

## Kansas State University Performance Report 1<sup>st</sup> Year – 1-01-2010 - 12-31-2010

<b>Institution: Kansas State University</b>		Contact Person: Kelli Cox	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-5712	Date: 03-01-2011
<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 1: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
1. Increase the number of students who successfully complete an international/global course experience.	AY 2005-2006 = 1,273 AY 2006-2007 = 1,426, 12% increase AY 2007-2008 = 1,474, 3.4% increase Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 1,391	AY 2008-2010 = 1,503 AY 2009-2011 = 1,533 AY 2010-2012 = 1,564	AY 2008-2010: 1,535	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
2. Increase the number of students who successfully complete a formal undergraduate research experience program.	AY 2005-2006 = 138 AY 2006-2007 = 130, 5.8% decrease AY 2007-2008 = 158, 21.5% increase Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 142	AY 2008-2010 = 173 AY 2009-2011 = 188 AY 2010-2012 = 203	AY 2008-2010: 156	Target not met. No directional improvement.
3. Increase the number of students who successfully complete an Entrepreneurship or Innovation/ Creativity course experience.	AY 2005-2006 = 207 AY 2006-2007 = 232, 12.1% increase AY 2007-2008 = 189, 18.5% decrease Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 209	AY 2008-2010 = 215 AY 2009-2011 = 221 AY 2010-2012 = 227	AY 2008-2010: 216	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
4. Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete MATH 100 College Algebra.	AY 2005-2006 = 60% AY 2006-2007 = 63% AY 2007-2008 = 60% Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 61%	AY 2008-2010 = 63% AY 2009-2011 = 65% AY 2010-2012 = 67%	AY 2008-2010: 70%	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
5. Increase the number of students who successfully complete the First Year Seminars (FYS).	Baseline: Fall 2008 = 253 students	Fall 2010 = 328 Fall 2011 = 403 Fall 2012 = 478	2010: 478	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.

### **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors.**

#### **Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase the number of students who successfully complete an international/global course experience.**

**Data Collection:** Number of students receiving a grade of C or better in approximately 60 K-State courses identified as having an international or global focus will be counted. These courses include study abroad courses, but exclude modern language courses. The average of the previous three years will be reported.

**Performance History:** For the period of time from AY2006 to 2008, K-State averaged nearly 1,400 students who were taking courses with the words “global” or “international” in the title. The numbers have been trending upwards, but the percentage increase has been declining from 12% to 3%.

**Targets:** The target values for the three years of the agreement (AY2010-2012) assumed an 8% increase (in the 3-year average enrollments for the 60 specified courses) from the baseline to the first year, then a 2% increase for the remaining 2 years. For 2010, we exceeded the target. The percentage growth in 2008-2010 enrollments over the baseline was actually 10.3%. The data were gathered from the nearly 60 courses that were originally identified by title as having an international or a global focus.

**Indicator 2: Increase the number of students who successfully complete a formal undergraduate research experience program.**

**Data Collection:** Number of students who successfully complete a formal research program (e.g., Developing Scholars, McNair, Undergraduate Cancer Research Awards, and the University Honors Program) will be counted. The average of the previous three years will be reported.

**3-Year Performance History:** No current national data exist in this area. Over the previous three years, the data that we were able to collect showed major fluctuations from year to year. This is likely due to the amount of funding available in the formal programs.

**Targets:** K-State's goal is to increase the number of students involved in undergraduate research over the next 15 years. In setting the targets, we utilized five formal programs with very limited funding available – Developing Scholars, McNair Scholars, undergraduate research awards from the Johnson Center for Cancer Research, the University Honors Program, and K-INBRE. There are likely to be other research programs that currently exist or will be created for this in the future, given that this is clearly a focus of ours. Our targets represent an increase of over 21% from the baseline to the first year of the agreements, then increase by around 8% for the second and third years of the agreement. Using data from only the originally identified formal research programs, K-State did not meet the target in 2010. If we expand our data sources to formal experiences beyond the named programs, we would have exceeded the target. We defined the research experiences as requiring students to: (1) develop a research project on their own, (2) complete the project in the semester, and (3) present their research in a formal setting. With these experiences factored in, the three-year average for students in a formal research experience was 1,440. This result is significantly higher than all three targets combined.

