
***Vision 2020* Institutional Improvement Report**

University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus

submitted to the
Kansas Board of Regents

January 2001

Vision 2020: Institutional Improvement Report

University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus January 2001 Report

A. Context and Vision for Change

This is the sixth and final *Vision 2020* Institutional Improvement Report to the Regents. Initiated by the Kansas Board of Regents in December 1995, *Vision 2020* initiatives grew out of KU's regular strategic planning processes and a concern for major policy issues facing the University of Kansas. The University identified seven initiatives in the areas of student advising, progress to degree, graduate education, faculty workload, faculty support and development, minority recruitment and retention, and management of operations.

Progress was achieved in each of the *Vision 2020* areas. With the passing of the Higher Education Coordination Act (S.B. 345) in 1999, KU is developing an institutional improvement plan that will be proposed to the Kansas Board of Regents in the Spring 2001 semester.

B. Initiative 1. Improve Advising Services for Freshmen and Sophomores

The establishment of centralized advising is a primary offshoot of KU's *Vision 2020* initiatives. The Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center (FSAC) has completed its third year of operations and continues to expand and improve its advising services to KU freshmen and sophomores. Awareness of the FSAC and its services have increased, as evidenced in a 66% increase in student initiated contact with the Center as compared to last year.

Progress Report - Advising

- \$ For Fall 2000, all freshmen and many sophomores, including all undecided sophomores, have been assigned to ***individual advisors***. The FSAC directly handles 5600 of these student assignments, an increase of 30% over last year.
- \$ The freshman to sophomore ***retention rate*** for Fall 2000 is 80.3%, up from 77.6% in 1998, prior to FSAC implementation. While many factors affect retention, this increase underscores the importance of the efforts of the FSAC.
- \$ The FSAC ***staff*** has expanded to fifteen professional advisors, seven faculty advisors, and over 30 graduate assistant and undergraduate peer advisors to assist students.
- \$ The FSAC has expanded ***fall advising group meetings*** to two separate programs: a September program to address academic issues and an October program to discuss advising

and enrollment. Over 2,500 students attend these meetings annually.

- \$ Student attendance at the *second annual Majors Fair* in Spring 2000 increased by 35% to 450 students. The Majors Fair features over 50 KU academic and student services offices and introduces students to majors available.
- \$ A *Sophomore Series*® will be continued in the 2000-2001 academic year to assist second year students with declaring majors and entering professional schools. Second-semester sophomores are encouraged to finalize their choice of major.
- \$ All student advisees are part of their advisors' *e-mail group* as of Fall 2000. Advising announcements and enrollment deadlines, add/drop policies and other advising issues are sent to all advisees.
- \$ Over 375 faculty and staff advisors receive information and over 180 attended the FSAC-sponsored *monthly brown bag lunch series*. Topics include fostering retention; advising students with disabilities; understanding the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act; understanding transfer credit; and advising students of color.
- \$ The FSAC *advisor at Johnson County Community College* has expanded onsite visits to assist transfer students. There was a 65% increase from Fall 1999 to Spring 2000 in appointments; there are plans to expand services to other community colleges.
- \$ Strong interest in the *Freshman Summer Institute* continues, with a 29% increase in student attendance for Summer 2000. (Summer 1999 had 105 participants while Summer 2000 had 135.) A higher percentage of the 1999 participants re-enrolled in the Spring semester compared to a control group. Of the 1999 FSI participants, 93% returned for their second semester compared to 80.3% of the entire freshmen class.

C. Initiative 2. Reduce the time required to graduate for undergraduates and raise the proportion of those earning a degree

KU's strategies for change in graduation rates and time to degree indicators include the establishment of academic support operations to work directly with students.

Progress Report - Graduation Rates

- \$ In Fall 1999, *PRE 101 - Orientation Seminar* was expanded from 10 to 19 sections to accommodate approximately 380 students. Students who enrolled in PRE 101 had significantly higher retention rates, and significantly higher graduation rates than students who did not take the course. After four semesters, 80.0% of the students who took the course in

1996 were still enrolled, compared to 60.7 % of the control group.

