

May 11, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Regents

FROM: David L. Buhler

SUBJECT: USHE – 2016-17 Performance Based Funding Amendments and Allocation

Issue

The Board of Regents received an appropriation of \$5 million one-time funds from the 2016 Legislature to support USHE performance funding initiatives. In addition there are two recommended changes to the performance funding model for FY 2017: a legislative change in the definition of the institutional efficiency metric and a change in the data source used to identify graduate research expenditures.

Background

During the 2015 legislative session, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 232 *Higher Education Performance Funding* and appropriated \$9 million (\$2 million on-going and \$7 million one-time) to implement Performance Based Funding at USHE institutions. The Legislature charged the Board of Regents to develop a funding model that focused on the following five performance metrics:

- Degrees and certificates granted
- Services provided to traditionally underserved populations
- Responsiveness to workforce needs
- Institutional efficiency (graduation efficiency)
- Graduate research for research universities

Last year, the Commissioner and his staff worked collaboratively with co-chairs Senator Urquhart and Representative Grover, USHE presidents, and institutional representatives to develop a performance funding model that met the requirements and intent of S.B. 232. The model developed was approved by the Regents at the July 2015 board meeting. Regents approved the detailed descriptions of the performance metrics, methodology, and proposed implementation guidelines and approved the allocation of the \$9 million to USHE institutions.

The USHE performance funding model begins by identifying the possible funds that an institution could earn by using the institution's share of USHE graduates and state tax funding, weighted equally (50/50). This amount is then divided among the performance metrics for each institution, establishing a target amount that an institution could earn for each metric. Each institution's performance is then measured as an output using a five-year rolling average comparison in order to earn the available funds.

The USHE performance model requires that institutions demonstrate progress in the performance metrics in order to receive 100 percent of their earned allocation. Progress is defined as the outputs improving by one percent or greater (compared to the previous five-year rolling average). If institutions stay the same for a particular measure (defined as within a band of +/- 1 percent), or decrease in their 5-year rolling average, they will be awarded 95 percent of the amount earned. Funds not awarded through the performance funding model were redistributed to institutions on a one-time basis in proportion to their success in meeting identified metrics.

Regents recognized that as the system gains further experience with the implementation of the model, additional improvements to the metrics and/or methodology may be made and asked that changes come back to the Board for approval. There are two proposed changes to the performance funding model for FY2017: a legislative change in the definition of the institutional efficiency metric and a change in the data source used for the graduate research expenditures.

The first change is as a result of legislative intent language passed in House Bill 2 that changed the definition of the institutional efficiency metric (graduation rates) from 150 percent graduation rate for first-time full-time students to awards per FTE, beginning July 1, 2016. This change removes peer comparisons in the institutional efficiency metric, graduate research metric, and safe harbor condition, replacing them with five year rolling averages as currently used in the other three metrics. The second change recommended is to change the data source used for graduate research expenditures to Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) similar to other performance metrics for consistency in data sources for all performance metrics.

The 2017 Performance Funding model is attached. The attachment has three pieces:

- Proposed Performance Funding Model Description Document
- Performance Funding Detail by Institution
- One-Time Reallocation of Unearned Funds and Total Earned Funds

Commissioner's Recommendation

The Commissioner recommends the Board of Regents approve the following recommendations regarding the Performance Based Funding Model:

1. Approve the changes outlined in the Performance Funding Model Document;
2. Approve the following fund allocation for fiscal year 2016-17;

<u>University of Utah:</u>	<u>\$1,387,306</u>
<u>Utah State University:</u>	<u>\$1,072,945</u>
<u>Weber State University:</u>	<u>\$ 651,510</u>
<u>Southern Utah University:</u>	<u>\$ 220,916</u>
<u>Snow College:</u>	<u>\$ 139,173</u>
<u>Dixie State University:</u>	<u>\$ 243,446</u>
<u>Utah Valley University:</u>	<u>\$ 718,993</u>
<u>Salt Lake Community College:</u>	<u>\$ 565,711</u>
<u>Total:</u>	<u>\$5,000,000</u>

3. Direct institutions to use the performance based funding to enhance the performance of the institution including in the areas of total number of graduates, graduates in high market-demand areas, service to underserved populations, and improving retention and graduation rates; and
4. Report back to the Board at the July 2016 Board meeting highlighting planned uses of these funds.

