

Kansas State University Performance Agreement Application

1. Institutional Goal 1: Increase collaboration with Kansas Community Colleges and Enhance Efficiency at K-State.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of place-bound students in western Kansas enrolled in Distance Education programs and courses offered by Kansas State University.

a. Data Collection: The number of place-bound students (students who are unable to relocate due to family or employment commitments) enrolled for the fall semester in Distance Education courses from a geographic area west of the eastern border of counties beginning with Smith on the north and ending with Barber on the south will be counted, based on zip code of the student's current residence. The baseline value is 237 students enrolled in Fall 2003.

b. Targets: The enrollment numbers will measure whether K-State's offerings and partnerships are meeting the needs of Kansans in these targeted areas. The formal affiliations we are developing with community colleges to facilitate the completion of a K-State degree are new, and so no trend data are available for comparison. Data from the University of Kansas Policy Center shows that adults in western Kansas are very well educated, and those who have only high school diplomas have none or very few college credits and therefore are not yet ready to enter KSU's programs that begin with the junior year. Another constraint is that many of these potential students will not be ready to enter the K-State programs at the junior level for some time, even if they start now at the freshman or sophomore level, because they will typically be only part-time students at their local community colleges. Thus, this relatively small group of eligible students has many barriers to participating in higher education. Our target of a 24% increase from the baseline reflects these constraints while representing an appropriate stretch goal. Target values have been increased from those in the 2005 Performance Agreement to reflect the increased number of formal affiliations.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of student credit hours (SCH) taken at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students based on a calendar year.

a. Data Collection: Compile the number of SCH generated by transfer students attending Kansas State University for a calendar year (spring, summer, fall) and compare it to the prior calendar year. The baseline value is 143,885 SCH in CY 2003.

b. Targets: With K-State's emphasis on seamless transition to a four-year institution, the number of transfer students enrolled is expected to increase. Although the number of students enrolled will increase, the number of SCH generated fluctuates and does not follow the same pattern as enrollment. The average number of credits per student continues to decline. Many transfer students choose to work while attending K-State because of the numerous job opportunities in Manhattan, and this often inhibits them from taking a full load of 12 credits or more.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of degree programs offered through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliance (IAA).

a. Data Collection: Compile the number of degree programs each year in which K-State participates through the Great Plains IDEA and the KSU IAA. The baseline value is 3 programs offered in CY 2004.

b. Targets: This indicator is specifically chosen to address the efficiency aspect of Regents Goal A. By collaborating with other universities, K-State enhances its efficiency by offering degree programs that it could not offer on its own. These programs allow students to remain at K-State instead of transferring to other institutions. A number of our programs have begun discussions that could lead to new collaborative offerings. There is no trend data available, but we have selected our target values based on aggressive solicitation of new partnership opportunities.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.

a. Data Collection: Determine the number of courses during a calendar year that use K-State Online or that offer a portion of the course in a mediated format. The baseline value is 2,628 courses in CY 2004.

b. Targets: This indicator also addresses the efficiency aspect of Regents Goal A. K-State Online increases the efficiency of both students and faculty. Students have 24/7 access to course materials and information about their grades, and can submit questions to their instructors at any time. Not all courses will utilize mediated instruction, but a realistic goal might be 75%. Our target values are selected to attain this goal by CY 2008.

Comments: We removed the indicator present in our 2004 and 2005 Performance Agreements that measured the number of place-bound students who were contacted by K-State through Access US and the formal affiliations, since the number of place-bound students who enroll is a more direct result of our efforts to meet the needs of these students. We also have expanded Goal 1 to address the efficiency aspect of Regents Goal A as requested at the June 2005 Board of Regents meeting. Indicators 3 and 4 have been added to measure aspects of efficiency.

2. Institutional Goal 2: Improve student-learning outcomes that are part of the university's program assessment for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of assessment plans in which at least half of the assessment methods are direct measures of student learning.

a. Data Collection: College-level assessment committees will review all degree program assessment plans for their college. The committees help to ensure that the approved assessment plans contain the minimum percentage of direct measures of student

learning, which are linked to the university's student learning outcomes. Plans that are not approved are returned to the department to be revised and resubmitted, until all criteria are met. The data are the percentage of submitted plans that meet the direct measure criterion. The baseline is 68%, which was calculated by dividing the number of plans approved in Spring 2005 by the number of assessment plans submitted at the end of CY 2004.

b. Targets: The target is the percentage of degree programs with an approved assessment plan that contains the required proportion of direct measures of student learning. The process of incorporating direct measures of learning is new to most programs; and there are no trend data to aid in the selection of the target values. Therefore, our targets are based on an estimated timeframe for full campus implementation. The goal is to achieve a high percentage in a short time period.

