

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & email: 532-6224 rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: Updated April 5, 2007
---	----------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

Regents' System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Efficiency at K-State

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of place-bound students in western Kansas enrolled in Distance Education programs and courses offered by Kansas State University.	Fall 2003 = 237	Target yr 1: Fall 2006, enrollments will increase to 279. Target yr 2: Fall 2007, enrollments will increase to 287 Target yr 3: Fall 2008, the number of enrollments will increase to 293.	Number enrolled in Fall 2006 = 296	Increase of 59 students enrolled or 24.9% increase; exceeded the target
2. Number of student credit hours (SCH) taken at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students based on a calendar year.	CY 2003: SCH = 143,885	Target yr 1: CY 2006, SCH will increase to 145,000. Target yr 2: CY 2007, SCH will stabilize at 145,000. Target yr 3: CY 2008, SCH will stabilize at 145,000.	Number of credit hours taken in CY 2006 = 146,807	Increase of 2,922 SCH or 2.0% increase; exceeded the target
3. Number of degree programs offered through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances	Fall 2004 = 3:	Target yr 1: Fall 2006, number of programs will increase to 5. Target yr 2: Fall 2007, number of programs will increase to 8. Target yr 3: Fall 2008, number of programs will increase to 12.	The number of programs in Fall 2006 = 5	Increase of two programs or 66.6% increase; met the target

4. Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.	CY 2004 = 2,628	Target yr 1: CY 2006, number of courses will increase to 3,250. Target yr 2: CY 2007, number of courses will increase to 3,450. Target yr 3: CY 2008, number of courses will increase to 3,650.	The number of courses in CY 2006 = 3,348	Increase of 720 courses or 27.4% increase; exceeded the target
--	-----------------	--	--	--

Regents' System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

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 (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. The percentage of assessment plans in which at least half of the assessment methods are direct measures of student learning.	CY 2004 = 68%	Target yr 1: CY 2006, percentage will be 95% Target yr 2: CY 2007, percentage will be 98% Target yr 3: CY 2008, percentage will be 99%	CY 2006 = 99%	Increase of 31%; exceeded the target
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2004 = 434 students enrolled in KSU's Study Abroad program.	Target yr 1: Enrollment will increase to 540 students in FY 2006. Target yr 2: Enrollment will increase to 590 students in FY 2007. Target yr 3: Enrollment will increase to 640 students in FY 2008.	In FY 2006, 557 students enrolled	Increase of 123 students or 28% increase; exceeded the target
3. Number of students earning a minor in the interdisciplinary minor degree program in Leadership Studies	FY 2004 = 77 students earning a minor in Leadership Studies.	Target yr 1: For FY 2006, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 109. Target yr 2: For FY 2007, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 120. Target yr 3: For FY 2008, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 125.	Total FY 2006 Leadership Studies minor degrees conferred = 79	Increase of two students or 2.6% increase; target not met

4. The mean score from three academic learning outcomes within the general self-report education program	2.77 (three-year average)	<p>Target yr 1: For FY 2006, the mean score will increase to 3.10.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For FY 2007, the mean score will increase to 3.15.</p> <p>Target yr 3: For FY 2008, the mean score will increase to 3.18.</p>	Mean for FY 2006 = 2.91	Increase of 0.14 over the baseline; target not met
5. Number of K-State undergraduate students successfully completing a capstone course or experience.	For AY 2004-2005, 2,928 students successfully completed a capstone course or experience	<p>Target yr 1: For AY 2005-2006, students completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,000.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For AY 2005-2006, students completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,075.</p> <p>Target yr 3: AY 2005-2006, students completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,150.</p>	In AY 2005-06, 3,068 students successfully completed a capstone course	Increase of 140 students or 4.8% increase; exceeded the target

Regents' System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access

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

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.	Fall 2003 = 505 Hispanic students enrolled.	<p>Target yr 1: For Fall 2006, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 538.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For Fall 2007, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 546.</p> <p>Target yr 3: For Fall 2008, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 556.</p>	Hispanic student enrollment for Fall 2006 = 641	Increase of 136 students or 26.9% increase; exceeded the target
2. The percent of at-risk students (minority and students with ACT < 19) enrolled for the second year.	Cohort group 2003 - 1 st year retention of at risk students = 69%	<p>Target yr 1: For cohort 2005, 1st year retention will increase to 70.6%.</p> <p>Target yr 2: Retention of cohort 2006 will increase to 71.4%</p> <p>Target yr 3: Retention of cohort 2007 will increase to 72.2%</p>	Cohort group 2005, 1st year retention = 70.1%	Increase of 1.1%; target not met

