

<b>Institution: Kansas State University</b>	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-4797; rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: March 1, 2008	
<b>Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
1. Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.	FY 2004-2006 = 32,150	Target yr 1: FY 2005-2007 = 32,750 Target yr 2: FY 2006-2008 = 33,500 Target yr 3: FY 2007-2009 = 34,250	Three-year average (FY 2005-2007) credit hours generated for credit courses = 33,346 credits.	Increase of 1,196 credits or 3.7% increase; exceeded the target.
2. Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.	Fall 2005 = 1,675	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 1,925 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 2,075 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 2,225	Number of students enrolled in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses for Fall 2007 = 2,522 students.	Increase of 597 students or 35.6% increase; exceeded the targets for all proposed years.
3. Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).	Fall 2005 = 3	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 7 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 9 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 11	The number of programs in Fall 2007 = 7.	Increase of four programs or 133.3% increase; met the target.
4. Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.	CY 2005 = 3,621	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 3,750 Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 3,800 Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 3,890	The number of courses in CY 2007 = 4,213.	Increase of 592 courses or 16.3% increase; exceeded the targets for all proposed years.

## **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.**

### **Key Performance Indicator 1: Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.**

**Data Collection:** Compile the number of SCH generated by for-credit courses through the Division of Continuing Education at Kansas State University by fiscal year (summer, fall, spring) and average them over three years. The baseline value is 32,150 SCH, which is the 3-year average for FY 2004-06.

**Targets:** Continuing Education provides students with different avenues to complete the necessary coursework for graduation or to gain a certification in a specialized area. Students are very adept at using the Internet and appreciate the flexibility provided through enrollment in courses that may fit better with their work schedules and family commitments. Courses are offered in several modes of delivery, including face-to-face, mediated, asynchronous and synchronous formats. These offerings help students with the efficient and effective scheduling of their time, allowing K-State to serve more students who have various scheduling needs. The university has experienced a steady growth in courses offered through continuing education, in part due to the additional number of collaborative programs and courses offered and new certificate programs that have been approved. We anticipate a growth of 600-800 credit hours generated per year.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

### **Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.**

**Data Collection:** Determine the headcount & curriculum of all students enrolled in a fall semester Division of Continuing Education (DCE) course in which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. Students in non-degree-seeking curricula will be removed from the total headcount. The baseline value is 1,675 students for Fall 2005.

**Targets:** Several factors should contribute to a steady annual increase in the headcount for students in degree-seeking programs who are enrolled in distance education courses for which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. These factors include increased targeted marketing of DCE distance degree programs to placebound degree-seeking students; the University continuing to add new distance degree programs each year; and the various 2 + 2 agreements established with community colleges in Kansas and in other parts of the U.S. These courses provide students with the flexibility in scheduling that they need and provide place-bound students with enhanced access. These benefits lead to more students being served and those students being more efficient in completing their degrees. Our optimistic targets reflect an increase of 150 students per year.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, and we have attained our goal by exceeding the CY 2009 target two years early. Over the last two years, significant increases occurred in the number of students enrolled in distance education courses who were in the following programs: animal sciences, dietetics, early childhood education, family studies and human services, food science, general business, operations research, social sciences, and all master's level education programs including the advising certificate and adult education doctorate program. Various factors, such as the cost of commuting to campus, increased degree program offerings for place-bound students, and the flexibility needed to balance working and attending class, are contributing to more students enrolling in distance education courses.

### **Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).**

**Data Collection:** Compile the number of degree programs each fall in which K-State participates through the Great Plains IDEA and the KSU IAA,

either by offering complete degree programs or courses that are part of a degree program. The baseline value is 3 programs for Fall 2005.

**Targets:** By collaborating with other universities, K-State enhances its efficiency by participating in or 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. Faculty members in a number of our degree programs have begun discussions that we expect will lead to new collaborative offerings. Our target values incorporate these expected collaborations and represent stretch values, since some programs currently under consideration for such collaboration may not be approved or implemented.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we met our target. The seven programs include: Community Development, Dietetics, Family Financial Planning, Food Safety and Defense, Gerontology, Merchandising, and Youth Development.

**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 for which the instructor uses K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is delivered in a mediated format. The baseline value is 3,621 in CY 2005.

**Targets:** K-State Online increases the efficiency of both students and faculty. Students have 24/7 access to course materials and information about their grades, and they can submit questions to their instructors at any time. Not all courses will desire to utilize mediated instruction, but a realistic goal might be 75%. Our target values are selected to attain this goal by CY 2009.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, and we have attained our goal by exceeding the CY 2009 target two years early. Over the past year, the number of courses using K-State Online increased considerably, partially due to the impending implementation of the new student information system and the desire to become more electronically savvy, and due to faculty responding to students' desires and needs to have more course materials and information available online.

