

**Agenda Materials**  
**General Academic Institutions Formula**  
**Advisory Committee (GAIFAC) for the**  
**2022-2023 Biennial Appropriations**

October 2019

## **Table of Contents**

Agenda.....	1
Draft of Prior Meeting’s Minutes .....	2
Commissioner’s Charges .....	5
General Academic Institutions Formula Advisory Committee for the 2022-2023 Biennium .....	6
Charge 1 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the operations support and space support formulas and the percent split between the “utilities” and “operations and maintenance” (O&M) components of the space support formula. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b)).....	7
Projected Funding Levels Based on Inflation and Growth.....	8
Charge 2 – Review the expenditure study that is used for the cost matrix, including determining and reviewing the growth of costs affiliated with higher education and its consequent impact on higher education institutions, and make recommendations for improvements to better reflect the actual expenditures of the institutions. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259)).....	9
Charge 3 – Review the Space Projection Model as it relates to distance education courses, including the different physical space and technology needs between traditional courses, online courses, and distance education courses, as well as information on associated costs of each course type, and recommend changes to the Space Projection Model. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259)).....	10
Charge 4 – Study and make recommendations for an outcomes-based methodology for allocating the balance remaining in the B-On-Time account after the underutilized amount is allocated.....	11
Appendix A: Texas Education Code § 61.0593. Student Success-based Funding Recommendations.....	12

## Agenda

**Meeting of the General Academic Institution Formula Advisory Committee  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**

**Lone Star Room, Second Floor, 2.140 (different room location)**

**1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin**

Thursday, October 17, 2019

11:00 a.m.

### Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Consideration and approval of the minutes from the September 19, 2019 meeting
- III. Discussion, review, and consideration of the Commissioner's 2022-2023 Biennium charges
- IV. Planning for subsequent meetings
- V. Adjournment

## Draft of Prior Meeting's Minutes

**Meeting of the General Academic Institutions Formula Advisory Committee  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Board Room, First Floor  
1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin  
Thursday, September 19, 2019  
11:00 a.m.**

### Minutes

**Attendees:** Ms. Noel Sloan (Chair), Mr. Bob Brown (Vice Chair), Ms. Susan Brown, Mr. John Davidson, Dr. Danny Gallant, Mr. Daniel Harper, Dr. Robert Kinucan, Dr. James Marquart, Ms. Veronica Mendez, Dr. Juan Munoz, Dr. Karen Murray, Dr. Jerry Strawser, Mr. R. Jason Tomlinson, and Ms. Angie W. Wright

**Absent:** Dr. Harrison Keller

**Staff:** Dr. Julie Eklund, Mr. David Young, Ms. Jennifer Gonzales

1. The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.
2. The minutes from the August 19th meeting were unanimously approved by a motion from Dr. Munoz with a second from Ms. Brown.
3. The committee discussed, reviewed, and considered the Commissioner's 2022-2023 biennium charges.
  - a. Charge 1 – Funding Levels

The committee reviewed the projections for growth and inflation and the resulting funding levels. During the 2020-21 biennium, the Legislature appropriated an additional \$18.5 million for the Small Institution Supplement (SIS), which effectively changed the supplement rate from \$750K to \$1.3M. Mr. Harper recommended starting with the 2020-21 appropriated rate (\$1.3M), adding inflation, and maintaining the methodology that distributes a step-down approach for student headcounts between 5,000 and 10,000. The committee agreed. Ms. Gonzales will provide updated projections in October to include this recommendation.

The committee agreed that the recommendations should include growth and inflation. Ms. Brown also advocated for adding language to the committee's report that recommends against reducing the space support formula for distance education courses. The committee considered this recommendation under charge 3.