**Indicator 3: Increase the number of students who successfully complete an Entrepreneurship or Innovation/Creativity course experience.**

**Data Collection:** The number of students receiving a grade of C or better in K-State courses identified as having an entrepreneurship or innovation/creativity focus will be counted. The average of the previous three years will be reported.

**3-Year Performance History:** Entrepreneurship is one of the fastest growing academic areas over the past 10 years. Interest from our prospective students has been steadily increasing over the past 5 years. For our entrepreneurship-related courses, enrollments have fluctuated over the past three years. There has been no identifiable trend, but new programs and courses have been designed.

**Targets:** K-State has initiated an interdisciplinary Center for the Advancement of Entrepreneurship, is in the process of creating an interdisciplinary entrepreneurship minor, and the College of Business Administration has already gained approval for an Entrepreneurship major in Business that begins in Fall 2009. We anticipate that several departments across the university will either initiate new courses on or incorporate into existing courses the topics of entrepreneurship, innovation, and/or creativity. Our target values represent stretch goals of approximately 3% increase for each of the target years. For the 2010 year, 262 students successfully completed course experiences in Entrepreneurship or related topics. The new business major in Entrepreneurship was the main driver of the increase for this indicator. In Fall 2009, there were only six Entrepreneurship majors. The number of majors grew to 64 by Fall 2010, and is nearly 100 in the Spring 2011 semester. For the major, there are two new courses that have been implemented.

**Indicator 4: Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete MATH 100 College Algebra.**

**Data Collection:** Percentage of students receiving a grade of C or better in all sections of MATH 100 will be counted. The average over the previous three years will be reported.

**3-Year Performance History:** Strong performance level compared to national rate. Nationwide, approximately 50% of students receive a C or better in the course, while at K-State the rate has averaged 61% over the past three years (AY 2006-2008), with little change from year to year. This indicator impacts a large number of our students, as the 61% corresponds to approximately 1300 students.

**Targets:** College algebra is generally a gatekeeper course that spells the difference between success and failure for students. The Mathematics Department and the Center for Quantitative Education have developed and implemented an innovative method for teaching algebra in a studio environment that provides students with the opportunity to immediately apply what they have learned in real life situations. Due to the lack of studio space, we cannot offer all sections of college algebra in the new format; however, we have set a stretch goal to increase the percent of students receiving a C or better in the course to 67% over the next 3 years. In this first year of the program (2010), we achieved exceptional student improvement in MATH 100 over the baseline. The 2009 performance level of 71% (1464 out of 2070 students) and 2010 performance level of 74% (1421 out of 1927 students) resulted in the increase of our 3-year average to 70% for 2008-10.

**Indicator 5: Increase the number of students who successfully complete the First Year Seminars (FYS).**

**Data Collection:** Number of students receiving a grade of C or better in K-State FYS courses will be counted at the end of each fall semester.

**3-Year Performance History:** No previous three year performance history available from K-State.

**Targets:** The First-Year Seminars (FYS) program was created to help students make the transition to living and learning in the university. The FYS courses provide an open environment where students can ask questions about the university, practice skills needed to succeed, and learn about additional support systems that are available in the K-State community. Each course section is limited to 22 freshmen. The FYS program was piloted in Fall 2008 with 16 sections (270 students), with the hope for 23 sections in Fall 2009. Budget reductions have not affected the program yet, as the number of sections has grown to 28 in Fall 2010 with 478 students served. Data indicate that retention rates are higher among students who enroll in the FYS compared to those who do not. We will clearly continue to fund this successful program.