David L. Buhler
Commissioner of Higher Education

DLB/KLH/BLS
Attachments

Performance Funding Allocation to Institutions

Funds are allocated to each institution based on a 50/50 weighting of:

1. Percentage share of total ongoing USHE state appropriations from the most recent fiscal year (2017).
2. Percentage share of total USHE degrees and certificates awarded for the most recent academic year that data is available (2014-15).

For FY 2017, the Legislature appropriated \$5 million to Performance Funding (all one-time). As funds are earned and distributed for 2016-17.

The following table provides the breakdown by institution if 100% of the funding were earned (as defined above) as well as individual allocations based on the agreed-upon metric weightings identified with the Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee (HEAC) Co-Chairs.

Institution	% of Total Appropriation	Total Allocation	Completions	Underserved	Market	Efficiency	Research
Metric Weighting			25%	10%	10%	40%	15%
UU	27.90%	\$1,395,200	\$348,800	\$139,520	\$139,520	\$558,080	\$209,280
USU	21.33%	\$1,066,500	\$266,625	\$106,650	\$106,650	\$426,600	\$159,975
Metric Weighting			25%	15%	10%	50%	
WSU	12.69%	\$634,300	\$158,575	\$95,145	\$63,430	\$317,150	
SUU	4.53%	\$226,400	\$56,600	\$33,960	\$22,640	\$113,200	
SNOW	2.71%	\$135,600	\$33,900	\$20,340	\$13,560	\$67,800	
DSU	4.99%	\$249,400	\$62,350	\$37,410	\$24,940	\$124,700	
UVU	14.00%	\$700,000	\$175,000	\$105,000	\$70,000	\$350,000	
SLCC	11.85%	\$592,600	\$148,150	\$88,890	\$59,260	\$296,300	
Total	100.00%	\$5,000,000	\$1,250,000	\$626,915	\$500,000	\$2,253,830	\$369,255

Metric Definitions

SB 232, passed in 2015, defines the performance outcomes on which USHE institutions will be measured. Data will be taken from a 5-year period that culminates with the most recent academic year (2014-15). Working with the Co-Chairs of the HEAC, below are the definitions associated with each metric outlined in SB 232. **Changes to the Efficiency Metric were outlined in the 2016 Legislative session.**

Metric	Definition
Completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total certificates, associate, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate awards as reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Awards are weighted according to weights reviewed by HEAC (http://le.utah.gov/interim/2015/pdf/00001151.pdf). This includes transfer students reported in the IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey for two-year institutions.
Underserved Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of students receiving Pell grant assistance according to the IPEDS Financial Aid Survey (1:1 value for all students). Note: USHE is exploring additional data to be collected from institutions to improve this definition by focusing on first-generation students served.
Market Demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assign classification of instructional program (CIP) codes to the corresponding top 10 "5-star" occupations requiring a college degree or certificate (as defined by the Utah Department of Workforce Services) & STEM degrees. "5 Star" Degree areas by CIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 01) AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURE OPERATIONS, AND RELATED SCIENCE 03) NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION 11) COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES AND SUPPORT SERVICES 14) ENGINEERING 15) ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGIES AND ENGINEERING-RELATED FIELDS 26) BIOLOGICAL AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES 27) MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS 41) SCIENCE TECHNOLOGIES/TECHNICIANS 51) HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS 13) EDUCATION. 46) CONSTRUCTION TRADES. 52) BUSINESS, MANAGEMENT, MARKETING, AND RELATED SUPPORT SERVICES
Graduation Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awards per FTE Students Awards: Total awards granted as reported to the IPEDS completions survey (first major only). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the case of multiple degrees (e.g. associate, bachelor's) in the same year, both degrees are counted. Double majors with the same degree (BS Business, BS Economics) are only counted once. FTE: Total 12 Month FTE as reported on the IPEDS 12 Month Enrollment Report Five year averages were computed for this metric Institutions are compared to previous 5 year average and the percentage of the previous 5-year average was multiplied by the available allocation for the potential award amount. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An institution must would need be at a 101% of the previous 5-year average to receive full funding.
Research (University of Utah, Utah State University only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data for this metric was replaced with <i>Total Research Expenditures</i>, as reported on the IPEDS Finance survey. Comparison groups were dropped from the analysis and a five year average for each institution was computed. Five year average comparison is the same method as used in the other metrics Dollar value was recalibrated for similar results as were observed in the 2016 allocation Change was necessitated by need for yearly data

