

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 **THREE YEAR PERFORMANCE HISTORY**, i.e., value of the key performance indicator (data) for December 31, 2007, 2006, and 2005, if available. If the key performance indicator is an average, be sure to show the appropriate average for each of the past three years.
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. **EVALUATION** of performance, i.e., target met, target not met, directional improvement or no directional improvement.
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.
7. The narrative should not repeat information in the table. Instead, the narrative should provide explanation of anything in the table that may not be obvious to the reader. If applicable, the narrative for the performance report should also describe any circumstances that prevented the institution from making directional improvement and specific future plans for improving performance.

Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

1. **Institutional Goal 1:** List goal exactly as it appears in the summary table.

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Data point 1): Identify the data to be collected using 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, so absolutely no doubt exists as to how the data are calculated. When appropriate, indicate the range of scores (as in a survey or standardized test).
- b. 3-year Performance History:** Indicate whether these values represent relatively low, average, or strong performance. Comparison to state or national data will be useful.
- c. 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 comments that are **ESSENTIAL** to understanding the goal. A layperson should be able to understand the goal, its implications, and its significance.

And so on up to six goals.

Performance Agreement/Report

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Kelli Cox	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-5712	Date: Revised 12-6-11
---	---------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 1: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase the number of students who successfully complete an international/global course experience.	AY 2007-2008 = 6,874 students; AY 2008-2009 = 7,061 students, 3% increase; AY 2009-2010 = 7,353 students, 4% increase Baseline: AY 2008-2010 = 7096 students (3-year average)	Year 1: AY 2008-2010 = 7,096 students (3-year average) ACTUAL Year 2: AY 2009-2011 = 7,240 students (3-year average) Year 3: AY 2010-2012 = 7,385 students (3-year average)		
2. Increase the number of students who successfully complete a formal undergraduate research experience program.	AY 2005-2006 = 1,032 students; AY 2006-2007 = 1,307 students, 26.6% increase; AY 2007-2008 = 1,373 students, 5% increase Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 1,237 students (3-year average)	Year 1: AY 2008-2010 = 1,286 students (3-year average) ACTUAL Year 2: AY 2009-2011 = 1,312 students (3-year average) Year 3: AY 2010-2012 = 1,338 students (3-year average)		
3. Increase the number of students who successfully complete an Entrepreneurship or Innovation/	AY 2005-2006 = 207 students; AY 2006-2007 = 232	Year 1: AY 2008-2010 = 215 students (3-year average)		

Creativity course experience.	students, 12.1% increase; AY 2007-2008 = 189 students, 18.5% decrease Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 209 students (3-year average)	Year 2: AY 2009-2011 = 221 students (3-year average) Year 3: AY 2010-2012 = 227 students (3-year average)		
4. Increase the percentage of students who successfully complete MATH 100 College Algebra.	AY 2005-2006 = 60% successful completion; AY 2006-2007 = 63% successful completion; AY 2007-2008 = 60% successful completion Baseline: AY 2006-2008 = 66% successful completion (3-year average)	Year 1: AY 2008-2010 = 70% successful completion (3-year average) ACTUAL Year 2: AY 2009-2011 = 72% successful completion (3-year average) Year 3: AY 2010-2012 = 74% successful completion (3-year average)		
5. Increase the number of students who successfully complete the First Year Seminars (FYS).	No previous 3 year performance history available from K-State. Baseline: Fall 2008 = 258 students	Year 1: Fall 2010 = 478 students ACTUAL Year 2: Fall 2011 = 600 students Year 3: Fall 2012 = 690 students		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1(Title Only): Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors.

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Increase the number of students who successfully complete an international/global course experience.

Data Collection: We have altered our method for measuring our performance for this indicator. Our previous list of courses did not include all courses with an international or global focus. This new method includes every such course in the course catalog approved in 2010 by the new general education Global Issues and Perspectives area as having an international/global focus, which is a better reflection of the courses available to include for this indicator. The data collected will thus be the number of students receiving a grade of C or better in the approximately 200 Kansas

State University courses identified as having an international or global focus. The measure will be the average number of successful students over the three previous years.

3-Year Performance History: For the period of time from AY2008 to 2010, Kansas State University averaged 7096 students who received a C or better in the identified courses. The number of students successfully completing these courses increased by 3% from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 and again increased 4% in 2009-2010. But the growth slowed in 2010-2011 to less than 1%. We used the 2008-2010 average as our baseline for the remaining two years of the agreement.

