

# Kansas State University Performance Narrative Summary

## CY 2005

In accordance with Senate Bill 647, Kansas State University (K-State) developed and implemented a performance agreement plan for CY 2005. In this plan, all four goals identified by K-State support the Kansas Board of Regents' (KBOR) system goals.

### **Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Kansas Community Colleges**

The first goal is to increase collaboration with Kansas Community Colleges and supports the KBOR goal of Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness. In order to achieve this goal, K-State has implemented a coordinated effort to improve the transfer process for students from community colleges to the university by providing information regarding higher education opportunities and encouraging the use of distance education by place-bound students in Kansas.

**Indicator 1:** Over the past year, K-State contacted 351 place-bound Kansas students through Access US and other formal affiliations. This first indicator shows an increase of 59.5% from the base year of 2003. The contacts made in 2005 included those from a "cold call" campaign for determining interest in Access US. The contacts made from the "cold calls" are not included in our indicator unless the cold call actually results in a traceable inquiry from the person about a specific distance learning program. This campaign will not be conducted every year. In addition, the number of personal contacts included in our indicator are limited to those meeting the following "quality" guidelines: (1) personal contacts that result in a specific distance learning program inquiry that connects a student name to one or more potential program names; or (2) the personal contacts are made by K-State's two "site managers" in western Kansas or as a specific personal contact in western Kansas made directly through the Distance Education office. Contacts with people who are physically transferring from western Kansas to the campus in Manhattan or Salina are not included if these individuals so identify their plans at the time of contact.

**Indicator 2:** The second indicator for this goal, the number of students enrolled in distance education programs and courses through K-State, Access Us, and 2+2 programs that feed to K-State, increased by 31.6% (from 237 students in CY 2003 to 312 students in CY 2005). This considerable increase is attributed to: (1) the visibility of K-State 2+2 program managers who are on-site at the community colleges in western Kansas, (2) public announcements about the 2+2 program and advising opportunities, (3) attendance by K-State representatives at the community college "open houses" held for place-bound students, and (4) more people completing associate degrees through EduKan distance learning and becoming aware of further educational opportunities.

**Indicator 3:** The third indicator is the number of credit hours taken at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students. This indicator is one measure of the extent to which K-State's programmatic offerings meet the needs of transfer students and the effectiveness of communication between K-State and Kansas Community Colleges. Such efforts have resulted in an increase in the

number of transfer students attending K-State. For CY 2005, the number of on-campus credit hours in which transfer students are enrolled increased by 1.5%. It is apparent with this increase that even though students may start at another institution, many students are choosing K-State to complete their degrees.

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

Over the past six years, K-State has been actively engaged in developing institution-wide program assessment for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs in an effort to improve student learning. This is the second of K-State's performance goals. After identifying student learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate students at the university level, every degree program has articulated a list of student learning outcomes for graduates. During this past year, degree program faculty have developed and submitted three-year assessment plans that have gone through a review and approval process. Before plans were approved by the Provost, they were required to have at least half of their assessment strategies be direct measures of student learning (i.e. measures of student ability or performance as opposed to indirect measures that might include student satisfaction, employer ratings of graduates, or student perceptions of progress on outcomes, for instance).

**Indicator 1:** The first indicator is the percentage of assessment plans that include at least half of their measure being direct measures of students learning, and in CY 2005, 94% of the assessment plans were approved and achieved this criterion. This represents an 88% increase over the target goal of 50% for CY 2005.

**Indicator 2:** Since one of K-State's student learning outcomes focuses on gaining awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world, our second indicator is the number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program. The baseline for FY 2004 was 473 students. For FY 2005, the total enrollment was 512 students, which corresponds to an 8.2% increase. This increase is attributed to an increased number of study-abroad scholarships available for students, as well as additional support provided to K-State faculty to take a group of students with them to another country and teach their courses in an international setting.

**Indicator 3:** The third indicator is the number of students receiving a minor in the interdisciplinary minor degree program in Leadership Studies. The Leadership Studies program is the fastest growing program on our campus. It requires 18 hours to complete and emphasizes the combination of life experience, strong undergraduate education, and specialized educational environments to enhance leadership abilities. In FY 2004, the baseline was 77 students who completed the minor degree program. In FY 2005, 96 students completed the program, which is a 24.7% increase. We expect this number to continue to increase, since over 1,000 students are currently enrolled in these courses each semester. However, to enable more students to complete this minor, we will need to increase the number of course sections offered. Courses must be taken in sequence and currently, a limited number of course sections

are available for the second segment of this curriculum. With more instructors to teach more courses sections, students will be able to enroll in the necessary courses to complete this minor degree.