<b>Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 2: Provide campus-based learners with educational experiences aligned directly with the workforce demands of Kansas, specifically in the areas of Public Health, Animal Health and Biotechnology.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
1. Increase the number of students who graduate in undergraduate degree programs that are directly relevant to public health.	FY 2006 = 609 FY 2007 = 683, 12.2% increase FY 2008 = 640, 6.3% decrease  Baseline: FY 2006-2008 = 644	FY 2008-2010 = 690 graduates FY 2009-2011 = 710 graduates FY 2010-2012 = 730 graduates	FY 2008-2010: 693	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
2. Increase the number of students graduating in the Masters in Public Health (MPH) program.	FY 2006 = 4 FY 2007 = 4 FY 2008 = 6  Baseline: FY 2006-2008 = 5	FY 2008-2010 = 8 FY 2009-2011 = 10 FY 2010-2012 = 11	FY 2008-2010: 8	Target met. Directional improvement.
3. Increase the number of bachelor's degree graduates in the combined areas of Animal Science and Biology.	FY 2006 = 191 FY 2007 = 234; 22.5% increase FY 2008 = 224, 4.3% decrease  Baseline: FY 2006-2008 = 216	FY 2008-2010 = 228 FY 2009-2011 = 235 FY 2010-2012 = 241	FY 2008-2010: 224	Target not met. No directional improvement.

**INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Provide campus-based and community-based learners educational experiences which are aligned directly with the workforce demands of Kansas, specifically in the areas of Public Health, Animal Health and Biotechnology.**

**Indicator 1: Increase the number of students who graduate in undergraduate degree programs that are directly relevant to public health.**

**Data Collection:** Twelve undergraduate programs, spanning three colleges across the University, have been identified as directly relevant to public health. The summer, fall, and spring graduates in these programs will be counted, and a 3-year average will be computed.

**3-Year Performance History:** The undergraduate programs related to public health have had steady growth over the past three years. These programs are in the College of Agriculture, College of Arts and Sciences, and College of Human Ecology. Each of these colleges has multiple funding sources in addition to tuition and the state general fund (i.e., Cooperative Extension, Agriculture Experiment Station, NIH and NSF grants, etc.). These funding sources provide opportunities for growth in each of the programs, as they are not completely dependent on State funds and tuition dollars for financial support.

**Targets:** Thirty-four percent of the aggregate public health jobs are administrative positions, which likely require either an associates or bachelors degree at entry. K-State is dedicated to preparing students for these administrative public health positions. Over the past three years, the trend for the number of graduates in necessary degree programs has been fluctuating. Our target values project an increase in enrollments of 4% per year. Given the uncertain economic climate and potential decreases in enrollments, the 3-year averages were set to increase by 3% per year. Though the three-year average (2008-2010) of graduates in a public health, animal health, and/or biotechnology focus (a 1.8% increase from the previous 3-year average) slightly exceeded the goal of 690 students, the number of graduates in the past two years (721 in FY 2009 and 720 in FY 2010) has been significantly higher, showing a 12.5% increase from FY 2008.

**Indicator 2: Increase the number of students graduating in the Masters in Public Health (MPH) program.**

**Data Collection:** Number of graduates in the MPH program each year will be counted, and a three-year average will be reported.

**3-Year Performance History:** The health of Kansas citizens and communities depends on establishing and maintaining a workforce of competent public health professionals. Currently, there are areas that could be improved, as the state ranks 23<sup>rd</sup> in obesity rates and 20<sup>th</sup> in human cases of West Nile virus. At the same time, Kansas is deficient in public health workers compared to the Midwest region and the country. In 2000, there were only 63 public health workers per 100,000 Kansans, compared to 77 workers per 100,000 in surrounding states. There is a need to increase public health workers and professionals. The MPH program has been in existence for only a brief time, and is a small program, as the averages demonstrate.

**Targets:** The number of graduates in the MPH program met the target. The number of MPH degrees conferred in each of the last two years was nine. More importantly, the number enrolled in the MPH program has grown dramatically in the last five years, tripling the number of majors. Thus the opportunity to exceed the targets in the future looks very promising.