Targets: The University's new general education program will require all incoming students to take a class from the list of courses in the Global Issues and Perspectives area during their collegiate training, thus we do expect the numbers of students earning a C or better to increase, but this increase will occur gradually. Considering the slower growth in the past two years, we have set targets for the remaining two years of the performance agreements to reflect 2% growth per year.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Increase the number of students who successfully complete a formal undergraduate research experience program.

Data Collection: We have altered our method for measuring our performance for this indicator. Our previous method counted only students enrolled in formal research programs. This method was flawed in that those formal programs were working with limited funding and could not grow, and that we realized we were undercounting the number of students who were engaged in courses that included research projects as part of the class. Thus, the new indicator will count the number of students who successfully complete a formal research program (e.g., Developing Scholars, McNair Scholars, Undergraduate Cancer Research Awards, and the University Honors Program), plus those students who earned a C or better in undergraduate courses that include a formal research experience. Forty-nine undergraduate courses have been identified as including a formal research experience, defined as carrying out a full scholarly experience in which results were presented in a public forum. The measure will be the average of the previous three years.

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. Using the new method for data gathering, there was a 7% increase from the 2006-2008 to the 2007-2009 three-year average, but a 4% decrease for the 2008-2010 three-year average. Some fluctuation is likely due to the amount of funding available in the formal programs. We used the 3-year average from 2008-2010 as the baseline to predict the final two years of the agreement.

Targets: The University's strategic plan calls for increasing the number of undergraduates who complete a research experience. The projected targets reflect an increase of 26 students over the previous year's measure, or about a 2% increase annually in the number of undergraduate students participating in research.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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: There is no comparable data at the class level, however entrepreneurship represents one of the fastest growing academic areas in higher education over the past 10 years. Interest from prospective students has been steadily increasing over the past 5 years. In

addition, in the 2005 “Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity State Report,” the State of Kansas ranks in the lower third among all states in entrepreneurial activity per capita. There is clearly a need for an enhanced focus on Entrepreneurship on all university campuses. The number of students participating in entrepreneurship and innovation courses over the last three years has fluctuated from year to year, showing no identifiable trend.

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. This is an area of growth for the University, as students from all majors will have access to courses designed to enhance their interest and potential for the pursuit of entrepreneurial activity within their major. Our target values represent stretch goals of approximately 3% increase for each of the target years.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 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: K-State has shown strong performance levels compared to the national rate. Nationwide, approximately 50% of students receive a C or better in the course, while at K-State the rate has averaged 70% over the three years from AY2008 to AY2010). This indicator impacts approximately 1300 students.

Targets: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. K-State’s excellent performance on this measure is primarily due to new approaches to mathematics instruction developed by the Mathematics Department and the Center for Quantitative Education. We now offer the course using two methods: the traditional lecture/recitation version and a new studio version. The studio version replaces one lecture with a studio session where students have the opportunity to apply what they have been learning to real-world situations and connect the techniques they have learned to other areas of interest. Unfortunately, limitations on both studio space and teaching personnel mean that only about 1/3 of the students can be served by the studio version. We have not ignored the traditional version, however, and have made other changes that affect both methods. We have created an online homework system with substantial feedback options and are experimenting with using a classroom response system to improve engagement during lectures. Our new stretch goal is to increase the percentage of students receiving a C or better in College Algebra at 2% points per year.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 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: There has been about a 26% increase each year for the past three years.

Targets: We are revising our targets for this indicator because we were able to achieve our 2012 target in the first year of the three-year agreement due to an increase in funding for the program (which led to an increase in the number of sections offered). The purpose of the FYS program is to help students make the transition to university courses and college-level learning. Each course section has a maximum enrollment of 22 students and is limited to freshmen only. The FYS program was piloted in Fall 2008 with 16 sections and approximately 258 students enrolled. In Fall 2010, we were able to fund 29 sections of the class, which allowed 478 students to successfully complete the FYS. For the fall 2011, we offered 36 sections of

the FYS. Given that the number of sections has increased by nearly 25% from 2010 to 2011, we expect students who complete the class to grow by 25% also. For the third year (2012), it is not clear yet if we will be adding more sections. We will project an increase of 15% in student successfully completing the class, assuming that we do not increase the number of sections but fill all 36 sections (at present, enrollments are about 19 per section).