**Comments:** None.

<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
1. Percent of English 100 students enrolled in "Diversity Writing" sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.	CY 2005 = 17%	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 63% Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 73% Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 85%	Percent of English 100 students enrolled in Diversity Writing sections for CY 2007 = 66.3%.	Increase of 49.3%; exceeded the target.
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2006 = 603	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 630 Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 660 Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 690	Number of students studying abroad for FY 2007 = 660 students.	Increase of 57 students or 9.4%; exceeded the target.

3. Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience with a grade of "C" or better.	FY 2005 = 75.3%	Target yr 1: FY2007 = 83% Target yr 2: FY2008 = 85% Target yr 3: FY2009 = 87%	In FY 2007, 89% of the students successfully completed a capstone course.	Increase of 13.7%; exceeded the targets for all proposed years.
4. Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.	AY 2006 = 27.5%	Target yr 1: AY 2007 = 30% Target yr 2: AY 2008 = 35% Target yr 3: AY 2009 = 40%	In AY 2007, there was a 27.5% difference between the pre-test and post-test scores.	No change from the baseline; target was not met.

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of English 100 students enrolled in “Diversity Writing” sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.**

**Data Collection:** Enrollment figures (last day of class) will be calculated by dividing the total number of students enrolled in the "Diversity Writing" sections of ENGL 100 ("Expository Writing I") by the total number of students enrolled in all sections of ENGL 100. Pass/fail rates will be calculated by dividing the total number of students who passed by the total number of students in the course at the end of the semester.

**Targets:** This curriculum transformation project addresses three of our undergraduate learning outcomes: communication, diversity, and critical thinking. The goal of the English department is to, eventually, teach all of the English 100 sections with this methodology. Student work is evaluated via a portfolio method using a common scoring rubric. Assignments in the "Diversity Writing" sections require students to identify, describe, research, and analyze issues of diversity. This approach engages students with diversity issues in society and prepares them to think and write about real world situations. The English department is training new sets of instructors and graduate teaching assistants each fall semester and adding sections as they have instructors trained in this method. In the Fall 2006 semester, 25 GTAs and five instructors will be trained, so that approximately 42% of ENGL 100 sections can be taught using the "Diversity Writing" approach. In the following two fall semesters, additional GTAs and instructors will be trained. By the Fall 2008 semester, the "Diversity Writing" content will be the mainstream curriculum for ENGL 100.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

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

**Data Collection:** Students who register with our Study Abroad office and successfully complete a study abroad experience will be counted.

**Targets:** K-State has a goal of increasing the number of students who participate in a study abroad experience, because we believe (and have instituted an assessment plan to measure) that students who have such experiences gain "awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world" - one of our university's undergraduate student learning outcomes. We have been recruiting more students to participate, increasing the number of scholarships available for study abroad, and providing financial support to faculty who want to take groups of students to another country. The national average annual growth in study abroad is 4%; our stretch target values reflect a 5% increase.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience.**

**Data Collection:** All students in a given academic year who passed, with a grade of "C" or better, one of the courses designated by a department as a capstone course or experience will be counted. This number will be expressed as a percent of the number of students who are awarded associate or bachelors degrees during the academic year.

**Targets:** As a part of K-State's efforts to establish assessment of student learning as a priority at the department level, we have encouraged faculty to utilize capstone courses or experiences as vehicles for doing comprehensive assessment of integrated learning within the major. In capstone experiences, students are asked to demonstrate the learning of degree program outcomes and university learning outcomes (e.g., communication, critical thinking, ethics) in a final project or within an internship or through a case-based real-world challenge to which they are asked to respond. In some cases, performance is evaluated by both faculty and professionals outside of the university. These courses already existed in many disciplines, and it is our goal to continue to create such experiences. Given that new course development is a complex and sometimes time-consuming process, our target values represent a challenge for us, but are ones we are committed to reaching.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, and we have attained our goal by exceeding the CY 2009 target two years early.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.**

**Data Collection:** Students in a 1<sup>st</sup>-year required business course are given a 40-item exam on management concepts. The same exam is given to seniors in a required business course. The average score for all 1<sup>st</sup>-year students and the average score for all seniors will be computed and compared.