Regarding Space Support funding, Mr. Harper advocated for the formula recommendation to break out a separate line item for utilities for Sul Ross - Rio Grande. The institution's facilities are leased, but the institution does pay all utilities through a triple net lease. The committee agreed that the institution should have its own line and that language be added to the page to support the recommendation.

b. Charge 3 – Space Projection Model for Distance Education Courses

Dr. Marquart began the discussion by sharing that costs associated with distance education are unstructured, with students seeking assistance at all hours of the day. He stated that this helps meet the needs of non-traditional students and helps to meet the goals of *60X30TX*, but it's more expensive to design these courses and to have instructors and IT available at those times as well. Dr. Munoz noted that future cost may continue to grow as instructional design becomes more expensive. Mr. Davidson noted that his institution was also having to meet the technological needs of students with disabilities. In summary, the committee agreed on the need to communicate information in their recommendations about the costs and challenges of delivering distance education and to advocate against adjusting the space support formula for distance education. Ms. Sloan will summarize the points made during the discussion for the committee's final report.

c. Charge 4 – Additional B-On-Time Allocation Methodology

The committee discussed the recent history regarding the end of the B-On-Time program. Mr. Harper shared his understanding of the allocation methodology that came out of the negotiated rule-making committee, which was to distribute funds back to the donor institutions, but he understood that this charge was specific to the remaining balance after those distributions have been made. Dr. Eklund reminded the committee that statute requires a recommendation regarding outcomes-based funding, and that this charge addresses that requirement.

Ms. Brown noted that when UT-Brownsville and UT-Pan American merged as UT-Rio Grande Valley, UT-Brownsville lost its status as a donor institution, and she suggested that part of that funding should go back to UTRGV.

Mr. Brown asked whether the committee was legislatively bound to tie the remaining funds back to the outcomes-based funding. Ms. Eklund explained that Texas Education Code §61.0593 (d-g) provides more detail on what is required and that the staff would provide further details to the committee at the next meeting.

Charge 2 – Expenditure Study

Dr. Gallant shared that the Expenditure Study workgroup had a conference call on September 9, 2019. The group examined the departmental operating expense (DOE) allocation methodology. Institutions can currently allocate via direct expenses, semester credit hours, faculty salaries, or a combination of these. The workgroup members agreed that a consistent methodology would provide more stability in the weights. Dr. Gallant made a motion that DOE expenses be allocated via direct expenses, when possible, and that remaining DOE expenses be allocated via faculty salaries. Ms. Brown seconded the motion and the full committee unanimously agreed.

Dr. Gallant asked if non-funded hours were included in the study, citing that institutions still bear the expense for educating the non-funded semester credit

hours. Through discussion, the committee realized that since all costs are included, but non-funded hours are not included, this would result in an increase in the cost per SCH. Ms. Sloan thought this might be why we are seeing compression in the weights. Dr. Gallant and Ms. Brown said these non-funded hours may be more likely when students are taking upper level courses. Dr. Eklund relayed that staff would try to examine the distribution of these non-funded hours to see if they might affect the study.

4. The committee discussed action items for the October meeting:

Ms. Gonzales will provide updated funding projections, which will include the recommended changes to the Small Institution Supplement.

Ms. Sloan will consolidate the committee's discussion and comments on the higher costs associated with providing distance education for the committee's approval.

Regarding Charge 4, the THECB will provide more information on legislative and statutory requirements. Mr. Harper also asked the THECB to run a model that would show Ms. Brown's suggested change to the B-On-Time allocation that came out of the negotiated rule-making process. In addition, Mr. Harper requested to see a model that runs the remaining \$26 million using the graduation supplement methodology for at-risk students.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m. until October 17, 2019 at 11:00 a.m.

## Commissioner's Charges

The GAIFAC, conducted in an open and public forum, is charged with proposing a set of formulas that provide the appropriate funding levels and financial incentives necessary to best achieve the four major goals of *60x30TX* plan. A preliminary written report of its activities and recommendations is due to the Commissioner by December 13, 2019, and a final written report by January 28, 2020. The GAIFAC's specific charges are to:

1. Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the operations support and space support formulas and the percent split between the "utilities" and "operations and maintenance" (O&M) components of the space support formula. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b))
2. Review the expenditure study that is used for the cost matrix, including determining and reviewing the growth of costs affiliated with higher education and its consequent impact on higher education institutions, and make recommendations for improvements to better reflect the actual expenditures of the institutions. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259))
3. Review the Space Projection Model as it relates to distance education courses, including the different physical space and technology needs between traditional courses, online courses, and distance education courses, as well as information on associated costs of each course type, and recommend changes to the model. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259))
4. Study and make recommendations for an outcomes-based methodology for allocating the balance remaining in the B-On-Time account after the underutilized amount is allocated.

