

Kansas State University Performance Report 2nd Year – 1-01-2011 - 12-31-2011

| Institution: Kansas State University | | Contact Person: Kelli Cox | Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-5712 | Date: 03-01-2012 |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------|
| Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes | | | | |
| Institutional Goal 1: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors. | | | | |
| Key Performance Indicator | 3-Year Performance History | Targets | Performance Outcome | Evaluation |
| 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 AY 2009-2011: 1,564 | Target Exceeded |
| 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 AY 2009-2011: 215 | Target Exceeded |
| 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 AY 2009-2011: 266 | Target Exceeded |
| 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% AY 2009-2011: 72% (4,375/6,066) | Target Exceeded |
| 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 2011: 610 | Target Exceeded |

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 (AY 2010-2012) assumed an 8% increase (in the three year average enrollments for the 60 specified courses) from the baseline to the first year, then a 2% increase for each of the remaining two years. For 2010, we exceeded the target, showing a 10.3% increase over the baseline compared to the predicted 8% increase.

In 2011, we once again exceeded our target for the second year, but the percent increase from our first year performance was more in line with our expectations at 2% (from 1535 to 1564). While we have already exceeded our target for the third year of the agreement, we still believe that a

growth rate of 2% between the second and third years is the proper expectation.

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.

For 2011, we exceeded not only the target for this year, but for the third year of the agreements as well. This result is likely due to funding and focus. A few of the programs have increased the number of grants provided to undergraduates choosing to work on research, or have recovered from a few down years due to the economy. Also, since undergraduate research is a focus of K-State's new strategic plan, these programs have put more emphasis on recruiting highly qualified undergraduate students into research.

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.

In 2011, the three-year average number of students earning a C or better in entrepreneurship courses increased by nearly 38%, greatly exceeding the targets for 2011 and 2012. This growth rate is the result of strong interest in the entrepreneurship major in business. With the likelihood of a new interdisciplinary entrepreneurship minor to be implemented in the coming year, we expect this area to continue to grow.

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 2011, once again, we were able to see improvement in student success in the College Algebra course. The three-year average for students receiving a C or better in the course rose to 72%, for 2009-2011, which is significantly higher than our original target for the third year of the agreements. The continued success of this program suggests that the new methodology for teaching College Algebra should be extended to all course sections.

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). Data indicate that retention rates are higher among students who enroll in the FYS compared to those who do not.

We exceeded the target for 2011, as well as the target for 2012. The continued growth in the First Year Seminars is due to increased funding. We have more than doubled the number of classes offered since this program was initiated in 2008, which has led to the increase in enrollments of nearly 28% over the 2010 performance level. The effectiveness of this program as a student retention strategy is a testament for its continued expansion and funding. It is truly a worthwhile investment.

| Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 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. | | | | |
| Key Performance Indicator | 3-Year Performance History | Targets | Performance Outcome | Evaluation |
| 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 FY 2009-2011: 730 | Target Exceeded |
| 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 FY 2009-2011: 9 | Target Not 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 FY 2009-2011: 227 | Target Not Met 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. Demand for graduates in public health fields continues to be strong in 2011 and thus, enrollments in these fields continue to grow. Out of the 12 undergraduate programs tracked, Food Science, Kinesiology, Life Sciences, and Dietetics had the highest growth this past year and according to our recruiters, incoming students are most interested in these areas as well. The target was exceeded for 2011 with directional improvement.

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 23rd in obesity rates and 20th 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: Even though the target for 2011 was not met, there was directional improvement. Many of the students enrolled in MPH are also pursuing their DVM degrees and thus, time to degree will be a little longer. Even so, these graduates with both a DVM and MPH degrees will be in high demand within the state of Kansas, nationally and even internationally.

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. There are about 52,000 job opportunities in the US, with 32,300 specifically in agriculture and life sciences. For this indicator, we have experienced some fluctuations in the number of graduates at K-State, from a high of 234 in 2007 to a low of 191 in 2006.

Targets: This year the number of students graduating actually increased by 1.5% over the previous three year period, thus showing directional improvement but not meeting the 3-year average target for FY 2009-11. Again, the year-to-year change in the number of graduates was positive, increasing from 232 graduates in FY 2010 to 234 graduates in FY 2011.

| 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 (historically under-represented U.S. groups and families with limited resources or access to higher education). | | | | |
| Key Performance Indicator | 3-Year Performance History | Targets | Outcome | Evaluation |
| 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 AY 2011 - 119 8-week courses = 3,037 students and 51 online intersession courses = 1,049 students. | Target Exceeded |
| 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 Fall 2011: 13.5%, 3,218 | Target Exceeded |
| 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%. AY 2011: 38% (6,953/18,201) | Target Met |
| 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 FY 2011: \$677,102 | Target Exceeded; No 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. K-State began 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. The new course formats are very appealing to students especially because they provide students with opportunities to reach their goal of graduating in four years. The 2011 results greatly exceeded the target values for both 2011 and 2012. We expect to continue to show positive growth in the third year of these agreements.