**Indicator 3: Increase the number of bachelor's degree graduates in the combined areas of Animal Science and Biology.**

**Data Collection:** Number of graduates in the Biology and Animal Science undergraduate degree programs.

**3-Year Performance History:** The Animal Science and Biology programs at K-State are two programs with the highest enrollments in their respective colleges. The curriculum prepares students in each of these programs to pursue several options after graduation, such as attaining a DVM or another health professional degree or seeking job opportunities within the public health field. In addition, Purdue University and USDA's Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service produced a report on the Employment Opportunities for College Graduates in the U.S. Food, Agricultural and Natural Resources System 2005-2010. This report found the strongest opportunities are in food safety/biosecurity, nutrition services, and animal health and well-being. Basically, there are about 52,000 job opportunities in the US, with 32,300 specifically in agriculture and life sciences. Recent trend data show that the number of graduates with bachelors degrees has declined, while enrollment has increased by an average of 4% over the last three years. We have experienced some fluctuations in the number of graduates at K-State, from a high of 234 to a low of 191.

**Targets:** For FY 2009, the number of graduates declined to 212. Thus, with the uncertain economic climate and fluctuation in the number of students graduating year to year, the targets are based on a 2.5% increase in the 3-year average from FY 2010 to FY 2012.

**Results:** As suspected, the fluctuation in the number of students graduating created a 0.3% decline in the three-year average and thus, the indicator did not meet the target nor did it have directional improvement (compared to FY 2007-2009). However, the year-to-year change in the number of graduates was positive, increasing from 215 graduates in FY 2009 to 232 graduates in FY 2010.

<b>Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (historically under-represented U.S. groups and families with limited resources or access to higher education).</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
1. Increase the number of courses offered in non-traditional formats such as online intersession (two or three week session) and eight week courses during the Academic Year.	AY 2007 = 12 online 8-week classes = 149 students; 0 online intersession; AY 2008 = 16 online 8 week classes = 305 students; 0 online intersession; AY 2009 = 16 online 8 week classes = 376 students; 10 online intersession classes = 290 students.  Baseline: AY 2009 = 16 online 8 week classes = 376 students; 10 online intersession classes = 290 students.	AY 2010 – 28 8-week courses = 445 students; 12 online intersession courses = 310 students. AY 2011 - 33 8-week courses = 519 students; 14 online intersession courses = 330 students. AY 2012 - 33 8-week courses = 597 students; 16 online intersession courses = 350 students.	AY 2010: 48 8-week courses = 812 students; 26 online intersession courses = 600 students	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
2. Increase the percent of historically under-served students enrolled.	Fall 2006 = 9.10%, 2,109 Fall 2007 = 9.51%, 2,218 Fall 2008 = 9.69%, 2,278  Baseline: Fall 2008 = 9.69%, 2,278	Fall 2010 = 9.90%, 2,346 Fall 2011 = 10.2%, 2,417 Fall 2012 = 10.5%, 2,489	Fall 2010: 12.5%, 2,946	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
3. Increase the percentage of full-time undergraduate students receiving Need-Based assistance.	AY 2007 = 25%, 4,557 AY 2008 = 35%, 6,224 AY 2009 = 36%, 6,249  Baseline: AY 2009 = 36%, 6,249	AY 2010 = 37% AY 2011 = 38% AY 2012 = 39%	AY 2010: 37%.	Target met. Directional improvement.
4. Increase the amount of external resources contributed through the KSU Foundation for diversity programs and services.	FY 2006 = \$410,206 FY 2007 = \$614,711, 49.9% increase FY 2008 = \$557,808, 9.3% increase  Baseline: FY 2008 = \$557,808	FY 2010 = \$607,000 FY 2011 = \$657,000 FY 2012 = \$707,000	FY 2010: \$1,118,970	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.

**INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (historically under-represented U.S. groups and families with limited resources or access to higher education).**

**Indicator 1: Increase the number of students enrolled in courses of non-traditional formats such as online intersession (two to three week session) and eight week courses during the Academic Year.**

**Data Collection:** Count the number of courses offered/number of students enrolled during winter, spring, and summer Intersessions which are taught online, and count the number of course offerings/number of students enrolled during the fall and spring semesters that are taught in an 8 week format.

