

July 9, 2014

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: David L. Buhler

SUBJECT: 2014-2015 USHE Performance Funding Measures

Background

During the 2014 legislative session, \$1.5M in one-time funding was allocated for performance funding, to be focused on efforts to increase completions to reach the goal of 66% of adult population aged 25-34 having some form of post-secondary education credential by the year 2020. The Board of Regents has approved guidelines, time-lines, and procedures for measures to be submitted to the Commissioner's office. This document meets the intent of the legislation as proposed by Senator Urquhart, and has the agreement of the USHE institutional Presidents.

Issue

According to the adopted time-line, each institution has submitted specific measures, metrics, current data, and benchmarks, which will be used to evaluate whether institutions have completed or made significant progress toward achieving one or more of the specified measures. Funds will then be allocated to institutions based on distribution group and the degree to which the measures are met during the 2014-15 fiscal year, with allocation to take place by July 1, 2015. Institutional amounts have been adjusted to include 2013-2014 funds carried forward.

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends the Regents approve each institutions core performance measures, specific measurements, metrics, current data, allocations, and one-year goal for fiscal year 2015.

David L. Buhler
Commissioner of Higher Education

DLB/GLS/BLS
Attachment

**Utah System of Higher Education
Guidelines for Performance Funding, 2014-2015
June 30, 2014**

The Utah Legislature has provided a second year of performance funding (\$1.5 million in one-time for 2014-15) to address the most urgent needs in reaching the 66% goal. It is proposed that the core performance measures of 2013-14 be used for 2014-15 as follows:

- a. 1st year to 2nd year retention
- b. Increased completion rates (transfer counts towards completion)
- c. Acceleration in fulfilling the general education math requirement (such as requiring at least one math class during the first two semesters)
- d. Rapid transition of students from developmental math to successful completion of college math course
- e. Increase in graduate education (as applicable by institutional mission)

Intent language with the legislative funding in the first year included (but did not limit selection to) the performance measures listed above. It is expected similar measures will be used for the second year. These are the core performance measures from which each institution may select as appropriate for mission and student mix and as determined by the institution as having the greatest effect on moving the needle on performance measures. By June 15, 2014, each institutional President will submit the final list of 2014-15 core performance measures, specific measures, current data, and benchmarks to the Commissioner’s Office to be approved by the Board of Regents and finalized at the July 18, 2014 Board meeting.

Proposed Funding Allocation: Institutions will provide the data on performance to the Commissioner no later than June 1, 2015. The Board of Regents will allocate performance funding to each institution, to be released by July 1, 2015, based on completion or significant progress toward achieving one or more of the specified measures. Money will be allocated based on the degree to which the measure(s) are met, e.g., if 100% achieved (or surpassed) 100% will be allocated; if 50% achieved, 50% will be allocated, etc. For institutions with more than one measure, the funding allocation will be divided accordingly.

The Commissioner recommends to the Board of Regents the following distribution (with the amounts representing 100% allocations):

Group I	Group II	Group III
UU \$328,620	WSU \$197,170	SUU \$131,450
USU \$328,620	UVU \$197,170	DSU \$131,450
	SLCC \$197,170	Snow \$131,450
Includes 2013-14 allocation of \$143,100		

