.0% <small>Fall 2014</small>	20.0% <small>2015-16</small>	20.0% <small>2016-17</small>	19.0% <small>2017-18</small>	19.0% <small>2018-19</small>
12. Percent of Undergraduate FTE in Online Courses	21.0% <small>2013-14</small>	24.0% <small>2014-15</small>	25.5% <small>2015-16</small>	26.2% <small>2016-17</small>	27.0% <small>2017-18</small>	27.7% <small>2018-19</small>
16. Percent of Bachelor’s Degrees in STEM & Health	38.0% <small>2013-14</small>	43.0% <small>2014-15</small>	44.3% <small>2015-16</small>	45.0% <small>2016-17</small>	46.0% <small>2017-18</small>	47.0% <small>2018-19</small>
18. Percent of Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health	56.0% <small>2013-14</small>	61.0% <small>2014-15</small>	64.0% <small>2015-16</small>	65.0% <small>2016-17</small>	66.0% <small>2017-18</small>	67.0% <small>2018-19</small>
IMPROVING METRICS		9 of 11	9 of 11	7 of 11	9 of 11	8 of 11

*FTIC 4-Year graduation rate percentages represent students starting and ending at USF (Tampa).

¹ 44.3% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2010 cohort graduated within the USF System

² 51.1% of USF (Tampa) students of the 2011 cohort graduated within the USF System



KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (continued)

Scholarship, Research and Innovation Metrics (from the 2025 System Strategic Plan)

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
20. Faculty Awards	7 2012	8 2013	7 2014	8 2015	9 2016	10 2017
22. Total Research Expenditures (\$M)	\$489 2013-14	\$485 2014-15	\$486 2015-16	\$501 2016-17	\$516 2017-18	\$531 2018-19
23. Research Expenditures Funded from External Sources	60% 2013-14	55% 2014-15	56% 2015-16	57% 2016-17	58% 2017-18	59% 2018-19
25. Licenses/Options Executed	75 2012-13	91 2013-14	119 2014-15	120 2015-16	121 2016-17	122 2017-18
26. Number of Start-up Companies Created	11 2013-14	11 2014-15	8 2015-16	9 2016-17	10 2017-18	11 2018-19
IMPROVING METRICS		2 of 5	3 of 5	5 of 5	5 of 5	5 of 5

Institution Specific Goals (optional)

To further distinguish the university's distinctive mission, the university may choose to provide additional narrative and metric goals that are based on the university's own strategic plan.

Narrative Goals.

USF's first strategic priority is student at both the undergraduate and graduate levels with Metric 1 selected and supported through the new USF System STEM collaborative initiative. As a part of our commitment to student success we continue to increase the percentage of talented, diverse students within our new FTIC cohorts (Metric 2). Our student success strategic priority also is reflected through our focus on increasing the percent of course section offered via distance and blended learning (Metric 3). As a Carnegie R1 university with a strategic goal of engaging in high impact research, USF will continue to build a sustainable research infrastructure included total research expenditures (Metric 4) and federal research expenditures (Metric 5) as defined by the National Science Foundation.

	2015 ACTUAL	2016 ACTUAL	2017 GOALS	2018 GOALS	2019 GOALS	2020 GOALS
Metric #1 Graduate Degrees in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	2,274 2013-14	2,670 2014-15	2,791 2015-16	2,850 2016-17	2,905 2017-18	2,945 2018-19
Metric #2 Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class	30.0% Fall 2014	34.0% Fall 2015	35.0% Fall 2016	35.0% Fall 2017	36.0% Fall 2018	36.0% Fall 2019
Metric #3 Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning	12.0% 2013-14	12.0% 2014-15	12.0% 2015-16	12.0% 2016-17	13.0% 2017-18	13.0% 2018-19
Metric #4 Total Research Expenditures	\$489 M 2013-14	\$485 M 2014-15	\$486 M 2015-16	\$501 2016-17	\$516 2017-18	\$531 2018-19
Metric #5 Federal Research Expenditures	\$223 M 2013-14	\$218 M 2014-15	\$219 M 2015-16	\$222 M 2016-17	\$226 M 2018-19	\$229 M 2019-20



ENROLLMENT PLANNING

Planned Headcount Enrollment by Student Type *(for all students at all campuses)*

	FALL 2013 ACTUAL	FALL 2014 ACTUAL	FALL 2015 ACTUAL	FALL 2016 PLAN	FALL 2017 PLAN	FALL 2018 PLAN	FALL 2019 PLAN
UNDERGRADUATE							
FTIC	15,469	15,662	15,823	15,902	16,021	16,182	16,194
AA Transfers ¹	8,615	8,366	8,199	8,240	8,302	8,385	8,490
Other ²	6,303	6,251	6,265	6,268	6,171	6,063	5,881
Subtotal	30,387	30,279	30,287	30,410	30,494	30,629	30,564
GRADUATE³							
Master's	6,126	6,300	6,446	6,510	6,608	6,707	6,808
Research Doctoral	2,294	2,226	2,229	2,232	2,235	2,238	2,241
Professional Doctoral	1,220	1,379	1,309	1,239	1,241	1,244	1,246
Subtotal	9,640	9,905	9,984	9,981	10,085	10,189	10,295
UNCLASSIFIED							
H.S. Dual Enrolled	46	16	25	41	57	80	113
Other ⁴	1,615	1,865	1,895	1,900	1,937	1,974	2,012
Subtotal	1,661	1,881	1,920	1,941	1,994	2,054	2,125
TOTAL	41,688	42,065	42,191	42,333	42,573	42,873	42,985

Notes: This table reports the number of students enrolled at the university by student type categories. The determination for undergraduate, graduate and unclassified is based on the institutional class level values. Unclassified refers to a student who has not yet been formally admitted into a degree program but is enrolled. The student type for undergraduates is based on the Type of Student at Time of Most Recent Admission. The student type for graduates is based on the degree that is sought and the student CIP code. (1) Includes AA Transfers from the Florida College System. (2) Undergraduate – Other includes Post-Baccalaureates who are seeking a degree. (3) Includes Medical students. (4) Unclassified – Other includes Post-Baccalaureates who are not seeking a degree.

Planned FTE Enrollment by Method of Instruction *(for all students at all campuses)*

	2012-13 ACTUAL	2013-14 ACTUAL	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 PLAN	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN
UNDERGRADUATE							
Distance (80-100%)	5,732	5,918	6,830	7,359	7,580	7,807	8,041
Hybrid (50-79%)	588	452	406	188	190	192	194
Traditional (0-50%)	22,410	22,195	21,285	21,273	21,108	20,936	20,758
Subtotal	28,729	28,565	28,521	28,820	28,878	28,935	28,993
GRADUATE							
Distance (80-100%)	1,563	1,611	1,803	1,851	1,907	1,964	2,023
Hybrid (50-79%)	210	224	180	63	64	64	65
Traditional (0-50%)	5,674	5,884	6,004	6,159	6,248	6,338	6,429
Subtotal	7,447	7,719	7,987	8,073	8,218	8,366	8,517

Note: Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the standard national definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30 and graduate credit hours by 24. **Distance Learning** is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.). **Hybrid** is a course where 50% to 79% of the instruction is delivered using some form of technology, when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per SUDS data element 2052). **Traditional** refers to primarily face to face instruction utilizing some form of technology for delivery of supplemental course materials for *no more* than 49% of instruction (per SUDS data element 2052).

Data Provided by USF at the institution level



ENROLLMENT PLANNING (continued)

Planned FTE Enrollment Plan by Student Level

	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 ESTIMATE	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN	2019-20 PLAN	2020-21 PLAN	2021-22 PLAN	Planned Annual Growth Rate*
STATE FUNDABLE									
RESIDENT									
LOWER	10,096	10,039	10,069	10,099	10,129	10,160	10,190	10,221	0.3%
UPPER	15,307	15,184	15,215	15,245	15,276	15,306	15,337	15,367	0.2%
GRAD I	3,972	3,815	3,884	3,954	4,025	4,098	4,171	4,246	1.8%
GRAD II	1,256	1,153	1,174	1,195	1,217	1,239	1,261	1,284	1.8%
TOTAL	30,631	30,192	30,342	30,494	30,647	30,802	30,960	31,119	0.5%
NON RESIDENT									
LOWER	1,110	1,331	1,333	1,336	1,339	1,341	1,344	1,347	0.2%
UPPER	1,067	1,326	1,329	1,331	1,334	1,337	1,339	1,342	0.2%
GRAD I	1,206	1,443	1,469	1,496	1,523	1,550	1,578	1,606	1.8%
GRAD II	877	925	942	959	976	994	1,011	1,030	1.8%
TOTAL	4,260	5,025	5,073	5,122	5,171	5,222	5,273	5,325	1.0%
TOTAL									
LOWER	11,205	11,370	11,402	11,435	11,468	11,501	11,534	11,568	0.3%
UPPER	16,374	16,510	16,543	16,576	16,610	16,643	16,676	16,709	0.2%
GRAD I	5,178	5,259	5,353	5,450	5,548	5,648	5,749	5,853	1.8%
GRAD II	2,133	2,079	2,116	2,154	2,193	2,232	2,272	2,313	1.8%
TOTAL	34,891	35,217	35,415	35,615	35,818	36,024	36,232	36,443	0.6%
NOT STATE FUNDABLE									
LOWER	578	588	589	570	561	552	543	534	-1.9%
UPPER	364	352	353	353	354	355	356	356	0.2%
GRAD I	651	677	690	702	715	728	741	754	1.8%
GRAD II	24	58	59	60	61	62	63	65	2.0%
TOTAL	1,617	1,675	1,691	1,685	1,691	1,697	1,703	1,709	0.2%

Note: Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the standard national definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30 and graduate credit hours by 24. Note*: The Planned Annual Growth Rate is a compounded rate based on the following formula: $(2021-22 \text{ value} \div \text{the } 2016-17 \text{ value}) \text{ to the } (1/5) \text{ exponent minus one}$.

Medical Student Headcount Enrollments (E&G Funded)

	2014-15 ACTUAL	2015-16 ESTIMATE	2016-17 PLAN	2017-18 PLAN	2018-19 PLAN	2019-20 PLAN	2020-21 PLAN	2021-22 PLAN	Annual Growth Rate*
MEDICAL DOCTORATES									
RESIDENT	438	430	415	415	413	406	406	406	-0.4%
NON-RESIDENT	53	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	0.0%
TOTAL	491	504	489	489	487	480	480	480	-0.4%

Data Provided by USF at the institution level



ACADEMIC PROGRAM COORDINATION

New Programs For Consideration by University in AY 2016-17

The S.U.S. Council of Academic Vice Presidents (CAVP) Academic Program Coordination Work Group will review these programs as part of their on-going coordination efforts. The programs listed below are based on the 2015 Work Plan list for programs under consideration for 2016-17.