Below is an explanation of terms used on the attached institution funding detail for FY17 for the following metrics:

COMPLETION, UNDERSERVED STUDENTS, MARKET DEMAND, RESEARCH

Dollar Multiplier

Ties the weighted performance metrics (Completion, Underserved Students, Market Demand, and Research) to corresponding funding allocations. **The dollar multipliers have been updated**

proportionally based on amounts appropriated by the Legislature for Performance Funding. This was done by dividing 5,000,000 / 9,000,000 \approx .55, then $.55 * \$25 = 13.89$. The dollar amount was then adjusted to \$13.75 based on comparisons to 2016 data and the value that would have yielded similar distributions of awards (percentage of allocation) if the 2016 funding amount had been at \$5,000,000. This adjustment was based on the primary allocation/ earned amounts and not the awarded amounts after the reallocated funds were applied.

Available Allocation

The funds available for a specific metric based on the current appropriation, distributed according to each metric's weighting.

Earned Units

Completion, Underserved Students, Market Demand, Research

The five-year historical average of the summed units earned in a specific metric, weighted according to the agreed-upon weighting rubric (e.g. four units per four-year degree awarded, one unit per certificate awarded).

Research

The total research expenditures dollars (x1000) for each of the research colleges (see Metrics above).

Potential Award

The total dollars an institution could conceivably earn within a specific metric. This often exceeds the dollars available based on funding, as it is based solely on the dollar multiplier and weighted units regardless of actual funding.

Earned Award

The amount of **actual** funds earned by an institution, within a specific metric, based on its performance and corresponding funded portion of that metric. The funded portion is the allocated amount of the institution's overall share of the total current appropriation to USHE, divided among the institution's metric weightings.

Percent Funded

The *Earned Award* as percentage of the *Available Allocation*.

Unearned Balance

The unearned funds within a specific metric become part of an overall one-time reallocation for each metric. The unearned funds are redistributed to all institutions based on each institution's portion of all funds awarded in each metric. For example, if an institution is awarded 50% of all funds awarded for the Completion metric, it would earn 50% of the overall unearned allocation for that metric.

Below is an explanation of terms used on the attached institution funding detail for FY16 for:

GRADUATION EFFICIENCY

Available Allocation

The funds available for a specific metric based on the current appropriation, distributed according to each metric's weighting.

Awards per FTE

A calculation based on the ratio of total awards granted as reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS Completions survey and the 12-Month Full-time Equivalent Students as reported on the IPEDS 12-Month Enrollment Survey).

Earned Award

The proportional amount of an institution's *Available Allocation* earned based a comparison to the previous 5 year average. *Formula: (current 5-yr rolling average / previous 5-year rolling average) * available allocation.* Note: the current 5-year average must be at least 101% of the previous five year average in order to receive full funding.

MEASURING YEAR-TO-YEAR OUTCOMES FOR COMPLETIONS, UNDERSERVED STUDENTS, AND MARKET DEMAND

FY16 - Baseline Year

If approved by the Board of Regents, FY16 will be used to define the appropriate benchmarks for the weighted units of each metric. FY16 Performance Funds will be allocated by August 31, 2015. The Dollar Multipliers are consistent across institutions for each metric to establish a baseline against which future progress will be measured.