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) 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 (Data)	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 graduates FY 2007 = 683 graduates, 12.2% increase FY 2008 = 640 graduates, 6.3% decrease Baseline: FY 2006-2008 = 644 graduates, (3 year average)	Year 1: FY 2008-2010 = 690 graduates (3 year average) Year 2: FY 2009-2011 = 710 graduates (3 year average) Year 3: FY 2010-2012 = 730 graduates (3 year average)		
2. Increase the number of students graduating in the Masters in Public Health (MPH) program.	FY 2006 = 4 graduates FY 2007 = 4 graduates FY 2008 = 6 graduates Baseline: FY 2006-2008 = 5 graduates (3 year average)	Year 1: FY 2008-FY 2010 = 8 graduates (3 year average) Year 2: FY 2009-2011 = 10 graduates (3 year average) Year 3: FY 2010-2012 = 11 graduates (3 year average)		
3. Increase the number of bachelor's degree graduates in the combined areas of Animal Science and Biology.	FY 2006 = 191 graduates FY 2007 = 234 graduates; 22.5%	Year 1: FY 2008-2010 = 228 graduates (3 year average) Year 2: FY 2009-		

	<p>increase FY 2008 = 224 graduates, 4.3% decrease</p> <p>Baseline: FY 2006- 2008 = 216 graduates, (3 year average)</p>	<p>2011 = 235 graduates (3 year average) Year 3: FY 2010- 2012 = 241 graduates (3 year average)</p>		
4.				
5.				

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): 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.

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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.

Target: The aggregate makeup of the public health workforce employed by the 50 states is described in a 2007 report issued by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. In general, 34% of the aggregate public-health state work force resides in administrative positions that are likely to require either an associates or bachelors degree at entry. K-State is dedicated to preparing students with different backgrounds for these opportunities. Recent trend data show that the number of graduates has fluctuated in these programs at K-State over the past three years. Our target values reflect an annual increase in the number of graduates of 4% per year. Thus, with the uncertain economic climate, potential decreases in enrollment, and the time to degree fluctuations, the baseline and targets are three-year averages reflecting a stretch goal of 3% increase per year.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 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 and well-being of Kansas citizens and communities depends on establishing and maintaining a competent public health workforce. Currently, the health of the public in Kansas presents significant opportunities for improvement. For example, the state ranks 23rd in obesity rates for children and adults; the state is 20th in human cases of the emerging vector-borne disease West Nile virus. At the same

time, Kansas is deficient in public health workers when compared to the midwest region and the nation. According to the National Center for Health Workforce Information Analysis conducted for HRSA in 2000 there were 1678 public health workers in Kansas. This translates to 63 public health workers per 100,000 Kansans. In the same survey, the mean worker-to-population ratio for the region that includes Kansas, Iowa, Missouri and Nebraska was 77 workers per 100,000 residents. Nationally, the ratio was 158 workers per 100,000 US citizens. The shortfall of public health workers in Kansas documented in 2000 is likely to get worse rather than better, given that 41% of public health workers in Kansas will be eligible for retirement by 2012, and the state's population is projected to grow rather than to shrink.

Targets: The aggregate makeup of the public health workforce employed by the states is described in a 2007 report issued by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. In general, 39% of the workforce is comprised of professionals, including: environment health workers, food scientists, laboratory workers, social workers, epidemiologists, health educators, nutritionists and public health information specialists. In these careers that require at least a bachelors degree for entry, professional growth and advancement typically requires graduate education and at least a Masters degree. The target values were chosen to reflect an increase in graduates of 5% per year. The 3-year average baseline and targets meet or exceed the KBOR required minimum for a masters program. The number of enrolled students in this program from 2005 through 2008 has remained fairly constant, but we have selected an aggressive goal of 10-25% increase. This represents a stretch goal, particularly in light of the uncertain economic climate.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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 Univeristy 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.