PROGRAM TITLES	CIP CODE 6-digit	AREA OF STRATEGIC EMPHASIS	OTHER UNIVERSITIES WITH SAME PROGRAM	OFFERED VIA DISTANCE LEARNING IN SYSTEM	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT <i>in 5th year</i>	PROPOSED DATE OF SUBMISSION TO UBOT
BACHELOR'S PROGRAMS						
BS Public Relations, Advertising, And Applied Communications	09.0900	GAP	FSU	25%	580	Fall 2016

MASTER'S, SPECIALIST AND OTHER ADVANCED MASTER'S PROGRAMS						
MS Public Relations, Advertising, And Applied Communications	09.0900	GAP	FSU, UNF	0%	68	Spring 2017

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS						

New Programs For Consideration by University in 2017-19

These programs will be used in the 2017 Work Plan list for programs under consideration for 2017-18.

PROGRAM TITLES	CIP CODE 6-digit	AREA OF STRATEGIC EMPHASIS	OTHER UNIVERSITIES WITH SAME PROGRAM	OFFERED VIA DISTANCE LEARNING IN SYSTEM	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT <i>in 5th year</i>	PROPOSED DATE OF SUBMISSION TO UBOT
BACHELOR'S PROGRAMS						

MASTER'S, SPECIALIST AND OTHER ADVANCED MASTER'S PROGRAMS						

DOCTORAL PROGRAMS						
OTD Occupational Therapy	51.2306	HEALTH	-	0%	80	TBD
PhD Pharmacy	51.2099	STEM	FAMU, UF	30%	5	TBD



STUDENT DEBT & NET COST

Student Debt Summary

	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
Percent of Bachelor's Recipients with Debt	53%	57%	59%	60%	60%
Average Amount of Debt <i>for Bachelor's who have graduated with debt</i>	\$21,780	\$22,620	\$22,720	\$22,720	\$22,899
NSLDS Cohort Year	2008-11	2009-12	2010-13	2011-14	2012-15 Preliminary
Student Loan Cohort Default Rate (3rd Year)	10.1%	9.0%	7.5%	5.3%	5.2%

Cost of Attendance *(for Full-Time Undergraduate Florida Residents in the Fall and Spring of 2015-16)*

	TUITION & FEES	BOOKS & SUPPLIES	ROOM & BOARD	TRANSPORTATION	OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL
ON-CAMPUS	\$6,410	\$1,200	\$9,400	\$1,600	\$2,500	\$21,110
AT HOME	\$6,410	\$1,200	\$4,700	\$1,600	\$2,500	\$16,410

Estimated Net Cost by Family Income *(for Full-Time Undergraduate Florida Residents in the Fall and Spring of 2015-16)*

FAMILY INCOME GROUPS	FULL-TIME RESIDENT UNDERGRADUATES HEADCOUNT	PERCENT	AVG. NET COST OF ATTENDANCE	AVG. NET TUITION & FEES	AVG. GIFT AID AMOUNT	AVG. LOAN AMOUNT	
Below \$40,000	5,551	32%	\$11,188	-\$3,171	\$9,059	\$3,936	
\$40,000-\$59,999	2,009	12%	\$13,290	-\$956	\$6,904	\$3,802	
\$60,000-\$79,999	1,529	9%	\$15,440	\$1,382	\$4,643	\$4,458	
\$80,000-\$99,999	1,319	8%	\$16,497	\$2,536	\$3,512	\$4,846	
\$100,000 Above	3,976	23%	\$16,601	\$2,520	\$3,533	\$3,869	
Not Reported	2,702	16%	n/a	\$3,296	\$2,730	\$153	
TOTAL	17,086	100%	AVERAGE	\$13,918*	\$284	\$5,695	\$3,423

Notes: This data only represents Fall and Spring financial aid data and is accurate as of March 31, 2016. Please note that small changes to Spring 2016 awards are possible before the data is finalized. **Family Income Groups** are based on the Total Family Income (including untaxed income) as reported on student FAFSA records. **Full-time Students** is a headcount based on at least 24 credit hours during Fall and Spring terms. **Average Gift Aid** includes all grants and scholarships from Federal, State, University and other private sources administered by the Financial Aid Office. Student waivers are also included in the Gift Aid amount. Gift Aid does not include the parental contribution towards EFC. **Net Cost of Attendance** is the actual average of the total Costs of Attendance (which will vary by income group due to the diversity of students living on- & off- campus) *minus* the average Gift Aid amount. **Net Tuition & Fees** is the actual average of the total costs of tuition and fees (which will vary by income group due to the amount of credit hours students are enrolled) *minus* the average Gift Aid amount (see page 16 for list of fees that are included). **Average Loan Amount** includes Federal (Perkins, Stafford, Ford Direct, and PLUS loans) and all private loans. 'Not Reported' represents the students who did not file a FAFSA. The bottom-line **Total/Average** represents the average of all full-time undergraduate Florida residents (note*: the total Net Cost of Attendance does not include students who did not report their family income data).



UNIVERSITY REVENUES

University Revenues *(in Millions of Dollars)*

EDUCATION & GENERAL	2014-15	2015-16
Main Operations		
State Funds	\$ 239.8	\$250.3
Tuition	\$ 165.7	\$ 169.6
Subtotal	\$ 405.5	\$ 419.9
Health-Science Center / Medical Schools		
State Funds	\$ 74.7	\$ 74.2
Tuition	\$ 50.6	\$ 57.7
Subtotal	\$ 125.2	\$ 131.9
E&G TOTAL	\$ 530.8	\$ 551.8
OTHER BUDGET ENTITIES		
Auxiliary Enterprises	\$ 189.6	\$ 224.5
Contracts & Grants	\$ 278.3	\$ 384.8
Local Funds	\$ 429.9	\$ 477.7
Faculty Practice Plans	\$ 229.2	\$ 245.9

Note: State funds include recurring and non-recurring General Revenue funds, Lottery funds appropriated by the Florida Legislature. Actual tuition includes base tuition and tuition differential fee revenues for resident and non-resident undergraduate and graduate students net of waivers. Source: Tables 1A & 1E of the annual Accountability Report.



UNIVERSITY TUITION, FEES AND HOUSING PROJECTIONS

University of South Florida - Main Campus							
<u>Undergraduate Students</u>	Actual			Projected			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Tuition:							
Base Tuition - (0% inc. for 2016-17 to 2019-20)	\$105.07	\$105.07	\$105.07	\$105.07	\$105.07	\$105.07	\$105.07
Tuition Differential ⁵	\$46.88	\$46.88	\$46.88	\$46.88	\$46.88	\$46.88	\$46.88
Total Base Tuition & Differential per Credit Hour	\$151.95	\$151.95	\$151.95	\$151.95	\$151.95	\$151.95	\$151.95
% Change	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fees (per credit hour):							
Student Financial Aid ¹	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25
Capital Improvement ²	\$6.76	\$6.76	\$6.76	\$6.76	\$6.76	\$6.76	\$6.76
Activity & Service	\$12.08	\$12.08	\$12.08	\$12.08	\$12.08	\$12.08	\$12.08
Health	\$9.94	\$10.15	\$10.15	\$10.15	\$10.15	\$10.15	\$10.15
Athletic	\$14.46	\$14.46	\$14.46	\$14.46	\$14.46	\$14.46	\$14.46
Transportation Access	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00
Technology ¹	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25	\$5.25
Marshall Center Fee	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50	\$1.50
Student Green Energy	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Sub total (credit hour fees)	\$59.24	\$59.45	\$59.45	\$59.45	\$59.45	\$59.45	\$59.45
Total Tuition and Fees per credit hour	\$211.19	\$211.40	\$211.40	\$211.40	\$211.40	\$211.40	\$211.40
% Change	1.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Fees (block per term):							
Activity & Service	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$7.00
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Athletic	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Transportation Access	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marshall Center Fee	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
<i>Proposed New Fee</i>							
Total Block Fees per term	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00
% Change	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Tuition for 30 Credit Hours	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50
Total Fees for 30 Credit Hours	\$1,851.20	\$1,857.50	\$1,857.50	\$1,857.50	\$1,857.50	\$1,857.50	\$1,857.50
Total Tuition and Fees for 30 Credit Hours	\$6,409.70	\$6,416.00	\$6,416.00	\$6,416.00	\$6,416.00	\$6,416.00	\$6,416.00
\$ Change	\$75.30	\$6.30	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
% Change	1.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Out-of-State Fees							
Out-of-State Undergraduate Fee	\$346.50	\$346.50	\$346.50	\$346.50	\$346.50	\$346.50	\$346.50
Out-of-State Undergraduate Student Financial Aid ³	\$17.32	\$17.32	\$17.32	\$17.32	\$17.32	\$17.32	\$17.32
Total per credit hour	\$363.82	\$363.82	\$363.82	\$363.82	\$363.82	\$363.82	\$363.82
% Change	10%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total Tuition for 30 Credit Hours	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50	\$4,558.50
Total Fees for 30 Credit Hours	\$12,765.80	\$12,772.10	\$12,772.10	\$12,772.10	\$12,772.10	\$12,772.10	\$12,772.10
Total Tuition and Fees for 30 Credit Hours	\$17,324.30	\$17,330.60	\$17,330.60	\$17,330.60	\$17,330.60	\$17,330.60	\$17,330.60
\$ Change	\$1,067.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
% Change	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Housing/Dining⁴							
	\$9,250.00	\$9,403.00	\$9,403.00	\$10,324.00	\$11,074.00	\$11,800.00	\$11,800.00
\$ Change		\$153.00	\$0.00	\$921.00	\$750.00	\$726.00	\$0.00
% Change		1.7%	0.0%	9.8%	7.3%	6.6%	0.0%
² as approved by the Board of Governors. ³ can be no more than 5% of tuition and the out-of-state fee. ⁴ combine the most popular housing and dining plans provided to students ⁵ report current tuition differential. Only UF or FSU can reflect potential increases up to 6%.							

Note: The University will continually assess the need for changes to tuition & fees in support of student success and fiscal responsibility consistent with FL Statute 1009.24



DEFINITIONS

Performance Based Funding

Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+)

in the U.S. One Year After Graduation

This metric is based on the percentage of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are enrolled or employed (earning at least \$25,000) somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers and are not found enrolled are excluded. Note: This data now non-Florida employment data.

Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One Year After Graduation

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. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse.

Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree

Costs to the university

For each of the last four years of data, the annual undergraduate total full expenditures (includes direct and indirect 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. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Expenditure Analysis: Report IV.

Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate

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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 4D).

Academic Progress Rate

2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4B).

University Access Rate

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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 3E).

Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4H).

Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 5C).



BOG Choice Metrics

Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

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.

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, and credit hours earned in military science courses that are part of the Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) program). Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

BOT Choice Metrics

Number of Postdoctoral Appointees
USF

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.

Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).

Preeminent Research University Funding Metrics

Average GPA and SAT Score

An average weighted grade point average of 4.0 or higher and an average SAT score of 1200 or higher for fall semester incoming freshmen, as reported annually in the admissions data that universities submit to the Board of Governors. This data includes registered FTIC (student type='B','E') with an admission action of admitted or provisionally admitted ('A','P','X').

Public University National Ranking

A top-50 ranking on at least two well-known and highly respected national public university rankings, reflecting national preeminence, using most recent rankings, includes: Princeton Review, Fiske Guide, QS World University Ranking, Times Higher Education World University Ranking, Academic Ranking of World University, US News and World Report National University, US News and World Report National Public University, US News and World Report Liberal Arts Colleges, Forbes, Kiplinger, Washington Monthly Liberal Arts Colleges, Washington Monthly National University, and Center for Measuring University Performance.



Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC)	Freshman Retention Rate (Full-time, FTIC) as reported annually to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The retention rates that are reported in the Board's annual Accountability report are preliminary because they are based on student enrollment in their second fall term as reported by the 28th calendar day following the first day of class. When the Board of Governors reports final retention rates to IPEDS in the Spring (usually the first week of April), that data is based on the student enrollment data as reported after the Fall semester has been completed. The preliminary and final retention rates are nearly identical when rounded to the nearest whole number.
6-year Graduation Rate (Full-time, FTIC)	Cohorts are based on undergraduate students who enter the institution in the Fall term (or Summer term and continue into the Fall term). Percent Graduated is based on federal rate and does <u>not</u> include students who originally enroll as part-time students, or who transfer into the institution. This metric complies with the requirements of the federal Student Right to Know Act that requires institutions to report the completion status at 150% of normal time (or six years). For more information about how this data is calculated, see: http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/docs/performance_funding/PBF_GRADUATION and RETENTION Methodology FINAL.pdf .
National Academy Memberships	National Academy Memberships held by faculty as reported by the Center for Measuring University Performance in the Top American Research Universities (TARU) annual report or the official membership directories maintained by each national academy.
Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	Science & Engineering Research Expenditures, including federal research expenditures as reported annually to the National Science Foundation (NSF).
Non-Medical Science & Engineering Research Expenditures (\$M)	Total S&E research expenditures in non-medical sciences as reported to the NSF. This removes medical sciences funds (9F & 12F in HERD survey) from the total S&E amount.
National Ranking in S.T.E.M. Research Expenditures	The NSF identifies 8 broad disciplines within Science & Engineering (Computer Science, Engineering, Environmental Science, Life Science, Mathematical Sciences, Physical Sciences, Psychology, Social Sciences). The rankings by discipline are determined by BOG staff using the NSF WebCaspar database.
Patents Awarded (3 calendar years)	Total patents awarded by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) for the most recent three calendar year period. Due to a year-lag in published reports, Board of Governors staff query the USPTO database with a query that only counts utility patents:"(AN/"University Name" AND ISD/yyyymmdd->yyyymmdd AND APT/1)".
Doctoral Degrees Awarded Annually	Doctoral degrees awarded annually, as reported annually in the Board of Governors Accountability Report.
Number of Post-Doctoral Appointees	The number of Postdoctoral Appointees awarded annually, as reported in the TARU annual report. This data is based on National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).
Endowment Size (\$M)	This data comes from the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and Commonfund Institute's annual report of Market Value of Endowment Assets - which, due to timing, may release the next fiscal year's data after the Board of Governors Accountability report is published.



Key Performance Indicators	
Teaching & Learning Metrics	
Freshmen in Top 10% of HS Graduating Class	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. As reported by the university to the Common Data Set (C10).
Professional/Licensure Exam First-time Pass Rates	The number of exams with first-time pass rates above and below the national or state average, as reported in the annual Accountability report, including: Nursing, Law, Medicine (3 subtests), Veterinary, Pharmacy, Dental (2 subtests), Physical Therapy, and Occupational Therapy.
Average Time to Degree Mean Years for FTIC in 120hr programs	This metric is the mean number of years between the start date (using date of most recent admission) and the end date (using the last month in the term degree was granted) for a graduating class of first-time, single-major baccalaureates in 120 credit hour programs within a (Summer, Fall, Spring) year.
FTIC Graduation Rates In 4 years (or less)	As reported in the annual Accountability report (table 4D), First-time-in-college (FTIC) cohort is defined as undergraduates entering in fall term (or summer continuing to fall) with fewer than 12 hours earned since high school graduation. The rate is the percentage of the initial cohort that has either graduated from or is still enrolled in the <u>same</u> institution by the fourth academic year. Both full-time and part-time students are used in the calculation. The initial cohort is revised to remove students, who have allowable exclusions as defined by IPEDS, from the cohort.
Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded	This is a count of baccalaureate degrees awarded as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 4G).
Graduate Degrees Awarded	This is a count of graduate degrees awarded as reported in the Accountability Report (Table 5B).
Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded To African-American and Hispanic Students	Non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic do not include students classified as Non-Resident Alien or students with a missing race code – as reported in the Accountability Report (table 4I). Students who earn two distinct degrees in the same term are counted twice – whether their degrees are from the same six-digit CIP code or different CIP codes. Students who earn only one degree are counted once – even if they completed multiple majors or tracks. Percentage of Degrees is based on the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded to non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic students divided by the total degrees awarded - excluding those awarded to non-resident aliens and unreported.
Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled Fall term	This metric is based on the age of the student at the time of enrollment (not upon entry). Age acts as a surrogate variable that captures a large, heterogeneous population of adult students who often have family and work responsibilities as well as other life circumstances that can interfere with successful completion of educational objectives.
Percent of Undergraduate FTE Enrolled in Online Courses	Full-time Equivalent (FTE) student is a measure of instructional activity that is based on the number of credit hours that students enroll. FTE is based on the US definition, which divides undergraduate credit hours by 30. Distance Learning is a course in which at least 80 percent of the direct instruction of the course is delivered using some form of technology when the student and instructor are separated by time or space, or both (per 1009.24(17), F.S.).
Percent of Bachelor’s Degrees in STEM & Health	The percentage of baccalaureate degrees that are classified as STEM by the Board of Governors in the SUS program inventory as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 4H).
Percent of Graduate Degrees in STEM & Health	The percentage of baccalaureate degrees that are classified as STEM by the Board of Governors in the SUS program inventory as reported in the annual Accountability Report (Table 5C).



Key Performance Indicators (continued)

Scholarship, Research & Innovation Metrics

Faculty Awards	Awards include: American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Fellows, Beckman Young Investigators, Burroughs Wellcome Fund Career Awards, Cottrell Scholars, Fulbright American Scholars, Getty Scholars in Residence, Guggenheim Fellows, Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigators, Lasker Medical Research Awards, MacArthur Foundation Fellows, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Distinguished Achievement Awards, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) Fellows, National Humanities Center Fellows, National Institutes of Health (NIH) MERIT, National Medal of Science and National Medal of Technology, NSF CAREER awards (excluding those who are also PECASE winners), Newberry Library Long-term Fellows, Pew Scholars in Biomedicine, Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE), Robert Wood Johnson Policy Fellows, Searle Scholars, Sloan Research Fellows, Woodrow Wilson Fellows. As reported by the Top American Research Universities – see: http://mup.asu.edu/research_data.html .
Total Research Expenditures (\$M)	Total expenditures for all research activities (including non-science and engineering activities) as reported in the National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).
Percent of R&D Expenditures funded from External Sources	This metric reports the amount of research expenditures that was funded from federal, private industry and other (non-state and non-institutional) sources. Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).
Licenses/Options Executed	Licenses/options executed in the fiscal year for all technologies as reported in the annual Accountability Report (table 6A).
Number of Start-up Companies	The number of start-up companies that were dependent upon the licensing of University technology for initiation as reported in the annual Accountability Report (table 6A).



Student Debt Summary

Percent of Bachelor’s Recipients with Debt

This is the percentage of bachelor’s graduates in a given academic year who entered the university as a first-time-in-college (FTIC) student and who borrowed through any loan programs (institutional, state, Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and unsubsidized, private) that were certified by your institution - excludes parent loans. Source: Common Dataset (H4).

Average Amount of Debt for Bachelor’s who have graduated with debt

This is the average amount of cumulative principal borrowed (from any loan program certified by the institution) for each native, FTIC bachelor’s recipient in a given academic year that graduated with debt – see metric definition above. This average does NOT include students who did not enter a loan program that was certified by the institution. Source: Common Dataset (H5).

Student Loan Cohort Default Rate (3rd Year)

Student loan cohort default rate (CDR) data includes undergraduate and graduate students, and refers to the three federal fiscal year period when the borrower enters repayment and ends on the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the borrower entered repayment. Cohort default rates are based on the number of borrowers who enter repayment, not the number and type of loans that enter repayment. A borrower with multiple loans from the same school whose loans enter repayment during the same cohort fiscal year will be included in the formula only once for that cohort fiscal year. Default rate debt includes: Federal Stafford Loans, and Direct Stafford/Ford Loans – for more information see: <http://ifap.ed.gov/DefaultManagement/CDRGuideMaster.html>.