Five-Year Rolling Average Measures Year-to-Year Progress

Each year beginning in 2015-16, a new five-year historical average for each metric will be used and then measured against the previous year's five-year historical average to determine outcomes in each metric. This rolling average (adding the most recent year's data and dropping the oldest year) is the output measure that determines the *Earned Award* for each metric.

FY17 and Beyond:

To anticipate the normal variability in outcome measures beyond any institution's control, a control band of +/- 1% of an institution's five-year rolling average for each metric is established to mitigate the effects of such short-run variations. Increases and decreases will be calculated using the percentage decrease from the previous year's earned units, with funding awarded using the *Dollar Multiplier* of the current year.

To encourage year-to-year progress beyond current efforts, an institution must increase its five-year rolling average of *Earned Units* by one percent (1%) or more annually. If the *Earned*

Units of the most recent year are within the control band or less than the previous year's Earned Units, the Actual Award for that metric will be reduced by 5%. It is expected that with experience in implementing this model additional modifications may be made over time to fulfill the goals of SB 232.

Example:

	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	5 Year Average
1st five year rolling average	5,500	5,555	5,611	5,667	5,723		5,611
2nd five year rolling average		5,555	5,611	5,667	5,723	5,781	5,667
Percent change of the 5 year rolling averages = (5,667-5,611) / 5,611 =							1%

SAFE HARBOR

[Intent language adopted by the Legislature in 2016SB-232](#) specified that efficiency measure (graduation rates) would be replaced with certificates/degrees per full-time equivalent student and performance measures are now only based institutional progress by comparing 5 year rolling averages.

Additionally, the research metric for the University of Utah and Utah State University are also now based on a five year rolling averages of research expenditure and not peer rankings. These changes have eliminated all measures that utilized lists of comparable institutions.

Since comparable institutions are no longer used in performance metrics, the Safe Harbor measures based on peer comparisons have also been discontinued.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Weighting and Unit matrix approved by the Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee for purposes of defining the *Potential Award* and measuring the *Earned Award* for the Completion, Underserved Students, and Market Demand metrics (with minor modifications agreed to by the Subcommittee Chairs).
- Proposed second year (FY17) Performance Funding allocation and award detail for each USHE institution.

Performance Funding Detail by Institution
Recalibrated amounts

Research Universities						
	Completion	Underserved Students	Market Demand	Research	Efficiency	Total
<i>Weighting</i>	25%	10%	10%	15%	40%	100%
<i>Dollar Multiplier</i>	\$13.75	\$13.75	\$13.75	\$1.75		
University of Utah						
Available Allocation (27.90%)	\$ 348,800	\$ 139,520	\$ 139,520	\$ 209,280	\$ 558,080	\$1,395,200
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	26,904	7,487	11,801.0	269,756	101.03%	
Potential Award	\$ 369,930	\$ 102,946	\$ 162,264	\$ 472,073	\$ 563,849	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	2.81%	5.02%	4.68%	1.81%	1.03%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 348,800	\$ 102,946	\$ 139,520	\$ 209,280	\$ 558,080	\$1,358,626
<i>Percent (%) Funded</i>	100.0%	73.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.4%
Balance	\$ 0	\$ 36,574	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 36,574
Utah State University						
Available Allocation (21.33%)	\$ 266,625	\$ 106,650	\$ 106,650	\$ 159,975	\$ 426,600	\$1,066,500
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	18,160	8,929	9,457.0	136,727	102.71%	
Potential Award	\$ 249,700	\$ 122,774	\$ 130,034	\$ 239,272	\$ 438,144	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	3.64%	3.53%	4.26%	4.26%	2.71%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 249,700	\$ 106,650	\$ 106,650	\$ 159,975	\$ 426,600	\$1,049,575
<i>Percent (%) Funded</i>	93.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	98.4%
Balance	\$ 16,925	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 16,925