Comments: As degree program assessment plans are implemented over the next two-three years, this indicator will be changed to incorporate the results of the direct measures of student learning and examples of the modifications that degree programs make in response to the findings.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.

a. Data Collection: Identify number of students who had a study-abroad experience during a fiscal year. The previous baseline value of 473 enrolled students was reduced to correspond to reporting the participation on a summer, fall, and spring basis for a fiscal year. The new baseline for FY 2004 (summer 2003, fall 2003, and spring 2004) is 434 students.

b. Targets: One of the university's student learning outcomes focuses on gaining awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world. The K-State Study Abroad Program enhances the ability of students to be successful in their chosen field and have a much broader view and understanding of the world. The program provides students with a variety of international group travel seminars, exchange options, and credit or non-credit learning opportunities. Students from all of disciplines across the university participate in this program. The average increase in participation each year over the last six years has been 47 students. The target values have been increased over those in the 2005 Performance Agreement and are slightly above the average increase over the last six years.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of students earning a minor in the interdisciplinary minor degree program in Leadership Studies.

a. Data Collection: Self-explanatory. The baseline is 77 students receiving a minor in FY 2004.

b. Targets: One of the key goals of K-State's undergraduate programs is to produce great leaders. The Leadership Studies Program emphasizes the combination of life experiences, strong undergraduate education, and specialized educational environments to enhance leadership abilities. More than 1200 students from all disciplines are enrolled in courses taught by this program, though not all plan to complete the minor. The average annual increase in the number of students receiving a minor in Leadership Studies over the last six years has been 14 students. The target values selected for the first two years are above this average increase and for the last year show a smaller increase since the growth in this program may have reached its maximum. However, we have still increased our target values over those in the 2005 Performance Agreement.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Mean score from three academic learning outcomes within the general education program.

a. Data Collection: The data consist of a mean score derived from student ratings related to three academic learning outcomes (e.g., critical thinking, writing, and discussion skills) within the current University General Education (UGE) program. The mean score is based on students' assessment of the degree to which the course promoted their learning (1=strongly disagree to 4=strongly agree) of these outcomes. Our three-year (CY 01, 02, 03) baseline is a mean score of 2.77. An average of more than 8700 students in 127 class sections participated each year in establishing the three-year baseline.

b. Targets: Critical thinking and communication are two of the five university-wide student-learning outcomes (SLOs). Research on learning tells us that there is a high correlation between what students perceive that they are learning and what they have actually learned, thus student self-assessments provide important data about student learning. Improvements to student learning within the UGE program have been ongoing over the past four years. After the Fall 03 semester, faculty members began making more targeted changes in their UGE courses. A common effect when improvements are made is to observe a large initial increase, followed by progressively smaller increases over time, and this is the trend in these scores since 2003. Thus, the target values were increased over those in our 2005 performance agreement, but the increase is smaller in each year.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of undergraduate students successfully completing a capstone course or experience.

a. Data Collection: "Successfully completed" is defined as having a grade of "C" or better in a course that is identified by the department as being a capstone course or including a capstone experience. The baseline for AY04-05 is 2,928 students.

b. Targets: A capstone course or experience is one in which students integrate and demonstrate learning from their major by means of a design project, an exhibition, a theoretical paper, a supervised field experience, or other projects. These measures of student learning provide excellent opportunities for faculty to directly assess learning that spans the entire degree curriculum. As academic programs implement their assessment strategies, we expect two to three capstone courses to be added in each of the next three years. With about 25 to 40 students in each course, our targets will increase by an additional 75 students per year.

