

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-4797; rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: March 1, 2009	
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
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 2006-2008) credit hours generated for credit courses = 37,185 credits.	Increase of 5,035 credits or 15.7% over baseline; increase of 3,839 credits or 11.5% over 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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 2008 = 2,854	Increase of 1,179 students or 70.4% over baseline; increase of 332 students or 13.2% over 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.
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 2008 = 10.	Increase of seven programs or 233.3% over baseline; increase of three programs or 42.9% over 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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 2008 = 4,604.	Increase of 983 courses or 27.1% over baseline; increase of 391 courses or 9.3% over 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We are very encouraged by the growth we have experienced in this indicator. It is indicative of the increase in demand by our constituents for more flexibility in course scheduling and reflects our strategic scheduling of courses needed through alternative means.

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

Data Collection: Determine the headcount and 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 place-bound 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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. DCE has developed an extensive marketing plan and both print and television ads have highlighted the opportunities for students to participate in these programs. We believe this has contributed to the large growth in the number of students enrolled in mediated distance education courses, as well as the growing readiness by individuals to engage in mediated learning.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. The ten programs include eight degree programs (Community Development, Dietetics, Family Financial Planning, Food Safety and Defense, Gerontology, Merchandising, Youth Development, and Nuclear Engineering) and two programs offering courses in Agricultural Mechanization and Grasslands. The IAA is the leader in the nation in developing higher education alliances by providing the support to help establish and implement these alliances with no direct K-State funding. The IAA wrote the grant to establish the Big 12 Engineering Consortium and thus, the Nuclear Engineering program was formed. Currently, IAA has been instrumental in the Agricultural Mechanization and Grasslands programs by offering courses on a course exchange basis. These two programs are actually a spin-off from AG*IDEA institutions. Agricultural Mechanization has begun development of a Precision Agriculture Certificate. Grasslands Management has been slower to develop, but they are now working on a Graduate Certificate program and have expanded the participating institutions beyond the original four institutions in the grant. The Grasslands program has identified a core curriculum and several electives. This may be developed into a full Master's degree program in the future.

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 (KSOL) 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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. It is often difficult to anticipate how rapidly users will incorporate a new technology into an existing structure. The continual improvements that our technology staff members introduce into KSOL each year have made this tool not only easier to use but more versatile. Our faculty have responded by adopting KSOL more quickly and more extensively than we originally expected. Our new faculty also are more technology savvy and this has contributed to the accelerated use of KSOL.

Comments: We are very encouraged to see a much more rapid growth than we anticipated in our distance education enrollments and the number of programs and courses available for students to take. We had based our projections on both historical trends and the increased demand that we expected from students for more flexibility in course offerings and to help them meet their work schedules and family commitments. We are very pleased to be able to respond to the needs of our students across the state of Kansas and beyond, and to provide the means to help them make substantial progress toward completing their degrees. We will continue to work with our faculty to identify additional courses and degree programs that we can include in our offerings to further meet the needs of our constituents. We have exceeded the targets for all of the indicators for this goal and thus, we have met the overall goal this year.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
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 (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
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 2008 = 95.2%.	Increase of 78.2% over the baseline; increase of 28.9% over 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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	Number of students studying abroad for FY 2008 = 676 students.	Increase of 73 students or 12.1% over the baseline;

		= 660 Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 690		increase of 16 students or 2.4% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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 2008, 90.1% of the students successfully completed a capstone course.	Increase of 14.8% over the baseline; increase of 1.1% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.
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 2008, there was a 30.0% difference between the pre-test and post-test scores.	Increase of 2.5% over both the baseline and the 2007 data; 2008 target was not met, but performance improved over 2007.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 and 2009 targets. The significant increase from 2005 has been achieved by the department providing training to more instructors and GTAs than they originally anticipated. This has allowed them to more quickly integrate additional Diversity Writing sections into the program, thus, nearing their goal of teaching all English 100 sections with this methodology. In addition, we have exceeded the goal of maintaining a pass rate of 90% (Pass rate = 92% for CY 2008).

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We continue to create new and promote existing study abroad opportunities to provide the global experiences sought by our students. This fall we initiated a competitive process to provide mini-grants for faculty to develop new study-abroad classes, and we anticipate that this will result in even more opportunities for our students.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We are working closely with our faculty to expand and enhance the use of capstone experiences and courses to provide additional opportunities for our students to demonstrate their achievements related to degree program learning outcomes.