Performance Funding Detail by Institution
Recalibrated amounts

Regional Universities					
	Completion	Underserved Students	Market Demand	Efficiency	Total
<i>Weighting</i>	25%	15%	10%	50%	
<i>Dollar Multiplier</i>	\$13.75	\$13.75	\$13.75		
Weber State University					
Available Allocation (12.69%)	\$ 158,575	\$ 95,145	\$ 63,430	\$ 317,150	\$ 634,300
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	13,760	7,187	8,353.0	103.20%	
Potential Award	\$ 189,200	\$ 98,821	\$ 114,854	\$ 327,297	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	4.47%	4.77%	4.68%	3.20%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 158,575	\$ 95,145	\$ 63,430	\$ 317,150	\$ 634,300
Percent (%) Funded	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Balance	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$
Southern Utah University					
Available Allocation (4.53%)	\$ 56,600	\$ 33,960	\$ 22,640	\$ 113,200	\$ 226,400
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	5,224	2,872	2,725.0	100.29%	
Potential Award	\$ 71,830	\$ 39,490	\$ 37,469	\$ 113,530	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	-0.51%	0.50%	-2.06%	0.29%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 53,770	\$ 32,262	\$ 21,508	\$ 107,540	\$ 215,080
Percent (%) Funded	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Balance	\$ 2,830	\$ 1,698	\$ 1,132	\$ 5,660	\$ 11,320

Performance Funding Detail by Institution
Recalibrated amounts

	Completion	Underserved Students	Market Demand	Efficiency	Total
Dixie State University					
Available Allocation (4.99%)	\$ 62,350	\$ 37,410	\$ 24,940	\$ 124,700	\$ 249,400
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	4,608	3,883	1,879.0	95.77%	
Potential Award	\$ 63,360	\$ 53,391	\$ 25,836	\$ 119,425	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	3.84%	3.72%	-1.88%	-4.23%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 62,350	\$ 37,410	\$ 23,693	\$ 113,454	\$ 236,907
Percent (%) Funded	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	91.0%	95.0%
Balance	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,247	\$ 11,246	\$ 12,493
Utah Valley University					
Available Allocation (14.00%)	\$ 175,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 700,000
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	14,738	12,385	6,373	102.56%	
Potential Award	\$ 202,648	\$ 170,294	\$ 87,629	\$ 358,947	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	6.51%	3.15%	6.22%	2.56%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 175,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 700,000
Percent (%) Funded	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Balance	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$

Performance Funding Detail by Institution
Recalibrated amounts

Community Colleges						
	Completion	Underserved Students	Market Demand		Efficiency	Total
<i>Weighting</i>	25%	15%	10%		50%	
<i>Dollar Multiplier</i>	\$13.75	\$13.75	\$13.75			
Snow College						
Available Allocation (2.71%)	\$ 33,900	\$ 20,340	\$ 13,560		\$ 67,800	\$ 135,600
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	2,798	1,472	989		101.50%	
Potential Award	\$ 38,473	\$ 20,240	\$ 13,599		\$ 68,820	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	4.93%	5.61%	2.21%		1.50%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 33,900	\$ 20,240	\$ 13,560		\$ 67,800	\$ 135,500
Percent (%) Funded	100.0%	99.5%	100.0%		100.0%	99.9%
Balance	\$ 0	\$ 100	\$ 0		\$ 0	\$ 100
Salt Lake Community						
Available Allocation (11.85%)	\$ 148,150	\$ 88,890	\$ 59,260		\$ 296,300	\$ 592,600
Earned Units (5-Yr Average)	11,414	8,776	3,330		98.61%	
Potential Award	\$ 156,943	\$ 120,670	\$ 45,788		\$ 292,170	
1% Progress Measure (increase/decrease)	-0.85%	3.12%	-2.00%		-1.39%	
Actual Award within Available Allocation	\$ 140,743	\$ 88,890	\$ 43,498		\$ 277,561	\$ 550,692
Percent (%) Funded	95.0%	100.0%	73.4%		93.7%	92.9%
Balance	\$ 7,408	\$ 0	\$ 15,762		\$ 18,739	\$ 41,908
Remaining Balances (to be reallocated based on performance)						
	Completion	Underserved Students	Market Demand	Research	Efficiency	Total
	27,163	38,372	18,140.9	0	35,645	\$ 119,320