## General Academic Institutions Formula Advisory Committee for the 2022-2023 Biennium

Name	Institution	Contacts
<b>Mr. Bob Brown</b> (2022) VP for Finance & Administration	University of North Texas 1501 W. Chestnut St, Denton, TX 76201	<a href="mailto:bob.brown@unt.edu">bob.brown@unt.edu</a> 940-565-2055
<b>Ms. Susan Brown</b> (2024) AVP for Strategic Analysis & Institutional Reporting	The University of Texas - Rio Grande Valley, 1201 West University Drive, Edinburg, TX 78539	<a href="mailto:susan.brown@utrgv.edu">susan.brown@utrgv.edu</a> 956-665-2383
<b>Mr. John Davidson</b> (2022) AVP – Budget, Planning & Analysis	The University of Texas at Arlington 219 West Main St, Arlington, TX 76019	<a href="mailto:john.davidson@uta.edu">john.davidson@uta.edu</a> 817-272-5499
<b>Mr. Danny Gallant</b> (2022) VP for Finance & Administration	Stephen F. Austin State University P.O. Box 6108, Nacogdoches, TX 75962	<a href="mailto:dgallant@sfasu.edu">dgallant@sfasu.edu</a> 936-468-2203
<b>Mr. Daniel Harper</b> (2024) Vice Chancellor & CFO	Texas State University System 601 Colorado Street, Austin, TX 78701	<a href="mailto:daniel.harper@tsus.edu">daniel.harper@tsus.edu</a> 512-463-6449
<b>Dr. Harrison Keller</b> (2020) Deputy to the President for Strategy & Policy	The University of Texas at Austin 1 University Station G1000, Austin, TX 78712	<a href="mailto:harrison.keller@austin.utexas.edu">harrison.keller@austin.utexas.edu</a> 512-232-8277
<b>Dr. Robert Kinucan</b> (2024) Executive VP & Provost	Sul Ross State University P.O. Box C-97, Alpine, Texas, 79832	<a href="mailto:kinucan@sulross.edu">kinucan@sulross.edu</a> 432-837-8662
<b>Dr. James Marquart</b> (2020) Provost & VP for Academic Affairs	Lamar University PO Box 10002, Beaumont, TX 77710	<a href="mailto:james.marquart@lamar.edu">james.marquart@lamar.edu</a> 409-880-8398
<b>Ms. Veronica Mendez</b> (2022) VP for Business Affairs	The University of Texas at San Antonio One UTSA Circle, San Antonio, TX 78249	<a href="mailto:veronica.mendez@utsa.edu">veronica.mendez@utsa.edu</a> 210-458-4201
<b>Dr. Karen Murray</b> (2020) Executive VP - Academic Affairs & Provost	Tarleton State University 1333 West Washington, Stephenville, TX 76402	<a href="mailto:kmurray@tarleton.edu">kmurray@tarleton.edu</a> 254-968-9992
<b>Dr. Juan Munoz</b> (2024) President	University of Houston-Downtown One Main Street, Houston, TX 77002	<a href="mailto:uhdpresident@uhd.edu">uhdpresident@uhd.edu</a> 713-221-8001
<b>Mr. R. Jason Tomlinson</b> (2024) VP for Finance & Administration	Texas Woman's University P.O. Box 425588, Denton, TX 76204	<a href="mailto:jtomlinson1@twu.edu">jtomlinson1@twu.edu</a> 940-898-3505
<b>Ms. Noel Sloan</b> (2020) CFO & VP of Administration & Finance	Texas Tech University 2500 Broadway, Lubbock, TX 79409	<a href="mailto:noel.a.sloan@ttu.edu">noel.a.sloan@ttu.edu</a> 806-834-1625
<b>Dr. Jerry R. Strawser</b> (2020) Executive VP of Finance & Administration & CFO	Texas A&M University 1181 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843	<a href="mailto:jstrawser@tamu.edu">jstrawser@tamu.edu</a> 917-862-7777
<b>Ms. Angie W. Wright</b> (2020) VP for Finance & Administration	Angelo State University 2601 West Ave N, San Angelo, TX 76903	<a href="mailto:angie.wright@angelo.edu">angie.wright@angelo.edu</a> 325-942-2017

Note: The year after the member's name is when that member's term expires.

