

**Appendix Two**  
**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**

<b>Contact Information</b>	
_____ Institution	_____ Date
_____ Individual to be contacted	
_____ Contact phone number and email	
<b>Summary</b>	
Institutional Goal: <u>  <b>Increase Collaboration with Kansas Community Colleges.</b>  </u>	
<hr/>	
Check one:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supports Regents System Goal (name goal most centrally addressed below)	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Goal Only
<b>Regents' System Goal A:</b> <i>Increase System Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness</i>	
Summary of institutional indicators (no more than 5) for this institutional goal:	
1. Number of place bound Kansas students who are contacted by K-State through Access US and the formal affiliations.	
2. Number of enrollments by Kansas students in Distance Education programs and courses through Kansas State University, or Access US, or 2+2 programs that feed to Kansas State University.	
3. Number of credit hours taken on-campus at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students.	

**Respond to the items below, using the format and numbering indicated below.**

1.) **Summary.** In 50 words or less, briefly describe the institutional goal.

To increase collaboration with Kansas community colleges by developing and expanding specific initiatives such as AAccess US@ and formal affiliations with specific community colleges, by improving the transfer process from community colleges to the university, and by encouraging use of Distance Education by place-bound students in Kansas.

2.) **Regents' System Goal.** If applicable, in 75 words or less, describe how the institutional goal supports the indicated Regents' System Goal.

AAccess US@ is a collaboration involving six western Kansas community colleges, ESU, FHSU, and KSU. KSU has also established Aaffiliation agreements@ with Barton County and Dodge City Community Colleges. Additional formal affiliations are planned. Affiliations promote educational

transitions beneficial for all students, but especially for non-traditional and place-bound students.

- 3.) **Institutional Indicators.** SB647 requires the performance agreement to include “performance measures which will be used to demonstrate compliance and progress.” These measures are referred to below as institutional “indicators.” Describe each of the institutional indicators as noted below (use the institutional indicator numbers in the box above).
- a) Exactly how will this institutional indicator be used to measure performance? (Be specific enough so that the reviewer could direct the data collection effort.)
  - b) Against what benchmark will progress be judged? For example:
    - i) Describe baseline measurement including year collected and source of data OR
    - ii) Describe peer measurement to be used including year collected and source of data OR
    - iii) Describe preset measurement, including source of data, and explain how measurement was selected OR
    - iv) Other
  - c) Describe target measurements for the next three years and describe how the targets were selected.

1. Number of place bound Kansas students who are contacted by K-State through Access US and the formal affiliations. Potential university students in western rural Kansas have little accurate awareness on the higher education programs that are currently available to them. This information is and will be provided to people through programs at the community colleges and the universities.

- a) KSU has begun keeping track of these contacts since 2003 and following up with information and further contacts.
- b) Thus, 2003 data will serve as the baseline data for improvement (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*).
- c) Over 2004 to 2006, the number and nature of contacts made through these programs will be tabulated and analyzed. The targets have been selected from data that describes the types of contacts that have been made in the early stages of the community college affiliations and through the marketing efforts of the Access US program. Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: For 2004, the number and quality of contacts will increase by 5 percent.  
Target Year 2: For 2005, the number and quality of contacts compared to the prior year will increase by 5 percent.  
Target Year 3: For 2006, the number and quality of contacts compared to the prior year will stabilize.

2. Number of enrollments by Kansas students in Distance Education programs and courses through Kansas State University, or Access US, or 2+2 programs that feed to Kansas State University. The number of enrollments is a measure of whether K-State offerings and partnerships meet the needs of those Kansans who are targeted by these programs.

- a) Kansas State University has benchmark data of the number of Kansans enrolled in KSU Distance Education (by ZIP of their current location) for the prior year, and has benchmark data on one specific 2+2 program (Dietetics) that has been established through the affiliation agreement with Barton County Community College.

b) Targets have been selected based on the replicable data that are currently being collected about Kansans enrolled in Distance Education, on the current number of students in specific 2+2 programs in the formal affiliations, and on Access US data. As KSU creates dual advising programs for students who are in the 2+2 programs, these data will describe these students even before they actually enroll at KSU. (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*).