Percent of Total Funded Applied to Unallocated	<i>Underserved</i>						<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
	<i>Completion</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Market Demand</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Research</i>			
5-year Average Unallocated	\$ 27,163	\$ 38,372	\$ 18,141	\$ 35,645	\$ -	\$ 119,320		
University of Utah	7,748	6,712	5,253	8,968	-	28,680	24.04%	
Utah State University	5,547	6,953	4,015	6,855	-	23,370	19.59%	
Weber State University	3,522	6,203	2,388	5,096	-	17,210	14.42%	
Southern Utah University	1,194	2,103	810	1,728	-	5,836	4.89%	
Dixie State University	1,385	2,439	892	1,823	-	6,539	5.48%	
Utah Valley University	3,887	6,846	2,635	5,624	-	18,993	15.92%	
Snow College	753	1,320	511	1,090	-	3,673	3.08%	
Salt Lake Community College	3,126	5,795	1,638	4,460	-	15,020	12.59%	
Total	\$ 27,163	\$ 38,372	\$ 18,141	\$ 35,645	\$ -	\$ 119,320	100.00%	

TOTAL ALLOCATION

Funded and Redistribution of Unallocated	<i>Underserved</i>						<i>Total</i>	<i>% of Total</i>
	<i>Completion</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Market Demand</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Research</i>			
5-year Average								
University of Utah	356,548	109,658	144,773	567,048	209,280	1,387,307	27.75%	
Utah State University	255,247	113,603	110,665	433,455	159,975	1,072,945	21.46%	
Weber State University	162,097	101,348	65,818	322,246	-	651,510	13.03%	
Southern Utah University	54,964	34,365	22,318	109,268	-	220,916	4.42%	
Dixie State University	63,735	39,849	24,585	115,277	-	243,446	4.87%	
Utah Valley University	178,887	111,846	72,635	355,624	-	718,993	14.38%	
Snow College	34,653	21,560	14,071	68,890	-	139,173	2.78%	
Salt Lake Community College	143,869	94,685	45,136	282,022	-	565,712	11.31%	
Total	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 626,915	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,253,830	\$ 369,255	\$ 5,000,000	100.00%	

**USHE FY 2017 PERFORMANCE FUNDING
DISTRIBUTION 50% DEGREES AND 50% APPROPRIATIONS**

Institution	2014-15 Degrees &	% of Degrees & Awards	50% \$2,500,000	FY 2017 On-going Appropriated Tax	% of On- going	50% \$ 2,500,000
UU	8,183	24.95%	\$ 623,761	\$ 252,294,900	30.86%	\$ 771,488
USU	6,082	18.54%	\$ 463,609	\$ 197,171,600	24.12%	\$ 602,927
WSU	5,086	15.51%	\$ 387,688	\$ 80,640,100	9.86%	\$ 246,588
SUU	1,545	4.71%	\$ 117,770	\$ 35,533,100	4.35%	\$ 108,656
SNOW	856	2.61%	\$ 65,250	\$ 22,996,900	2.81%	\$ 70,322
DSU	1,941	5.92%	\$ 147,956	\$ 33,170,500	4.06%	\$ 101,431
UVU	5,082	15.50%	\$ 387,383	\$ 102,229,600	12.50%	\$ 312,606
SLCC	4,022	12.26%	\$ 306,583	\$ 93,522,800	11.44%	\$ 285,982
Total	32,797	100.0%	\$2,500,000	\$ 817,559,500	100.0%	\$ 2,500,000

¹ 2014-15 Degrees & Awards from 2016 Data Book.

² FY 2017 on-going appropriated tax funds (all line items except UU SOM MD).

One-time Performance	% of Total
\$ 1,395,200	27.90%
\$ 1,066,500	21.33%
\$ 634,300	12.69%
\$ 226,400	4.53%
\$ 135,600	2.71%
\$ 249,400	4.99%
\$ 700,000	14.00%
\$ 592,600	11.85%
\$5,000,000	100.0%