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Institution: **University of Kansas – Lawrence Campus**  
Contact Person: Kathleen McCluskey-Fawcett  
Contact phone & email: 785.864.4904 kamf@ku.edu  
Date: July 15, 2005 (revised 9/14/05)

### Regents’ System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

#### Institutional Goal 1: Continue to develop consortia arrangements with other Regents institutions to leverage resources and expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)¹</th>
<th>Baseline²</th>
<th>Targets³</th>
<th>Performance Outcome⁴</th>
<th>Amount of Directional Improvement⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Number of database and book titles available through the Kansas Regents Library Database Consortium and KAN-ED | FY 2004 Database titles 21 Book titles 9,547 | Total Database Titles Total Book Titles  
1. FY 2006 17 10,000  
2. FY 2007 17 10,000  
3. FY 2008 18 11,000 | | |
| 2. Collaborative research productivity | Three-year rolling avg % increase  
KU US FY 00-02 12.7 10.9 | Using three-year rolling averages:  
1. FY 02-04: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
2. FY 03-05: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
3. FY 04-06: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase | | |
| 3. Cost efficiency in information technology purchases | FY 02-04 Three-year rolling avg $73,193 | % increase in avg savings  
1. FY04-06 5.0%  
2. FY05-07 3.0%  
3. FY06-08 0.0% | | |
### Regents’ System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

#### Institutional Goal 2: Enrich the undergraduate learning experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Amount of Directional Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of students participating in Thematic Learning Communities (TLC)</td>
<td>Fall 2004 201</td>
<td>1. Fall 2006 600 2. Fall 2007 800 3. Fall 2008 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of students awarded Global Awareness Program (GAP) certification</td>
<td>Certification requirements established; First certifications awarded in FY 2005</td>
<td>1. FY 2006 115 2. FY 2007 150 3. FY 2008 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of students earning service learning certification</td>
<td>Service learning certification requirements established</td>
<td>1. FY 2006 90 2. FY 2007 150 3. FY 2008 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of students earning research certification</td>
<td>UG research certification requirements established</td>
<td>1. FY 2006 90 2. FY 2007 150 3. FY 2008 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regents’ System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development

#### Institutional Goal 3: Enhance workforce development in Kansas through training and degree availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)¹</th>
<th>Baseline ²</th>
<th>Targets ³</th>
<th>Performance Outcome ⁴</th>
<th>Amount of Directional Improvement ⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of bachelors, masters, doctorate, and first professional degrees awarded</td>
<td>Three-year rolling avg FY 02-04 5,307</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 % increase</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 0.5% 2. FY 05-07 0.5% 3. FY 06-08 0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of programs and the number of graduates at the Edwards Campus</td>
<td>Fall 2004 Programs: 25 FY 2004 Graduates: 407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of participants in continuing education and training for the professions</td>
<td>Three-year rolling avg FY 02-04 22,593</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 % increase</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 6% 2. FY 05-07 5% 3. FY 06-08 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of participants in fire service training</td>
<td>Three-year rolling avg FY 02-04 7,076</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 % increase</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 3% 2. FY 05-07 2% 3. FY 06-08 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of participants in law enforcement training</td>
<td>Three-year rolling avg FY 02-04 2,366</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 % increase</td>
<td>1. FY 04-06 1% 2. FY 05-07 1% 3. FY 06-08 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regents’ System Goal E: Increase External Resources

#### Institutional Goal 4: Increase external funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Amount of Directional Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Federal science and engineering research expenditures relative to national averages | Three-year rolling avg % increase  
KU US  
FY 00-02 12.7 10.9 | Using three-year rolling averages:  
1. FY 02-04: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
2. FY 03-05: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
3. FY 04-06: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase | | |
| 2. Federal life sciences research expenditures relative to national averages | Three-year rolling avg % increase  
KU US  
FY 00-02 15.3 13.0 | Using three-year rolling averages:  
1. FY 02-04: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
2. FY 03-05: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase  
3. FY 04-06: KU % increase will be greater than federal % increase | | |
| 3. Federal science and engineering research expenditures relative to peer institutions | Three-year rolling avg % increase  
KU US  
FY 00-02 12.7 11.5 | Using three-year rolling averages:  
1. FY 02-04: KU % increase will be greater than peer % increase  
2. FY 03-05: KU % increase will be greater than peer % increase  
3. FY 04-06: KU % increase will be greater than peer % increase | | |
| 4. Level of philanthropic support | FY 2004  
$64,784,308 | % increase  
1. FY 2006 4%  
2. FY 2007 4%  
3. FY 2008 5% | | |