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: For 2004, enrollments will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 2: For 2005, enrollments will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 3: For 2006, enrollments will increase by 2 percent.

3. Number of credit hours taken on-campus at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students. Credit hours taken by transfer students measures the degree to which K-States programmatic offerings meet the needs of transfer students and the effectiveness of communication between K-State and community college students.

a) A five-year average of on-campus credit hours produced by transfer students including the most recent fall semester will be compared to a similar five year average from the prior year.

b) The baseline data will be the five year average for 1999 to 2003. The average will be adjusted each year to drop the first year in the average and add the last year. (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*)

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: For 2004, the five year average of SCH will increase 3 percent over previous five year average.

Target Year 2: For 2005, the five year average of SCH will increase by 2 percent over previous five year average.

Target Year 3: For 2006, the five year average of SCH will increase by 1 percent over previous five year average. Since K-State has a strong legacy of serving transfer students, gradual growth is a stretch goal.

**Board use only**

According to the information provided, does this institutional goal have the capacity to make a significant improvement to (check all that apply) \_\_\_ Regents' System \_\_\_ Institution  
*Comments:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 1:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 2:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 3:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 4:*

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 5:*

Is this institutional goal recommended for approval?

\_\_\_\_ accept \_\_\_\_ return for revision \_\_\_\_ not accepted

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

*Comments:*

**Appendix Two**  
**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**

<b>Contact Information</b>	
<u>          Kansas State University          </u> Institution	<u>  02/15/2004  </u> Date
<u>          Ronald G. Downey, Associate Provost          </u> Individual to be contacted	
<u>          785-532-5712  dooney@ksu.edu          </u> Contact phone number and email	
<b>Summary</b>	
Institutional Goal: <u>  Develop and institutionalize program assessment for all undergraduate and graduate academic degree programs          </u>	
Check one:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supports Regents System Goal (name goal most centrally addressed below)	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional Goal Only
<b><i>Regents' System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</i></b> <u>  </u>	
Summary of institutional indicators (no more than 5) for this institutional goal:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The number of undergraduate and graduate degree programs with student learning outcomes.</li><li>2. The number of undergraduate and graduate degree programs with assessment plans and procedures.</li><li>3. The number of degree program that include student learning measures as a significant part of their assessment plans and programs.</li><li>4. Measure the degree of learning for university wide undergraduate student learning outcomes.</li><li>5. Number of degree programs using assessment data to improve student learning.</li></ol>	

**Respond to the items below, using the format and numbering indicated below.**

**1.) Summary.** In 50 words or less, briefly describe the institutional goal.

K-State must establish assessment as a part of its culture. Assessment is essential to demonstrate to its constituencies that learning is the goal of its educational programs. Key elements include: identifying outcomes; developing plans based on the outcomes; using learning measures; using assessment for improvement; and developing an accountability approach.

**2.) Regents' System Goal.** . If applicable, in 75 words or less, describe how the institutional goal supports the indicated Regents' System Goal.

K-State has an exemplary history as the land grant institution for the State. Undergraduate and graduate students from our many degree programs are employed throughout the state, nation and the world. While high quality graduates have always been our goal, K-State as an institution must continue to improve. At its heart, program assessment is about improvement in student learning outcomes in all academic programs. The improvements will translate into better people, citizens and workers for Kansas.

**3.) Institutional Indicators.** SB647 requires the performance agreement to include “performance measures which will be used to demonstrate compliance and progress.” These measures are referred to below as institutional “indicators.” Describe each of the institutional indicators as noted below (use the institutional indicator numbers in the box above).

