

Minutes of Presidents Council Meeting  
June 2, 2015

The Presidents Council met at 11:00 a.m. on June 2, 2015 in the First Floor Boardroom of the Department of Higher Education. Executive Council members present were Don Bobbitt, Stephen Schoonmaker, Glen Jones, Larry Davis, Laurence Alexander and Margaret Ellibee. Charles Welch (co-chair) participated via phone call. Sandra Massey (co-chair) was unable to attend.

Staff members present were Brett Powell, Harold Criswell, Rick Jenkins, Ann Clemmer, Alana Boles, Callan Callaway, Chandra Robinson, Jeanne Jones and Angela Lasiter.

Powell began by announcing that due to technical difficulties, the meeting would not be available by conference call. However, Welch was able to connect to the meeting via cell phone.

Donald Bobbitt moved to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2015 meeting. Stephen Schoonmaker seconded and the council unanimously concurred.

*Reallocation of Funds Lost Through the Performance Funding Model*

Powell began by reminding everyone that at the May 1 Coordinating Board meeting, the results of the performance funding model were presented. He explained that the maximum score that can be earned on the University and College Performance Funding Model is ten (10) points. In order for an institution to maintain one-hundred percent (100%) of its performance (outcome-centered) funding, a minimum score of six (6) is required. If an institution scores below six (6), performance funding may be reduced using a graduated scale based on the institution's score.

One-hundred percent (100%) of an institution's performance (outcome-centered) funds will be distributed to that institution each year that the minimum score of six (6) is received on the Performance Funding Model. At such time that an institution scores below the minimum score of six (6), performance funds will be redistributed based on the following guidelines for universities.

In the first year that a university does not meet the minimum score of six (6), the university may submit an improvement plan outlining the areas where performance has not been met and detail the actions the university will take to achieve or exceed the minimum score required for the Performance Funding Model. If approved, the university may receive improvement funding, up to the amount of performance funding that was lost.

If an improvement plan is not submitted or is not approved for the amount of performance funding lost, those funds will be redistributed, on a competitive basis, to other universities that meet the required performance funding score. To receive redistribution funding, a university must submit a proposal outlining plans to improve some performance-funding outcome measure. Submitted proposals will be ranked and funded beginning with the highest ranked proposal until all redistribution funds are exhausted.

If a university fails to meet the minimum score of six (6) for a second consecutive year, and each consecutive year thereafter that a university does not meet the minimum score of six (6), performance funds will be reduced using the graduated scale based on the institution's score. These funds will be redistributed on a competitive basis, to other universities that meet the required performance funding score. To receive redistribution funding, a university must submit

a proposal outlining plans to improve some performance-funding outcome measure. Submitted proposals will be ranked and funded beginning with the highest ranked proposal until all redistribution funds are exhausted.

The ADHE will assemble a committee that includes ADHE staff and university representation. This committee will be responsible for approving and ranking improvements plans, said Powell.

In the first year that a college does not meet the minimum score of six (6), the college may submit an improvement plan outlining the areas where performance has not been met and detail the actions the college will take to achieve or exceed the minimum score required for the Performance Funding Model. If approved, the college may receive improvement funding, up to the amount of performance funding that was lost.

If an improvement plan is not submitted or is not approved for the amount of performance funding lost, those funds will be redistributed, on a competitive basis, to other colleges that meet the required performance funding score. To receive redistribution funding, a college must submit a proposal outlining plans to improve some performance-funding outcome measure. Submitted proposals will be ranked and funded beginning with the highest ranked proposal until all redistribution funds are exhausted.

If a college fails to meet the minimum score of six (6) for a second consecutive year, and each consecutive year thereafter that a college does not meet the minimum score of six (6), performance funds will be reduced using the graduated scale based on the institution's score. These funds will be redistributed on a competitive basis, to other colleges that meet the required performance funding score. To receive redistribution funding, a college must submit a proposal outlining plans to improve some performance-funding outcome measure. Submitted proposals will be ranked and funded beginning with the highest ranked proposal until all redistribution funds are exhausted.

The ADHE will assemble a committee that includes ADHE staff and college representation. This committee will be responsible for reviewing improvement plans, said Powell.

Welch asked if by consecutive year Powell meant two years in a row. Meaning that if an institution fell below the first and third year, they would be alright. Powell said that is correct.

Next, Welch asked why presidents and chancellors were included in the review group and not just ADHE staff. Powell said that would be up to the council whether or not they feel that is necessary. However, ADHE felt that if they are reviewing improvement plans, the presidents and chancellors could have an input as to whether or not those plans could be effective.

Glen Jones stated that there needs to be a way to determine why an institution fell below the threshold. We need to build in a way for the institution to address this. Powell said we would probably need to work that into the guidelines for submitting the improvement plans.

He then stated that at this point, ADHE staff will review all of the comments and see if there are any additions, changes or modifications to be made to the policy before it is placed on the AHECB July agenda. If approved in July, we will ask that the institutions submit their improvement plans by August 1.

If you do not get all of the funds or if you do not get an improvement plan submitted, it would be helpful to see a sample timeline said Schoonmaker.

Powell said once we get past this first year, we can better determine a timeline for future years.

### *Higher Education Master Plan*

Presently, we are looking at what the planning and goal development process might look like. Then we will look at the implementation process, said Powell. After further discussions, Powell said this process is preliminary and will require a lot of input from the presidents and chancellors.

### Announcements

Powell introduced the new ADHE Senior Associate Director for Research and Technology Dr. Tim Atkinson.

Senior Associate Director for Academic Affairs Ann Clemmer will host a CAO meeting at the Cooperative Extension Service Center on June 16.

The next Presidents Council meeting will be July 7, 2015.

With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.