- \$ As of October 2000, KU's *Student Writing Center* is two years old. Over 2,200 visits to the Writing Centers have been recorded at satellite operations, the Writer's Roosts. In addition, 2964 students received instruction from the Writing Center during classroom visits.
- \$ The Writing Center provides *face-to-face tutoring* 86 hours per week on the Lawrence campus and 5 hours per week on the Edwards Campus in Overland Park. An additional 779 open hours are maintained for online tutoring.
- \$ The *average ACT score*, a primary predictor of potential for success in higher education, has remained stable the past three years--23.8 (Fall 1996); 24.2 (Fall 1997); 24.2 (Fall 1998); 24.2 (Fall 1999) and 24.4 (Fall 2000). [Source: *Profiles*, 9-405.]
- \$ KU has set a new record by recruiting a class of *116 National Merit Scholars* in Fall 2000. This year's total easily surpasses last year's record of 101, which made KU one of the nation's the top 10 public universities in the enrollment of new National Merit Scholars. KU's current national ranking is eighth in the nation.
- \$ The fourth year of the *Mount Oread Scholars program* (2000-2001) is enrolling a record number of students with a 68% increase in Fall 2000. (Fall 1999 had 220 compared to 370 in Fall 2000.)
- \$ In 1999-2000, the *Haskell Mentor Program* served 12 Haskell Indian Nations University students and to date, 8 students have signed up for the Fall 2000. Monthly visits to the Haskell campus to provide information and assistance to students who want to transfer to KU will be continued.

D. Initiative 3. Review, reform and improve graduate education

Working collaboratively, the staff of the Graduate School and the Provost's Office revised KU's academic program review process for January 2000 to incorporate specific elements from the Graduate School review process. The end result has been to streamline the work required of departments under review by using a single, comprehensive review packet that addresses both Regents and North Central Accreditation program review requirements.

Progress Report - Graduate Education

- C The Graduate School completed an *external review* of the department of Religious Studies. The reviewer's report will be used for program planning.

- C The Graduate School completed *internal graduate program reviews* of the master's and doctoral programs in Architecture, Urban Planning, History of Art, Geography, Geology, Journalism, HDFL, Psychology and Clinical Child Psychology.
- C The Graduate School is working with the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to develop a *centralized system of data collection* to streamline reporting.
- C The Graduate School continues to collect and review the annual departmental reports on the *assessment of student outcomes*.
- C The Graduate School has researched *on-line applications for admission to graduate studies* and forwarded recommendations to the Provost.
- C The Graduate School has developed an *exit survey to collect data about doctoral student* satisfaction, advising and mentoring experience, funding while in graduate school, time to degree, and professional placement plans.
- C The Graduate School hosted a *workshop for graduate program directors and department chairs* focusing on future trends and current developments in graduate education.

E. Initiative 4. Monitor Allocation of Faculty Time and Talent

The Office of the Provost continues to monitor faculty workload data annually. By encouraging faculty to emphasize those areas in which they can be most productive, KU's teaching and research mission is served. While KU supports differential workloads for faculty, *all* faculty remain involved in teaching at some level.

Progress Report - Faculty Time and Talent

- C A five-year, \$9.9 million grant will bring together 19 scientists from KU, the KU Medical Center, KSU and ESU to establish a *Center for Cancer Experimental Therapeutics* and conduct research on lung and ovarian cancers, a strain of childhood leukemia, tumor growth and methods to improve the delivery of anti-cancer drugs.
- C KU, KSU, and WSU are working together to create a *network of collaborative relationships*, not only with each other but also with regional institutions such as the Stowers Institute in Kansas City, Mo., and the Boeing Company in Wichita.

- C A collaborative initiative among Senator Roberts' Science and Technology for the Future Committee, the Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation, KU, KSU, and WSU have targeted strategic initiatives in *agricultural biotechnology, aviation, human biosciences and information technology*.
- C Business plans for two statewide KTEC initiatives valued at about \$9.4 million were developed. The Information and Telecommunications Technology Center produced a plan for the *Kansas Information Technologies Enterprise (KITE)*. KUMC and the Higuchi Biosciences personnel proposed *ImaGen Therapeutics*.
- C In March 2000, KU, KSU, and WSU collaborated on a *AResearch Infrastructure Report*® which was presented to the Kansas Board of Regents.
- C The *Wakarusa Research* building, leased by KUCR, will add 20,000 square feet of research space for new projects.
- C Access to *high speed data links* has been secured for projects such as the Bio-informatics initiative, the NASA project, cosmology research and engineering applications.
- C A *Science Education Task Force*, consisting of 16 prominent KU scientists, considered issues of revitalizing the science curriculum, examining the current infrastructure, developing a science education center, and creating outreach methods to help K-12 teachers better teach math and science. Recommendations include the construction of a new building for undergraduate science laboratories.
- C The *creation of the additive drug*, Captisol, by KU pharmaceutical researchers, ensures the safe delivery of a variety of drugs, from anti-cancer agents to epilepsy treatments, by making them more soluble in the body.
- C A *statewide survey* of 800 residents in 97 counties conducted by Research America, found that 96 percent of Kansans surveyed said it is important for the state to support research.
- C Scientists soon will use state-of-the-art brain-imaging equipment to study the causes, effects and cures for a wide range of brain diseases and disorders such as developmental disabilities, autism, cerebral palsy, stroke, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease and epilepsy at KUMC's new facility, the *Hoglund Brain Imaging Center* scheduled for completion in 2002.

