

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University  
Board of Trustees



**Strategic Planning and Performance Measures Committee Report**  
**Trustee Harper, Chair**  
**Wednesday, June 7, 2023**

The Strategic Planning and Performance Measures Committee met on Wednesday, June 7, 2023. The meeting was attended by Trustee Harper, Trustee Stone, Trustee Reed, Trustee Cliatt, and Trustee Washington. A quorum was present.

**Action Items:**

**Approval of Minutes February 15, 2023 meeting.**

The committee approved the minutes from the February 15, 2023 meeting.

Dr. McMurray gave an overview of the performance funding methodology including historical trends, and shared key initiatives.

Using the 2022 Performance-Based funding model as an example, Dr. McMurray provided a background and overview of how points are allocated. She explained there are two scales under the model. One is the Excellence scale and the other is the Improvement scale. For each of the metrics under the model, an institution can get a certain number of points based on their performance each year.

Dr. McMurray explained the PBF Funding Allocation Methodology showing the connection between our score from the Excellence/Improvement scale and the PBF funding allocation. She emphasized the importance for the University to meet certain performance thresholds to avoid losing a portion of our base budget.

She stated if an institution scores below 60 in a given year, they are not eligible for the State or the Institutional investment and an improvement plan is required.

Using a table to illustrate the various scenarios she explained if FAMU scored below 60, it means we will lose 14 million dollars from our base budget. But, if FAMU were to score higher than 60, the next question would be, is that score 70 or higher? If not, that means a score between 60 and 69 was received. This would result in the institution receiving half of the State

investment in the Fall and half in the Spring, but the institution would be required to implement a Student Success Plan.

This will allow you to retain your institutional investment, but you'll receive half of the State investment at the beginning of the year and the other half in the middle of the year, pending the approval of the Student Success Plan.

She continued by explaining, if the institution scores higher than 70, and they are in the top 3 overall, they receive all of the State investment.

If the institution scored 70 or higher and is not in the top 3 and did not decline two years in a row, the institution can receive a hundred percent of the State investment. But if the institution did decline two years in a row, then the institution must complete a Student Success Plan. And again, they can receive the State investment in two allocations, one at the beginning of the year and the other during the middle of the year.

Trustee Washington pointed out the impact of the score of low 60 by stating while you lose your Institutional investment, which is the 14 million, you also don't get any State investment. So, it would be the \$14 million plus the \$12.5 million. So, it's actually a \$26.5 million impact. Not, just the 14 million dollars. She added, knowing that right now, we are probably not in the top 3, any decline that we have this year means that we can't have a decline next year, or we drop into this other bucket.

President Robinson agreed with Trustee Washington and added the University could stand to lose more gain, because that \$14 million is a recurring amount, and losing it would be very difficult to retain.

Trustee Dubose asked about strategies to increase the Excellence scores. Dr. McMurray explained how the system allocates funding under the model. Funding is allocated from two sources. One source is called the Institutional investment, and the other source is called the State investment.

For the Institutional investment, each institution in the system allocates a portion of its base budget towards performance funding, for example, 14 million of FAMU's base budget is essentially put into a pot and we have to meet minimum outcomes on the model each year in order for the \$14 million to be returned to us. We tend to focus on the State investment, which is the allocation of additional monies above and beyond our base.

In 2022, we received \$12.6 million in the State investment and that's where the focus again typically is. But we also must pay attention to the other component of the model. And that has to do with the Institutional investment that is also included in the model.

President Robinson stated if there was a need in the future to replace the \$14 million base budget, with the Board's approval, the money could be replaced from the University Reserve account.

Trustee Harper assured everyone that we are not at risk at this point.

Dr. McMurray continued with a discussion about the PBF outcomes stating there are 4 metrics that are trending down, and they are-our academic progress rate, our Bachelor degrees award, programs of strategic emphasis, and University access rates. And those are ones to watch as well as watching our FTIC four-year graduation rate.

Trustee Dubose stated to catch the root cause of the down-trend earlier, counselors would need to catch things early with students-whether they be a transfer student, or just coming through normal channels into the University. He added the KPI's ought to be tied to the PBF outcomes. They should be tied to things that are tangible and measurable, and have the cause and effect on making the metrics all green instead of red.

Provost Watson shared recent strategies used by the University by sharing how they had a day-long retreat with the deans exploring ways to articulate performance-based metric one. Dr. Lewis Johnson helped the deans to work through strategies at the retreat, identify what outcomes would look like and how they would be translated to the academic advisors.

Trustee Harper added there are several drivers, and root causes that lead up to each of these PBF metrics. She continued by point out Dr. McMurray is developing a very robust and comprehensive score card that our Board will begin to see on a regular cadence. One of the other factors that leads to these metrics is certainly our recruitment profile, and this is the recruitment strategy, as well as the student profile of the students who are admitted. And so, there is definitely a correlation between what we discussed earlier and what we see every board meeting around the profile of students who are being admitted to the University. Because, as we work through the development of the strategic plan, Dr. Lewis Johnson, had excellent statistics and correlation analysis, just like we see with the College of Law-the undergraduate GPA, and LSAT score. There is a correlation as a predictive model. He showed us the same predictive model as it relates to high school GPA and ACT and SAT test scores, particularly in math and science. And so, that has led to some of the additional changes as a relation to the student profile. So, there are multiple drivers across the institution that lead to these metrics, and you will start to see that in the score cards it will be more visible.