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.	Cohort group 2003 - 1 st year retention of women in SEM disciplines = 62.2%	<p>Target yr 1: For cohort 2005, 1st year retention will increase to 63.6%.</p> <p>Target yr 2: Retention of cohort 2006 will increase to 64.4%</p> <p>Target yr 3: Retention of cohort 2007 will increase to 65.2%</p>	Cohort group 2005, 1 st year retention = 63.8%	Increase of 1.6%; exceeded the target
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Regents' System Goal E: Increase External Resources

Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.	FY 2003 = \$95.7M	<p>Target yr 1: For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$11 2M.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For FY 2007, funding will increase to \$11 5M.</p> <p>Target yr 3: For FY 2008, funding will increase to \$118M.</p>	Extramural funding for FY 2006 = \$108.3M	Increase of \$12.6M or 13.2% increase; target not met
2. The amount of private support in a fiscal year.	FY 2003 = \$44.8M	<p>Target yr 1: For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$62M.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For FY 2007, funding will increase to \$64M.</p> <p>Target yr 4: For FY 2008, funding will increase to \$66M.</p>	Private support for FY 2006 = \$57.6M	Increase of \$12.8M or 28.6% increase; target not met
3. The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 3 year average (2001, 2002, 2003): Licensing Income = \$77.4K	<p>Target yr 1: For CY 2006, the prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$275K.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For CY 2007, prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$305K.</p> <p>Target yr 3: For CY 2008, prior 3-year average funding will decline to \$200K.</p>	For CY 2004-06, 3-year average: Cash licensing revenue = \$448,575	Cash licensing revenue increased \$371,175 or 479.6% increase; exceeded the target

Kansas State University Narrative

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.

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.

Targets: The enrollment numbers measure whether K-State's offerings and partnerships are meeting the needs of Kansans in these targeted areas. The formal affiliations we have developed with community colleges to facilitate the completion of a K-State degree are new, and so no trend data are available for comparison. One factor that we expected to limit the potential participation of adults in western Kansas was that those who have only high school diplomas either have no or very few college credits and therefore would not be ready to enter KSU's programs that begin with the junior year. Another constraint was that many of these potential students would not be ready to enter the K-State programs at the junior level for some time, even if they started now at the freshman or sophomore level, because they would typically be only part-time students at their local community colleges. In spite of these barriers, we have seen steady growth in the number of these students who are enrolling in our distance education programs. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target value for 2006.

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.

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.

Targets: With K-State's emphasis on seamless transition to a four-year institution, we expected the number of transfer students who enrolled at K-State to increase. However, experience has also shown that the number of credit hours generated by transfer students fluctuates and does not always follow the same linear increase as enrollment. 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. We do provide guidelines to assist transfer students, as well as all students, in balancing the number of credit hours they take in a given semester with the number of hours they choose to work. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target value for 2006.

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).

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.

Targets: This indicator was 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. Because this is a relatively new program, there was no trend data available. However, our target values were based on aggressive solicitation of new partnership opportunities. We are pleased to report that the anticipated new partnerships were implemented. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we met our target.

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

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.

Targets: This indicator demonstrates a higher level of interactive learning and also addresses the efficiency aspect of Regents Goal A. The use of K-State Online increases the efficiency of both the students and the faculty members. Students have 24/7 access to course materials and information about their grades, and they can submit questions to their instructors at any time. Faculty members can electronically post answers to students' questions, so that all of the students can learn from both the questions and the answers. Faculty members are learning new and creative ways to use K-State Online to enhance their teaching, and as a result, we achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

Comments:

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.

Data Collection: College-level assessment committees have reviewed all of the degree program assessment plans in their college. This review ensured that the approved assessment plans contained the minimum percentage of direct measures of student learning. Plans that were not approved were returned to the department to be revised so that the criteria were met and then resubmitted for a second review. 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.