F. Initiative 5. Enhance Faculty Development, Support and Rewards

Progress Report - Faculty Development

- \$ The ***Center for Teaching Excellence*** is in its third year of operations. The center provides leadership and advocacy for KU's teaching mission, assists faculty and GTAs in course design, helps faculty integrate technology into instruction, and offers teaching improvement activities.
- \$ In August, the center held its second ***Summit on Teaching***. Over 350 faculty participated in sessions which addressed issues in teaching and learning.
- \$ Another fifty faculty participated in 3 three-day ***professional development seminars*** on integrating Web-based resources into courses.
- C ***Chairs training sessions*** continue to be effective in reinforcing institutional objectives outlined in the performance measures and goals. The Spring 2000 session focused on clarifying expectations and strengthening departmental and school faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure processes.

G. Initiative 6. Enhance Minority Recruitment and Retention

Progress Report - Minority Recruitment and Retention

- \$ The ***number of minority instructional faculty has increased*** to 130 from 94 in Fall 1992 (a 38% increase).
- \$ A cooperative project between Haskell Indian Nations University and KU, ***A Bridges to the Future,*** was awarded \$560,000 from the National Institutes of Health to provide math and science enhancements for Haskell programs and research opportunities for Haskell students in KU labs.
- \$ About 500 Kansas and Missouri high school students in grades 9 through 12 who are viewed as gifted with leadership potential attended the 15th annual ***Black Leadership Symposium,*** ***A Black Leadership for the 21st Century,*** in October at KU.
- \$ A diversity video, ***Shades of Crimson and Blue: Becoming Part of the KU Family*** is being shown to all new students and family members that attend New Student Orientation.
- \$ The first Haskell/KU ***undergraduate research symposium,*** ***A Pathway to a Biomedical Career,*** was held in December 2000 and had presentations by six American Indian students.

- \$ A KU-Haskell collaborative program to increase the number of minority students who progress to doctoral study has been developed for the ***Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement***. The \$4 million project will support the improvement of Haskell's educational infrastructure and research experiences for Haskell students.

H. Initiative 7. Streamline Operations and Enhance Support Processes

1. Information Technology

Progress Report - Information Technology

- \$ In September 2000, KU received just under \$1.4 million from the ***USDE Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)*** to upgrade the existing campus networking infrastructure and expand its Internet and Internet2 capabilities.
- \$ Late in FY 2000, a new unit, ***Decision Support Services***, began operations to design, develop, and implement a data warehouse that will generate and store data for university staff. This initiative is a cooperative effort between the Lawrence and Medical Center campuses.
- \$ KU is a founding partner in ***BioOne, an electronic journal project*** to address scholarly publication issues. Scheduled for January 2001, the initial data base will include 40 journals in biology and environmental science. Other charter organizations include the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, the Big 12 Plus Library Consortium, and Allen Press of Lawrence, Kansas.
- C An ***Information Technology Steering Council*** has been appointed by the Provost to promote better information services planning and to improve communication across campus.
- \$ ***Blackboard's Course Manager*** was selected as the development platform for instructors to provide Web-based course materials, discussion boards, virtual chat, and online assessments.
- \$ The University ***Web presence*** has been redesigned with improved visual appeal, dynamic graphics, a revamped structure featuring a variety of navigation methods, a daily events calendar, and an improved ***Apeople search*** function.