- Time-Line:
- May 16, 2014: Regents approve 2014-15 guidelines.
 - June 15, 2014: Specific measures, current data, and benchmarks submitted by the institutions to the Commissioner’s Office.
 - July 18, 2014: Board of Regents approves proposed measures and benchmarks.
 - June 1, 2015: Institutions provide Commissioner’s Office with report on meeting approved benchmarks.
 - July 1, 2015: Commissioner’s Office allocates performance funding. Unallocated funds will be carried forward to next year for future allocation.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Institution	Core Performance Measures (as Prioritized by Each Institution)	Specific Measurements to be Used to Determine Success	Current Data on Specific Measures	Benchmark: One-year Goal (2015)
University of Utah	a. Retention	Initial focus is on retention of first to second year for first time, full time freshmen. Supporting programs: student learning outcomes, proactive intervention for students at risk, integrated general education	First time, full time freshmen cohorts: Fall 2007 83.4% Fall 2008 82.8% Fall 2009 85.0% Fall 2010 86.5% Fall 2011 87.6% Fall 2012 88.4%	One-year Goal: 88.5%
	b. Completion	Focus on increased 4 and 6 year graduation rates for first time, full time freshmen. Supporting programs: strategic enrollment management, Futures scholarships, mandatory advising	First time, full time freshmen cohorts 6 year graduation rates: 2010 56.9% 2011 55.3% 2012 58.9% 2013 60.0%	One-year Goal: 60.8%
	c. Successful completion of college math course	Grade of C or higher in Math 1050 Supporting programs: pilot program involving flipped classrooms	2011-2012 64.3% 2012-2013 65.5% 2013-2014 71.8% Three year running average: 67.2%	One-year Goal: 67.7%
	e. Increase graduate education	Long-term focus is on increasing 6-year doctoral completion rate. Supporting programs: Mentorship best practice resources for faculty and career counseling	Three-year running average of number of degrees: FY2009 2,196 FY2010 2,243 FY2011 2,277 FY2012 2,370 FY2013 2,518	One- year Goal: 2,550

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Institution	Core Performance Measures (as Prioritized by Each Institution)	Specific Measurements to be Used to Determine Success	Current Data on Specific Measures	Benchmark: One-year Goal (2015)
Utah State University	Recruitment and Enrollment	Management of communication with prospective domestic freshman students to increase applications, enrollment, and % of applicants who enroll (yield)	Yield percentages from AAA: Fall 2013: 33.10% Fall 2012: 38.60% Fall 2011: 38.50% Fall 2010: 40.60% Fall 2009: 41.90% Fall 2008: 43.90%	Increase applications by 5% and increase yield (applicants who enroll) by 1%
Weber State University	a. Retention	First-Year Retention rates as reported to IPEDS	WSU's First Year Retention rate for the Fall 2012 to Fall 2013 was 68%	WSU will increase the First Year Retention Rate by 1.0 percentage point, or more, so the retention rate for Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 will be 69 percent or higher
	b. Completion	Three-year moving average of total degrees awarded. A three-year average is used to control for random, year-to-year fluctuations	Three-year moving average was 4,177 degrees awarded in 2012-13	Three-year moving average ending in 2013-14 will increase by 5 percent, or more, so total degrees awarded will exceed 4,386
	c. Accelerate GE Math Requirement	Three-year moving average of those successfully completing Math 0950, 0990 and 1010	Three-year moving average was 3,127 students passing developmental math in 2012-13	The three-year moving average ending in 2013-14 will increase by 5 percent, or more, so the number of students passing developmental math will exceed 3,283
Southern Utah University	Transition from developmental math to successful completion of college math course	Percentage of first-time students who successfully complete remedial math in their first year and also successfully complete a Math GE course with their first two years	30.9% (five-year average for Fall 2008 to Fall 2012 cohorts)	35%

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Institution	Core Performance Measures (as Prioritized by Each Institution)	Specific Measurements to be Used to Determine Success	Current Data on Specific Measures	Benchmark: One-year Goal (2015)
Snow College	c. Accelerate GE Math Requirement	Compare the average time to successful completion (passing with a C- or higher grade) of Math 1050 by first-time freshman students (excluding high school)	4-year average of successful Math 1050 completion is .67 years (a little over one semester)	Decrease the average time for successful Math 1050 completion from .67 years to .6 years over the next three years by the following: A Math committee will consider Pedagogies for teaching 1050; the department will do a better job of placing students in appropriate levels of math. Some do not need 1050; Experiment with pedagogies being explored through the ILearn program for advanced placement to Math 1050
		The number of concurrent enrollment students successfully (passing with C- or higher grade) taking Math 1050	4-year growth average for concurrent enrollment students successfully taking Math 1050 is 0%	A 5% increase in the number of concurrent enrollment students successfully taking Math 1050. We will add 1050 sections to concurrent enrollment IVC
	Transition from developmental to successful completion of college-level math	Average time to completion of college level math by developmental math students (first-time freshman, excluding high school students)	The 4-year average time to completion of college math by first-time freshman students taking developmental math is 1.67 years (approximately 3 semesters)	Reduce the time it takes to complete developmental math to less than three sem. With the USHE completion grant, we will compile a database of 120 projects where students engage in everyday math. Professors will also be trained on best practices for project use in developmental math, which will allow students to reach a level of proficiency that will enable them to move into Math 1030 and 1040 in one semester