Trustee Cliatt, pointing out a direct link between metric numbers 5 and 6 and academic advising asked, who sets the tone, the goals and the tools that the academic advisors will use? Are those established by the deans, or by whomever the academic advisors report to? Where does their direction come from? Where do their goals for the day for the students come from?

Provost Watson explained the tone is set from our President, our Board of Trustees, and then of course, the Division of Academic Affairs through her. She informed everyone that a meeting was held with the advisors early on to roll out the complete plan so that they know how important they are to this process, and the University will be investing in them in terms of professional development. Associate Provost, Dr. Jennifer Collins handles student success and first year experiences, and leads academic advising as the chief leader in Academic Affairs.

There is a layer between the Provost, Dr. Collins, Kimberly Black and Julian Born-Smothers, and then they have lead advisor liaisons as well as advisory councils that are comprised of faculty administrators and other advisors.

Dr. Lewis Johnson added, the University is constantly monitoring the objectives and are constantly monitoring leading indicators, incoming profile of the students, first year performance, number of touches that they've received from the advisors, number of times they visit academic coaches, and the curriculum.

There are just a wealth of data and metrics that the University is constantly measuring. So, the advisors, the coaches, the departments, the deans - everyone is a cog in the machinery that has some effect sometimes, and sometimes it doesn't necessarily have that big of effect when moving a metric from year to year. But the University is constantly looking at analyzing those metrics. As a result, Dr. Jennifer Collins was hired to be basically over the freshman to coordinate all freshman activities. We've experienced a 10-point jump on our score from the 70's to the 80's. So now, we're on a whole other set of challenges so that we can move that student body from where they are to our next goal of getting them at the high 80's or low 90's score.

Trustee Cliatt pointed out the trend of rising and dipping over the 2017-2023 period and suggested focusing on ways to get to where the trajectory is on an incline each year verses a dip. He continued by asking if we have the number of advisors needed for a University of our size.

Dr. Johnson shared a new model has been executed that calls for a ratio of one advisor to every 200-225 students. Additional advisors are being hired and hopefully by the Fall semester all advisors will be on board. There is also software and academic policies in place to assist advisors. Additionally, new academic policies are being put in place to redirect students who are not making adequate progress, into a major in which they're going to be much more comfortable. He continued by pointing out, advising is part of the question. An early alert system to pinpoint students who are having academic trouble quicker is another part.

Trustee Washington asked if we are looking at course availability for courses that are creating bottlenecks for students. She also asked if the University could look at where our scores are on certain metrics and triage where we could actually improve scores.

Trustee Stone inquired about the incentive structure and compensation for academic advisors.

Provost Watson explained with the funding and investment from the State, the University is able to get more academic coaching so that it's not falling on certain shoulders. The University is looking at professional development for the advisors such as how to look at their ultimate goals using things like tuition waivers that we have for state employees so they can further their education, get a master's or doctorate, as well as building modules so that they have time to talk to one another and share best practices. Academic Affairs is looking at using the

Advisory Council so that two councils can come together and give us their feedback on what they have experienced and how we can help change it. Plans are in the making to send all advisors to professional development conferences at Nakata as well as other conferences.

Trustee Mondelus expressed concern for timely course offerings to allow students to graduate on time and wanted to know what the University is doing to ensure the systems students are using are accurate and up to date. She also asked about accountability measures relating to monitoring data as it relates to the metrics or plans to make sure the University is reaching their goals.

Provost Watson responded by explaining it takes communication on all fronts, so that as we communicate up to the Dean's, and that communication is filtered down to the academic advisors and then to their associate teams that we have those courses built in. She concluded by explaining accountability measures used by the University.

Trustee Stone requested the Board be refreshed on the dashboard process being handed down to the dean so that each department chair can have their own individualized dashboard so that each department based on the size of their department, knows the number of students they have to get through the pipe in order for us to hit the bigger goal. Dr. McMurray agreed to provide that refresher and she and Trustee Harper explained Colleges/Schools dashboards are on the President's Goal's website and is publicly available.

Dr. McMurray wrapped up by mentioning the metrics that should be watched to increase our numbers:

1. 4yr Graduation Rate
2. 3yr-Transfer Graduation Rate
3. FTIC Pell Graduation Rate
4. Academic Progress rates

Dr McMurray also informed the Board of the Best Practices that have been implemented so far in regards to graduation rates and retention rates:

1. Restructured Academic Advising
2. Enhanced first year experiences for all students
3. Utilized peer mentoring
4. Added intrusive advising measures
5. Have a target focus on entry to exit to improve our 4 yr graduation and retention rate
6. Restructured approaches to students' transition
7. Hired student retention specialists as well as academic coaches
8. The Office of Freshman Studies
9. A Transfer Studies area

## **Information Items:**

### **Update of the Performance Based Funding Metric Methodology**

Trustee Harper provided the following items for follow-up at the next meeting:

1. Share leading indicators for the Performance Based Funding.
2. Continue to engage and provide visibility to the Scorecard.
3. Ensure students will have availability and accessibility to needed courses.  
Do an analysis of if there are bottleneck classes to ensure students have the access to what they need, so that they are not unnecessarily extending their time here at FAMU.
4. Share how roles in academic advisement will be filled.  
Dr. Johnson and Provost Watson mentioned September 30<sup>th</sup> as the goal. Trustee Harper would like an update as to where we are.
5. Show how items 4 and 5 under Key Initiatives that are “red” indicating a need to be increased can become “green” indicating a good standing.
6. Refresh the Board on the dashboard process being handed down to the dean so that each department chair can have their own individualized dashboard such that each department based on the size of their department, knows the number of students they have to get through the pipe in order for us to hit the bigger goal.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.