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, but through providing workshops for departments, arranging individual consultations with faculty members, and sharing articles and other resources with faculty members, they have become more familiar with these methods. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, exceeded our target value for 2006.

Comments:

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

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.

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 continues to expand its offerings, and it provides students with a variety of international group travel seminars, exchange options, and credit or non-credit learning opportunities. Students from every college participate in this program, and they share their experiences with others through invited presentations to classes, to alumni groups, and to other events on and off our campus. As a result, we are seeing more students inquire about participation in these programs and an increased understanding of the importance of having an international experience during their college career. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

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

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

Targets: The Leadership Studies Program emphasizes the combination of life experiences, strong undergraduate education, and specialized educational environments to enhance leadership abilities. More than 1,200 students from all disciplines are enrolled in courses taught by this program, though not all plan to complete the minor. Though we showed directional improvement relative to our baseline, we did not meet our target for this year. The number of students who are able to complete this minor is limited by the availability of the upper level courses in this curriculum. Courses must be taken in sequence and currently, a limited number of course sections are available for the second segment of this curriculum. This is reflected in the lower number of students who were able to complete the minor in FY 2006. A strategy has been put into place to increase the number of tenure-track faculty teaching these courses, and this should greatly improve the availability of the upper level courses and the ability for students to finish the curriculum. Since the further expansion of the tenure-track faculty will be a multi-year project, the numbers of completed minors will not increase until that is in place.

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

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 8,700 students in 127 class sections participated each year in establishing the three-year baseline.

Targets: Critical thinking and communication are two of the five university-wide student-learning outcomes (SLOs). The source of the data for this indicator is a review process through which each UGE course is evaluated every five years to check the extent to which it is reflecting the pedagogy that is central to our UGE program. The course surveys include feedback that is used to improve individual courses in an effort to maintain the highest quality of the courses being offered for UGE. More than 30 different general education courses are evaluated in a given semester, and the set of instructors teaching these courses changes every semester. We expected that the ongoing change in instructors teaching

these courses from one semester to the next and the change in the set of courses actually being reviewed each semester might result in relatively large variations in the scores from one semester to the next, and that is indeed what we have seen. Though we achieved positive directional improvement in this indicator relative to our baseline, we did not meet our target value for this year. We will continue to work with faculty members who are teaching the UGE courses to improve these courses.

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

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.

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 some other project. These measures of student learning provide excellent opportunities for faculty to directly assess learning that spans the entire degree curriculum. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

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

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

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

Targets: Our baseline enrollment is almost completely composed of long-time Kansas residents. Many of the recent Hispanic immigrants to Kansas are first or second generation citizens and are not as familiar with the educational opportunities in our state. We are working with both high schools and community colleges in southwest Kansas that have significant enrollments of Hispanic students to share information about qualified admission standards, our academic programs, scholarship opportunities, and career paths. Our efforts are resulting in larger enrollments of Hispanic students at our institution. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

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

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.

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 0.63%. Though we achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline (69%), our retention rate for the Fall 2005 cohort of this group of students (70.1%) did not quite reach the stretch target value of 70.6%. However, it does reflect an important continued increase in the retention rate of these students compared to previous years. We are pleased that our efforts to help at-risk students be successful in the first year is reflected in the continuous upward trend of retention that we have been able to achieve over the last three years.

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.

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 first-year retention of women in SEM disciplines is 62.2% of Fall 2003 cohort.

Targets: The first-year retention of women in SEM disciplines has had an average increase over the past four years of 0.76%. We have implemented several activities and initiatives designed to enhance the retention of women students in these disciplines, and as a result, we have seen an increased retention rate over previous years. We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

Comments:

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.

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

Targets: Emphasis on enhanced research/scholarly activity has resulted in additional external funding at about \$5.5M per year over the last three years. With regard to this indicator, we achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, but did not reach our target value. In 2005, K-State received \$110.8M in extramural funding and substantially exceeded our target value for this indicator in the 2005 Performance Agreement. When we prepared the 2006 Performance Agreement, we raised our target value for FY2006 from the \$104.6M value in the 2005 Performance Agreement to \$112M. This was an aggressive stretch goal, since the dramatic increase we saw in FY 2005 was primarily due to some one-time bricks-and-mortar and equipment funding of about \$6.5M for the Biosecurity Research Institute (BRI). Our actual FY2006 extramural funding of \$108.3M fell short of the more aggressive target of \$112M, but exceeded the original target value of \$104.6M. We will continue to work on increasing our level of extramural funding in future years.