**Charge 1 – Study and make recommendations for the appropriate funding levels for the operations support and space support formulas and the percent split between the “utilities” and “operations and maintenance” (O&M) components of the space support formula. (TEC, Section 61.059 (b))**

In the 2020-2021 General Appropriations Act, the Legislature added additional funding to the Small Institution Supplement. The scenario below uses the 2020-2021 appropriated annual funding supplement of \$1,316,566 and adds a 2.35% inflation rate (based on projected CPI-U), equating to a recommended supplement of \$1,347,506 for the 2022-23 biennium.

Institution	Projected Headcount Fall 2020	Actual GAA SIS Appropriation FY 2020-21	Recommended Annual Funding FY 2022-23	Recommended Biennial Funding FY 2022-23	Recommended Increase
UT-Arlington	43,690	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-Austin	53,136	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-Dallas	29,563	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-El Paso	25,767	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-Rio Grande Valley	29,290	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-Permian Basin	5,998	\$ 2,135,456	\$ 1,078,558	\$ 2,157,116	\$ 21,660
UT-San Antonio	33,003	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UT-Tyler	9,989	\$ 143,670	\$ 2,954	\$ 5,909	\$ (137,761)
TAMU	65,484	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAMU-Galveston	1,857	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
Prairie View	9,783	\$ 206,389	\$ 58,369	\$ 116,738	\$ (89,651)
Tarleton	13,487	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAMU-Central	2,533	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
TAMU-CC	12,264	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAMU-Kingsville	8,781	\$ 769,028	\$ 328,517	\$ 657,034	\$ (111,994)
TAMU-San Antonio	6,802	\$ 1,771,453	\$ 861,886	\$ 1,723,772	\$ (47,681)
TAMI	8,106	\$ 1,097,798	\$ 510,555	\$ 1,021,110	\$ (76,688)
WTAMU	10,312	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAMU-Commerce	12,411	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAMU-TeXarkana	2,125	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
UH	47,626	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UH-Clear Lake	9,213	\$ 545,805	\$ 212,146	\$ 424,291	\$ (121,514)
UH-Downtown	14,662	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UH-Victoria	4,504	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
Midwestern	5,873	\$ 2,169,790	\$ 1,112,361	\$ 2,224,723	\$ 54,932
UNT	39,157	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
UNT-Dallas	3,863	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
SFA	13,425	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TSU	10,005	\$ 141,136	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (141,136)
TTU	38,909	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Angeb	10,530	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TWU	15,796	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lamar	14,574	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sam Houston	21,616	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TXST	39,730	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sul Ross	1,938	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
Sul Ross-Rio Grande	915	\$ 2,633,133	\$ 1,347,506	\$ 2,695,012	\$ 61,879
<b>University Total</b>	<b>676,716</b>	<b>\$27,412,454</b>	<b>\$ 13,597,889</b>	<b>\$ 27,195,777</b>	<b>\$ (216,677)</b>

## Projected Funding Levels Based on Inflation and Growth

<b>General Academic Institution Formula Funding Level Recommendation</b> (does not include Texas State Technical College or Lamar State College Space Support)		
<b>Operations Support and Teaching Experience Supplement (in millions)</b>		
<b>Inflation</b>		
2020-2021 Appropriated Rate	\$	55.85
Anticipated Inflation Rate		2.3%
Recommended Funding Rate (with inflation)	\$	57.16
<b>Growth</b>		
2020-2021 Weighted Semester Credit Hours		37,114,370
Anticipated Growth Rate		2.8%
2022-2023 Projected Growth in Weighted Semester Credit Hours		38,157,355
2020-2021 I&O + Teaching Exp Appropriation	\$	4,146
<b>2022-2023 Recommendation with Inflation and Growth</b>	\$	4,362
Recommended Increase	\$	217
Percent Increase		5.2%