Three Year CDR			
Cohort Fiscal Year	Year Published	Borrowers in the Numerator Borrowers in the Denominator	3-Yr Time Period (Numerator) 1-Yr Time Period (Denominator)
2009	2012	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2009 and defaulted in 2009, 2010 or 2011 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2009	10/01/2008 to 9/30/2011 10/01/2008 to 9/30/2009
2010	2013	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2010 and defaulted in 2010, 2011 or 2012 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2010	10/01/2009 to 9/30/2012 10/01/2009 to 9/30/2010
2011	2014*	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2011 and defaulted in 2011, 2012 or 2013 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2011	10/01/2010 to 9/30/2013 10/01/2010 to 9/30/2011
2012	2015	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2012 and defaulted in 2012, 2013 or 2014 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2012	10/01/2011 to 9/30/2014 10/01/2011 to 9/30/2012
2013	2016	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2013 and defaulted in 2013, 2014 or 2015 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2013	10/01/2012 to 9/30/2015 10/01/2012 to 9/30/2013
2014	2017	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2014 and defaulted in 2014, 2015 or 2016 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2014	10/01/2013 to 9/30/2016 10/01/2013 to 9/30/2014
2015	2018	Borrowers who entered repayment in 2015 and defaulted in 2015, 2016 or 2017 Borrowers who entered repayment in 2015	10/01/2014 to 9/30/2017 10/01/2014 to 9/30/2015

Performance-Based Funding

Overview & Strategies for Improvement

Ralph Wilcox, Terry Osborn, Martin Tadlock, Terry Chisolm,
Russ Coughenour, Paul Dosal, Nick Trivunovich, Dwayne Smith
January 5, 2017

Statute

- **1008.46 State Accountability Process**

- Systematic, ongoing evaluation of quality and effectiveness of state universities by the BOG
- Adoption of BOG determined system wide performance standards and goals
- *Annual Accountability Reports* by the universities and the BOG reflect measures defined through performance-based budgeting
- The performance-based budgeting measures must also reflect the elements of teaching, research, and service inherent in the missions of the state universities

Title XLVIII , Chapter 1008

K-20 Education Code, Assessment & Accountability

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?mode=View%20Statutes&SubMenu=1&App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=performance+based&URL=1000-1099/1008/Sections/1008.46.html Tab 1

FL BOG Guiding Principles for PBF

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

http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php

FL BOG PBF Key Components

- Institutions will be evaluated on either Excellence or Improvement for each metric
- Data are based on one-year
- Benchmarks for Excellence based on BOG 2025 System Strategic Plan goals and analysis of relevant data trends, whereas benchmarks for Improvement were determined after reviewing the data trends for each metric
- Florida Legislature and Governor determine the amount of new state funding, and a proportional amount of institutional funding that would come from each university's recurring base budget

http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php

FL BOG PBF New vs. Base Funding

- **New Funds:**

- A University scoring 50 points or less or the three lowest scoring Universities will not receive any new funds.
- A University earning more than 50 points will receive new funds proportional to their existing base funds with the highest scoring universities eligible for additional new funds.

- **Base Funds:**

- A prorated amount will be deducted from each University's base recurring state appropriation.
- A University earning more than 50 points will have its' base funding restored.
- A University scoring 50points or less will have to submit an improvement plan to the BOG and show improvement according to the approved plan in order to have its' base funding restored.

http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php

Performance-Based Funding Metrics

1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (25,000+) in the U.S. One Year after Graduation
2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year after Graduation
3. Net Cost per Degree for Resident Undergraduates in 120hr Program
4. Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time)
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0)
6. Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis
7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)
8. Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis
9. Percent of Bachelor Degrees Without Excess Hours (FL BOG Choice Metric)
10. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees (USF System BOT Choice Metric)

Revised effective 2017 PBF Model

Metric 1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+) in the U.S. One Year After Graduation

- Definition:** % of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are enrolled or employed (earning at least \$25,000) somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers and are not found enrolled are excluded.

Sources: Accountability Report (Table 40). State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	Recast 2016 PBF Score based on addition of \$25,000 minimum salary	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2011-12	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2013-14		Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16
System	69.0% (3 points)	75.0% (5 points)	75.4% (8 points)	65.3%	66.8%	TBD (TBD Points)	69.9%
USF	68.0%	73.7%	74.5%	65.3%	66.8%	TBD	70.0%
USFSP	71.7%	73.7%	76.9%	67.2%	69.0%	TBD	71.0%
USFS-M	71.9%	75.8%	72.7%	62.9%	63.5%	TBD	66.0%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal			
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal			
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance			

Metric 1 Benchmarks	Metric 1 - Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further *									
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence (11/3/16)	72.8%	70.5%	68.3%	66.0%	63.7%	61.4%	59.2%	56.9%	54.6%	52.3%
2016 Excellence	80.0%	77.5%	75.0%	72.5%	70.0%	67.5%	65.0%	62.5%	60.0%	57.5%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 1	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	70.1%	75.8%	75.7%	75.7%	67.9%	52.8%	74.8%	72.1%	75.4%	70.2%	75.4%
Excellence Score	6	8	8	8	5	0	7	6	8	6	8
Improvement Score	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Ranking		1st	tied 2nd	tied 2nd					tied 3rd		tied 3rd

Metric 2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time One Year after Graduation

- Definition:** 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.

Sources: Accountability Report (Table 40). State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2011-12	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2013-14	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16
System	\$34,600 (4 points)	\$35,200 (4 points)	\$36,300 (8 points)	\$36,333	TBD (TBD points)	\$36,767
USF	\$34,700	\$35,300	\$36,500	\$37,000	TBD	\$37,500
USFSP	\$34,900	\$34,800	\$35,400	\$36,000	TBD	\$36,300
USFS-M	\$33,200	\$36,000	\$35,600	\$36,000	TBD	\$36,500
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

2016 Model	Metric 2 - Median Wages of Employed Baccalaureate Graduates									
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence (11/3/16)	\$ 42,700	\$ 38,200	\$ 35,700	\$ 33,200	\$ 30,700	\$ 28,200	\$ 25,700	\$ 23,200	\$ 20,700	\$ 18,200
2016 Excellence	\$ 40,000	\$ 37,500	\$ 35,000	\$ 32,500	\$ 30,000	\$ 27,500	\$ 25,000	\$ 22,500	\$ 20,000	\$ 17,500
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 2	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	\$31,100	\$36,500	\$35,200	\$36,900	\$32,700	\$24,800	\$36,200	\$35,200	\$35,900	\$34,900	\$36,300
Excellence Score	6	8	8	8	7	3	8	8	8	7	8
Improvement Score	10	2	0	3	7	0	7	2	7	10	6
Ranking		2nd		1st							3rd

Metric 3. Net Cost per Degree for Resident Undergraduates in 120hr Program *(Effective for 2017 PBF Model; previously Average Cost per Undergraduate Degree to the Institution)*

- New metric based on:** Student's net tuition and fee cost for a 120 hour baccalaureate degree. Four variables that can be impacted: 1) Fees; 2) Textbooks; 3) Financial aid; and 4) Students taking only the courses needed to obtain their baccalaureate degree in 120 hours.

(Approved by BOG, Nov. 3, 2016)

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	Recast 2016 Score based on change of "net cost to university" to "net cost to student"	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2019-13	Metric year: 2010-14	Metric year: 2011-15		Metric year: 2012-16	Metric year: 2012-16	Metric year: 2013-17
System	\$24,340 (3 points)	\$25,490 (3 points)	\$26,990 (5 points)	\$13,540	N/A	\$13,160 (5 points)	TBD
USF	System Level Only	System Level Only	System Level Only	System Level Only	System Level Only	System Level Only	System Level Only
USFSP							
USFS-M							
	Points for Excellence				Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement				Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report					Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

Metric 3 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence (11/3/16)	\$ 9,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 11,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 13,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 18,000
2016 Excellence	\$ 21,589	\$ 22,939	\$ 24,287	\$ 25,637	\$ 26,986	\$ 28,336	\$ 29,685	\$ 31,034	\$ 32,383	\$ 33,733
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 3	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	\$44,520	\$28,270	\$30,080	\$25,990	\$27,820	\$79,250	\$24,190	\$26,450	\$32,630	\$31,830	\$26,990
Excellence Score	0	5	3	6	5	0	8	6	1	2	5
Improvement Score	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ranking				2nd			1st	3rd			4th

2014-15 COST TO THE STUDENT: Net Tuition per Degree for Resident Undergraduates in 120hr Program [DRAFT 10/12/2016]

A	1. STICKER PRICE				2. FINANCIAL AID						3. NET	
	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	L	M	N
UNIV	2014-15 UNDERGRAD RESIDENT TUITION & FEES (per SCH)	2014-15 BOOKS & SUPPLIES (per SCH)	2014-15 MEAN TOTAL CREDIT HOURS FOR 120 HR PROGRAMS	2014-15 STICKER COST PER DEGREE =(B+C)*D	AY2014-15 RESIDENT UNDERGRAD GRANTS	AY2014-15 RESIDENT UNDERGRAD SCHOLARSHIPS	AY2014-15 RESIDENT UNDERGRAD WAIVERS	AY2014-15 RESIDENT UNDERGRAD TOTAL SFA (F+G+H)	AY2014-15 RESIDENT UNDERGRAD CREDIT HOURS (ALL)	AY2014-15 GIFT AID PER CREDIT HOUR (I/J)	GIFT AID PER 120 CREDITS (Lx120)	NET TUITION PER DEGREE (ROUNDED) (E-M)
FAMU	\$194	\$41	153	\$35,966	\$28,522,512	\$9,240,691	\$584,609	\$38,347,811	205,097	\$187	\$22,437	\$13,530
FAU	\$206	\$41	129	\$31,894	\$53,576,029	\$18,387,666	\$504,894	\$72,468,590	568,323	\$128	\$15,302	\$16,590
FGCU	\$206	\$41	130	\$32,048	\$23,752,889	\$12,073,753	\$1,716,406	\$37,543,048	322,017	\$117	\$13,990	\$18,060
FIU	\$216	\$41	137	\$35,245	\$109,391,119	\$29,555,491	\$2,227,942	\$141,174,552	953,097	\$148	\$17,775	\$17,470
FPU	\$165	\$41	.	.	\$142,464	\$3,396,526	\$420,497	\$3,959,487	14,599	\$271	\$32,546	.
FSU	\$217	\$41	121	\$31,183	\$64,842,047	\$54,731,769	\$1,279,368	\$120,853,184	864,397	\$140	\$16,777	\$14,410
NCF	\$192	\$41	140	\$32,611	\$1,537,601	\$3,325,389	\$8,916	\$4,871,906	24,224	\$201	\$24,939	\$7,670
UCF	\$212	\$41	125	\$31,639	\$118,993,003	\$63,216,006	\$1,003,247	\$183,212,255	1,315,858	\$139	\$16,708	\$14,930
UF	\$210	\$41	122	\$30,654	\$80,577,627	\$79,854,273	\$471,840	\$160,903,740	914,034	\$176	\$21,124	\$9,530
UNF	\$213	\$41	127	\$32,217	\$28,289,096	\$16,826,335	\$542,648	\$45,658,079	352,245	\$130	\$15,554	\$16,660
USF	\$210	\$41	127	\$31,847	\$91,042,986	\$49,711,787	\$2,221,453	\$142,976,226	919,280	\$156	\$18,664	\$13,180
UWF	\$212	\$41	126	\$31,854	\$22,137,023	\$6,325,505	\$2,310,434	\$30,772,962	215,092	\$143	\$17,168	\$14,690
SUS	\$211	\$41	127	\$32,026	\$622,804,395	\$346,645,191	\$13,292,254	\$982,741,840	6,668,263	\$147	\$17,685	\$14,340

SOURCE: Board of Governors staff analysis of the State University Database System (SUDS).