**Indicator 4:** The last indicator for Goal 2 is the increase from baseline in students' perception of developed skills that support the academic learning outcomes within general education, critical thinking, writing, and discussion. Improvements in student perception of learning within the general education program have been ongoing over the past four years. Mean scores are based on students' perceptions of their progress, for instance, "This course helped me to develop writing skills, in addition to teaching me new information." The baseline three-year (CY 2001, 2002, 2003) average is 2.77. The mean score for CY 2005 is 3.15, which is a 13.7% increase. This is based on a 4-point Likert scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree.

**Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (minorities and women)**

K-State continues to develop programs and approaches that will serve current at risk and under-served populations (minorities and women). This initiative supports the KBOR goal of Targeted Participation and Access. K-State recognizes and values diversity not simply as a matter of form, but as an imperative for the intellectual and social development of all students and faculty. Therefore, K-State has focused on recruiting students from specific targeted geographic areas where there is an increasing population of students of color and enhancing academic programs for at-risk or underserved populations. The at-risk population includes students of color and students who have an ACT score less than or equal to 19. K-State defines one of its underserved populations as female students who enter K-State majoring in a science, engineering, or math (SEM) degree program.

**Indicator 1:** The first indicator for this goal is the number of Hispanic students enrolled at K-State and in cooperative programs. The Hispanic population in western Kansas has increased over the past 10 years and with the centralized contact efforts through Access US and other formal affiliations, K-State's Fall 2005 enrollment was 595 Hispanic students. This is an increase of 17.8% from the Fall 2003 baseline enrollment of 505 Hispanic students.

**Indicator 2:** Another important indicator of progress for at-risk or underserved populations is the percent of students enrolled who return for their second year. The baseline value (62.5%) that was reported for the 2005 Performance Measures Application was unfortunately miscalculated. Previously, we had reported separately the first-year retention rates for at-risk and for underserved populations, specifically women in SEM disciplines. When we attempted to combine the rates into one number, we made a miscalculation. The target values chosen as part of the application were based on the baseline value of 62.5%, and the target for 2005 was set at 63.0%. The new recalculated baseline value for the 2002 Cohort group is 69.61%, which represents both at-risk and underserved populations. The first-year retention of at-risk and underserved populations for the 2004 Cohort group was 69.48% or a 0.13%

decrease from the recalculated baseline. The reason that the baseline data are from the 2002 rather than from the 2003 Cohort group is that the Performance Agreement for 2005 was submitted in the summer of 2004 and the first-year retention data for the 2003 Cohort was not yet available. Though the retention rates for the combination of at-risk and underserved populations essentially did not change from 2002 to 2004, K-State is committed to improving these rates. The retention of female students in SEM curricula is one particular concern, as the retention rate for this group tends to be lower than for some of the other groups. K-State will continue to address this issue through its Women in Engineering and Science Program (WESP), which is a cooperative effort between the Colleges of Engineering and Arts & Sciences and is designed to cultivate the science and technology interests of women from middle school through postgraduate levels. The Director of WESP has recently been awarded a National Science Foundation Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Talent Expansion Program (STEP) award, and this program will provide support for women students in SEM curricula and increase the number of science, technology, engineering, and math students completing a post-secondary degree. Future performance agreements will include a separate indicator for this group, so that we can better assess progress with this particular group.

**Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources**

K-State has been a major engine for economic development in Kansas. K-State currently produces about \$3 billion in economic benefit to the state each year. Over the past several years, the percentage of K-State's budget that comes from state funds has continued to decline and K-State has had to rely on other external sources to fund many of its academic, research, and public service programs. Thus, increasing funding from extramural resources is K-State's fourth goal.

**Indicator 1:** The first indicator for this goal is an increase in the extramural awards and expenditures that support research and scholarly activity. The baseline for FY 2003 is \$95.7 million. The increase for FY 2005 was 15.8%, which reflects \$110.8 million in extramural awards. This increase over our both our baseline and CY 05 target value was due primarily to Biosecurity Research Institute (BRI) related awards (one for \$4.5M for equipment and one for \$2M to enhance BRI research activity once the BRI becomes operational in 2006).