- \$ Cooperative planning and implementation made *five-digit dialing* available between the Lawrence campus (KULC), KU Medical Center (KUMC) in Kansas City, and the Wichita School of Medicine.
- \$ Over half of KU's faculty and staff are being served by *Exchange service*, which provides email services, calendaring, public folder access, and other collaborative communication tools by Microsoft Outlook.
- \$ Library technical functions and extensive searching capabilities for users was significantly improved with the implementation of the *Voyager integrated library system* and its companion database and imaging products from the Endeavor Corporation.
- \$ KU's *electronic communications environment* is being improved by an integrated system for email services, calendaring, public folder access, and other collaborative communication tools. Over half of KU's faculty and staff are being served.

2. Re-engineered Processes and Systems Upgrade

Progress Report - Re-engineered Processes and Systems Upgrade

- C The PeopleSoft *Human Resources System* was upgraded to version 7.5 from version 4.0, an almost total re-implementation of the system. KU is working to upgrade this system in order to take advantage of additional processes offered by the latest release of the software.
- C The new *financial management system* is providing real time data on the status of all accounts and permits ready generation of information to all users.
- C The PeopleSoft *Admissions* module (version 7.5) replaces five separate systems originally designed in the early 1970s. The student administrative computing system will replace legacy software used on Lawrence and Edwards campuses, KUMC and KUMC Wichita for recruitment, admissions and scholarships, enrollment, student records, financial aid, billing and receivables, and academic advising. Undergraduate admissions at Lawrence is currently using the new system for recruitment.

3. Space Management

Progress Report - Space Management

- C The Office of Instructional Research and Planning has created a *data base of space inventory and allocation* that includes small scale drawings of over 75% of Lawrence campus buildings. It has also incorporates a space allocation formula.
- C The University Space Policy Committee completed a *comprehensive plan for management and allocation of space* on the Lawrence campus, which includes a database with a calculated assessment of space needs by discipline.
- C Funding has been identified to completely rewire Malott and Learned Halls to bring them up to contemporary *100BaseT standards*. Approval for 100BaseT upgrades for sixteen additional buildings has been made.

**2000 Vision 2020 Institution-specific Performance Indicators
University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus**

A. Initiative 1. Improve advising services for freshmen and sophomores

a. **Indicator** - Amount of Funds Allocated to Centralized Advising

Until Fall 1997, KU's advising was decentralized--managed by departments, schools, and the College. With *Vision 2020* initiatives, KU implemented a new Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center over a three-year period through reallocation of existing resources and allocation of modest new funding. From this point on, we expect modest additions to this operation.

Amount of Funds Allocated to Centralized Advising

	Base Yr. FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2002
University-wide Advising	0	\$273,536	\$465,595	\$694,867		

Source: Office of the Provost

b. **Indicator** - Student Contacts with Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center

Student response to new advising services continues to be very positive. Contacts initiated by both KU and students themselves have increased between FY 1999 and 2000. Clearly, as student recognition of available advising services has expanded, the demands on the Center have increased.

Number of Student Contacts with Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center

	Base Year FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2002
Institution-initiated	5,578	12,519	13,636		
Student-initiated	1,200	3,275	5,443		
Total	6,778	15,794	19,079		

Source: Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center

c. **Indicator** - Student Satisfaction with Advising

The data below indicate a downward trend between 1987 and 1996. It is this trend that KU is working to reverse with *Vision 2020*. It is important to note that these graduating students did *not* have access to the advising services now available with the implementation of *Vision 2020* initiatives. In coming years, as students who have been served by the new advising system participate in the Senior Survey, we expect significant improvement in mean satisfaction surveys. The data for the Class of 2000 give reason for optimism in changing this trend at KU.

Student Satisfaction with Advising

	Grad Class 1987	Grad Class 1992	Grad Class 1996	Grad Class 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2004
Mean Satisfaction Rating	3.41	3.28	3.26	3.32	3.35	3.60
Total Number Surveyed	2,124	2,389	2,044	2,192		
Percent Who Responded	51%	45%	46%	43%		

Source: Senior Survey, various years. The scale ranges from 1 to 5 with 1 indicating a rating of Very Unsatisfactory and 5 indicating a response of Very Satisfactory

d. **Indicator** - Undergraduate Student Retention Rates (See Core Performance Indicator I. in Attachment B)

KU's retention rates have improved--progressing from 76% (entering class of 1994) to 77% (entering class of 1995) to 78% (entering class 1996). KU's goal of an 80% retention rate for the entering class of 2001 appears reachable.