- a) Exactly how will this institutional indicator be used to measure performance? (Be specific enough so that the reviewer could direct the data collection effort.)
  - a. Against what benchmark will progress be judged? For example:
    - i) Describe baseline measurement including year collected and source of data  
OR
    - ii) Describe peer measurement to be used including year collected and source of data  
OR
    - iii) Describe preset measurement, including source of data, and explain how measurement was selected  
OR
    - iv) Other
  - c) Describe target measurements for the next three years and describe how the targets were selected.
1. Develop student learning outcomes for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs.
  - a) The indicator in this case will be the increase in the number of degrees with student learning outcomes (SLO) submitted to the provost.
  - b) The benchmark is the number meeting the December 15, 2003 deadline versus the number submitted by the end of the spring 2004 semester. The next measure will be the SLOs for the distance degrees, secondary majors, minors and certificates.
  - c) Target measurements for the next three years are:
    - Target Year 1: The baseline will be zero versus those submitted by December 15, 2004.
    - Target Year 2: It is expected that by the end of fiscal year 2005, 95 percent of the degree programs will have well developed SLOs.
2. Develop assessment plans and procedures for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs.
  - a) The indicator here will be the number of assessment plans completed and submitted to the deans.
  - b) There are currently no assessment plans expected until December 15, 2004.

c) The baseline will be zero versus those submitted by December 15, 2004.

3. Identify student learning measures as a significant part of all assessment plans and programs.

a) The indicator will be the percent of assessment plans that include specific student learning measures for their identified outcomes.

b) There is currently no information.

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: The baseline will be zero versus those submitted by December 15, 2004.

Target Year 2: The target for July 2005 is 50 percent for 80 percent of the degrees.

Target Year 3: The target for the following year (CY 2006) is 95 percent of the degree programs having 50 percent of the assessment plans including specific student learning measures for their identified outcomes.

4. Measure the degree of learning for university wide undergraduate student learning outcomes. Student learning outcomes will vary significantly over undergraduate and graduate degree programs and the resultant measures will be in the hundreds or more. The university has identified five common undergraduate student learning outcomes: knowledge, critical thinking, communication, diversity, and academic and professional integrity. Most, if not all, undergraduate degree programs will identify one or more of these five outcomes as part of their degree program outcomes. Many of the programs will develop student learning measures for these outcomes. These measures will be collected centrally and the percent meeting the programs' goals will be averaged over the five outcomes and the programs using a learning outcome measure.

a) The indicator will be the percent of students meeting student learning goals. Since we are dealing with multiple student learning outcomes (5) and multiple degree programs (will vary from program to program and year to year), the percents will be averaged over outcomes and degree programs.

b) There is currently no information.

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: The baseline will be 2005.

Target Year 2: The target for 2006 will be a 3 percent increase over 2005 in the percent of students meeting student learning goals, averaged over degree programs and student learning outcomes.

Target Year 3: The target for 2007 will be a 3 percent increase over 2006 in the percent of students meeting student learning goals, averaged over degree programs and student learning outcomes.

5. Develop an institutional culture of using assessment results to improve academic programs.

a) The indicator will be the percent of the assessment plans that contain well articulated program improvement strategies

b) There is currently no information.

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: The baseline will be zero versus those submitted by December 15, 2004.

Target Year 2: The target for July 2005 is 80 percent of the programs will have improvement plans.

Target Year 3: The target for 2006 is that 90 percent of the programs will have improvement plans.

**Board use only**

According to the information provided, does this institutional goal have the capacity to make a significant improvement to (check all that apply) \_\_\_ Regents' System \_\_\_ Institution  
*Comments:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 1:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 2:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 3:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 4:*

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 5:*

Is this institutional goal recommended for approval?

\_\_\_\_ accept \_\_\_\_ return for revision \_\_\_\_ not accepted

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

*Comments:*

**Appendix Two**  
**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF AN INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**

<b>Contact Information</b>	
_____ Kansas State University _____ Institution	___02/15/2004___ Date
_____ Ronald G. Downey, Associate Provost _____ Individual to be contacted	
_____ 785-532-5712 downey@ksu.edu _____ Contact phone number and email	
<b>Summary</b>	
Institutional Goal:___ <b>Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at risk and under-served populations (minority and women).</b>	
Check one:	
___X___ Supports Regents System Goal (name goal most centrally addressed below)	_____ Institutional Goal Only
<i>Supports Regents' System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</i>	
Summary of institutional indicators (no more than 5) for this institutional goal:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Enrollment of at risk and under-served populations.</li><li>2. Number of KSU programs used by at risk and under-served populations.</li><li>3. The percent retention of at risk and under-served populations enrolled in the program.</li><li>4. Graduation rates for students enrolled in programs for at risk and under-served populations.</li><li>5. Placement rates for students enrolled in programs for at risk and under-served populations.</li></ol>	

