

Guiding Principles and Equity Components Compiled from April and June Presidents Funding Model Meetings

Guiding Principles

<u>April</u>	<u>June</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based in shared operational definitions, metrics, and a common dataset about current funding, enrollment, and outcomes • Is simple to explain and easy to understand (for legislators, trustees, taxpayers, faculty/staff) - including the rationale behind allocations of funds • Accounts for programmatic differences • Be clear that what we are developing is a distribution model while considering economy of scale • Some acknowledgement of enrollment, growth as well as productivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for programmatic differences (5 Teams) • Based in shared operational definitions, metrics, and a common dataset about current funding, enrollment, and outcomes (4 Teams) • Is easy to understand (for legislators, trustees, taxpayers, faculty/staff) - including the rationale behind allocations of funds (4 Teams) • Equity/fairness of distribution (4 Teams) • Be responsive to the legislative request to develop a student funding model while considering economies of scale (3 Teams) • Some acknowledgement of enrollment, growth as well as productivity (3 Teams) • Accounts for regional cost differentials (3 Teams) • Make a model that cannot be gamed (incentivize output) (3 Teams) • Accounts for the costs of multiple campuses and sites (2) • Create standard tuition rate across institutions. There is currently variation in tuition and fees rate across institutions. Students are paying different rates for the same education. (2) • Recognize that tuition/fees are frozen, and account for differences in revenues collected by student tuition/fees (1)

Equity Components

<u>April</u>	<u>June</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program mix. Cost of instruction per student in different programs (welding, nursing...) • Expect differences due to economies of scale to be (monotonic) • Based in data, not conjecture • Headcount vs FTE. Each "head" has to be served • Ensures all institutions/students are funded equitably in relation to one another 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge there's an increase in the cost of doing business. (e.g., utilities, insurance, FRS) (4 Teams) • Based in data, not conjecture (3 Teams) • Outputs (e.g., a certificate, degree, non-traditional completions)/performance (3 Teams) • Considers differences in tuition and fees across institutions (3 Teams) • Program mix. Cost of instruction per student in different programs (welding, nursing...) (2) • Expect differences due to economies of scale to be (monotonic) (2) • Headcount vs FTE. Each "head" has to be served (2) • Ensures all institutions/students are funded equitably in relation to one another (2) • Recognize economies of scale and the differences between institutions (1) • Think first of strategic consequences - achieved goals but consequences are sometimes not positive. (1) • Multiple campus/site factor (1) • Total square footage managed (1) • Respects regional cost differentials (1) • Balance our workforce outcomes with the funding that our institutes receive (1) • Consider weighting percentage of Pell students (1)