Targets: Animal health companies demand a skilled workforce that includes university trained scientists with bachelors, masters and doctoral degrees in life sciences and veterinary medicine as well as veterinary and research laboratory technicians with associates and/or bachelors degrees. 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. Even with this steady increase in enrollment, the number of students graduating in these fields has flunctuated from a high of 234 graduates to a low of 191 graduates. For FY 2009, the number of graduates declined again to 212, a 5.5% decline from FY 2008. Thus, with the uncertain economic climate and flunctuation in the number of students graduating from year to year, the targets are based on a 2.5% increase in the 3-year average from FY 2010 to FY 2012.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) 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 (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance 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 8-week classes = 149 students and 0 online intersession classes; AY 2008 = 16 8 week classes = 305 students (105% increase) and 0 online intersession classes; AY 2009 = 16 8 week classes = 376 students (23.3% increase) and 10 online intersession classes = 290 students. Baseline: AY 2009 = 16 8 week classes = 376 students (23.3% increase) and 10 online intersession classes = 290 students.	Year 1: AY 2010 – 48 8-week courses = 812 students and 26 online intersession courses = 600 students. ACTUAL Year 2: AY 2011 - 119 8-week courses = 3,037 students and 51 online intersession courses = 1,049 students. ACTUAL Year 3: AY 2012 - 125 8-week courses = 3,188 students and 54 online intersession courses = 1,100 students.		

2. Increase the number of historically under-served students enrolled at K-State.	Fall 2006 = 2,109 students Fall 2007 = 2,218 students Fall 2008 = 2,278 students Baseline: Fall 2008 = 2,278 students	Year 1: Fall 2010 actual = 2,946 students ACTUAL Year 2: Fall 2011 actual = 3,218 students ACTUAL Year 3: Fall 2012 = 3,556 students (10.5% increase)		
3. Increase the percentage of full-time undergraduate students receiving Need-Based assistance.	AY 2007 = 25%, 4,557 students AY 2008 = 35%, 6,224 students AY 2009 = 36%, 6,249 students Baseline: AY 2009 = 36%, 6,249 students	Year 1: AY 2010 = 37% Year 2: AY 2011 = 38% Year 3: AY 2012 = 39%		
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 2006-2008 = \$527,575 (3-year average)	Year 1: FY 2008-2010 = \$874,387 (3-year average) ACTUAL Year 2: FY 2009-2011 = \$961,826 (3-year average) Year 3: FY 2010-2012 = \$1,009,916 (3-year average)		
5.				

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): 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 1(Title Only): 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 and number of students enrolled during winter, spring, and summer Intersessions which are taught online, and count the number of course offerings and number of students enrolled during the fall and spring semesters that are taught in an

eight-week format (either face-to-face or online 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 online 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: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. For the first year of the agreement, we offered 48 8-week courses (for 812 students) and 26 online intersession courses (for 600 students), which nearly tripled the number of students in such courses compared to the baseline. Data for the second year are already in, and we have more than doubled again over the fall 2009-2010 levels -- 119 8-week courses for 3,037 students and 51 online intersession courses for 1,049 students. We do not see the same amount of growth likely or possible for the third year of the agreement, so we have adjusted the AY 2012 targets to reflect a 5% increase in the number of students enrolled in 8-week courses and a 5% increase in the number of students enrolled in online intersession courses.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Increase the number of historically under-served students enrolled at K-State.

Data Collection: The number of African American/Black, Asian American, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 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 under-served populations, 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 the general population of Kansas. Overall, K-State is fairly comparable to other institutions in their percent of minority students enrolled.

Targets: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. 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 fall 2010, our enrollments reflected an under-served population of 2,946 students, which greatly exceeded our original third year target in 2012 of 2,278 students. For fall 2011, under-served enrollments have grown again to a total of 3,218 students. Some of this increase is due to a change in the reporting of race/ethnicity mandated by the Federal Government which has encouraged students to self-identify using more than one race and to report Hispanic ethnicity separately. To project for 2012, we used the same rate of growth (10.5%) as we experienced from 2010 to 2011.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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.

3-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 that the number of full-time students has declined since AY 07.

Targets: A family's inability to pay for college is one of the most significant reasons why students with need do not attend K-State or why they withdraw after starting. Thus, the university must do all it can to help make a college education more affordable, and we are committed to increasing the percentage of full-time undergraduates who receive need-based aid. 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.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Increase the amount of external resources contributed through the KSU Foundation for diversity programs and services.

Data Collection: The amount of external resources designated over the past three fiscal years for diversity programs and services that were raised through the Kansas State University Foundation.

3-Year Performance History: The baseline is the average of gifts received from individuals, foundations, and corporations by the KSU Foundation for diversity programs in FY 2006-2008. Over the original three years of baseline information, the amount of external resources designated for diversity programs fluctuated, likely due to the tough economic times.