1. Identify the key performance indicator (i.e. data) that will be used to determine progress toward goals. Be as specific and as succinct as possible. The key performance indicator (data) may be quantitative or qualitative.
2. Show the baseline value of the key performance indicator (data). The baseline means “where are you now?”
3. Show targets for the next 3 years. Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) identified in the first column.
4. Performance outcomes must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) listed in the first column.
5. Amount of directional improvement equals the difference between actual performance and the target.
6. At least one institutional goal must support Regents’ System Goal A. Institutional goals must support two additional Regents’ System Goals selected from Regents’ System Goals B, C, and D.
1. **Institutional Goal 1: Extension of consortia arrangements with other institutions**

**Key Performance Indicator 1:** Number of database and book titles through the Kansas Regents Library Database Consortium (RLDC) and KAN-ED

- **Data Collection:** The RLDC Coordinator compiles statistics for consortium members annually.
- **Targets:** The FY 2007 target for book titles was revised downward from 11,000 to 10,000 to reflect a more gradual growth pattern for electronic books among participating Kansas Regents institutions in response to lower-than-expected usage figures. The targets for database titles remained unchanged since 2004. (Note: The Consortium itself modified its acquisition plans in July 2004 and consequently the database title target was revised downward in July 2004 to reflect this change.)

**Key Performance Indicator 2:** Collaborative research productivity

- **Data Collection:** NSF’s annual publication of federal science and engineering expenditures will be the source of the data.
- **Targets:** A measure of collaborative research productivity was defined, baseline data for FY 2000 to FY 2002 were determined, and targets for future years were established. The targets reflect KU’s continuing commitment to develop and improve science and engineering collaborative research at a more rapid rate than most universities, despite being in a state and within a region of the country that has historically received lesser amounts of federal funding.

**Key Performance Indicator 3:** Cost efficiency in information technology purchases

- **Data Collection:** The cost savings that is documented annually by Information Services is the difference between costs actually incurred versus those that would have been incurred if not for the statewide cooperative agreements.
- **Targets:** KU has achieved a 20% reduction in software costs and intends to maintain the savings over time. Potential savings are approaching the point of diminishing returns and as a result the FY 2007 target was revised downward from 5% to 3%. The FY 2008 goal reflects the intent to maintain current cost efficiencies over time.

2. **Institutional Goal 2: Enrich the undergraduate learning experience.**

The four newly implemented programs described under institutional goal two are part of KU’s long-term efforts to improve retention and graduation rates.

**Key Performance Indicator 1:** Number of students participating in Thematic Learning Communities (TLC)

- **Data Collection:** Students enrolled in TLCs will be counted.
- **Targets:** The targeted increase of 200 additional students in both Fall 2006 and in Fall 2007 represents an addition of 10 learning communities of 20 students each. Program growth is dependent upon increasing student and faculty interest and each group’s sustained participation. Continued expansion of the program requires a significant university financial commitment; therefore, the efficacy of the new program will be evaluated in 2008.

**Key Performance Indicator 2:** Number of students awarded the Global Awareness Program (GAP) certification

- **Data Collection:** Number of certificates awarded.
- **Targets:** Targets represent estimates of certifications awarded through the new program. Projections reflect steady growth through additional student participation.
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Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of students earning certification in service learning

a. **Data Collection:** Number of students earning certification on transcript. Indicator was refined to measure certification counts rather than participation counts. The revision provides a more accurate and robust measure.

b. **Targets:** Certification requirements and a tracking system are established. Student recruitment and participation are ongoing. The first certifications will be awarded in FY 2006. Targets are estimates that reflect planned growth for the first three years of the new program.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of undergraduate students earning research certification

a. **Data Collection:** Number of students earning certification on transcript. Indicator was refined to measure certification counts rather than participation counts. The revision provides a more accurate and robust measure.

b. **Targets:** Certification requirements and a tracking system are established. Student recruitment and participation are ongoing. The first certifications will be awarded in FY 2006. Targets are estimates that reflect planned growth for the first three years of the new program.