**3-Year Performance History:** The Chronicle Research Services report that looked at The College of 2020 found that institutions need to be more flexible and to start courses and programs at multiple times throughout the year. The report also predicts that more students will attend classes online, study part time, take courses from multiple institutions, and transfer in and out of colleges. Such flexibility provides increased educational options to families who have limited resources or access to higher education. Such non-traditional options as online intersession courses and 8-week courses provide avenues for those with limited resources to take full-time courses or allow them to take courses from home via online technology. Over the past three years, K-State has begun to move in this direction with a large increase in 8-week course offerings from AY 2007 to AY 2008. K-State has offered several semester online courses, but in AY 2008 offered its first online intersession course during the August intersession, and then expanded to four courses in January, two courses for the May intersession and four courses in August.

**Targets:** Through the Division of Continuing Education (DCE), students are able to complete coursework that will lead to additional specialized education, a certificate, or graduation. DCE courses are offered in several modes of delivery, including face-to-face, mediated, asynchronous and synchronous formats, with new courses, programs, and certificates being developed and approved. Offerings through the DCE realized a 13% increase in student credit hours for the 2008-2009 academic year. The targets reflect an increase in the number of students enrolled of approximately 12-13% per year. With reduced funding and staff, the development and implementation of these courses create some challenges. In 2010, the January intersession offered 10 classes, May intersession offered seven classes and August intersession offered nine classes. The 8-week courses offered in the fall and spring were concentrated in the areas of sociology, animal sciences, family studies and human services, and hotel & restaurant management. This indicator has exceeded all target years.

**Indicator 2: Increase the number of historically under-served students enrolled at K-State.**

**Data Collection:** The number of African American/Black, Asian American, Hispanic American/Mexican, Native American, and multiracial American students enrolled on the 20<sup>th</sup> day fall semester, which includes undergraduate and graduate students.

**3-Year Performance History:** Like the rest of the country, the population base of Kansas is diversifying. The further one looks into the K-12 pipeline, the more diverse the cohorts of students become. As an institution, we seek to increase the enrollment of students from the minority population, many of whom are first generation and low-income. K-State's ethnic/racial proportions do reflect the state's population as a whole, but Hispanic students are the least well-represented ethnic group in the student body when compared to the proportion of Hispanics in Kansas.

**Targets:** Kansas State University is currently engaged in many new initiatives to expand the access, recruitment, and retention of under-served students in Kansas. Additionally, the excellence of our nationally-ranked academic programs is beginning to attract more multicultural students from out-of-state. The targets reflect a 3% increase each year. The percentage increase in our multicultural student enrollment over the last three years has averaged 4.9%, but was only 2.7% in Fall 2008. We believe the worsening economic climate contributed to this decline in percentage increase in our enrollment, and thus, our goal of a 3% increase each year over the next three years represents an ambitious one, given the uncertainties of any financial recovery in the near future.

**Results:** With the new mandate by OMB and Department of Education to resurvey the student population to ensure that each student has had an opportunity to report his/her race/ethnicity using the new format, the number of unknown responses declined by 85% and the number of multi-racial and Hispanic responses rose by 56% and 30% respectively. The number of American Indians and Asians declined (23% and 2% respectively) with Black increasing by 12%. This indicator has exceeded all three target years (2,946 under-served students enrolled out of 23,588 total enrolled students = 12.5%). In the future, we project there will be directional improvement, but not at the same rate.

**Indicator 3: Increase the percentage of full-time undergraduate students receiving Need-Based assistance.**

**Data Collection:** The percentage of full-time undergraduate students receiving need-based grant assistance from all federal, state and university sources in an academic year.

**Performance History:** With the ever increasing cost for tuition, books, and housing, and the downturn in the economy, nationally and within the state of Kansas, more students will be applying for need-based assistance. For K-State, this trend actually started in AY 2008 with an increase of 10% more full-time students receiving need-based assistance. This is compounded by the fact the number of full-time students has declined since AY 07.