**Indicator 2:** Private support for university activities through cash contributions by K-State alumni, friends, corporations, and foundations is the second indicator for this goal. These funds support student scholarships, establish endowed professorships, provide programmatic support, and improve campus infrastructure. The baseline year for this indicator is FY 2003, with a value of \$44.8 million in cash contribution. For FY 2005, the cash contributions decreased 6.7% to \$41.8 million. Cash contributions can vary considerably from year to year depending upon the economic conditions and whether individuals choose to make their contributions through trusts or endowments rather than cash. For example, in FY 2004 cash contributions totaled \$54.2M, which included three estates that amounted to a total of around \$11-\$12M. In FY 2005, K-State did not receive this level of similar bequests. Our current capital

campaign, Changing Lives, is focused on increasing private support in terms of both cash contributions and deferred gifts, so we anticipate that cash contributions will increase over the next few years.

**Indicator 3:** Finally, technologies derived from K-State's intellectual property are sometimes licensed or optioned to companies in Kansas, thereby contributing to economic development in the state. The third indicator is 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. The baseline is the average of funding received over the three-year period from CY 2001-2003, and is \$77,390 of licensing income and equity received and \$2.83 million of SBIR funding. Over the past three years (CY 2003-05), the average cash licensing income and equity revenue was \$346,380 or a 347.6% increase over baseline. Royalty revenue was received from eight Kansas companies. Equity was also received from one of these companies. The technologies involved were developed in the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering. Four of the companies sold products in 2005 that are based on these technologies. Similarly, the SBIR funding showed an increase of 4.2% from the baseline with an average 3-year funding of \$2.95M. In the last year, awards were given to two start-up companies, NanoScale Materials and AgRenew. USDA funded two Phase I innovative research for AgRenew. One is in the area of fermentation and the other involves a polymer blend. AgRenew will be submitting proposals for Phase II grants on both projects.

**Summary:**

We are very pleased to report that all but two of our indicators surpassed the baseline values in our CY 2005 Performance Agreement, and except for two indicators (private support as cash contributions and SBIR funding), all of the other indicators showed increases over our CY 05 target values. If we compare equivalent performance indicators in CY 05 with the ones in CY 04, we find that only one indicator in CY 05 is below the corresponding value achieved in CY 04 (private support as cash contributions). We have efforts in place to address both of the indicators for which we showed relatively small declines this year below our baseline values. We have found that there can be large fluctuations from year to year in some indicators, such as those associated with cash contributions and other extramural support. The target values for all of our CY 2005 indicators were chosen to reflect historical trends, while at the same time representing what we anticipated to be reasonable stretch values. We were delighted with some of the substantial gains that we were able to achieve, as well as disappointed with the two in which we did not achieve as much success. There will always be a level of uncertainty associated with predicting the target values, but as we become more experienced with this process, our goal is to become more skilled in selecting suitable stretch values.

## Performance Agreement Application and Reporting Form

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & email: 532-6224 rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: Updated March 1, 2006
--------------------------------------	---------------------------	--	-----------------------------

### Regents' System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

#### Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Kansas Community Colleges

Key Performance Indicator (Data) <sup>1</sup>	Baseline <sup>2</sup>	Targets <sup>3</sup>	Performance Outcome <sup>4</sup>	Amount of Directional Improvement <sup>5</sup>
1. Number of place bound Kansas students who are contacted by K-State through Access US and the formal affiliations.	Year 2003 = 220	<b>Target yr 1:</b> Year 2005, number and quality of contacts will increase to 240. <b>Target yr 2:</b> Year 2006, number and quality of contacts will stabilize at 245. <b>Target yr 3:</b> Year 2007, number and quality of contacts will stabilize at 245.	Number of contacts in CY 2005 = 351	Increase of 131 contacts or 59.5% increase
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.	Fall 2003 = 237	<b>Target yr 1:</b> Year 2005, enrollments will increase to 250. <b>Target yr 2:</b> Year 2006, enrollments will increase to 255. <b>Target yr 3:</b> Year 2007, the number of enrollments will stabilize at 255.	Number enrolled in CY 2005 = 312	Increase of 75 students enrolled or 31.6% increase
3. Number of credit hours taken at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students.	Year 2003: SCH = 143,885	<b>Target yr 1:</b> Year 2005, SCH will increase to 145,000. <b>Target yr 2:</b> Year 2006, SCH will increase to 146,000. <b>Target yr 3:</b> Year 2007, SCH will stabilize at 146,000.	Number of credit hours taken in CY 2005 = 146,009	Increase of 2,124 SCH or 1.5% increase