**Respond to the items below, using the format and numbering indicated below.**

**1.) Summary.** In 50 words or less, briefly describe the institutional goal.

Continue the development of programs and approaches that will: a) serve current at risk and under-served populations (minority [non-Caucasians] and women); b) increase enrollments of these groups; c) improve performance and retention of these groups; d) improve the graduation rates of these groups; and e) improve the job placement of these groups after graduation. Ties to our current programs of Developing Scholars, BESITOS, Advance, PILOTS, and the groups from Goal A above.

**2.) Regents' System Goal.** If applicable, in 75 words or less, describe how the institutional goal supports the indicated Regents' System Goal.

KSU is targeting geographic areas and academic programs with at risk or under-served populations for development of programs and services to serve these groups. Programs are and will be directed at the development of cooperative agreements with other institutions and some at on-campus programming for these students. Both of these approaches will help to further the Regents= goal of increased participation of at risk and under-served populations.

- 3.) **Institutional Indicators.** SB647 requires the performance agreement to include “performance measures which will be used to demonstrate compliance and progress.” These measures are referred to below as institutional “indicators.” Describe each of the institutional indicators as noted below (use the institutional indicator numbers in the box above).
- a) Exactly how will this institutional indicator be used to measure performance? (Be specific enough so that the reviewer could direct the data collection effort.)
  - b) Against what benchmark will progress be judged? For example:
    - i) Describe baseline measurement including year collected and source of data OR
    - ii) Describe peer measurement to be used including year collected and source of data OR
    - iii) Describe preset measurement, including source of data, and explain how measurement was selected OR
    - iv) Other
  - c) Describe target measurements for the next three years and describe how the targets were selected.

1. Access US is a collaboration involving six western Kansas community colleges, ESU, FHSU, and KSU. KSU has also established Affiliation agreements@ with Barton County and Dodge City Community Colleges. The entire geographic region served by the programs has seen a significant increase in the Hispanic population.

- a) The indicator is targeted at increasing the enrollment of at risk and under-served populations. Thus, increased enrollments of Hispanics, both in the cooperative programs and at KSU, will be tracked over a three year period.
- b) (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*)
- c) Target measurements for the next three years are:  
Target Year 1: Year one, 2004, will serve as the baseline year.  
Target Year 2: Years 2005 will see increases of 5 percent in Hispanic enrollments.  
Target Year 3: 2006 will see increases of 5 percent in Hispanic enrollments.

2. An important indicator of progress is the use of KSU on-campus programs for at risk and under-served populations. The majority of the programs are directed towards improving the academic success of enrolled students.

- a) Thus, the number of students using these services will be tracked over a three year period.

b) *(Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible).*

Target Year 1: Year one, 2004, will serve as the baseline year.

Target Year 2: Years 2005 will see increases of 5 percent in Hispanic enrollments.

Target Year 3: 2006 will see increases of 5 percent in Hispanic enrollments.

3. An important indicator of progress is the percent retention of at risk and under-served populations enrolled in KSU on-campus programs. The majority of the programs are directed at improving the academic success of enrolled students.

a) The number of students remaining enrolled at the end of the first, the second, the third and fourth semesters will be measured.

b) *(Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible)*

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: Year one, 2004, will serve as the baseline year.

Target Year 2: 2005 will see increases of 2 percent in retention.

Target Year 3: 2006 will see increases of 2 percent in retention.

4. An equally important indicator of progress is the graduation rate for at risk and under-served populations enrolled in targeted on-campus programs.

a) The percent of students graduating after six semesters will be measured..

b) Rates will be measured for current underserved students with the base line years being 2004 through 2009.

Target Year 1: Students entering in the fall of 2004 will be followed through 2010.

Target Year 2: Students entering in the fall of 2005 will be followed through 2011.