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

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

Targets: Though we showed positive directional improvement in this indicator, had a dramatic increase in this indicator compared to last year, and have recorded the largest value in this indicator in the last four years, we did not reach our stretch target for 2006. Cash contributions can vary considerably from year to year depending upon economic conditions and whether individuals choose to make their contributions through trusts or endowments rather than cash. For example, the cash contributions in the last three years ranged from \$44.8M in FY2003 to \$54.2M in FY2004, and back down to \$41.8M in FY 2005. In FY 2006, we received \$57.6M in cash, which is the largest amount in the last four years. In addition, the total gift activity, which includes both cash contributions and deferred gifts, totaled \$92.8M, which is a \$25M increase from the prior year and a \$9.5M increase compared to FY2003. Though we did not reach our stretch goal of \$62M in cash contributions only, we are encouraged by the significant increase in this indicator over the last year and will continue our efforts in this area in the future.

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

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 of \$77.4K is a 3-year (2001-2003) average of licensing income and equity.

Targets: Licensing income is a rather volatile indicator, as it can show dramatic changes from one year to the next. Licensing income was \$110.9K in CY 2003, and prior to that time increased only by an average of \$30K per year. However, in CY 2004, our licensing income was \$554.8K, a dramatic increase from previous years. Over the last two years, we have continued to see fluctuations in this indicator, but we achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and exceeded our target for this year.

Comments:

KBOR use only: Kansas State University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

The performance agreement is very similar to the previous agreement.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

Comments about the last performance agreement included: “Recommend approval with the understanding that t strengthen future performance agreements by including stronger measurements of learner outcomes.” Indicator address this concern.

Recommendation and Comments

Recommend approval with the understanding that the institution will continue to strengthen future performance additional direct measurements of learner outcomes.

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, 2007
--------------------------------------	---------------------------	---	-----------------------------

Regents' System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Efficiency at K-State

Key Performance Indicator (Data) ¹	Baseline ²	Targets ³	Performance Outcome ⁴	Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵
1. Number of place-bound students in western Kansas enrolled in Distance Education programs and courses offered by Kansas State University.	Fall 2003 = 237	Target yr 1: Fall 2006, enrollments will increase to 279. Target yr 2: Fall 2007, enrollments will increase to 287 Target yr 3: Fall 2008, the number of enrollments will increase to 293.	Number enrolled in Fall 2006 = 296	Increase of 59 students enrolled or 24.9% increase
2. Number of student credit hours (SCH) taken at K-State by students originally matriculated as transfer students based on a calendar year.	CY 2003: SCH = 143,885	Target yr 1: CY 2006, SCH will increase to 145,000. Target yr 2: CY 2007, SCH will stabilize at 145,000. Target yr 3: CY 2008, SCH will stabilize at 145,000.	Number of credit hours taken in CY 2006 = 146,807	Increase of 2,922 SCH or 2.0% increase
3. Number of degree programs offered through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances	Fall 2004 = 3:	Target yr 1: Fall 2006, number of programs will increase to 5. Target yr 2: Fall 2007, number of programs will increase to 8. Target yr 3: Fall 2008, number of programs will increase to 12.	The number of programs in Fall 2006 = 5	Increase of two programs or 66.6% increase
4. Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.	CY 2004 = 2,628	Target yr 1: CY 2006, number of courses will increase to 3,250. Target yr 2: CY 2007, number of courses will increase to 3,450. Target yr 3: CY 2008, number of courses will increase to 3,650.	The number of courses in CY 2006 = 3,348	Increase of 720 courses or 27.4% increase