Metric 4. Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time)

- Definition:** % of total *Full-time and Part-time* first-time-in-college (FTIC) students who started in the Fall (or summer continuing to Fall) term and graduated from the same institution within six years.

Source: Accountability Report (Table 4D).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2007-13	Metric year: 2008-14	Metric year: 2009-15	Metric year: 2010-16	Metric year: 2010-16	Metric year: 2011-17
System	63.2% (5 points)	66.1% (3 points)	67.8% (8 points)	66.7%	66.2% (6 points)	69.6%
USF	62.5%	66.6% (67.6% Swirl)	68.1% (69.1% Swirl)	66.3%	67.1% (7 points)	70.0%
USFSP	41.4%	31.6% (52.6% Swirl)	38.3% (60.3% Swirl)	42.0%	36.6% (0 points)	44.0%
USFS-M	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

Metric 4 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	70.0%	68.8%	67.5%	66.3%	65.0%	63.8%	62.5%	61.3%	60.0%	58.8%
2016 Excellence	70.0%	68.8%	67.5%	66.3%	65.0%	63.8%	62.5%	61.3%	60.0%	58.8%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 4	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
PBF 4	38.6%	48.4%	43.0%	56.8%	79.3%	70.5%	70.1%	86.5%	54.0%	46.7%	67.8%
Excellence Score	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	8
Improvement Score	0	6	0	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Ranking					2nd	3rd	4th	1st			5th

Metric 5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)

- Definition:** % of 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).

Source: Accountability Report (Table 4B).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2013-14	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2016-17
System	84.5% (3 points)	85.3% (3 points)	85.1% (3 points)	85.6%	86.4% (6 points)	86.9%
USF	86.4%	86.7% (86.9% Swirl)	85.6% (85.9% Swirl)	86.5%	88.1% (8 points)	87.5%
USFSP	57.3%	61.6% (74.2% Swirl)	66.9% (76.3% Swirl)	68.0%	65.8% (0 points)	72.0%
USFS-M	N/A	69.9% (77.1% Swirl)	78.7% (86.7% Swirl)	80.2%	75.9% (0 points)	82.0%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report						
				Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

Metric 5 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	90.0%	88.8%	87.5%	86.3%	85.0%	83.8%	82.5%	81.3%	80.0%	78.8%
2016 Excellence	90.0%	88.8%	87.5%	86.3%	85.0%	83.8%	82.5%	81.3%	80.0%	78.8%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 5	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	75.4%	71.9%	73.5%	80.4%	91.0%	81.3%	86.6%	94.6%	74.6%	64.3%	85.1%
Excellence Score	0	0	0	2	10	3	7	10	0	0	6
Improvement Score	10	10	3	7	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
Ranking					2nd		3rd	1st			4th

Metric 6. Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

- Definition:** % of total 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).

Source: Accountability Report (Table 4H).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2013-14	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2016-17
System	49.5% (4 points)	51.0% (5 points)	54.6% (10 points)	54.8%	59.0% (10 points)	54.8%
USF	51.7%	53.5%	56.6%	57.0%	62.0% (10 points)	57.0%
USFSP	35.9%	36.5%	42.3%	43.0%	43.3% (7 points)	43.0%
USFS-M	39.6%	33.9%	41.1%	42.0%	37.0% (4 points)	43.0%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report					Meeting goal; Decreased performance	

Metric 6 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	50.0%	47.5%	45.0%	42.5%	40.0%	37.5%	35.0%	32.5%	30.0%	27.5%
2016 Excellence	50.0%	47.5%	45.0%	42.5%	40.0%	37.5%	35.0%	32.5%	30.0%	27.5%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 6	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	49.6%	54.2%	44.7%	46.9%	39.1%	39.5%	49.7%	56.1%	44.7%	51.1%	54.6%
Excellence Score	9	10	7	8	5	5	9	10	7	10	10
Improvement Score	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	2	7
Ranking		3rd						1st			2nd

Categories of Strategic Emphasis

(Approved in 2013 by FL BOG; Effective Fall 2014 Term)

1. Critical Workforce - Education

2. Critical Workforce - Health

3. Critical Workforce – Gap Analysis

4. Economic Development – Global Competitiveness

5. Economic Development - STEM

Metric 7. University Access Rate *(Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)*

- Definition:** % of total number of undergraduates, enrolled during the fall term, who received a Pell grant. Unclassified students, who are not eligible for Pell grants, were excluded from this metric.

Source: Accountability Report (Table 3E).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	Recast 2016 Score Identification of Students in Denominator not eligible for PELL: Did not impact points or funding	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: Fall 2012	Metric year: Fall 2013	Metric year: Fall 2014		Metric year: Fall 2015	Metric year: Fall 2015	Metric year: Fall 2016
System	42.0% (5 points)	42.1% (5 points)	41.6% (10 points)	43.0%	40.0%	41.2% (10 points)	40.1%
USF	42.4%	42.5%	41.7%	42.8%	40.0%	40.9% (10 points)	40.0%
USFSP	39.2%	40.0%	41.6%	43.3%	40.0%	42.3% (10 points)	40.0%
USFS-M	41.7%	40.7%	41.0%	45.2%	41.0%	44.4% (10 points)	41.0%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal			
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal			
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance			

Metric 7 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	30.0%	28.8%	27.5%	26.3%	25.0%	23.8%	22.5%	213.0%	20.0%	18.8%
2016 Excellence	30.0%	28.8%	27.5%	26.3%	25.0%	23.8%	22.5%	213.0%	20.0%	18.8%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 7	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	64.7%	40.9%	33.8%	50.5%	28.4%	30.0%	39.0%	31.6%	32.7%	40.6%	41.6%
Excellence Score	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
Improvement Score	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Ranking	1st			2nd							3rd

Metric 8. Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

- Definition:** % of total graduate degrees awarded from BOG designated 'Programs of Strategic Emphasis'. Double-majors are included.

Source: Accountability Report (Table 5C)

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2012-14	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2016-17
System	69.2% (5 points)	69.0% (5 points)	72.7% (10 points)	74.0%	74.6% (10 points)	73.8%
USF	71.5%	71.5%	76.3%	76.3%	78.0% (10 points)	76.3%
USFSP	35.7%	33.7%	29.7%	30.2%	28.4% (0 points)	30.2%
USFS-M	31.1%	27.3%	12.0%	19.0%	24.5% (10 points)*	19.5%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

*Based on Improvement Score

Metric 8 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	60.0%	57.5%	55.0%	52.5%	50.0%	47.5%	45.0%	42.5%	40.0%	37.5%
2016 Excellence	60.0%	57.5%	55.0%	52.5%	50.0%	47.5%	45.0%	42.5%	40.0%	37.5%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 8	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	51.5%	61.2%	60.2%	54.1%	42.0%	45%	61.7%	69.2%	50.0%	38.8%	72.7%
Excellence Score	6	10	10	7	2	8	10	10	6	1	10
Improvement Score	10	10	0	3	7	8	8	0	0	0	7
Ranking							3rd	2nd			1st

Metric 9. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

(FL BOG Choice Metric)

- Definition:** % of total baccalaureate degrees awarded within 110% of the credit hours required for a degree based on the Board of Governors Academic Program Inventory.

Source: Accountability Report (Table 4J).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: 2012-13	Metric year: 2012-14	Metric year: 2014-15	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2015-16	Metric year: 2016-17
System	58.2% (0 points)	63.9% (5 points)	65.8% (4 points)	68.1%	72.6% (10 points)*	70.6%
USF	56.7%	62.8%	65.1%	67.5%	72.2% (10 points)*	70.0%
USFSP	64.2%	67.9%	69.4%	70.0%	73.2% (7 points)	72.0%
USFS-M	71.3%	75.4%	71.7%	72.9%	76.7% (10 points)*	76.0%
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report					Meeting goal; Decreased performance	

*Based on Improvement Score

Metric 9 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	80.0%	77.5%	75.0%	72.5%	70.0%	67.5%	65.0%	62.5%	60.0%	57.5%
2016 Excellence	80.0%	77.5%	75.0%	72.5%	70.0%	67.5%	65.0%	62.5%	60.0%	57.5%
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 9	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model	29.0%	74.6%	75.9%	68.9%	78.0%	35.0%	69.2%	80.0%	71.9%	75.8%	65.8%
Excellence Score	0	7	8	5	1	10	5	5	6	8	4
Improvement Score	0	3	7	2	0	0	4	0	1	6	3
Ranking	8th	3rd	1st	6th	N/A	N/A	5th	N/A	4th	2nd	7th

* BOG Choice Metric for FSU, NCF, UF is different. Excess Hours shown for comparative purposes. Scores based on assigned metric.

Metric 10. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees *(USF System BOT Choice Metric)*

- Definition:** Number of postdoctoral 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.

Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).

Institution	2014 PBF Cycle (2012-13 AAR) 5 point scale	2015 PBF Cycle (2013-14 AAR) 5 point scale	2016 PBF Cycle (2014-15 AAR) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale	2017 PBF Cycle (2015-16 AAR) Estimate 12/23/16	2018 PBF Cycle (2016 Work Plan) 10 point scale
	Metric year: Fall 2011	Metric year: Fall 2012	Metric year: Fall 2013	Metric year: Fall 2014	Metric year: Fall 2014	Metric year: Fall 2015
System	300 (5 points)	289 (4 points)	321 (10 points)	298	298 (10 points)	282
USF	300	289	321	298	298 (10 points)	277
USFSP	0	0	0	0	0 (0 points)	0
USFS-M	0	0	0	0	0 (0 points)	5
	Points for Excellence			Meeting goal		
	Points for Improvement			Not meeting goal		
AAR = Annual Accountability Report				Meeting goal; Decreased performance		

* Benchmark for top score decreased from 300 to 200 by request.

Metric 10 Benchmarks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2017 Excellence	200	190	180	110	100	90	80	70	60	50
2016 Excellence	200	190	180	110	100	90	80	70	60	50
Improvement	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%

PBF 10*	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	UWF	USF System
2016 Model*	81.0%	45.2%	504	85.3%	114	100.0%	12,629	24	13.1%	30.9%	321
Excellence Score	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	7	10	10	10
Improvement Score	2	2	10	2	0	0	4	3	5	0	10

* BOT Choice Metric. Cannot compare "Model" data, but can compare Excellence and Improvement Scores.