Target Year 3: Students entering in the fall of 2006 will be followed through 2012.

5. Little has been gained if students graduate but are unable to be properly placed in a job. Improved placement rates for students enrolled in programs for at risk and under-served populations will be tracked.

a) The percent of students employed within one year of graduation will be measured.

b) Rates will be measured for current underserved students with the base line years being 2004 through 2009.

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: Students entering in the fall of 2004 will be followed through 2010.

Target Year 2: Students entering in the fall of 2005 will be followed through 2011.

Target Year 3: Students entering in the fall of 2006 will be followed through 2012.

**Board use only**

According to the information provided, does this institutional goal have the capacity to make a significant improvement to (check all that apply) \_\_\_ Regents' System \_\_\_ Institution  
*Comments:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 1:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 2:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 3:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 4:*

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 5:*

Is this institutional goal recommended for approval?

\_\_\_\_ accept \_\_\_\_ return for revision \_\_\_\_ not accepted

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

*Comments:*



provide viable programming in areas with the potential to support economic development outcomes. Increasing funding from extramural sources will be a major factor in KSU's ability to enhance economic development within Kansas.

**3.) Institutional Indicators.** SB647 requires the performance agreement to include "performance measures which will be used to demonstrate compliance and progress." These measures are referred to below as institutional "indicators." Describe each of the institutional indicators as noted below (use the institutional indicator numbers in the box above).

- a) Exactly how will this institutional indicator be used to measure performance? (Be specific enough so that the reviewer could direct the data collection effort.)
- b) Against what benchmark will progress be judged? For example:
  - i) Describe baseline measurement including year collected and source of data OR
  - ii) Describe peer measurement to be used including year collected and source of data OR
  - iii) Describe preset measurement, including source of data, and explain how measurement was selected OR
  - iv) Other
- c) Describe target measurements for the next three years and describe how the targets were selected.

1. Increasing the extramural awards and expenditures that support research and scholarly activity at K-State is a continuing annual goal. There is no way to control all external factors (federal and state) that might prevent this from occurring some years, but the upward trend of the past fifteen to twenty years is expected to continue.

- a) The total dollars generated in the extramural awards will be collected.
- b) Information for 2003 will serve as the baseline data (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*).
- c) Target measurements for the next three years are:  
Target Year 1: For 2004, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.  
Target Year 2: For 2005, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.  
Target Year 3: For 2006, funding will increase by 3 percent.

2. Increasing private support for university activities through contributions by K-State alumni, friends, corporations, and foundations is a continuing annual goal. Such philanthropy funds student scholarships (undergraduate and graduate), establishes endowed professorships, provides programmatic support, and improves campus infrastructure, thereby sustaining and enhancing excellence.

- a) The total dollars generated each year from new funds will be used.
- b) Information for 2003 will serve as the baseline data (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*).

Target Year 1: For 2004, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 2: For 2005, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 3: For 2006, funding will increase by 3 percent.

3. Technologies derived from K-State intellectual property are sometimes licensed or optioned to companies in Kansas, thereby contributing to economic development in the state.

a) Success can be measured by the amount of licensing revenues and equity received from these companies and/or the amount of Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) awards the companies receive to develop K-State technologies.

b) Information for 2003 will serve as the baseline data (*Baseline data is being collected and will be sent to the Board as soon as possible*).

c) Target measurements for the next three years are:

Target Year 1: For 2004, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 2: For 2005, funding will increase by 3 percent over the prior year.

Target Year 3: For 2006, funding will increase by 3 percent.

**Board use only**

According to the information provided, does this institutional goal have the capacity to make a significant improvement to (check all that apply) \_\_\_ Regents' System \_\_\_ Institution  
*Comments:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 1 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 1:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 2 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 2:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 3 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 3:*

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 4 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 4:*

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval as a performance measure.

\_\_\_\_ Institutional Indicator 5 is recommended for approval for use in the allocation of state moneys on the basis of performance.

*Comments about institutional indicator 5:*

Is this institutional goal recommended for approval?

\_\_\_\_ accept \_\_\_\_ return for revision \_\_\_\_ not accepted

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

*Comments:*