B. Initiative 2. Reduce the time required to graduate for undergraduates and raise the proportion of those earning a degreea. **Indicator** - Five- and six-year Graduation Rates for Undergraduates (Core Performance Indicator I in Attachment B.)

There has been a slight drop in KU's five-year graduation rate (from 49% to 47%). The six-year rate has remained stable at 54%. The notable increase in the four-year graduation rate (going from 23% to 26%) is grounds for optimism that KU's graduation rates will improve as *Vision 2020* initiatives impact the lives of new generations of students. KU continues to address graduation rates through student support programs, advising and retention strategies.

b. **Indicator** - Plan of Study Completions

With centralized advising, KU plans to implement a new plan of study program. Undergraduate students will complete eight-semester plans of study in their first semester at KU. (Students in five- or six-year programs will complete ten- or twelve-semester programs of study as appropriate.)

KU has a good foundation for increasing the percentage of students who complete their degrees in eight semesters. From 1998 to 1999 the percentage completing degrees in eight semesters increased from 39.7% to 44.1%.

The Freshman-Sophomore Advising Center has initiated new "Graduate in Four" advising notebooks that will be given to all new freshmen in the fall semester. The notebooks detail for each student the process for completing their course of study in eight semesters (ten semesters for five-year programs). The notebooks include sections for each year, freshman through senior, as well as sections on the student's major and academic resources. Students will be encouraged to bring the notebooks to each advising session so the progress toward their degree can be tracked with each student's advisor. In addition, each student has received a copy of their Academic Requirements Tracking System (ARTS) form which details specific requirements that need to be fulfilled.

C. **Initiative 3. Review, reform and improve graduate education**

a. **Indicator**- Program review according to 1998-2005 Regents Guidelines

KU's academic program review process is being reworked this fall to incorporate specific elements from the Graduate School review process. The goal is to streamline the work required of departments under review by using a single, comprehensive review packet that addresses both Regents and North Central Accreditation program review requirements.

D. **Monitor allocation of faculty time and talent**

a. **Indicator** - Allocation of Tenured Faculty Effort

KU continues to operate within its modal range of faculty workload and monitors the percent of tenured faculty whose allocation of effort differs from the department/School modal expectation for teaching, research, and service. About one-third of KU's faculty should be on differential loads. The specific distribution will vary slightly each year.

Allocation of Tenured Faculty Effort

	Base Yr. Fall 1996	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Goal
Percent at Modal Distribution	58%	58%	61%	60%	59%	55-65%*
Percent Greater Teaching	14%	12%	8%	9%	8%	
Percent Greater Research	12%	12%	12%	13%	12%	
Percent Greater Service	16%	18%	19%	18%	21%	

Source: Office of the Provost

- b. **Indicator** - Undergraduate Student Credit Hours Taught by Ranked Faculty (See Core Performance Indicator II. in Attachment B)

KU has exceeded goals for integrating senior faculty into undergraduate classes as seen in Table II (Attachment B). Nearly 60% of all undergraduate courses are taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty.

- c. **Indicator**- The amount of external funding awarded for faculty research as reported in the Core Performance Indicators

KU moved up ten places in the national ranking of federally-financed research from 93rd in FY 1998 to 83rd in FY 1999. Expenditures in science and engineering increased 13.3% going from \$117.12 million in FY 1998 to \$132.75 million in FY 1999. (See Table VII in Attachment B.)

E. Enhance faculty development, support and rewards

- a.. **Indicator** - Funding for Faculty Development Activities

KU continues to increase amounts of funds available for faculty development. A 14% increase in funding is noted for FY 2000.

Funding for Faculty Development Activities

	Base Year FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2002
Amount	\$3,435,203	\$3,496,398	\$3,749,077	\$4,301,247	\$4,905,312		

Source: Office of the Provost

F. Enhance minority recruitment and retention

The data below indicate that the Lawrence Campus continues to make steady progress in enlarging its minority community. There has been a 38% increase in the number of minority instructional faculty since 1992.

Minority Instructional Faculty Head Count

	Base Yr. Fall 1992	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999
Minority Faculty	94	97	103	102	108	113	119	130

Source: Database Task Force Report, various years. These data reflect tenured and tenure-track faculty only. Faculty administrators, instructors, lecturers, and librarians are excluded.

Minority Student Head Count (Self-reported Data)

	Base Yr. Fall 1992	Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000
Minority Students	1,978	2,031	2,121	2,241	2,264	2,286	2,345	2,317	2,299

Source: University of Kansas Profiles, pp. 4-114, October 1999, OIRP.