Regents' System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
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 (Data)¹	Baseline ²	Targets ³	Performance Outcome⁴	Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵
1. The percentage of assessment plans in which at least half of the assessment methods are direct measures of student learning.	CY 2004 = 68%	Target yr 1: CY 2006, percentage will be 95% Target yr 2: CY 2007, percentage will be 98% Target yr 3: CY 2008, percentage will be 99%	CY2006 99%	Increase of 31%
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2004 = 434 students enrolled in KSU's Study Abroad program.	Target yr 1: Enrollment will increase to 540 students in FY 2006. Target yr 2: Enrollment will increase to 590 students in FY 2007. Target yr 3: Enrollment will increase to 640 students in FY 2008.	557 student enrolled in FY2006	Increase of 123 students or 28%
3. Number of students earning a minor in the interdisciplinary minor degree program in Leadership Studies	FY 2004 = 77 students earning a minor in Leadership Studies.	Target yr 1: For FY 2006, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 109. Target yr 2: For FY 2007, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 120. Target yr 3: For FY 2008, the number of students earning a minor will increase to 125.	Total FY 2005 Leadership Studies minor degrees conferred = 79	Increase of two students or 2.6% increase
4. The mean score from three academic learning outcomes within the general education program	2.77 (three-year average)	Target yr 1: For FY 2006, the mean score will increase to 3.10. Target yr 2: For FY 2007, the mean score will increase to 3.15. Target yr 3: For FY 2008, the mean score will increase to 3.18.	Mean for FY2006 2.91	Increase of .14 over the baseline.

Regents' System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

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 (Data)¹	Baseline ²	Targets ³	Performance Outcome⁴	Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵
5. Number of K-State undergraduate students successfully completing a capstone course or experience.	For AY 2004-2005, 2,928 students successfully completed a capstone course or experience	<p>Target yr 1: For AY 2005-2006, students successfully completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,000.</p> <p>Target yr 2: For AY 2005-2006, students successfully completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,075.</p> <p>Target yr 3: AY 2005-2006, students successfully completing a capstone course or experience will increase to 3,150.</p>	3068 students successfully completed a capstone course in AY2005-2006	Increase of 140 students or 4.8%

Regents' System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access

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

Key Performance Indicator (Data)¹	Baseline ²	Targets ³	Performance Outcome⁴	Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵
1. Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.	Fall 2003 = 505 Hispanic students enrolled.	Target yr 1: For Fall 2006, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 538. Target yr 2: For Fall 2007, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 546. Target yr 3: For Fall 2008, Hispanic enrollment will increase to 556.	Hispanic student enrollment for Fall 2006 = 641	Increase of 136 students or 26.9% increase
2. The percent of at-risk students (minority and students with ACT < 19) enrolled for the second year.	Cohort group 2003 - 1 st year retention of at risk students = 69%	Target yr 1: For cohort 2005, 1 st year retention will increase to 70.6%. Target yr 2: Retention of cohort 2006 will increase to 71.4% Target yr 3: Retention of cohort 2007 will increase to 72.2%	Cohort group 2005, 1st year retention = 70.1%	Increase of 1.1%
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.	Cohort group 2003 - 1 st year retention of women in SEM disciplines = 62.2%	Target yr 1: For cohort 2005, 1 st year retention will increase to 63.6%. Target yr 2: Retention of cohort 2006 will increase to 64.4% Target yr 3: Retention of cohort 2007 will increase to 65.2%	Cohort group 2005, 1st year retention = 63.8%	Increase of 1.6%

Regents' System Goal E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)¹	Baseline ²	Targets ³	Performance Outcome⁴	Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵
1. The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.	FY 2003 = \$95.7M	Target yr 1: For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$112M. Target yr 2: For FY 2007, funding will increase to \$115M. Target yr 3: For FY 2008, funding will increase to \$118M.	Extramural funding for FY 2005 = \$108.3M	Increase of \$12.6M or 13.2% increase.
2. The amount of private support in a fiscal year.	FY 2003 = \$44.8M	Target yr 1: For FY 2006, funding will increase to \$62M. Target yr 2: For FY 2007, funding will increase to \$64M. Target yr 4: For FY 2008, funding will increase to \$66M.	Private support for FY 2005 = \$57.6M	Increase of \$12.8M or 28.6% increase
3. The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 3 year average (2001, 2002, 2003): Licensing Income = \$77.4K	Target yr 1: For CY 2006, the prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$275K. Target yr 2: For CY 2007, prior 3-year average funding will increase to \$305K. Target yr 3: For CY 2008, prior 3-year average funding will decline to \$200K.	For CY 2004-06, 3-year average: Cash licensing revenue = \$448,575	Cash licensing revenue increased \$371,175 or 479.6% increase

¹ 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.

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

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

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

⁵ Amount of Directional Improvement equals the difference between actual performance and the target.

