

Instructions for Completing the Performance Agreement Application and Reporting Form

Provide the following information in the **PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT/REPORT**:

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 baseline and performance.
6. At least one institutional goal must support Regents’ System Goal B. Institutional goals must support two additional Regents’ System Goals selected from Regents’ System Goals A, C, and D.

Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

1. **Institutional Goal 1:** List goal as succinctly as possible.

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Data point 1): Identify the data to be collected as succinctly as possible. Use the same description that appears in the first column of the form.

a. Data Collection: Describe EXACTLY how the data for the key performance indicator will be collected. For example, if the data is “retention,” describe exactly how retention will be calculated.

b. Targets: Describe the rationale for selecting the targets in order for the Board to determine the degree of difficulty in achieving the target. This information is required. (Note: Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator/data. For example, if the key performance indicator is “retention,” the targets should be expressed in terms of the actual retention figures expected in the next 3 years.)

Continue in the same fashion for all indicators for this goal.

Comments: Include only comments that are ESSENTIAL to understanding the goal. Comments are optional.

And so on up to six goals.

Performance Agreement/Report

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-4797; rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: September 22, 2006
---	---------------------------	---	--------------------------

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		
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		
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		
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		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1 (Title Only): Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency

at K-State.

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments: We replaced one indicator and changed the scope of another indicator from our 2006 Performance Agreement. We also have added one indicator, which is the second one listed. We changed the indicator on number of place-bound students in Western Kansas enrolled in distance education courses to be the number of student credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education. We felt this expanded indicator captured a broader picture of the outreach to more students that these courses provide. We replaced the indicator on credit hours taken by transfer students, because this indicator did not follow the same pattern as the increased enrollment of transfer students, and we wanted to include an indicator that was more reflective of the efficiency we were wanting to provide to our students.

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%		
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		

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%		
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%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2 (Title Only): 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 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments: We have removed three indicators from the 2006 Performance Agreement and added three new indicators. We removed the indicator related to the percentage of degree programs having approved assessment plans with the required proportion of direct measures of student learning, because we had achieved our target values. We removed the indicator on number of students earning a minor in Leadership Studies and the indicator on mean score from learning outcomes in the general education program, because we had achieved significant change in these indicators over the last three years. We also wanted to add new indicators that included direct measures of student learning and that involved a larger number of students on our campus.

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		
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		
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		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3 (Title Only): 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 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only): 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 major 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.

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments: We removed two indicators from the 2006 Performance Agreement and added two new indicators. The indicators we deleted included only a relatively small number of students, and we replaced them with ones that include larger numbers of students and constituents.

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 2005 = \$110.9M	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = \$115M Target yr 2: FY 2008 = \$118M Target yr 3: FY 2009 = \$120M		
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		
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		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4 (Title Only): Increase financial support from extramural sources

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal Select One				
Institutional Goal 5:				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5 (Title Only):

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal Select One				
Institutional Goal 6:				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6 (Title Only):

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments:

KBOR use only: Institution Name:
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement
Recommendation and Comments