PBF: Lessons Learned and Next Steps

- We must strive for sustained maximal performance/points based on EXCELLENCE
 -and FOCUS on:
 - Improving freshman retention rate (APR)
 - Managing the cost of tuition and fees
 - Increasing financial aid (especially scholarships)
 - Eliminating excess hours
 - Increasing 6-year (and 4-year) FTIC graduation rates
 - Optimizing career preparedness and placement
 - Preparing our most talented students for progression to graduate school
 - Managing expansion of UG and GR degree programs in areas of strategic emphasis across the USF System, and
 - Increasing the number of postdoctoral appointees

Board of Governors

Performance Funding Model Overview

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 Florida Legislature and Governor determine the amount of new state funding and an amount of institutional funding that 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	6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis
2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida	7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant)
3. Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	8a. Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis 8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class - for NCF only
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

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 amount of the base state funding reallocated.

State Investment versus Institutional Base Funding:

The amount of the state investment appropriated by the Legislature and Governor for performance funding will be matched by an amount reallocated from the university system base budget. These “institutional base” funds are the cumulative recurring state appropriations the Legislature has appropriated to each institution. Any state investment funding appropriated would be allocated as follows:

State Investment Funding Allocation

1. Each university metric is evaluated based on Excellence or Improvement and has ten benchmarks ranging from low to high. The lowest benchmark receives one point, while the highest receives ten points. The higher point value for Excellence or Improvement on each metric are counted in the university’s total score.
2. The state investment will be allocated based on points earned, with a maximum of 100 points possible.
3. A university is required to earn more than 50 points in order to be eligible to receive the state investment.
4. A university not meeting the required point threshold or the three lowest scoring universities will not receive any of the state investment.
5. A university that is not one of the three lowest scoring institutions and has earned more than the required point threshold will receive the state investment funds proportional to their existing base funds with the highest scoring universities eligible for additional state investment funds.
6. All ties within the scoring will be broken using the Board’s approved tiebreaker procedure:
 - a. Compare the total of Excellence and Improvement scores
 - b. Give advantage to higher points earned through Excellence
 - c. Score metric by metric giving a point to the school with the higher score
 - d. If tied after three levels of tiebreakers, the tie will go to the benefit of the institutions

Institutional Base Funding Allocation

1. A prorated amount will be deducted from each university’s base recurring state appropriation.
2. A university earning more than 50 points will have their institutional investment funding restored.
3. A university scoring 50 points or less will have to submit an improvement plan to the Board of Governors and show improvement according to that approved plan in order to have their institutional investment funding restored.

PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING

2016 METRIC DEFINITIONS

1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Enrolled or Employed (\$25,000+)

in the U.S. One Year After Graduation

This metric is based on the percentage of a graduating class of bachelor's degree recipients who are enrolled or employed (earning at least \$25,000) somewhere in the United States. Students who do not have valid social security numbers and are not found enrolled are excluded. Note: This data now non-Florida employment data.

Sources: Accountability Report (Table 4O). State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) analysis of Wage Record Interchange System (WRIS2) and Federal Employment Data Exchange (FEDES), and National Student Clearinghouse (NSC).

2. Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-time in Florida One Year After Graduation

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. Sources: Accountability Report (Table 4O). State University Database System (SUDS), Florida Education & Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), National Student Clearinghouse.

3. Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree

Costs to the university

For each of the last four years of data, the annual undergraduate total full expenditures (includes direct and indirect 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. Sources: State University Database System (SUDS), Expenditure Analysis: Report IV.

4. Six Year FTIC Graduation Rate

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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 4D).

5. Academic Progress Rate

2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4B).

6. Bachelor's Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 4H).

7. University Access Rate

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. Source: Accountability Report (Table 3E).

8a. Graduate Degrees within Programs of Strategic Emphasis

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). Source: Accountability Report (Table 5C).

8b. Freshmen in Top 10% of High School Class

NCF

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. Source: New College of Florida as reported to the Common Data Set (C10).

PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRIC DEFINITIONS

BOG Choice Metrics

9a. Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Without Excess Hours

FAMU, FAU, FGCU, FIU,
UCF, UNF, USF, UWF

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.

Source: Accountability Report (Table 4J).

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 (eg, 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, and credit hours earned in military science courses that are part of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program). Source: State University Database System (SUDS).

9b. Number of Faculty Awards

FSU, UF

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.

Source: Center for Measuring University Performance, Annual Report of the Top American Research Universities (TARU).

9c. National Ranking for University

NCF

This metric is based on the number of Top 50 university rankings that NCF earned from the following list of publications: Princeton Review: Top 50 Colleges That Pay You Back, Fiske Guide, QS World University Ranking, Times Higher Education World University Ranking, Academic Ranking of World University, US News and World Report National University, US News and World Report National Public University, US News and World Report Liberal Arts Colleges, Forbes, Kiplinger, Washington Monthly Liberal Arts Colleges, Washington Monthly National University, and Center for Measuring University Performance.

Source: Board of Governors staff review.

PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING METRIC DEFINITIONS

BOT Choice Metrics

10a. Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources FAMU	<p>This metric reports the amount of research expenditures that was funded from federal, private industry and other (non-state and non-institutional) sources.</p> <p>Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</p>
10b. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities FAU, FGCU, FIU	<p>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.</p> <p>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</p>
10c. National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on U.S. and World News FSU	<p>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.</p> <p>Source: US News and World Report's annual National University rankings.</p>
10d. Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course NCF	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduate seniors who participate in a research course during their senior year.</p> <p>Source: New College of Florida.</p>
10e. Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded Annually UCF	<p>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.</p> <p>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</p>
10f. Total Research Expenditures UF	<p>This metric is the total expenditures (includes non-science & engineering fields) for research & development activities within a given fiscal year.</p> <p>Source: National Science Foundation annual survey of Higher Education Research and Development (HERD).</p>
10g. Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning UNF	<p>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.</p> <p>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</p>
10h. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees USF	<p>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.</p> <p>Source: National Science Foundation/National Institutes of Health annual Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS).</p>
10i. Percentage of Adult Undergraduates Enrolled UWF	<p>This metric is based on the percentage of undergraduates (enrolled during the fall term) who are at least 25 years old at the time of enrollment. This includes undergraduates who are not degree-seeking, or unclassified.</p> <p>Source: State University Database System (SUDS).</p>

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

Guiding principles

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. 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.

4. 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

Operational topics

5. What is the maximum number of points available?

- Prior to 2016-17, each of the 10 metrics are weighted the same and the highest point value for each was 5 points. Thus the total number of points available was 50.
- Starting in 2016-17, each of the 10 metrics remain weighted the same and the highest point value for each metric is now 10 points. Thus the new total number of points available is 100.

6. Will any of the metrics be weighted differently?

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

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- 7. To be eligible for new funding a university must score higher than 25 points on the 50-point scale or 51 points on the 100-point scale 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. For the first two years (2014-15 and 2015-16) of implementation of 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.
 - Starting in 2016-17, institutions must score 51 points and not be in the bottom three to be eligible for new funding.
- 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 set score 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 students with financial need. 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. 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.
- 13. How can the universities improve their performance on the metrics?**

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- 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.

14. What would happen if there was a tie, where two or more universities had the same total score?

- Prior to 2016-17, the Board's practice was to address all ties to the benefit, not the detriment, of the institutions in question. No matter where the tie took place in the score rankings, the practice was the same. For example, if two institutions had the same score and this score was the third best then both would be considered part of the "top 3." By the same practice if two universities tied for the score above the "bottom 3," both would be considered eligible for new funds.
- Starting in 2016-17, the following Tiebreaker Policy (approved at the November 2015 Board Meeting) has been established to break all ties:
 - i. Compare the total of Excellence and Improvement scores
 - ii. Give advantage to higher points earned through Excellence
 - iii. Score metric by metric giving a point to the school with the higher score
 - iv. If tied after three levels of tiebreakers, the tie will go to the benefit of the institutions

Data issues

15. 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.

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.

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

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

16. 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 and for others the net result of adjusting by region showed no effect.

17. Why not use expected graduation rates instead of actual 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.

18. 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.

19. 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 and therefore ensure that schools were rewarded for reasonable performance above, at, and just below the system average.

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

- FPU needs at least two years of data on enrolled students, 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. 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

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

why were recent graduates used instead of data on graduates three or more years post-graduation? ¹

- 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 worked with FETPIP and the Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) to add graduates employed out-of-state, graduates in the military, and graduates employed with the federal government. Florida has joined the national Wage and Record Information System (WRIS2) data system that provides 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 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.

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%
SUS	73%	90%

22. 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.

23. 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?

UNIV.	Percent of Baccalaureates Included
FAMU	35%
FAU	48%
FGCU	48%

¹ 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

- 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.

FIU	43%
FSU	36%
NCF	17%
UCF	48%
UF	28%
UNF	54%
USF	47%
UWF	40%
SUS	42%

24. 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.

25. 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 for 2011-12 are very similar and the difference between the two for the SUS is only \$334.

Determining performance funding allocations

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

- No restrictions or guidance has been provided on the expenditure of performance funds. Universities have discretion, but are encouraged to spend the funds on initiatives that enhance the student's experience and improve performance on the model's metrics.

27. Please give a detailed explanation for how "new funding" is allocated.

- Universities are scored on Excellence and Improvement on each of the ten metrics. The higher score for each metric is summed for a final score. The maximum score was 50 points prior to 2016-17. Starting in 2016-17 each metric is worth 10 points with a maximum score of 100 points.
- Prior to 2016-17, universities were required to earn at least 26 points to receive new funding. Starting in 2016-17, the requirement is now 51 points in order to be eligible for new funding.