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 1st-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 1st-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 1st-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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive improvement from pre-test to post-test relative to the baseline and the 2007 scores, however the 2008 target was not achieved. The 2008 scores showed that freshmen improved by 11 percentage points, while the seniors improved by 14 percentage points. Since multiple faculty members teach courses in each area, changes to the 2008 exam included an increased emphasis on constructing questions that reflected material taught that was common to all classes in each area. Faculty from each area (Organizational Behavior, Human Resource Management, and Quantitative Management) worked together to examine the collective validity of the questions on the test and their relationship to the desired student outcomes. In doing so, they were able to more clearly identify important areas within the courses that required additional coverage. In the ensuing semesters, they altered their coverage of topics in the classes to reflect the important material related to the selected student learning outcomes. The gap between seniors in Management and freshmen was 27% in 2007, and 30% in 2008. We attribute this progress to improvements made in reliability and validity of the test and to course revisions. Based on the current results, the department believes that the test questions are now a more reliable and valid measure of the knowledge they expect their Management majors to acquire. The establishment of

appropriate test questions has been a challenging process given the conceptual nature of the field, the different philosophical approaches taken by different faculty in each area, and the various teaching styles of the faculty members involved. Given these conditions, it was rewarding to see the improvement in 2008. The department faculty members will continue to make adjustments to the exam questions to ensure they appropriately reflect the student learning outcomes for the degree program, and they will use the results from the exam to refine the topics covered, the manner in which material is presented, and assignments given to students to enhance student learning. Though we did not meet the target for this indicator this year, the process of closing the loop on assessment is occurring and leading to improved outcomes.

Comments: We had no historical trends on which to base the target values for our first indicator, and thus we are very pleased to see the more rapid than expected transition to our Diversity Writing emphasis in English 100. This curriculum transformation addresses three of our undergraduate student learning outcomes, and we are very proud of the impact this project is having on our students. For our second and third indicators, we set target values that exceeded our internal historical trend data on study abroad and capstone course success and the national average growth in study abroad. Our faculty and administrators have worked to increase the various opportunities for study abroad, and our students who have completed study abroad experiences have encouraged their peers to participate. Likewise, faculty members are embracing the use of capstone experiences and courses to comprehensively measure achievement of the student learning outcomes in the degree programs. All of these efforts contributed to exceeding the target values for these two indicators. Though we did not meet the 2008 target for our last indicator, we are very encouraged by the process the department has undertaken to make modifications and enhance the learning outcomes. So, we see this as a true success in terms of the goals of the assessment process. We exceeded the 2008 targets on three of our four indicators and showed positive directional improvement on all four indicators. Thus, we met the overall goal.

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).

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
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 2008 = 756 students.	Increase of 161 students or 27.1% over the baseline; increase of 81 students or 12% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.
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 2007-08 = 4,425 students.	Increase of 347 students or 8.5% over the baseline; increase of 308 students or 7.5% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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 2008, the number of individuals/families provided nutritional education = 1,318 Families; 6,177 youth for a total of 7,495.	Increase of 991 families and youth combined or 15.2% over the baseline; decrease of 141 families and youth combined or -1.8% compared to the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.

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 20th 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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We believe that our long-term university outreach efforts that begin with Kansas students in grade school and continue on through high school are starting to contribute to our increased Hispanic enrollments. We have several new initiatives underway that specifically focus on students from underrepresented groups, and we expect these programs to also lead to more students attending K-State.