**Targets:** The baseline percentage corresponds to 6,249 students, so this is a significant number of students who are impacted by this indicator. The university has limited financial aid resources, while at the same time more students have financial need due to the declining economy. Thus, there is more demand with potentially fewer resources. Therefore, our targets of an increase of 1% each year represent a significant stretch goal. In 2010, we achieved positive directional improvement compared to the baseline. We exceeded the 2009 baseline by 295 students who received Need Based Tuition Waivers (6,544 undergraduate students were provided with need-based aid out of a total enrollment of 17,689 = 37%).

**Indicator 4: Increase the amount of external resources contributed through the KSU Foundation for diversity programs and services.**

**Data Collection:** The amount of external resources designated in a fiscal year for diversity programs and services that were raised through the Kansas State University Foundation.

**3-Year Performance History:** The baseline is the sum of gifts received from individuals, foundations, and corporations by the KSU Foundation for diversity programs in FY 2008. Over the past three years, the amount of external resources have fluctuated which may be due primarily to the tough economic times we are currently facing.

**Targets:** Many students from historically underserved populations, though not all of them, come to the university as first-generation students with economic challenges. Though extremely talented, many of these students need more financial support, guidance, mentorship, monitoring, advisement, engagement, and involvement in order to be successful. The infrastructure to provide these programs and services needs to be enhanced and cannot be developed with existing resources. The targets reflect an increase of \$50,000 each year in the amount of funding raised, or about 7.5% per year. In these uncertain financial times, we believe these targets represent stretch values.

**Results:** In FY 2009, the contributions were \$946,382, not including scholarships, and in FY 2010 they were 1,118,970. The FY 2009 and FY2010 contributions exceeded all three of the target years. Many companies and organizations continued or increased their commitment to diversity through departmental support, professorships, faculty fellowships, student clubs and organizations, and student financial assistance/awards. We anticipate that this positive directional improvement will continue in the future.

<b>Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources.</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
1. Increase the amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity.	FY 2007 = \$114.1M FY 2008 = \$118.0M, 3.5% increase FY 2009 = \$120.0M, 1.7% increase Baseline: FY 2007-FY 2009 = \$117.4M	FY 2008-2010 = \$120.5M FY 2009-2011 = \$123.6M FY 2010-2012 = \$127.3M	FY 2008-2010: \$133.1M	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
2. Increase the amount of private support (cash and deferred).	FY 2007 = \$91.5M FY 2008 = \$99.5 M, 8.8% increase FY 2009 = \$81.5M, 18.1% decrease Baseline: FY 2009 = \$81.5M	FY 2010 = \$83.1M FY 2011 = \$84.8M FY 2012 = \$86.5M	FY 2010: \$90.9M	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
3. Increase the amount of licensing income from the use of university-based technologies by other groups.	CY 2006 = \$1.59M CY 2007 = \$1.42M, 10.7% decrease CY 2008 = \$1.58M, 11.3% increase Baseline: CY 2008 = \$1.58M	CY 2008-2010 = \$1.69M CY 2009-2011 = \$1.77M CY 2010-2012 = \$1.84M	CY 2008-2010: \$1.51M	Target not met. No directional improvement.

**INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources.**

**Indicator 1: Increase the amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity.**

**Data Collection:** Average funding over a previous three-year period will be reported for each target year.

**3-Year Performance History:** Annual growth over the last four years (FY06 – FY09) has averaged 2%.

**Targets:** We have incorporated a stretch goal of a 3% increase on the three-year average baseline amount to obtain the target values. Despite the poor economic conditions, we have received some support through federal stimulus funding. Thus, we are optimistic about reaching our goal.

**Results:** Extramural funding in the past two years has increased over 10% each year and the target for 2008-2010 was exceeded. This outcome was welcomed, but unexpected.

**Indicator 2: Increase the amount of private support (cash and deferred).**

**Data Collection:** Data will be collected from the KSU Foundation and will be the amount recorded in cash and deferred gifts in each year.