<b>Regents' System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 2: Improve student learning outcomes that are part of the university's program assessment for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Baseline <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Targets <sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Performance Outcome<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement <sup>5</sup></b>
1. The percentage of assessment plans that include at least half of their measures being specific to student learning.	Baseline collected by December 2004	Target yr 1: 50% Target yr 2: 95% Target yr 3: 98%	CY 2005 – 94% of degree programs have 3-year assessment plans approved, all with at least half of direct measures	Target Met
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2004 = 473 students enrolled in KSU's Study Abroad program.	Target yr 1: Enrollment will increase to 495 students in FY 2005. Target yr 2: Enrollment will increase to 520 students in FY 2006. Target yr 3: Enrollment will increase to 545 students in FY 2007.	Total FY 2005 enrollment = 512 students.	Increase of 39 students or 8.2% increase
3. Number of students completing the interdisciplinary minor degree program in Leadership Studies	FY 2004 = 77 students receiving a minor in Leadership Studies.	Target yr 1: For FY 2005, the number of students completing a minor will increase to 85. Target yr 2: For FY 2006, the number of students completing a minor will increase to 90. Target yr 3: For FY 2007, the number of students completing a minor will increase to 95.	Total FY 2005 Leadership Studies minor degrees conferred = 96	Increase of 19 students or 24.7% increase
4. The percent increase from baseline in students' perception of developed skills that support the academic learning outcomes within general education.	2.77 (three-year average)	Target yr 1: Mean of 2.78. Target yr 2: Mean of 2.79. Target yr 3: Mean of 2.80.	Mean score CY 2005 = 3.15	Increase mean score of 0.38 or 13.7% increase

<b>Regents' System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (minorities and women).</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Baseline <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Targets <sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Performance Outcome<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement <sup>5</sup></b>
1. Enrollment of Hispanic students at KSU and in cooperative programs.	Fall 2003 = 505 Hispanic students enrolled.	<b>Target yr 1:</b> For 2005, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 515. <b>Target yr 2:</b> For 2006, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 525. <b>Target yr 3:</b> For 2007, Hispanic enrollment will stabilize at 525.	Hispanic student enrollment for Fall 2005 = 595	Increase of 90 students or 17.8% increase
2. The percent of at-risk and under-served populations enrolled for the second year.	Cohort group 2002 - 1 <sup>st</sup> year retention – 62.5% <b>Corrected 1<sup>st</sup> year retention – 69.61%</b>	<b>Target yr 1:</b> For cohort 2004, 1 <sup>st</sup> year retention = 63.0%. <b>Target yr 2:</b> For cohort 2005, 1 <sup>st</sup> year retention = 63.5%. <b>Target yr 3:</b> Retention of cohort 2006 will remain at the same level 63.5%.	Cohort group 2004, 1st year retention = 69.48%	Decrease of 0.13%

<b>Regents' System Goal E: Increase External Resources</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Baseline <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Targets <sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Performance Outcome<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement <sup>5</sup></b>
1. Funding levels for extramural support for research/scholarly activity.	FY 2003 = \$95.7M	<b>Target yr 1:</b> For FY 2005, funding will increase to \$101.5M. <b>Target yr 2:</b> For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$104.6M. <b>Target yr 3:</b> For FY 2007, funding will stabilize at \$104.6M.	Extramural funding for FY 2005 = \$110.8M	Increase of \$15.1M or 15.8% increase.
2. The amount of private support.	FY 2003 = \$44.8M	<b>Target yr 1:</b> For FY 2005, funding will increase to \$47.5M. <b>Target yr 2:</b> For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$48.9M. <b>Target yr 4:</b> For FY 2007, funding will increase to \$50.4M.	Private support for FY 2005 = \$41.8M	Decrease of \$3.0M or 6.7% decrease
3. Use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 3 year average (2001, 2002, 2003): Licensing Income = \$77.4K SBIR funding = \$2.8M	<b>Target yr 1:</b> For 2005, the prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$82.1K for licensing income and \$3M for SBIR funding. <b>Target yr 2:</b> For 2006, prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$84.5M for Licensing income and \$3.09M for SBIR funding. <b>Target yr 3:</b> For 2007, prior 3-year funding will stabilize at target year 2 levels.	For CY 2003-05, 3-year average: Cash licensing revenue = \$346,380 SBIR funding = \$2.95M	Cash licensing revenue increased \$268,980 or 347.5% SBIR funding increased \$150,000 or 4.2%

<sup>1</sup> Identify the key performance indicator (i.e. data) that will be used to determine progress toward goals. Be as specific and as succinct as possible. The key performance indicator (data) may be quantitative or qualitative.

<sup>2</sup> Show the baseline value of the key performance indicator (data). The baseline means “where are you now?”

<sup>3</sup> Show targets for the next 3 years. Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) identified in the first column.

<sup>4</sup> Performance outcomes must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) listed in the first column.

<sup>5</sup> Amount of Directional Improvement equals the difference between actual performance and the baseline.