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 plateau of tuition increases, the increase in the number of students receiving waivers is expected to taper off also, as is reflected in our targets.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We have placed a high priority on assisting students who have financial need, and the current economic climate means that more students will have additional financial need. This additional demand will put a larger amount of stress on our already limited resources, and next year we may not be able to provide the same level of support to as many students. The increase in the amount for Pell grants comes at a very crucial time and will be of tremendous help to our students.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to our baseline, but experienced a slight decline relative to our 2007 data. However, we exceeded our 2008 target. EFNEP is often the first contact its clients have with K-State Research and Extension (KSRE) programming, and in turn, those families' first educational experience with Kansas State University. EFNEP is now active in 9 counties in Kansas, and the FY08 numbers reflect the program's presence in 8 of those counties (one program in SW Kansas (Garden City) began in 6/08 and reported no graduates completing the program as of the close of FY08). In comparing the FY 08 data to the FY 07 data, EFNEP number of families (adults) served increased to 1,318, and the number of youth served decreased slightly to 6,177. These fluctuations are not unexpected, as our youth numbers increased dramatically last year. The current youth totals may reflect a more logical trend this year. The increase in the number of families (adult) served in FY08 seems to reflect the results of the goals associated with the KSRE strategic plan. The English/Spanish bilingual nutrition educator in Garden City has not only been working with Hispanic participants since the program began, but also has formed a Somali men's group whose attendees are interested in nutrition and preparing healthful "U.S." foods. With this initiative as well as the achievements made in Cherokee County, in which EFNEP was asked to provide programs because the organizing physician realized the benefits of EFNEP to increase birth outcomes, we look forward to a continual increase for the FY 2009 results.

Comments: Our targeted recruitment efforts for Hispanic students have been very successful, and we are equally pleased by the increase in enrollment for the entire minority population. We will continue to increase our activities to retain these minority students and will work toward achieving representation that is closely aligned with the State of Kansas demographics. We anticipate that the current economic climate will have a significant impact on the number of students who will request need-based financial aid in the next few years, and coupled with that is a reduction in the return on endowed scholarships, which will reduce the amount of funding available to assist students. So, though we have exceeded our target for this year, we know we will face increased demand and fewer resources in the future. Our outreach efforts to enhance nutrition education to our constituents in the State of Kansas is an integral part of our land-grant mission, and we are very proud of the growth we have experienced in the number of individuals and families we are serving. We are continuing our activities and expect to see additional growth in future years. We exceeded the targets for all three of the indicators associated with this goal, and thus we are pleased to report that we have met the overall goal this year.

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	FY 2005 = \$110.9M	Target yr 1: FY 2007	Extramural funding for FY 2008 = \$118.0M.	Increase of \$7.1M or

research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.		= \$115M Target yr 2: FY 2008 = \$118M Target yr 3: FY 2009 = \$120M		6.4% over the baseline; increase of \$3.9M or 3.4% over the 2007 data; the 2008 target was met.
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 2006-FY2008 = \$94.6M.	Increase of \$20.6M or 27.8% over the baseline; increase of \$10.6M or 12.6% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 target.
3. The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 5-year average (2001-2005): Licensing Income = \$232.1K	Target yr 1: For 2002-2006 = \$271K Target yr 2: For 2003-2007 = \$307K Target yr 3: For 2004-2008 = \$340K	For CY 2003-2007, 5-year average Cash licensing revenue = \$406.5K.	Increase of \$174.4K or 75.1% over the baseline; increase of \$100.5K or 32.8% over the 2007 data; exceeded the 2008 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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We met our 2008 target. As noted above, our baseline value was significantly higher than the historical trend data as a result of the additional BRI funding, and as we anticipated, our increases in external funding the last couple of years have not been as large. With the award of the NBAF and the increases in federal funding for research associated with the stimulus package, there may be the potential for additional increases over what we might normally expect, but there is still a large amount of uncertainty associated with all of these developments.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We recently completed a very successful capital campaign, which contributed greatly to our success this year. However, the current economic climate may severely impact our future performance on this indicator.

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.

2008 Report: We achieved positive directional improvement compared to both our baseline and the 2007 data. We exceeded our 2008 target. We are continuing to aggressively pursue licensing opportunities, and this is reflected in the growth associated with this indicator. We do have concerns about the impact that the volatility in the financial markets will have on this indicator next year.

Comment: Given the current economic climate, we are very pleased to be able to report that we have met or exceeded the target values for all three of the indicators associated with this goal, and thus we have met the overall goal for this year. Many of the state and federal research grants associated with our target values for 2008 were already in process before the last quarter of 2008, which coincided with the most recent major downturn in the economy. Our indicators for both private support and product licensing arrangements reflect the averages of these indicators over a few years, and this helps smooth out the fluxuations that can occur from one year to the next. Therefore, in spite of the decline in the economy, we were very fortunate to reach our target values for this calendar year. However, we have significant concerns about reaching the targets for the next calendar year, as each of the indicators will be substantially negatively impacted by different segments of the economy. We met or exceeded all three of the indicators associated with this goal, and thus, we have met the overall goal this year.

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