Minority Student First-time Freshmen One-year Retention Rates

	Base Yr. Fall 1993	Fall 1994	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	5-year Average
Minority Students	73.6%	69.0%	68.8%	70.3%	74.9%	71.2%	70.9%

Source: Attendance Patterns Data Base. OIRP.

G. Streamline operations and enhance support processes

- a. **Indicator** - Information Technology
Performance indicators focus on access to information technology and use.

Number of Circuits (Connections)

	Base Year FY 1995	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2002
Data							
Classrooms/labs	134	286	684	797	1,550	880	1,280
Offices/other	4,103	6,446	9,133	10,991	12,704	10,445	12,445
Residence Halls	0	1,003	1,972*	2,621	3,102	3,050	3,500
Voice							
Classrooms/Labs/ Offices/other	4,103	5,057	5,429	6,058	6,455	6,855	7,755
Residence Halls	2,548	2,460	2,559	2,335	2,428	2,500	2,500
Video							
Classrooms/Labs/ Offices/other	50	154	214	284	582	300	500
Residence Halls	2,650	2,540	2,639	2,636	2,639	2,500	2,500

b. Indicator - Re-engineered Processes and Systems Upgrade

The Business Procurement Card, a standard Visa card issued to departments, is being tested for direct purchase of goods under \$500 by phone order. The program greatly simplifies the purchasing process eliminating the need for departments to submit thousands of purchase orders for vendor payments.

Business Procurement Cards

	Base Yr. FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	Goal 2000	Goal 2002
Number of KU Payments	12	12	12	12		
Number of Transactions Covered	4,233	5,585	6,057	5,390		
Total Payment Dollars	\$439,004	\$719,092	\$926,567	\$800,179		
Number of Active Card Holders	130	151	195	181		

January 12, 2001

2000 Core Performance Indicators

University of Kansas - Lawrence and Medical Center

NOTE: *The reporting protocol has changed in the data below. Most performance indicators include combined data for the Lawrence Campus and Medical Center Campus. For the indicators in which combined data are being reported for the first time, the goals have been deleted.*

I. Indicators - Undergraduate Student Retention and Graduation Rates

A. Policy Priorities Addressed - A key issue for constituents and policy makers pertains to the productivity of the Regents universities: are academically prepared students progressing through the universities to the point of graduation at a reasonable pace? This is a performance and productivity issue for the universities since it reflects, in part, institutional performance in offering the courses, programs and academic support that enable academically prepared students to graduate in a timely manner. There are other important factors that impact student progression, including preparation for study at a Regents university, size of course loads, demands of outside employment and family, and personal and family finances.

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC)				Goals	
	First-Time Freshmen Entering Fall 1996	First-Time Freshmen Entering Fall 1997	First-Time Freshmen Entering Fall 1998	First-Time Freshmen Entering Fall 1999	First-Time Freshmen Entering Fall 2001
1. First Year Retention Rate - Total Rate	78%	78%	78%	78%	80%
a. By ACT Score					
No ACT	74%	72%	74%		
< 21	65%	64%	63%		
21 - 25	78%	78%	79%		
26 and >	89	87%	86%		
b. By Completion of Preparatory Curriculum					
Percentage of Completers Retained					
Percentage of Noncompleters Retained					

Retention rates are calculated according to national guidelines.

Attachment B

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC) (cont.)				Goals	
				Graduating Class of 2000	Graduating Class of 2002
	Cohort Entering Fall 1993	Cohort Entering Fall 1994	Cohort Entering Fall 1995	Cohort Entering Fall 1996	Cohort Entering Fall 1998
2. Four Year Graduation Rate - Total Rate	23%	26%	26%	24%	25%
a. No ACT	19%	16%	20%		
< 21	12%	12%	12%		
21 - 25	24%	25%	26%		
26 and >	36%	40%	40%		
	Cohort Entering Fall 1992	Cohort Entering Fall 1993	Cohort Entering Fall 1994	Cohort Entering Fall 1995	Cohort Entering Fall 1997
3. Five Year Graduation Rate - Total Rate	49%	47%	49%	51%	55%
a. No ACT	40%	39%	35%		
< 21	36%	33%	32%		
21 - 25	49%	49%	51%		
26 and >	62%	61%	63%		

Graduation rates are calculated according to national guidelines.