**Targets:** With this assessment, management faculty are asking two questions: 1. Do seniors in management know more about management concepts than 1<sup>st</sup>-year management students; and 2. Do management students know more about management concepts than other business majors (finance, accounting, marketing)? The results of this direct measure will help faculty to modify their teaching methods and/or course content to help students to learn better. The baseline is, at this point, based on only one semester, so targets are modest, but hopeful, as the faculty already have ideas on areas of improvement in their teaching strategies.

2007 Report: The difference between 1<sup>st</sup>-year and senior scores remained the same as the baseline value and we did not reach our target. Both the pre-test and the post-test scores were essentially the same in the first (Fall 2005) and second (Spring 2007) administrations of the test. Given these results, the faculty suspected that the test was not a valid assessment of overall knowledge. They analyzed the test questions more closely and determined that many of the questions were quite difficult in the level of expected knowledge, reflecting expectations that they would have of only the top students. Since the student learning outcomes are geared toward all students, they have made some revisions to the test, bringing the questions more in line with our student learning outcomes. They will administer the new test in the Spring 2008 semester, and they believe that the revised version will have more validity.

**Comments:** None.

**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 (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).**

<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
1. Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.	Fall 2005 = 595 Hispanic students enrolled.	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 625 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 650 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 665	Hispanic student enrollment for Fall 2007 = 675 students.	Increase of 80 students or 13.4% increase; exceeded the targets for all proposed years.
2. Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.	AY 2005-2006 = 4,078	Target yr 1: AY 2006-2007 = 4,100 Target yr 2: AY 2007-2008 = 4,150 Target yr 3: AY 2008-2009 = 4,200	Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers for AY 2006-07 = 4,117 students.	Increase of 39 students or 1% increase; exceeded the target.
3. The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).	FY 2005 = 1,290 families and 5,214 youth.	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 1,369 families and 5,532 youth Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 1,410 families and 5,697 youth Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 1,452 families and 5,868 youth	For FY 2007, the number of individuals/families provided nutritional education = 1,165 Families; 6,471 youth for a total of 7,636.	Increase of 1,132 families and youth combined or 17.4% increase; exceeded the target for the combined total for all proposed years.

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.**

**Data Collection:** The fall semester 20<sup>th</sup> day headcount will be used. The headcount includes undergraduate and graduate students. The baseline is 595 Hispanic students for Fall 2005.

**Targets:** Our baseline enrollment is almost completely composed of long-time Kansas residents. Any significant growth will come from recent immigrants who are first- or second-generation citizens (or undocumented immigrants with resident tuition status). This group is much harder to recruit because of multiple cultural and financial issues. The community colleges in southwest Kansas have significant enrollments of Hispanic students, but these students frequently take small numbers of credit hours and move slowly, if at all, through the associate degree programs. We have recognized the increase in the overall Hispanic population in western Kansas, and we have dedicated resources to recruit prospective Hispanic first- and second-generation students. In addition, on-line distance education provides opportunities for Hispanic students to enroll in K-State courses without leaving home. In reference to the baseline, our target values represent an increase of 12% by 2009. Because of the various factors noted above, we consider our target values to be particularly expansive.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, and we have attained our goal by exceeding the CY 2009 target two years early. All minority groups showed enrollment increases from Fall 2006 to Fall 2007, with the Hispanic enrollment increasing by 5%.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.**

**Data Collection:** Twenty percent of the money from tuition increases at K-State is set aside for Need Based Tuition Waivers. Eligibility for the waivers is based on the ability of the student and the student's family to pay for college, rather than on the actual cost of attending college. Since a family's ability to pay generally remains constant, improvement will be measured by an increase in the number of awards.

**Targets:** Since a family's inability to pay for college is one of the significant reasons why potential students do not attend K-State, or withdraw after starting, an increase in the number of awards will result in greater access to students from lower-income families to begin and continue to attend K-State. Given the projected plateauing of tuition increases, the increase in the number of students receiving waivers is expected to taper off also, as is reflected in our targets.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).**

**Data Collection:** Families and youth enroll in our programs, and we track their progress through a series of 10 or more lessons on nutrition. The number of enrolled families and youth will be compiled.