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 20th 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. In 2011, the number of students providing a response of "unknown" for their racial category increased by 150% and the number of multi-racial, Hispanic and Asian responses rose by 31.4%, 10.6% and 13.2% respectively. The number of American Indians and Blacks declined by 12.4% and less than 1% respectively. The 2011 results exceeded the targets for 2011 and 2012 (3,218 under-served students enrolled out of 23,863 total enrolled students = 13.5%). 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 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 2009, the percentage of full-time undergraduate students receiving Need-Based assistance was 36%, and in 2010 a 1% increase matched our goal. For 2011, the percentage again increased by 1% meeting the target. Kansas State University continues to provide financial assistance where the need is identified, even in these times of limited financial resources.

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.

In FY 2009, the contributions were \$946,382, not including scholarships, and in FY 2010 they were \$1,118,970, which exceeded all three of the target years. For FY 2011, the contributions declined to \$677,102 which exceeded the target but was not a positive directional improvement from last year. The reason for the decline is that several funds were awarded over a specific time period which ran out the year prior. Also, 66 contributors were listed in FY 2010 and only 57 contributors were listed for FY 2011. The economic situation in FY 2012 will determine the stability of maintaining the current contributors and possibly recruiting additional contributions.

| Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources. | | | | |
| Key Performance Indicator | 3-Year Performance History | Targets | Performance Outcome | Evaluation |
| 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 FY 2009-2011: \$135.3M | Target Exceeded |
| 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 FY 2011: \$107.2M | Target Exceeded |
| 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 CY 2009-2011: \$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.

The three-year average (2009-2011) extramural funding increased 3%, exceeding both the current target and the target for next year; however, the FY 2011 extramural funds actually declined by 15.6% from FY 2010. This shows the tightness of the number and amount of grants and contracts available. However, the K-State 2025 initiative has increased momentum to aggressively search and apply for extramural funding to reach our goal of being a Top 50 public research institution, and thus we project meeting our target for FY 2012 but may not have directional improvement.

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: Even with the weakened markets, the amount of giving for FY 2011 exceeded FY 2010 by almost 18% with cash and deferred giving showing modest increases. With this strong showing for FY 2011, we project we will show a positive directional improvement for next year even though we have already exceeded targets for all three years.

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%. We are not able to compare our data 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.

For the calendar years 2009 – 2011, 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 \$1.77 million per year. However, the year to year change was positive with a 6.3% growth in FY 2011 compared to FY 2010. In fact, KSURF has projected a 6% increase for FY 2012 which would show a positive directional improvement for next year even though we will not meet the targets.

| 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 CY 2011: 44 projects; 78,025 participants | Target Exceeded |
| 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 CY 2011: \$35.3M | Target Exceeded |
| 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 CY 2011: 69 classes; 7,706 students | Target Exceeded |

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.

We greatly exceeded our target for 2011 in terms of the number of projects and the number of participants, and have shown directional improvement over our performance in 2010. We believe that this is due to the number of campus and community partnerships we have formed, and the activity level of those partnerships.

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. Grants and contracts designated as public service are engaged projects, focusing on connecting campus resources and expertise with the needs and goals of external communities. Data is collected from a database of public service grants and contracts housed in the Office of Sponsored Projects and not through OEMI. Our performance on this indicator greatly exceeded our targets for the three years of the agreements, far beyond our expectations. The results also showed directional improvement over 2010.

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. Developing and receiving approval to teach new courses can be a rather lengthy and involved process, and thus our targets do represent stretch goals.

Through community service, volunteerism, and service learning classes, students develop their citizenship skills while at the same time helping K-State forge effective campus / community partnerships. This target focuses on the number of K-State classes employing a service learning pedagogy and then the total number of students involved in some form of civic engagement initiative. This performance indicator was assessed by using faculty responses to the Kansas Campus Compact annual survey. Encouragement of students to participate in service learning activities by faculty has contributed to meeting and exceeding the targets for all three years.

Comments: For each of the above indicators, we exceeded the targets for all three years. 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, we have not been able to use the OEMI database due to a variety of technical difficulties. Therefore, we have resorted to gathering data through other means and sources. We used these other sources for the 2010 performance results and did so again this year. These new sources are actually more thorough than the OEMI was, and we feel they provide better indicators of our performance in these areas. Given that the data are more thorough, we have shown results for 2010 and 2011 that already exceeds all targets for the indicators in Institutional Goal 5.

| |
|---|
| KBOR use only: Kansas State University |
| Kansas State University is reporting on the second year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in all of its goals. Full funding is recommended. |
| 561.09 |