Attachment B

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC) (cont.)	Cohort Entering Fall 1991	Cohort Entering Fall 1992	Cohort Entering Fall 1993	Cohort Entering Fall 1994	Cohort Entering Fall 1996
4. Six Year Graduation Rate - Total Rate	54%	54%	53%	59%	63%
a. No ACT	49%	45%	45%		
< 21	40%	42%	39%		
21 - 25	54%	55%	55%		
26 and >	67%	68%	67%		
5. Six Year Graduation Rate By Percentage of Preparatory Curriculum Completers					
a. Percentage of Completers Graduating					
b. Percentage of Noncompleters Graduating					
6. Undergraduate Degrees Conferred	FY 1998	FY 1999		FY 2000	
a. Total Number Conferred*	3,278 1,163	3,336 1,197		3,480 1,290	
b. Number of Transfers**	35.5%	35.9%		37.1%	
c. Percentage of Total Degrees Received by Transfers					

Graduation rates are calculated according to national guidelines.

* Students who graduate in the same fiscal year with multiple baccalaureate degrees are counted once.

** Transfers are designated as those students who did not enter KU as new freshmen in any fall semester.

C. Campus Commentary

II. Indicator - Undergraduate Student Credit Hours Taught by Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

A. Policy Priorities Addressed - Student accessibility to instruction by tenured/tenure track faculty, particularly at the lower division undergraduate level, is a major interest to constituents and policy makers. Implicit in this interest is the assumption that the quality of the undergraduate experience is enhanced by increasing the interaction between tenured/tenure track faculty and undergraduate students. Institutional performance in this area can be measured by the percent of student credit hours generated by regular tenured/tenure track faculty compared to the percent of student credit hours generated by graduate teaching assistants and part-time and adjunct faculty.

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC)	Historical Performance				
	Fall 1995	Fall 1996	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999
1. Percent of Undergraduate SCH Taught by Full Time Faculty (Tenured/Tenure Track)					
a. Lower Division SCH	47.4%	45.4%	47.3%	51.8%	49.8%
b. Total Undergraduate SCH	61.1%	58.9%	59.3%	60.1%	59.6%
2. Percent of Undergraduate SCH Taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants (Where Graduate Teaching Assistant is defined as Instructor of Record)					
a. Lower Division SCH	36.5%	37.1%	34.2%	29.2%	28.8%
b. Total Undergraduate SCH	23.7%	24.6%	23.0%	19.3%	19.7%
3. Percent of Undergraduate SCH Taught by All Other Personnel (includes instructors, lecturers, adjunct faculty and administrative personnel who also teach classes).					
a. Lower Division SCH	16.1%	17.5%	18.5%	19.0%	21.4%
b. Total Undergraduate SCH	15.2%	16.5%	17.7%	20.6%	20.7%
4. Total Undergraduate SCH Taught	258,607	254,792	257,887	262,249	264,235

Undergraduate credit hours include courses numbered 000-699.

Note: LD indicates Lower Division - courses numbered 100-299.

C. Campus Commentary - KU deploys its faculty and GTAs in patterns similar to other major research universities.

III. Indicator - General Use Expenditures by Category

- O. Policy Priorities Addressed** - The use of public funds for higher education is a major concern of tax payers, students, their parents and policy makers. In recent years, constituents have expressed interest in how money is used to finance the various activities of the Regents universities. One particular point of interest is the relative size of the administrative apparatus and budget, expressing concern the funds may be shifted away from instruction and academic support. An additional issue that concerns many constituents is the relative size of research and instruction as reflected in institutional expenditures.

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC)	Historical Performance						
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000
1. Percentage of Expenditures for Institutional Support (w/o computing)	9.0%	8.4%	8.6%	8.6%	8.7%	9.0%	8.5%
2. Percentage of Expenditures for Academic Administration	2.8%	3.3%	3.2%	3.4%	3.8%	4.2%	4.1%
3. Subtotal of Percentage of Expenditures for Institutional Support and Academic Administration (1 + 2)	11.8%	11.7%	11.8%	12.0%	12.5%	13.2%	12.6%
4. Percentage of Expenditures for Instruction	52.9%	52.4%	51.9%	52.4%	52.9%	53.3%	54.3%
5. Percentage of Expenditures for Research	5.0%	5.4%	5.4%	5.5%	4.8%	4.9%	4.7%
6. Percentage of Expenditures for Public Service	.7%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	.6%	.7%
7. Subtotal of Percentage of Expenditures for Instruction, Research and Public Service (4 + 5 + 6)	58.6%	58.8%	58.3%	59.0%	58.8%	58.8%	59.7%

Note: Expenditure data for Patient Services (PCS 3.1) at KUMC are excluded in this analysis.