3. Institutional Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and underserved populations (minorities and women).

Key Performance Indicator 1: The number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.

a. Data Collection: Self-explanatory. The baseline is 505 Hispanic students enrolled as of 20th day, Fall 2003.

b. Targets: Our baseline enrollment is almost completely composed of long-time Kansas residents. Any significant growth will come from recent immigrants who are first or second generation citizens (or undocumented immigrants with resident tuition status). This group is much harder to recruit because of multiple cultural and financial issues. The community colleges in southwest Kansas have significant enrollments of Hispanic students. However, completion rates of Hispanic students at the community colleges are much lower than the enrollment rates because these students frequently take small numbers of credit hours and move slowly through the associate programs. Additional constraints include (1) difficulty in identifying race/ethnicity due to the increase in individuals who are reporting their ethnicity as multi-racial (K-State's category) and unknown, which subsequently impacts the numbers in specific race/ethnic categories such as Hispanic, and (2) compliance with qualified admission standards. Currently, the average annual increase in Hispanic student population is approximately 1%. In reference to the baseline, our target values represent an increase of 10% by 2008. Because of the various factors noted above, we consider our target values to be particularly expansive.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The percent of at-risk students (minorities and students with ACT < 19) enrolled for the second year.

a. Data Collection: First-year retention rates will be calculated for first-year, full-time freshmen cohorts of students with ACT composite scores under 19 or who are from a minority group. The baseline value for 1st-year retention of at-risk students (minorities and students with ACT < 19) is 69% for Fall 2003 cohort.

b. Targets: K-State has developed programs that are directed at improving the academic success of enrolled students and is pursuing other initiatives to retain minority students. Over the past ten years, the average increase in first-year retention of at-risk students has been 0.75%. Our target values reflect a larger yearly increase than this ten-year average.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The percent of women students in science, engineering and math (SEM) disciplines who remain enrolled in one of these disciplines for a second year.

a. Data Collection: First-year retention rates will be calculated for first-year, full-time freshmen cohorts of women students who remain enrolled in SEM disciplines. The baseline value for 1st-year retention of women in SEM disciplines is 62.2% of Fall 2003 cohort.

b. Targets: The 1st year retention of women in SEM disciplines has had an average increase over the past four years of 0.76%. With several grant activities and initiatives being implemented to increase the awareness and motivation to retain women enrolled in SEM disciplines, we expect the average increase to be slightly higher than the 4-year average.

Comments: In this Performance Agreement we are reporting as separate indicators the first-year retention of at-risk students and of women in SEM disciplines, rather than reporting a combined first-year retention value for these two groups. Due to a miscalculation in computing the baseline retention values in our 2005 Performance Agreement, we have adjusted the baselines in this Performance Agreement to reflect the correct values. Increases in retention rates for at risk and underrepresented groups are particularly difficult to improve and our target values are aggressive.

4. Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources.

Key Performance Indicator 1: The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity for the fiscal year.

a. Data Collection: Self-explanatory. The baseline value is \$95.7M in FY03.

b. Targets: Emphasis on enhanced research/scholarly activity has resulted in additional external funding at about \$5.5M per year over the last three years. Our projected targets are in line with or slightly lower than our average annual increase since we have taken into consideration concerns about the levels of future federal funding and that we have fewer faculty members than in the past. However, the target values are increased over those in the 2005 Performance Agreement.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The amount of private support in a fiscal year.

a. Data Collection: Total dollars generated each fiscal year from new funds. The baseline value is \$44.8M in FY 2003.

b. Targets: The current capital campaign and other development activities will result in an estimated 3% increase in private support in each of the three target years, and these values reflect an increase over the targets included in the 2005 Performance Agreement.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.

a. Data Collection: Determine the average over three years of the amount of licensing revenues and equity received from companies to develop K-State technologies. Our baseline value is a 3-year (2001-2003) average of \$77.4K in licensing income and equity.

b. Targets: In CY 2004, our total licensing income was \$554.8K, however, based on income in 2001-2003, this appears to be an anomaly. Licensing income was \$110.9K in CY 2003, and prior to CY 2004, increased an average of \$30K per year. This trend would project CY 2005 to be \$170K, and produces a prior three-year (2003-2005) average of \$275K for CY 2006. We have incorporated an annual increase of \$30K into our target values.

Comments: We have modified this indicator to include only licensing income and equity. We believe this is a more accurate measure of the use of university-based technologies by other groups, and we have removed SBIR funding because it is more of a preliminary measure of interest and not of final adaptation.