Outcome Based Funding Analysis with “Survey Monkey”
*****
Second Survey
Outcome Based Funding Survey

- Survey was posted on the missionexcellence website for a period of 16 days in January, 2013
- There were 29 respondents in that period
- This analysis shows the details of that feedback
Institutional Affiliation of Respondents

- UM
- UMA
- UMF
- UMFK
- UMPI
- USM

Response n=74
Categorical Affiliation of Respondents

- Alumni: 22
- Faculty: 5
- Staff: 2
- Student: 0

Response n=74
Part II: Points Allocated for Completion Metrics: Premium for the number of Associates/Bachelors Degrees Awarded to Priority Populations - Adults. The age for an adult was raised from “25 or over” to “30 or over” when the degree is awarded. Please indicate your level of support for this change.

Response n=74
Part II: Points Allocated for Completion Metrics: Premium for the number of Associates/Bachelors Degrees Awarded to Priority Populations - Transfers.
The number of credits was raised from “24” to “30.” Please indicate your level of support for this change.

Response n=74
Part III. Points Allocated for Productivity Metric: Number of Degrees Awarded per 100 FTEThis metric was eliminated. Please indicate your level of support for this change.

Response n=74
Part III. Points Allocated for Productivity Metric: Number of Degrees Awarded per $100k of Revenue from state appropriation and net tuition and fees. This metric is now scaled by matriculated FTE (was no scaling in previous version). Please indicate your level of support for this change.
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Part V. Points Allocated for Research & Development Metrics: Points are now allocated based on actual award received during the fiscal year instead of total award. Please indicate your level of support for this change.

Response n=74
The name of the initiative was changed from Performance-Based Funding to Outcomes-Based Funding to more properly capture the intent. Please indicate your level of support for this change.

Response n=74
8. Please provide any comments concerning the interactive dashboard of the OBF model in the box below.

- not seen yet
- It was clear and helpful.
- Interesting. May be too complicated for many, but not sure what else to recommend.
- This really helps demonstrate how varying one factor affects others. Thanks for providing this level of interaction and also a feedback loop.
9. Please leave any other comments concerning OBF in the box below.

- this is a politically charged topic and will likely not be perfect the first-time but lets just make some decisions based on current info and implement....we don't really have another viable solution
- I remain supportive of the OBF initiative, the model and its underlying principles and formulas. I encourage the Board and the Chancellor to remain focused on the primary purpose of this initiative -- to allocate at least a portion of the public funding for UMS in a manner that more effectively encourages particular outcomes important to Maine. Adopting a complex mechanism to merely legitimize the current allocation of public monies would be disingenuous. Thanks to the OBF Team for their hard work, their skills and their staying power. Good work!
- This is a step in the right direction and certainly better than the current funding model.
- This survey seems a bit superficial, there are no substantive questions on the actual model, points, or percentages.
Having studied at the University of New Hampshire and also the University of British Columbia, I have seen the "outcomes" of performance based funding. Most of my experience has been with internal performance-based funding. I would not say, wholesale, that it is a bad idea. However, it was implemented very swiftly, and had a strong negative effect of collaboration between departments within the University. It also became clear that student success was not always the focus. It seems that this is an important part of this OBF. However, the Universities here in Maine will need support to implement this well.

Based on the Maine COMMUNITIES' extreme negative reaction a few years ago to closing a campus, I recommend emphasis be placed on educating the public about the KEY points of this initiative, e.g., it affects only a very small dollar amount of a university's funding; it is in response to the universities long-standing request for a redistribution model; it provides UMS BOT priorities thus a "game plan" for a university to improve its financial situation.
• Thanks for opportunity to influence the recalibration of how appropriation funds are distributed within the System - over the years, few opportunities have existed for the smaller campuses to explore, expand or create new directions - which have the potential to generate new net revenue once operational - if new such a new directions at a campus does indeed align with the overall UMS Goals, then this incentive (OBF) funding can make a significant difference -- with operational funding based on 40% (or less) appropriation and 60% raised in tuition (with tuition increases no longer viable), the proposed funding utilizing an outcomes based formula will be essential to the survival of these campuses - again thanks for asking
• I am very much in favor of this model that strengthens common markets for us all to attract, retain and ultimately graduate to build a stronger Maine!