Memo of Record Meeting of the Postsecondary Education Working Group November 28, 2016

The Postsecondary Education Working Group met Monday, November 28, 9:00 am ET, at the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education in Frankfort, Kentucky. Chair Gary Ransdell presided.

- WELCOME Chair Ransdell called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone.
- ROLL CALLMembers present: Wayne Andrews, Michael Benson, Jay Box, Robert Davies, David
Givens, Robert King, Andrew McNeill, Geoffrey Mearns, Aaron Thompson, Neville
Pinto, Gary Ransdell, and Arnold Simpson. Eli Capilouto was represented by Angie
Martin. Absent: John Chilton.

Chair Ransdell began by welcoming guest Frank Willey from Senate President-elect Hoover's office. Chair Ransdell stated that this meeting will focus on reaching agreement on the model components and agreeing on the language, generally speaking, for the report that will be submitted to the Governor and General Assembly by December 1, 2016. Consensus is needed on distribution of the 5 percent of funding and the goal is to sign a consensus document that allows the committee to move forward and have confidence that the model can be embraced for the 5 percent distribution. The report would be used to drive the legislative language going into the 2017 legislative session. Chair Ransdell deferred to the legislative members of the committee to draft the appropriate bill for the General Assembly's consideration. Chair Ransdell thanked Council on Postsecondary Education President King and the CPE staff, in particular Vice President Bill Payne, for the immense amount of work that has been put into this effort and noted that this is the final meeting of the work group.

PERFORMANCE FUNDING DISCUSSION

A) Four-year institutions

DING President King began the discussion on the four-year institution model by reminding the group that the spreadsheets shared at meetings have changed because CPE has responded to suggestions and recommendations from members of the work group in terms of metrics and the weighting applied to those metrics. These spreadsheets will continue to change. The spreadsheets shared in this meeting are not final because there is data to apply to the model that will not be available until January or February of 2017.

Council on Postsecondary Education Vice President Bill Payne reviewed the student success component and referred to the sample funding model handouts at members' places. In this version, bachelors' degrees have been normalized with a higher rate for underrepresented minorities and low income weights, and recognizing degrees per 100 full-time equivalent students. Dr. Payne continued with his presentation and referred to the spreadsheet that discussed funding for components. This model has normalizing metrics of bachelors' degrees at 9 percent, STEM+H at 5 percent, underrepresented minorities increased to 3 percent; and low income students at 3 percent. There also is a 3-5-7 percent per credit hour progression at the 30-60-90 credit hour thresh holds. This sample model distributes 100% of allocable resources. The operational support component includes maintenance and operations, institutional support, and academic support. The

Meeting Notes Meeting of the Postsecondary Education Working Group November 28, 2016

outcomes based component includes course completion funded at 35% of allocated dollars and student success funded at 35% of allocated dollars. Bill Payne explained that if the model is at equilibrium, it distributes a fair share of the funds given what the campuses are producing and given what resources they have to achieve that level of production.

Bill Payne continued with the next table, Distribution of Postsecondary Education Performance Fund which shows the 5 percent, or \$42.9 million, that was transferred to the performance fund. This table includes the mandated program adjustment which is in recognition of fact that when the General Assembly applied the 5 percent in House Bill 303, this is funding that cannot be applied to produce student success outcomes.

Comments included a suggestion to create a comprehensive index of graduation rates and retention rates and adding in criteria that calculates rates per 100. The group discussed the possibility of making the formula too complex and agreed to use one criterion for bachelor's degrees and one for degrees per 100 to avoid complexity. The group agreed to use the model and include the note that the rates should be applied consistently over the years and that the model should be evaluated in 2020.

The committee reached consensus on one sector for the four year institutions and one sector for the KY Community and Technical College System.

The committee reached consensus on the metrics and percentages for the student success component including bachelors' degrees at 9 percent, STEM+H at 5 percent, underrepresented minorities increased to 3 percent; and low income students at 3 percent.

After extensive discussion on weighting, non-resident students, and sector differentiation, the group came to consensus to accept the 5 percent distribution based on the performance criteria in the model. The group agreed to evaluate the model every three years to assure that there are no unintended consequences.

Bill Payne reminded the group that to achieve equilibrium and level the playing field, the model is based on one sector for the four-year institutions and one sector for the Kentucky Community and Technical College System. A request was made that the recommendation include: 1) That the report submitted reflects that there was robust discussion and concerns from the institutions remain; and 2) in the first evaluation of the model and in ongoing reviews, sector differentiation will be a point of specific review to assure there are no unintended consequences, so the legislative body will take this on. Chair Ransdell asked that this be duly noted in the meeting minutes.

Senator David Givens said that the report that is delivered to the General Assembly

includes the concerns addressed during the birth of this model and the hope is that the legislators look back at this document that the committee has produced as a starting point. Senator Givens suggested that a date be set for the review and that a reminder to pay special attention to the concerns be included in the report.
Operational Support Component (Maintenance and operations, institutional support, and academic support.)
Chair Ransdell moved to the Operational Support Component that includes maintenance and operations, institutional support, and academic support. President King said that on the first category of operational support—maintenance and operations, the model is based on information submitted by the campuses. A new study will be scheduled for spring of 2017 to establish a good base line for square footage.
The committee reached general consensus that the operation support component

including maintenance and operations funded at 10 percent of allocated dollars, institutional support funded at 10 percent of allocated dollars, and academic support funded at 10 percent of allocated dollars is fair and appropriate, pending the outcome of the new maintenance and operation data.

The group agreed to meet sometime during the third week of January to review bill language.

KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS MODEL
KCTCS president Box had not yet presented the model to the KCTCS presidents. Since that time, the KCTCS presidents have met and agreed to support this model. Enrollment has dropped at the eastern Kentucky KCTCS institutions and they will lose funds, along with some far western campuses, Henderson and Madison. If there is no stop/loss provision, the KCTCS campuses could face unintended consequences.

Chair Ransdell asked Bill Payne to walk the committee through the draft report. The committee agreed on edits to the report included adding in the periodic review paragraph to the guiding principles; bullet 2 in the four-year universities section to read, "It should be capable of distributing any level of state appropriations, up to and including 100% of allocable resources after an appropriate phase-in period;" bullet 3—strike the last part of the phrase, "for institutions in the comprehensive sector", adding in new bullets in the four-year section that includes information on equilibrium and the hold harmless provision; equilibrium definition; a recommendation that the CPE conduct annual assessments of four-year university net General Fund appropriations and tuition and fee revenue. . . ."; and a fourth bullet has been added that is related to the three year review of the model by the Postsecondary Education Working Group. For KCTCS, the same change is made to bullet 2 to the KCTCS section to read, "It should be capable of distributing any level

Meeting Notes Meeting of the Postsecondary Education Working Group November 28, 2016

	of state appropriations, up to and including 100% of allocable resources after an appropriate phase-in period;" adding in new bullets in the KCTCS section that includes information on equilibrium and the hold harmless provision; and a third bullet is added related to the three year review of the model by the Postsecondary Education Working Group.
NEXT STEPS	Chair Ransdell asked the CPE to send the revised report to the committee members by Tuesday afternoon, November 29, and the CPE will work with the presidents to secure signatures for the consensus signature page.
ADJOURNMENT	The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. (ET)