<b>Space Support (in millions)</b>		
<b>Inflation</b>		
2020-2021 Appropriated Rate	\$	5.33
Anticipated Inflation Rate		2.3%
Recommended Funding Rate (with inflation)	\$	5.46
<b>Growth</b>		
2020-2021 Adjusted Predicted Square Feet		71,414,661
Anticipated Growth Rate		4.8%
2022-2023 Projected Adjusted Predicted Square Feet		74,841,749
2020-2021 Space Support Appropriation	\$	764
<b>2022-2023 Recommendation with Inflation and Growth</b>	\$	817
Recommended Increase	\$	52.6
Percent Increase		6.9%

<b>Small Institution Supplement (in millions)</b>		
2020-2021 Small Institution Supplement	\$	27.4
<b>2022-2023 Recommendation with 2.6% Headcount</b>	\$	27.2
Recommended Increase	\$	(0.2)
Percent Increase		-0.8%

<b>Total Formula Funding (in millions)</b>		
2020-2021		
Operations Support with Teaching Experience Supplement	\$	4,146
Space Support	\$	764
Small Institution Supplement	\$	27
Total	\$	4,937
2022-2023		
Operations Support with Teaching Experience Supplement	\$	4,362
Space Support	\$	817
Small Institution Supplement	\$	27
<b>Total</b>	\$	5,206
Recommended Increase	\$	269
Percent Increase		5.4%

**Charge 2 – Review the expenditure study that is used for the cost matrix, including determining and reviewing the growth of costs affiliated with higher education and its consequent impact on higher education institutions, and make recommendations for improvements to better reflect the actual expenditures of the institutions. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259))**

Information on how unfunded hours would affect the weights in the Expenditure Study will be forthcoming.

**Charge 3 – Review the Space Projection Model as it relates to distance education courses, including the different physical space and technology needs between traditional courses, online courses, and distance education courses, as well as information on associated costs of each course type, and recommend changes to the Space Projection Model. (General Appropriations Act, HB 1, 86th Texas Legislature, Special Provisions Sec. 26 (page III-257 to III-259))**

The Chair has summarized the points of discussion from the September meeting and has drafted the paragraphs below to be consider for inclusion in the committee’s final report:

The GAIFAC acknowledges the timeliness of this charge and recognizes the reasonable perception that the cost of online instruction appears to be lower than that of the traditional classroom model, due to the apparent lack of physical space required. However, the committee agrees that there are actual, and sometimes increased, costs required to provide online education that are substantially similar or even exceed that of the traditional classroom delivery.

Online instruction has introduced a modality that is not as structured as traditional instruction where we could assess direct costs and measure fill rates and capacity. Online instruction begins with an investment in instructional designers, sound-proof studios with videographers, sound technicians and closed captioning services. Faculty invest significant time upfront to develop the courses. There is an investment in marketing, recruiting, call centers to respond to students 24/7, additional admissions personnel and transcript evaluators to support student enrollment. Once a student begins an online program, tutors must be made available along with dedicated IT personnel and librarians with potentially increased costs related to cybersecurity and proper student identification.

To invest in and support quality online courses and degree programs, institutions must provide the infrastructure and space support for all functions from development through student engagement. In addition, physical space is still required for some online courses, such as clinical space for nursing students, and hybrid courses.

For the above reasons, the GAIFAC recommends that all hours be included in the Space Projection Model with no discount related to online courses. It is unlikely that there will be a decrease in costs related to online courses and consideration may be given to forming a future committee to consider whether a different formula or Space Projection Model should be developed for online course infrastructure.

**Charge 4 – Study and make recommendations for an outcomes-based methodology for allocating the balance remaining in the B-On-Time account after the underutilized amount is allocated**

The balance remaining in the B-On-Time account after the underutilized amount is allocated will be approximately \$25.6 million. The graph below shows the allocation of this amount based on the graduation supplement methodology that awards institutions based on at-risk degrees.