Targets: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year and adjusted to a 3-year average instead of the year-to-year amount to alleviate problems with year-to-year fluctuations. Thus far, our fund raising efforts have been more successful than originally predicted. We have projected an increase of 10% for FY 2011 and a 5% increase for FY 2012. These will be stretch goals for us.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	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,	Year 1: FY 2008-2010 = \$120.5M (3		

	3.5% increase FY 2009 = \$120.0M, 1.7% increase Baseline: FY 2007- FY 2009 = \$117.4M (3 year average)	year average) Year 2: FY 2009- 2011 = \$123.6M (3 year average) Year 3: FY 2010- 2012 = \$127.3M (3 year average)		
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	Year 1: FY 2010 = \$90.9M ACTUAL Year 2: FY 2011 = \$107M Year 3: FY 2012 = \$110M		
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 2006- CY 2008 = \$1.53M (3 year average)	Year 1: CY 2008- 2010 = \$1.51M (3 year average) ACTUAL Year 2: CY 2009- 2011 = \$1.52M (3 year average) Year 3: CY 2010- 2012 = \$1.56M (3 year average)		

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

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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. The uncertainties associated with the state, national and global economic climate, and the recent hiring freeze and loss of faculty and staff positions due to the budget reductions are of concern in being able to reach our target values. However, the possibility of obtaining federal stimulus funding and the potential for NBAF-related activity may compensate for these other factors. Thus, we are optimistic about reaching our goals. When reporting on

our actual performance, we will include comments related to the eventual impact of these various factors.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 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 of the target years.

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: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. Because of the uncertainty associated with private support in the next year, we have selected target values which reflect projected increases over FY 2011 of 2.7%, which we think is a stretch goal, based on recent trend data and the fiscal climate.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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. Annual licensing revenue includes royalty payments, option and license signing and extension fees, infringement settlements, and cashed-in equity from university-generated technologies managed by the technology transfer office.

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: We are revising these targets because a number of agreements have been terminated by licensees in the last eighteen months making it difficult to reach targets. Several promising licensing deals have been executed this year, but the projected increases over the baseline remain a stretch goal in light of the continuing economic uncertainty. The target values reflect projected increases over the baseline of 2% by Year 3.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) 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 (Data)	3-Year 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	Year 1: CY 2010 = 40 projects: 71,825 participants ACTUAL Year 2: CY 2011 = 44 projects: 75,000 participants Year 3: CY 2012 = 48 projects: 80,000 participants		
2. : Increase campus and community revenues generated for engaged, public service research and teaching projects	Baseline: CY 2008 \$3.17M	Year 1: CY 2010 = \$19.92M ACTUAL Year 2: CY 2011 = \$21.0M Year 3: CY 2012 = \$22.0M		
3. Increase the number of classes and students participating in service learning.	CY 2008 = 33 classes: 286 students	Year 1: CY 2010 = 57 classes with 3,417 students ACTUAL Year 2: CY 2011 = 60 classes with 3,600 students Year 3: CY 2012 = 63 classes with 3,780 students		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5(Title Only): 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 1(Title Only): 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. K-State has begun benchmarking engaged faculty work through the implementation of the Outreach and Engagement Measuring Instrument (OEMI). During 2011, K-State pilot tested this instrument and is now making adjustments in the tool in response to that pilot test. This measuring instrument will indicate the variety of and breadth of engaged work occurring at Kansas State University. Additionally, data that has come from our application to the Carnegie Foundation for their “engaged university” designation and from our preparation of the Higher Learning Commission self study.

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

Targets: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. 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. In the first year, we far exceeded that amount, serving nearly 72,000 people. Using this as the new baseline, we have determined new targets - an increase of over 3,000 people in year 2, and 5,000 people in year 3. We believe that these are significant increases in our outreach, and thus, represent stretch goals.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Increase campus and community revenue generated for engaged, public service research and teaching projects.

Data Collection: Amount of funding brought into the university as public service projects. Grants and contracts designated as public service are engaged projects, focusing on connecting campus resources and expertise with 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.

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

Targets: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. Using the first year amount as the baseline, we determined the new targets for the remaining two years to represent a 5% increase in public service funding from projects per year.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Increase the number of classes and students participating in service learning.

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: We are revising these targets because we have already outperformed the 2012 target in our initial year. We were able to identify more classes that had not been identified under the previous data gathering method. Now that we have identified this much broader list of courses, we feel we have identified all that exist. We expect a 5% growth in students taking such classes in the future, as more faculty seek ways to expose students to community and civic engagement.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 6:				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6(Title Only):

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

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
561.09