**3-Year Performance History:** We have included this indicator in past performance agreements, but are modifying the baseline to reflect the highly reduced giving levels that we have experienced in FY 2009. We are anticipating that the extraordinary economic times will make fundraising more difficult than in the past and will change the manner in which people choose to contribute. The past few years have shown volatility from one year to the next in the amount of private support provided in a single year. The average increase per year from fiscal year 2006 to 2008 was 3.65%, but from 2008 to 2009 there was an 18% decline.

**Targets:** The gift level for 2009 dropped significantly compared to 2008 but regained in 2010 to similar levels for cash in 2008 and deferred in 2005. With the economic situation as it is, one would have thought the deferred giving might outpace the cash but fortunately, that was not the case in 2010.

**Indicator 3: Increase the amount of licensing income from the use of university-based and university owned technologies by other groups.**

**Data Collection:** Annual licensing revenue will be reported.

**3-Year Performance History:** From CY2006 to CY2008, the average increase was 0.15%. Unable to compare to national rate due to this being a specialized program.

**Targets:** This indicator has been expanded from previous performance agreements. In the past, we included only licensing income from university-based technologies, while the current agreement also includes university-owned technologies. Thus, the target amounts are significantly larger than were included in our past performance agreements. Some examples of licensed technologies include wheat varieties and wheat starch products. Because of the uncertainty of the economic climate, we have chosen to include three-year averages for the target values. The target values reflect projected increases over the baseline of 4% per year, which we consider to be a stretch goal in light of the recent trend data.

**Results:** For the calendar years 2008 – 2010, Kansas State University Research Foundation (KSURF) received over \$4.5 million in licensing revenue for an average of \$1.5 million per year. This is under the forecasted average of \$1.69 million per year. Several agreements were terminated for various reasons that resulted in lost revenue for 2010. Three licenses were assumed in mergers and then cancelled by the acquiring party. Only two new commercial agreements were signed in 2010. On the bright side, wheat varieties licensed to one entity are yielding royalties in excess of the forecast. Although companies continue to examine the licensing of various technologies, they are selective and are not making large investments at this time.

**Regents System Goal F: Improve Community/Civic Engagement**

**Institutional Goal 5: Improve Kansas State University’s civic and community engagement with Kansans and Kansas’ communities by building collaborative, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships, resulting in the exchange of new knowledge.**

Key Performance Indicator	Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase the number of participants in community-based, research and outreach projects.	CY 2008 = 27 projects: 15,000 participants	CY 2010 = 30 projects: 15,500 participants CY 2011 = 32 projects: 16,000 participants CY 2012 = 34 projects: 16,500 participants	CY 2010: 40 projects; 71,825 participants	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
2. Increase the revenue generated for K-State’s partner communities as a direct result of engaged activities.	2008 Baseline = \$3.17M generated from engaged work for community partners	CY 2010 = \$3.33M CY 2011 = \$3.50M CY 2012 = \$3.67M	CY 2010: \$19.92M	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.
3. Increase the number of students participating in service learning classes.	CY 2008 = 33 classes: 286 students	CY 2010 = 35 classes; 306 students CY 2011 = 36 classes; 316 students CY 2012 = 37 classes; 326 students	CY 2010: 57 classes; 3,417 students	Target exceeded. Directional improvement.

**INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Improve Kansas State University’s civic and community engagement with Kansans and Kansas’ communities by building collaborative, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial partnerships, resulting in the exchange of new knowledge.**

**Indicator 1: Increase the number of participants in community-based, research and outreach projects.**

**Data Collection:** Number of community-based, research and outreach projects and number of participants reported through KSU’s Outreach and Engagement Measuring Instrument (OEMI).

**3-Year Performance History:** No previous three-year performance history available from K-State.

**Targets:** Kansas State University has the expressed goal of becoming a more engaged university. One way to assess this goal is to determine the number of engaged projects in which faculty (both campus and extension professionals) are involved in terms of community-based research and outreach projects. The projects in the baseline served approximately 15,000 individuals, including students, faculty, and community citizens. K-State has just begun benchmarking engaged faculty work through the implementation of the OEMI. This measuring instrument will indicate the variety of and breadth of engaged work occurring at Kansas State University. We do not have any historical trends on which to base our targets, but the values chosen represent a significant increase in outreach of about 3% per year, and thus, represent stretch goals.