FICE	Institution	Biennial Graduation Supplement	Graduation Supplement Points	3 Yr-Avg	FY 2018	FY 2017	FY 2016
				At-Risk Degrees	At-Risk Degrees	At-Risk Degrees	At-Risk Degrees
003656	UT-Arlington	\$ 1,852,257	9,827	4,914	5,185	5,012	4,544
003658	UT-Austin	\$ 1,438,229	7,631	3,815	3,741	3,757	3,948
009741	UT-Dallas	\$ 706,172	3,747	1,873	2,077	1,840	1,703
003661	UT-El Paso	\$ 1,097,331	5,822	2,911	2,977	2,890	2,866
003599	UT-Rio Grande Valley	\$ 1,361,204	7,222	3,611	3,610	3,638	3,585
009930	UT-Permian Basin	\$ 215,747	1,145	572	609	587	521
010115	UT-San Antonio	\$ 1,326,021	7,035	3,518	3,616	3,504	3,433
011163	UT-Tyler	\$ 398,321	2,113	1,057	1,213	1,023	934
003632	TAMU	\$ 1,743,693	9,251	4,626	4,826	4,727	4,324
010298	TAMU-Galveston	\$ 87,832	466	233	253	228	218
003630	Prairie View	\$ 370,049	1,963	982	997	991	957
003631	Tarleton	\$ 694,110	3,683	1,841	1,904	1,851	1,769
042295	TAMU-Central	\$ 173,527	921	460	476	437	468
011161	TAMU-CC	\$ 475,724	2,524	1,262	1,290	1,291	1,205
003639	TAMU-Kingsville	\$ 315,390	1,673	837	820	857	833
042485	TAMU-San Antonio	\$ 347,306	1,843	921	967	937	860
009651	TAMI	\$ 389,149	2,065	1,032	1,101	1,008	988
003665	WTAMU	\$ 399,578	2,120	1,060	1,115	1,049	1,016
003565	TAMU-Commerce	\$ 478,488	2,539	1,269	1,293	1,288	1,227
029269	TAMU-Texarkana	\$ 99,643	529	264	278	263	252
003652	UH	\$ 1,744,321	9,255	4,627	4,862	4,433	4,587
011711	UH-Clear Lake	\$ 358,741	1,903	952	985	943	927
012826	UH-Downtown	\$ 814,862	4,323	2,162	2,181	2,240	2,064
013231	UH-Victoria	\$ 173,779	922	461	500	441	442
003592	Midwestern	\$ 274,050	1,454	727	771	722	688
003594	UNT	\$ 1,666,290	8,841	4,420	4,500	4,560	4,201
042421	UNT-Dallas	\$ 160,082	849	425	485	366	423
003624	SFA	\$ 606,655	3,219	1,609	1,637	1,626	1,565
003642	TSU	\$ 295,663	1,569	784	734	819	800
003644	TTU	\$ 1,280,660	6,795	3,397	3,637	3,370	3,185
003541	Angelo	\$ 238,867	1,267	634	633	675	593
003646	TWU	\$ 604,519	3,207	1,604	1,571	1,647	1,593
003581	Lamar	\$ 445,064	2,361	1,181	1,207	1,168	1,167
003606	Sam Houston	\$ 1,015,908	5,390	2,695	2,837	2,677	2,571
003615	TXST	\$ 1,830,142	9,710	4,855	5,074	4,914	4,577
003625	Sul Ross	\$ 60,062	319	159	171	154	153
000020	Sul Ross-Rio Grande	\$ 60,565	321	161	174	157	151
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 25,600,000</b>	<b>135,823</b>	<b>67,912</b>	<b>70,307</b>	<b>68,090</b>	<b>65,338</b>
	Rate	\$ 188.48			-	-	-

Source: CBM009, CBM00N, CBM00B, FAD

## Appendix A:

### **Texas Education Code § 61.0593. Student Success-based Funding Recommendations**

(a) The legislature finds that it is in the state's highest public interest to evaluate student achievement at institutions of higher education and to develop higher education funding policy based on that evaluation. Funding policies that promote postsecondary educational success based on objective indicators of relative performance, such as degree completion rates, are critical to maintaining the state's competitiveness in the national and global economy and supporting the general welfare of this state. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to ensure that institutions of higher education produce student outcomes that are directly aligned with the state's education goals and economic development needs.

(b) In this section:

(1) "At-risk student" means an undergraduate student of an institution of higher education:

(A) who has been awarded a grant under the federal Pell Grant program; or

(B) who, on the date the student initially enrolled in the institution:

(i) was 20 years of age or older;

(ii) had a score on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) or the American College Test (ACT) that was less than the national mean score for students taking that test;

(iii) was enrolled as a part-time student; or

(iv) had not received a high school diploma but had received a high school equivalency certificate within the last six years.