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

- Eligible universities receive new funding proportional to their existing recurring base funds compared to the total system recurring base funds, excluding IFAS and medical schools.
 - The three highest scoring universities are eligible for distribution of any new funds remaining based on final point total.
- 28. Please explain the impact on a university that scores below the point threshold in terms of the “base” funding at risk.**
- Prior to 2016-17, if a university scores below 26 points and loses a portion of its base budget, the reduction is only for one year. The following year the base budget would be restored (answer provided by Florida Board of Governors Chair, Mori Hosseni, and Vice Chair, Tom Kuntz).
 - Starting in 2016-17, the point threshold is now 51 points but the process remains the same.
- 29. Please explain the sources of funding that make up the “base” funding at risk and if only recurring funding included**
- The base funding at risk includes both Lottery and General Revenue E&G funds. Only recurring funding is included.
- 30. How is the prorated share of base funding at risk for each institution calculated?**
- The calculation uses the startup base for each institution for the year in question. For example, as the legislature prepared the 2016-17 budget, it calculated the beginning base for each institution before adding additional budget issues for 2016-17.
- 31. Are there any other funding sources included in the base such as E&G tuition and fees, Preeminence Program funding, for example?**
- The legislature determines the base for PBF purposes. They made two adjustments to the base; 1) they deducted preeminence funding for UF and FSU, and 2) they deducted the Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) from University of West Florida.
- 32. Is the state base for Florida Polytechnic University (General Revenue and Phosphate Trust Fund) included in the base funding calculations?**
- No, funding for Florida Polytechnic University is not included.
- 33. Please describe how the base calculated for the institutions is used when distributing the state investment funding.**
- The base, as determined by the legislature (with the adjustments for preeminence funding and funding for the Florida Virtual Campus) is used to calculate the institution's investment and to calculate the state's investment. The first distribution of the state investment is the percentage of the institution's share of the sum of recurring base dollars multiplied by the amount of state investment.
- 34. Please explain how the Top Three institutions receive extra funds during the distribution of the state investment.**
- The Top Three institutions receive the bonus funding based on points earned compared to the total of points for those three institutions.
 - For example; the school that finished first received 84 points, 2nd was 80 points and 3rd was 78 points. The total is 242. Thus the school that finished first will receive 34.7%

Board of Governors' Performance Funding Model (10 Metrics)

Questions and Answers

(84/242) of the 'bonus' money, the school in second 33.1% (80/242) and the school in 3rd will receive 32.2% (78/242).

Improvement plans

35. Briefly explain how the Improvement Plan process works for institutions scoring below the threshold of 51 points.

- An eligible institution may submit an improvement plan to the Board of Governors for consideration at the June Board Meeting. The Chancellor will withhold the institutional investment funds starting July 1. If the improvement plan has been approved, there are two progress checkpoints in December and May. At each progress checkpoint, the Board of Governors can release up to 50% of the withheld funds.
- If an institution fails to make progress and the full amount of withheld funds are not restored, any remaining funds will be distributed to the institutions earning the most improvement points on the performance based funding metrics.
- Starting July 1, 2016 each of the institutions has the opportunity to use the Improvement Plan process one time in order to have institutional investment funds restored. Institutions that used the process during the 2014-15 Fiscal Year also have one opportunity.

36. If an institution scores below 51 points and has already been through the Improvement Plan process after July 1, 2016, what happens to that institution's institutional investment funds?

- The funds are redistributed based on points earned to the other universities that scored 51 points or more.
- The forfeited institutional investment funding would only be lost to the non-achieving institution for that fiscal year only. Funds will be restored to that institution's base budget at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Florida Board of Governors
Performance Funding Allocation, 2016-2017
June 23, 2016

	Points	Allocation of State Investment	Allocation of Institutional Investment ¹	Total Performance Funding Allocation
FAMU	65	\$11,509,132	\$14,066,717	\$25,575,849
FAU	84	\$25,346,748	\$21,642,163	\$46,988,911
FGCU	67	\$8,010,396	\$9,790,484	\$17,800,880
FIU	76	\$25,253,750	\$30,865,695	\$56,119,445
FSU	68	\$35,574,608	\$43,480,076	\$79,054,684
NCF	59	\$0	\$2,740,857	\$2,740,857
UCF	84	\$39,301,181	\$38,697,580	\$77,998,761
UF	82	\$47,695,822	\$49,180,011	\$96,875,833
UNF	56	\$0	\$12,914,790	\$12,914,790
USF	79	\$32,308,363	\$39,488,000	\$71,796,363
UWF	57	\$0	\$12,133,627	\$12,133,627
Total		\$225,000,000	\$275,000,000	\$500,000,000

*Institutions scoring 50 points or less or the three lowest scoring universities will not receive any State Investment. Any ties in scores are broken using the tiebreaker policy approved by the Board.

Notes:

¹ Each university contributed a portion of their institutional budget, for a total of \$275 million, to be allocated based on performance. Universities that scored 51 points or higher receive their full institutional funding restored.

**2016 Performance Funding Model
2014-15 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	6	8	8	8	5	0	7	6	8	8	6
2	10	8	8	8	7	3	8	8	8	8	10
3	0	5	3	6	5	0	8	6	1	5	2
4	0	6	0	7	10	10	10	10	0	8	0
5	10	10	3	7	10	3	7	10	0	6	0
6	9	10	7	8	5	5	9	10	7	10	10
7	10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
8.a	10	10	10	7	7		10	10	6	10	1
8.b						8					
9.a	0	7	8	5			5		6	4	8
9.b					1			5			
9.c						10					
10.a	10										
10.b		10	10	10							
10.c					10						
10.d						10					
10.e							10				
10.f								7			
10.g									10		
10.h										10	
10.i											10
Total Score	65	84	67	76	68	59	84	82	56	79	57

- 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)

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
1. Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	Excellence	70.1%	75.8%	75.7%	75.7%	67.9%	52.8%	74.8%	72.1%	75.4%	75.4%	70.2%
	Improvement	0.0%	0.3%	1.3%	-2.2%	-1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.8%	-0.7%	1.0%	1.9%
Excellence Score		6	8	8	8	5	0	7	6	8	8	6
Improvement Score		0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Higher Score		6	8	8	8	5	0	7	6	8	8	6
2. Median Average full-time Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	Excellence	\$ 31,100	\$ 36,500	\$ 35,200	\$ 36,900	\$ 32,700	\$ 24,800	\$ 36,200	\$ 35,200	\$ 35,900	\$ 36,300	\$ 34,900
	Improvement	8.0%	1.4%	-0.3%	1.9%	3.5%	-5.7%	3.7%	1.1%	3.5%	3.1%	6.1%
Excellence Score		6	8	8	8	7	3	8	8	8	8	7
Improvement Score		10	2	0	3	7	0	7	2	7	6	10
Higher Score		10	8	8	8	7	3	8	8	8	8	10
3. Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	Excellence	\$ 44,520	\$ 28,270	\$ 30,080	\$ 25,990	\$ 27,820	\$ 79,250	\$ 24,190	\$ 26,450	\$ 32,630	\$ 26,990	\$ 31,830
	Improvement	11.1%	2.1%	2.3%	2.0%	4.2%	3.3%	7.8%	3.9%	6.1%	5.9%	0.5%
Excellence Score		0	5	3	6	5	0	8	6	1	5	2
Improvement Score		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Higher Score		0	5	3	6	5	0	8	6	1	5	2
4. Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-Time and Part-Time FTIC)	Excellence	38.6%	48.4%	43.0%	56.8%	79.3%	70.5%	70.1%	86.5%	54.0%	67.8%	46.7%
	Improvement	-0.7%	3.4%	-5.8%	3.7%	0.3%	1.1%	0.9%	-1.0%	-0.8%	1.7%	-3.9%
Excellence Score		0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	8	0
Improvement Score		0	6	0	7	0	2	1	0	0	3	0
Higher Score		0	6	0	7	10	10	10	10	0	8	0
5. Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0)	Excellence	75.4%	71.9%	73.5%	80.4%	91.0%	81.3%	86.6%	94.6%	74.6%	85.1%	64.3%
	Improvement	5.2%	6.1%	1.8%	3.5%	0.5%	1.1%	1.7%	-0.6%	-3.2%	-0.3%	-0.3%
Excellence Score		0	0	0	2	10	3	7	10	0	6	0
Improvement Score		10	10	3	7	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
Higher Score		10	10	3	7	10	3	7	10	0	6	0

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
6. Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	Excellence	49.6%	54.2%	44.7%	46.9%	39.1%	39.5%	49.7%	56.1%	44.7%	54.6%	51.1%
	Improvement	-1.5%	-0.9%	-0.4%	0.8%	1.5%	-2.8%	0.8%	1.5%	-0.1%	3.6%	1.1%
Excellence Score		9	10	7	8	5	5	9	10	7	10	10
Improvement Score		0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3	0	7	2
Higher Score		9	10	7	8	5	5	9	10	7	10	10
7. University Access Rate (Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell Grant)	Excellence	64.7%	40.9%	33.8%	50.5%	28.4%	30.0%	39.0%	31.6%	32.7%	41.6%	40.6%
	Improvement	3.2%	-0.3%	-1.2%	-0.4%	-1.6%	1.3%	0.6%	-0.8%	-0.8%	-0.5%	0.1%
Excellence Score		10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
Improvement Score		6	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
Higher Score		10	10	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
8a. Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	Excellence	51.5%	61.2%	60.2%	54.1%	42.0%		61.7%	69.2%	50.0%	72.7%	38.8%
	Improvement	8.2%	5.7%	-3.4%	1.7%	3.5%		4.3%	-0.6%	-0.2%	3.7%	-7.7%
Excellence Score		6	10	10	7	2		10	10	6	10	1
Improvement Score		10	10	0	3	7		8	0	0	7	0
Higher Score		10	10	10	7	7		10	10	6	10	1
8b. Freshman in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class - for NCF only	Excellence						45.0%					
	Improvement						4.0%					
Excellence Score							8					
Improvement Score							8					
Higher Score							8					

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
9a. Percentage of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Without Excess Hours	Excellence	29.0%	74.6%	75.9%	68.9%			69.2%		71.9%	65.8%	75.8%
	Improvement	-5.0%	1.7%	3.7%	1.3%			2.3%		0.9%	1.9%	3.0%
Excellence Score		0	7	8	5			5		6	4	8
Improvement Score	-	0	3	7	2			4		1	3	6
9b. Faculty Awards	Excellence					2			15			
	Improvement					-4			-5			
Excellence Score						1			5			
Improvement Score						0			0			
9c. National Ranking for Institutional & Program Achievements	Excellence						5					
	Improvement						0					
Excellence Score							10					
Improvement Score							0					
Higher Score		0	7	8	5	1	10	5	5	6	4	8

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
10a. Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources	Excellence	81.0%										
	Improvement	1.0%										
Excellence Score		10										
Improvement Score		2										
Higher Score		10										
10b Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	Excellence		45.2%	504	85.3%							
	Improvement		1.4%	11.5%	1.3%							
Excellence Score			10	10	10							
Improvement Score			2	10	2							
Higher Score			10	10	10							
10c. National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on U.S. and World News Report	Excellence					114						
	Improvement					-4.2%						
Excellence Score						10						
Improvement Score						0						
Higher Score						10						
10d. Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course	Excellence						100.0%					
	Improvement						0.0%					
Excellence Score							10					
Improvement Score							0					
Higher Score							10					
10e. Number of Bachelor Degrees Awarded Annually	Excellence							12,629				
	Improvement							2.1%				
Excellence Score								10				
Improvement Score								4				
Higher Score								10				

		FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	NCF	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF
10f. Total Research Expenditures	Excellence								24			
	Improvement								1.9%			
Excellence Score									7			
Improvement Score									3			
Higher Score									7			
10g. Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning	Excellence									13.1%		
	Improvement									2.6%		
Excellence Score										10		
Improvement Score										5		
Higher Score										10		
10h. Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	Excellence										321	
	Improvement										11.1%	
Excellence Score											10	
Improvement Score											10	
Higher Score											10	
10i. Number of Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled (in Fall)	Excellence											30.9%
	Improvement											-1.2%
Excellence Score												10
Improvement Score												0
Higher Score												10

Performance Based Funding Model 2016-17											
EXCELLENCE (Achieving System Goals)											
Points	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities											
1	Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education Further 1 Yr after Graduation	80%	77.5%	75%	72.5%	70%	67.5%	65%	62.5%	60%	57.5%
2	Median Average Full-time Wages of Undergraduates Employed in Florida 1 Yr after Graduation	\$40,000	\$37,500	\$35,000	\$32,500	\$30,000	\$27,500	\$25,000	\$22,500	\$20,000	\$17,500
3	Average Cost per Undergraduate Degree to the Institution	\$21,589	\$22,939	\$24,287	\$25,637	\$26,986	\$28,336	\$29,685	\$31,034	\$32,383	\$33,733
4	Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	70%	68.8%	67.5%	66.3%	65%	63.8%	62.5%	61.3%	60%	58.8%
5	Academic Progress Rate <i>2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0</i>	90%	88.8%	87.5%	86.3%	85%	83.8%	82.5%	81.3%	80%	78.8%
6	Bachelor's Degree's Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (<i>includes STEM</i>)	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%
7	University Access Rate <i>Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant</i>	30%	28.8%	27.5%	26.3%	25%	23.8%	22.5%	21.3%	20%	18.8%
8.A.	Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis (<i>includes STEM</i>)	60%	57.5%	55%	52.5%	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%
8.B.	Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class (<i>Alternative metric for NCF only</i>)	50%	47.5%	45%	42.5%	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%
9.A.	Percent of Bachelor's Degrees without Excess Hours	80%	77.5%	75%	72.5%	70%	67.5%	65%	62.5%	60%	57.5%
9.B.	Faculty Awards -- FSU	25	20	15	13	11	9	7	5	4	2
9.B.	Faculty Awards -- UF	31	27	23	21	18	15	12	8	5	3
9.C.	National Ranking for Institutional & Program Achievements (NCF Only)	5		4		3		2		1	
IMPROVEMENT											
% Improvement		5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	2.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%
Points		10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Performance Based Funding Model 2016-17

		EXCELLENCE <i>(Achieving System Goals)</i>									
Points		10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Metric 10											
10.A.	FAMU - Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources	80%	78%	76%	74%	72%	70%	68%	66%	64%	62%
10.B.	FAU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	40%	38%	36%	34%	32%	30%	28%	26%	24%	22%
10.B.	FGCU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	452	450	448	446	444	442	440	438	436	434
10.B.	FIU - Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	40%	37.5%	35%	32.5%	30%	27.5%	25%	22.5%	20%	17.5%
10.C.	FSU - National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on a US and World News Report	75	67	59	51	43	35	27	19	11	3
10.D.	NCF - Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course	100%	99.5%	99%	98.5%	98%	97.5%	97%	96.5%	96%	95.5%
10.E.	UCF - Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually	12,300	12,250	12,200	12,150	12,100	12,050	12,000	11,950	11,900	11,850
10.F.	UF - Total Research Expenditures	1st-6th	7th-12th	13th-18th	19th-24th	25th-30th	31st-36th	37th-42nd	43rd-48th	49th-54th	55th-60th
10.G.	UNF - Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning	7.5%	7.0%	6.5%	6.0%	5.5%	5.0%	4.5%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%
10.H.	USF - Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	200	190	180	170	160	150	140	130	120	110
10.I.	UWF - Number of Undergraduate Students Aged 25 and Older Enrolled in Fall	25%	24%	23%	22%	21%	20%	19%	18%	17%	16%

Note: 10.H. The USF System revised the benchmark to match the Florida Preeminence criteria and be consistent with PBF Metrics 4 and 5 (excellence threshold is same as Preeminence threshold).



Performance Funding Model 2016-2017

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	70.1%	6	0.0%	0	6
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$31,100	6	8.0%	10	10
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$44,520	0	11.1%	0	0
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	38.6%	0	-0.7%	0	0
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	75.4%	0	5.2%	10	10
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	49.6%	9	-1.5%	0	9
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	64.7%	10	3.2%	6	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	51.5%	6	8.2%	10	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	29.0%	0	-5.0%	0	0
Percent of R&D Expenditures Funded from External Sources	81.0%	10	1.0%	2	10
TOTAL					65



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

Florida Atlantic University

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	75.8%	8	0.3%	0	8
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$36,500	8	1.4%	2	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$28,270	5	2.1%	0	5
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	48.4%	0	3.4%	6	6
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	71.9%	0	6.1%	10	10
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	54.2%	10	-0.9%	0	10
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	40.9%	10	-0.3%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	61.2%	10	5.7%	10	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	74.6%	7	1.7%	3	7
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	45.2%	10	1.4%	2	10
TOTAL					84



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

Florida Gulf Coast University

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	75.7%	8	1.3%	2	8
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$35,200	8	-0.3%	0	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$30,080	3	2.3%	0	3
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	43.0%	0	-5.8%	0	0
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	73.5%	0	1.8%	3	3
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	44.7%	7	-0.4%	0	7
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	33.8%	10	-1.2%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	60.2%	10	-3.4%	0	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	75.9%	8	3.7%	7	8
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	504	10	11.5%	10	10
TOTAL					67



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

Florida International University

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	75.7%	8	-2.2%	0	8
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$36,900	8	1.9%	3	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$25,990	6	2.0%	0	6
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	56.8%	0	3.7%	7	7
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	80.4%	2	3.5%	7	7
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	46.9%	8	0.8%	1	8
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	50.5%	10	-0.4%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	54.1%	7	1.7%	3	7
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	68.9%	5	1.3%	2	5
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded to Minorities	85.3%	10	1.3%	2	10
TOTAL					76



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

Florida State University

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	67.9%	5	-1.6%	0	5
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$32,700	7	3.5%	7	7
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$27,820	5	4.2%	0	5
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	79.3%	10	0.3%	0	10
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	91.0%	10	0.5%	1	10
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	39.1%	5	1.5%	3	5
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	28.4%	8	-1.6%	0	8
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	42.0%	2	3.5%	7	7
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Faculty Awards	2	1	-4	0	1
National Rank Higher than Predicted by the Financial Resources Ranking Based on a US and World News Report	114	10	-4.2%	0	10
TOTAL					68



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

New College of Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	52.8%	0	0.0%	0	0
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$24,800	3	-5.7%	0	3
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$79,250	0	3.3%	0	0
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	70.5%	10	1.1%	2	10
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	81.3%	3	1.1%	2	3
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	39.5%	5	-2.8%	0	5
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	30.0%	10	1.3%	2	10
Freshmen in Top 10% of Graduating High School Class – NCF Only	45.0%	8	4.0%	8	8
Institution-Specific Metrics					
National Ranking for Institutional & Program Achievements	5	10	0	0	10
Percent of Undergraduate Seniors Participating in a Research Course	100.0%	10	0%	0	10
TOTAL					59



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

University of Central Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	74.8%	7	0.0%	0	7
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$36,200	8	3.7%	7	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$24,190	8	7.8%	0	8
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	70.1%	10	0.9%	1	10
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	86.6%	7	1.7%	3	7
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	49.7%	9	0.8%	1	9
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	39.0%	10	0.6%	1	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	61.7%	10	4.3%	8	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	69.2%	5	2.3%	4	5
Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded Annually	12,629	10	2.1%	4	10
TOTAL					84



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

University of Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	72.1%	6	-0.8%	0	6
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$35,200	8	1.1%	2	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$26,450	6	3.9%	0	6
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	86.5%	10	-1.0%	0	10
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	94.6%	10	-0.6%	0	10
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	56.1%	10	1.5%	3	10
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	31.6%	10	-0.8%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	69.2%	10	-0.6%	0	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Faculty Awards	15	5	-5	0	5
Total Research Expenditures	24	7	1.9%	3	7
TOTAL					82



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

University of North Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	75.4%	8	-0.7%	0	8
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$35,900	8	3.5%	7	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$32,630	1	6.1%	0	1
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	54.0%	0	-0.8%	0	0
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	74.6%	0	-3.2%	0	0
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	44.7%	7	-0.1%	0	7
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	32.7%	10	-0.8%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	50.0%	6	-0.2%	0	6
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	71.9%	6	0.9%	1	6
Percent of Course Sections Offered via Distance and Blended Learning	13.1%	10	2.6%	5	10
TOTAL					56



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

University of South Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	75.4%	8	1.0%	2	8
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in Florida (1 Yr after Graduation)	\$36,300	8	3.1%	6	8
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$26,990	5	5.9%	0	5
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	67.8%	8	1.7%	3	8
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	85.1%	6	-0.3%	0	6
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	54.6%	10	3.6%	7	10
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	41.6%	10	-0.5%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	72.7%	10	3.7%	7	10
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	65.8%	4	1.9%	3	4
Number of Postdoctoral Appointees	321	10	11.1%	10	10
TOTAL					79



Performance Funding Model 2016-17

University of West Florida

	Excellence		Improvement		Final Score
	Data	Points	Data	Points	
Key Metrics Common to All Universities Plus 2 Institution Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Graduates Employed and/or Continuing their Education (1 Yr after Graduation)	70.2%	6	1.9%	3	6
Median Wages of Bachelor's Graduates Employed Full-Time in (Florida 1 Yr after Graduation)	\$34,900	7	6.1%	10	10
Average Cost per Bachelor's Degree	\$31,830	2	0.5%	0	2
Six Year Graduation Rate <i>Full-time and Part-time FTIC</i>	46.7%	0	-3.9%	0	0
Academic Progress Rate 2nd Year Retention with GPA Above 2.0	64.3%	0	-0.3%	0	0
Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	51.1%	10	1.1%	2	10
University Access Rate Percent of Undergraduates with a Pell-grant	40.6%	10	0.1%	0	10
Graduate Degrees Awarded in Areas of Strategic Emphasis	38.8%	1	-7.7%	0	1
Institution-Specific Metrics					
Percent of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded without Excess Hours	75.8%	8	3.0%	6	8
Number of Adult (Aged 25+) Undergraduates Enrolled (in Fall)	30.9%	10	-1.2%	0	10
TOTAL					57