**Targets:** K-State's land-grant mission includes enriching the lives of the citizens of Kansas by extending to them opportunities to benefit from the results of research. This indicator is one example of the alignment of our land-grant mission with the Regents goal of increased targeted participation and access to university services. The mission of EFNEP is to assist families and youth with limited resources in making simple changes in eating behaviors so that over time, healthy choices become healthy habits. EFNEP lessons (available in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese/Laotian) help at-risk Kansans develop the skills and behaviors they need to improve their diets and effectively manage resources. Currently, the EFNEP programs assist Kansans in Sedgwick, Shawnee, Crawford and Bourbon counties through the efforts of nutrition assistants. Kansas EFNEP nutrition assistants teach in homes, schools, assisted living sites, prisons, clinics, and libraries. Our targets reflect an increase of 3% in the number of contacts in each of the next three years, as this program is expanded.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline in the total number of low-income individuals/families provided nutrition education, and attained our goal by exceeding the FY 2009 target two years early. Within each category we experienced different trends. We achieved positive directional improvement and exceeded our targets in the youth program, but noted a reduction in the family program compared to our baseline. We anticipate the number of adults and families who are provided nutrition education to increase within this coming year. Our adult numbers (termed families) are down due to staff turnover in all counties. Often, with newly hired staff, it takes some time to rebuild those relationships with adults. Meanwhile, our youth program has been steady and increasingly popular in all counties but particularly in Topeka, where it is incorporated into the school district on a first come, first served basis. In Topeka, the teachers receive a brochure in September and programs start in October and continue through the school year. We should be seeing our adult numbers regain soon, as we expand and begin programs in Montgomery County and southwest Kansas.

**Comments:** None.

<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)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
1. The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.	FY 2005 = \$110.9M	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = \$115M Target yr 2: FY 2008 = \$118M Target yr 3: FY 2009 = \$120M	Extramural funding for FY 2007 = \$114.1M.	Increase of \$3.2M or 2.9% increase; fell slightly short of meeting the target.
2. The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.	Average for FY 2003-2005 = \$74.0M	Target yr 1: FY 2005 – 2007 = \$79M Target yr 2: FY 2006 – 2008 = \$81M Target yr 4: FY 2007 – 2009 = \$83M	Average private support for FY 2005-FY2007 = \$84.0M.	Increase of \$10.0M or 13.5% increase; exceeded the target.
3. The amount of licensing income	Previous 5-year	Target yr 1: For	For CY 2002-2006, 5-year average Cash	Increase of \$73.9K or

from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	average (2001-2005): Licensing Income = \$232.1K	2002-2006 = \$271K Target yr 2: For 2003-2007 = \$307K Target yr 3: For 2004-2008 = \$340K	licensing revenue = \$306.0K.	31.8% increase; exceeded the target.
--	---	--	-------------------------------	---

## **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources**

### **Key Performance Indicator 1: The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.**

**Data Collection:** Self-explanatory. The baseline value is \$110.9M in FY05.

**Targets:** Emphasis on enhanced research/scholarly activity has resulted in additional external funding, especially with the start of the Biosecurity Research Institute (BRI). The FY 2005 baseline figure is a \$10M increase from FY 2004, which is due in part to the BRI receiving \$4.5M for equipment and \$2M to enhance BRI research activity once the BRI is operational in 2006. Our projected targets are conservatively lower (\$5M, \$3M, and \$2M consecutive increases), since we have taken into consideration concerns about the levels of future federal funding and that the significant BRI funding was a one-time expense for equipment.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, however, we fell slightly short of our target. The number of awards and funding level is up from past years, however, in some cases, the Federal government has taken a more conservative approach during these times of budget uncertainties and have funded only the current budget year versus forward funding the entire project up front as they have done in the past. We will continue to work closely with faculty members to facilitate grant preparations and submissions.

### **Key Performance Indicator 2: The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.**

**Data Collection:** Dollars generated each fiscal year from new funds, which include both cash and deferred gifts. The amounts are averaged over a three year period. The baseline value for FY 2003-05 is \$74.0M.

**Targets:** The current capital campaign and other development activities will result in an estimated 2%-3% increase in private support in each of the three target years. A three-year average is used to take into account the volatility of this indicator.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

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

**Data Collection:** Determine the average over five years of the amount of licensing revenues and equity received from companies to develop K-State technologies. Our baseline value is a 5-year (2001-2005) average of \$232.1K in licensing income and equity.

**Targets:** In CY 2004, our total licensing income was \$554.8K, however, based on income in 2001-2003, this appears to be an anomaly. Licensing income was \$110.9K in CY 2003 and \$383.4K in CY 2005. We have incorporated an annual increase of about \$30K into our target values to account for the extreme volatility that can occur in this measure.

2007 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline and for this year, we exceeded our target.

<b>KBOR use only: Kansas State University</b>
<b>Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement</b>
<b>Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement</b>
<b>Recommendation and Comments</b>