(2) "Critical field" means a field of study designated as a critical field under Subsection (c).

(c) Except as otherwise provided under Subdivision (2), the fields of engineering, computer science, mathematics, physical science, allied health, nursing, and teaching certification in the field of science or mathematics are critical fields. Beginning September 1, 2012, the board, based on the board's determination of those fields of study in which the support and development of postsecondary education programs at the bachelor's degree level are most critically necessary for serving the needs of this state, by rule may:

(1) designate as a critical field a field of study that is not currently designated by this subsection or by the board as a critical field; or

(2) remove a field of study from the list of fields currently designated by this subsection or by the board as critical fields.

(d) This subsection applies only to a general academic teaching institution other than a public state college. In devising its funding formulas and making its recommendations to the legislature relating to institutional appropriations of funds under Section 61.059 for institutions to which this subsection applies, the board, in the manner and to the extent the board considers appropriate and in consultation with those institutions, shall incorporate the consideration of undergraduate student success measures achieved during the preceding state fiscal biennium by each of the institutions. At the time the board makes those recommendations, the board shall also make recommendations for incorporating the success measures, to the extent the board considers appropriate in consultation with those institutions,

into the distribution of any incentive funds available for those institutions, including performance incentive funds under Subchapter D, Chapter 62. The board's recommendations must provide alternative approaches for applying the success measures and must compare the effects on funding of applying the success measures within the formula for base funding to applying the success measures as a separate formula. The success measures considered by the board under this subsection may include:

- (1) the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded by the institution;
  - (2) the total number of bachelor's degrees in critical fields awarded by the institution;
  - (3) the total number of bachelor's degrees awarded by the institution to at-risk students; and
  - (4) as determined by the board, the six-year graduation rate of undergraduate students of the institution who initially enrolled in the institution in the fall semester immediately following their graduation from a public high school in this state as compared to the six-year graduation rate predicted for those students based on the composition of the institution's student body.
- (e) Notwithstanding Subsection (d):

- (1) not more than 10 percent of the total amount of general revenue appropriations of base funds for undergraduate education recommended by the board for all institutions to which Subsection (d) applies for a state fiscal biennium may be based on student success measures; and
- (2) the board's recommendation for base funding for undergraduate education based on student success measures does not reduce or otherwise affect funding recommendations for graduate education.

(f) This subsection applies only to public junior colleges, public state colleges, and public technical institutes. In devising its funding formulas and making its recommendations to the legislature relating to institutional appropriations of incentive funds for institutions to which this subsection applies, the board, in the manner and to the extent the board considers appropriate and in consultation with those institutions, shall incorporate the consideration of the undergraduate student success measures achieved during the preceding state fiscal biennium by each of the institutions. The success measures considered by the board under this subsection may include:

- (1) the following academic progress measures achieved by students at the institution:
  - (A) successful completion of:
    - (i) developmental education in mathematics;
    - (ii) developmental education in English;
    - (iii) the first college-level mathematics course with a grade of "C" or higher;
    - (iv) the first college-level English course with a grade of "C" or higher; and
    - (v) the first 30 semester credit hours at the institution;
  - (B) transfer to a four-year college or university after successful completion of at least 15 semester credit hours at the institution; and
- (2) the total number of the following awarded by the institution:
  - (A) associate's degrees;
  - (B) bachelor's degrees under Section 130.0012; and
  - (C) certificates identified by the board for purposes of this section as effective measures of student success.

(g) Biennially, the board, in consultation with institutions to which Subsections (d) and (f) apply, shall review the student success measures considered by the board under those subsections.

(h) The board shall include in its findings and recommendations to the legislature under Section 61.059:

(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the student success measures described by this section in achieving the purpose of this section during the preceding state fiscal biennium; and

(2) any related recommendations the board considers appropriate.

(i) The board shall adopt rules for the administration of this section, including rules requiring each institution of higher education to submit to the board any student data or other information the board considers necessary for the board to carry out its duties under this section.