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Institution	Core Performance Measures (as Prioritized by Each Institution)	Specific Measurements to be Used to Determine Success	Current Data on Specific Measures	Benchmark: One-year Goal (2015)
Dixie State University	Expansion of First Year Peer Mentor Program	<p>Target at-risk students by HS GPA, ACT/SAT test scores, parental education, ethnicity, and AGI</p> <p>Assign peer mentors to each student with a strict communication plan</p> <p>Test retention rate against sample population not receiving treatment</p>	Fall 2012-2013 retention rate is 19.4% higher in targeted at-risk pool as compared to sample study of similarly indexed students	Increase fall-to-fall retention rate of targeted at-risk students by 3% as compared to a similarly indexed sample group
	Implementation of First & Second Year Advisement Model	<p>All students with < 30 credits assigned a “first year advisor”</p> <p>All students with > 30 credits and < 60 credits assigned a “second year advisor”</p> <p>Test to see quantity of students with appointment</p>	<p>37% of students with <= 30 credits received appointment during 2013-2014 year</p> <p>45% of students with > 30 credits and <= 60 credits received appointment during 2013-2014 year</p>	Increase participation rate in advisement appointments by 3% for both first (<= 30 credits) and second (> 30 credits and <= 60 credits) year students
	Shorten the Math Course Requirement pipeline and Implement Supplemental Instruction in Transitional Math	<p>Number of students going from Math 0900 directly into Math 1000 rather than from Math 0920 to Math 0990 to Math 1010</p> <p>Implement a supplemental instruction model in Transitional Math courses</p>	<p>639 students enrolled in Spring 2014 Math-1000 course</p> <p>New program - Preliminary pipeline data available Fall 2014</p>	<p>Increase pass rate by 5% over prior year</p> <p>Shorten the pipeline of target population taking 3 math courses to 2 math courses by 5%</p>

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Institution	Core Performance Measures (as Prioritized by Each Institution)	Specific Measurements to be Used to Determine Success	Current Data on Specific Measures	Benchmark: One-year Goal (2015)
Utah Valley University	b. Increased completion rates	Total number of certificates, diplomas, and degrees awarded	Three year rolling average: 2008-09 to 2010-11: 3,789 2009-10 to 2011-12: 4,162 2010-11 to 2012-13: 4,453	2011-12 to 2013-14: 4,700
	c. Acceleration in fulfilling the general education math requirement	Percent of students who have completed the Quantitative Literacy requirement by the end of the Spring Semester of their Sophomore year (excludes high school concurrent enrollment students; class standing measured at beginning of Spring Term)	Three year rolling average: 2008-2010: 46.8% 2009-2011: 47.5% 2010-2012: 48.1% 2011-2013: 49.4% 2012-2014: 50.7%	2013-2015: 51%
Salt Lake Community College	d. Rapid transition of students from developmental math to successful completion of college math course	Average GPA of the transitioning cohort in Math 1010 Percent of students in the transitioning cohort who successfully complete Math 1010 with a “C” or above	Current Average GPA of the transitioning cohort in Math 1010 is 2.12 Current Pass Rate of the transitioning cohort in Math 1010 is 52%	Increase the Average GPA for the cohort transitioning in Math 1010 to ≥ 2.5 Increase the pass rate of the transitioning cohort in Math 1010 to $\geq 60\%$