3. **Institutional Goal 3: Enhance workforce development in Kansas through training and degree availability**

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of bachelors, masters, doctorate, and first professional degrees awarded

a. **Data Collection:** Number of degrees awarded as reported to IPEDS.

b. **Targets:** Targets based on current enrollments and the number of students who potentially will earn degrees.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of programs and the number of graduates at the Edwards Campus

a. **Data Collection:** The published list of programs will be used to track program counts and a tracking system in the PeopleSoft Student System will provide the number of degree awarded to students enrolled in Edwards Campus programs.

b. **Targets:** The projected number of graduates is based upon current enrollments, program offerings, and market conditions. Targets were revised slightly downward to indicate a current plateau in enrollment. Although new programs have been added, there is a time lag between additional offerings and students completing the programs.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of participants in continuing education and training for the professions

a. **Data Collection:** KU Continuing Education (KUCE) maintains statistics on participation in training and education programs.

b. **Targets:** KUCE responds to the continually changing economic and financial environments. Participation numbers are based upon historical program analysis, program forecasts, and available funding projections. Growth rates for FY 2004 to FY 2007 were revised upward based upon additional grant opportunities, particularly in terrorism response.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of participants in fire service training

a. **Data Collection:** KUCE reports participation annually to the Kansas Fire and Rescue Training Commission.
b. **Targets**: Participation levels are based upon demand for and certifications required of fire service personnel and are contingent upon funding. Accordingly, the rate of growth for FY 2004 to FY 2007 was revised to account for leveling of training requests after a period of steep growth related to permanent funding. Required state fire service training needs have now reached a steady state.

**Key Performance Indicator 5**: Number of participants in law enforcement training

a. **Data Collection**: KUCE reports participation annually to the Kansas Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training.

b. **Targets**: Participation is based upon demand for and certifications required of law enforcement personnel. Targets for growth rates remain unchanged. (Note: New reporting guidelines were implemented for FY 2005 so slight increase is due to change in reporting practices.)

### 4. Institutional Goal 4: Increase external funding

Kansas is one of 22 states that participate in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR). EPSCOR is an NSF program that focuses on states that historically have received lesser amounts of federal research and development funding. KU’s ability to continue to increase research expenditures, particularly in the sciences, is closely tied to new faculty recruitment and development as well as available research space.

**Key Performance Indicator 1**: The KU percent change in federal science and engineering research expenditures will be greater than the overall increase in federal research expenditures

a. **Data Collection**: NSF’s annual publication of federal science and engineering expenditures for all U.S. institutions will be the source of the data. The NSF publication usually lags the actual data by two years.

b. **Targets**: The target reflects KU’s continuing commitment to develop and improve science and engineering research at a more rapid rate than most universities, despite being in a state and within a region of the country that typically receives lesser amounts of federal funding.

**Key Performance Indicator 2**: The KU percent change in federal life sciences research expenditures will be greater than the overall increase for federal life sciences research expenditures

a. **Data Collection**: NSF’s annual publication of federal science and engineering expenditures for all U.S. institutions will be the source of the data for specific information on life sciences expenditures.

b. **Targets**: The target reflects KU’s continuing commitment to develop and improve life sciences research at a more rapid rate than most universities, despite being in a state and within a region of the country that typically receives lesser amounts of federal funding.

**Key Performance Indicator 3**: The KU percent change in federal science and engineering expenditures will be greater than the overall increase in federal research expenditures at the Board of Regents identified KU peer institutions

a. **Data Collection**: NSF’s annual publication of federal science and engineering expenditures will be the source of the data.

b. **Targets**: The target reflects KU’s continuing commitment to develop and improve science and engineering research at a more rapid rate than peer institutions, despite being in a state and within a region of the country that typically receives lesser amounts of federal funding.

**Key Performance Indicator 4**: Level of philanthropic support

a. **Data Collection**: KU Endowment Association annually reports support for current operations (excluding capital support and deferred giving) to the Council for Aid to Education through the Voluntary Support of Education survey.

b. **Targets**: Targets are based on the momentum of the major capital campaign that ended in 2004, but tempered by more typical annual giving patterns.
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