**Indicator 2: Increase the revenue generated for K-State’s partner communities as a direct result of engaged activities.**

**Data Collection:** The K-State Center for Engagement and Community Development (CECD) has begun using the OEMI to benchmark its engagement activities and the outcomes of such activities in 2010. Each year, faculty receiving engagement grants will complete the survey to report on their work with their community partners, including not-for-profits, social service agencies, community economic development groups, small businesses, and others. The instrument collects information on the types of projects, the number of participants touched by the engaged work, and the revenue generated as a result of the engaged work. For the purposes of this indicator, the focus was on the revenue generated for the community partners as a direct result of the engagement projects. The reported revenue generated includes any external grants received by the communities, contracts, new business revenue, or other funds generated solely through the campus-community partnerships and in support of the community organizations.

**3-Year Performance History:** The CECD was created in 2005 to extend and expand upon K-State’s land grant mission by serving as a place where university faculty and community leaders can come together to address community challenges, meet community needs, and realize community dreams through effective scholarship-based engagement. The CECD has a one-year of history using the OEMI. The instrument was developed and tested at Michigan State University, where it has been used for nearly 15 years to track their outreach and engagement activity. Other land grant universities use the same instrument.

**Targets:** The targets reflect an assumption of 5% growth in the revenue generated for each year 2010-2012. Since K-State has only begun using the OEMI in 2008, we feel a growth rate of 5% per year is a stretch goal. The difficult economic times could hinder the ability of our faculty and partners to obtain grants, but we feel that we can sharpen our efforts over the three years of this agreement.

**Indicator 3: Increase the number of students participating in service learning classes.**

**Data Collection:** Number of Kansas State University students attending classes that incorporate service-learning as a teaching pedagogy.

**3-Year Performance History:** No previous three-year performance history available from K-State.

**Targets:** Service learning is an engaged teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience for students, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities. This performance indicator will be assessed by using faculty responses to the Kansas Campus Compact annual survey, the Center for Engagement and Community Development's OEMI survey, and OEIE's evaluation of the WaterLink program. All ask faculty about incorporating service learning into their classes. It is anticipated that KSU will increase the number of service learning classes by two each year between 2010 and 2012. The number of students who were involved with the baseline number of courses was 286. As the number of courses is increased, more students will be involved in these types of activities. Developing and receiving approval to teach new courses can be a rather lengthy and involved process, and thus our targets do represent stretch goals. The number of classes is targeted to increase by one class per year enrolling an additional 10 students, or about 3% growth per year.

**Comments:** For each of the above indicators, we exceeded all three years of targets. For our baseline data, we used data from a new survey instrument, the Outreach and Engagement Measurement Instrument (OEMI), developed by Michigan State University. We piloted the OEMI using a sample of 50 faculty members to determine our baseline and targets for each area. As these performance areas were new for us, we had no other source of institutional data from which to draw for the development of the baseline and targets. Unfortunately, the OEMI database is not yet ready for use. Therefore, we had to use another source for 2010 performance results. In 2010, we applied to the Carnegie Foundation to secure the "engaged university" designation. In completing this application, we had to identify campus / community partnerships, money generated by these partnerships (both for university and for community group), and the number of service learning classes and students enrolled in those classes. This was a campus-wide data collection effort, and these are the data used for the indicators above. We should be able to use the OEMI in late 2011 to catalog our engagement activities across the entire campus, and it will be used in future years for this area of performance indicators. We will discuss the need to adjust our baseline and the targets to reflect this change of participants.

**KBOR use only: Kansas State University**

- Kansas State University is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in all of its goals. Full funding is recommended.
- Staff has asked K-State to submit revisions to its 2010-2012 performance agreement. The revisions would raise targets for indicators in which the institution's 2010 performance greatly exceeded the targets. The institution has agreed to do so and will bring the proposed revisions to BAASC in the Fall.