C. Campus Commentary

- D. Source:** *Annual University Financial Report*; to be consistent with practices of other Regents institutions, all computing expenditures are categorized as academic support.

IV. Indicator - Placement of Undergraduates Six Months after Graduation

A. Policy Priorities Addressed - One of the most significant outcomes of the educational enterprise is the preparation it provides for careers or other post-collegiate experiences. One question frequently asked is whether the educational experience at the Regents universities prepares students for employment or to continue their preparation through enrollment in graduate or professional school.

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC)	Annual Surveys			
	May 1997 Graduates Surveyed		May 2000 Graduates Surveyed	
Number Responding	1027		1687	
Total Number Surveyed	1855		2097	
Percent Response	55.4%		80.5%	
1. Number and Percent Reporting Employment Six Months After Graduation	667	64.9%	905	53.6%
2. Number and Percent Reporting Enrollment in Graduate or Professional School Six Months After Graduation	301	29.3%	396	23.5%
3. Number and Percent Seeking Employment or Admission to Graduate or Professional School Six Months After Graduation	24	2.4%	271	16.1%
4. Number and Percent Indicating Other (includes those not seeking employment or admission to graduate school but doing something else, e.g., pursuing another undergraduate degree, engaged in missionary/service activity, traveling, raising a family, etc.)	35	3.4%	97	5.7%
4a. Missing data/No answer			18	1.1%
5. TOTAL (All Categories)	1027	100.0%	1687	100.0%
6. Percent Employed or Enrolled in Graduate School of Those Employed, Enrolled, or Seeking Employment or Admission to Graduate School (1+2)/(1+2+3)		97.6%		82.8%
7. Number and Percent Indicating Academic Background was or will be Highly or Moderately Useful in Their Career.	875	87.7%	1426	84.5%
8. Number and Percent of Graduates Responding to Item 7.	998	97.2%	1632	96.7%
8a. Missing data/No answer			55	3.3%

C. Campus Commentary

D. Measures - Operational definitions of the indicators were developed by Regents committee charged to address this issue to ensure consistency in measurement and sampling.

V. Indicator - Student Satisfaction with the Undergraduate Experience

A. Policy Priorities Addressed - Effective organizations, including state agencies, are interested in perceptions of the quality of their services. Student perceptions about the quality of instruction, availability of courses, faculty help, and intellectual challenge provide an array of extremely important information about the performance of the Regents universities in undergraduate education.

B.

B. Performance Data (Lawrence)	Spring 2000 Survey										
	Frosh		Soph		Juniors		Seniors				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. Number and Percent of Students Reporting Overall Satisfaction with Education by undergraduate class and response category (1. very unsatisfied 2. unsatisfied 3. neutral	1.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.6		
	2.	2	1.2	4	2.5	1	.6	5	3.1		
	3.	25	14.8	18	11.1	17	10.4	11	6.8		
	4.	91	53.8	99	61.1	100	61.4	102	62.9		
	5.	51	30.2	41	25.3	45	27.6	43	26.6		
2. Number and Percent of Students Reporting that Instructors Provided Effective Instruction by undergraduate class and response category (1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4.	1.	1	.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0		
	2.	0	0.0	1	.6	0	0.0	3	1.8		
	3.	11	6.5	6	3.8	6	3.6	14	8.6		
	4.	120	71.0	115	71.4	122	74.4	93	57.1		
	5.	37	21.9	39	24.2	36	22.0	53	32.5		
3. Number and Percent of Students Reporting that Faculty were Helpful Outside of the Classroom and response category (1. not at all helpful 2. not very helpful 3.	1.	0	0.0	1	.6	1	.6	2	1.2		
	2.	11	6.5	7	4.4	9	5.5	6	3.7		
	3.	46	27.2	43	26.9	47	28.7	34	20.9		
	4.	73	43.2	80	50.0	63	38.4	78	47.8		
	5.	39	23.1	29	18.1	44	26.8	43	26.4		
4. Number and Percent of Students Reporting that their Experience at the Regents University Provided Opportunities for Intellectual Challenge by undergraduate class and response category (1. never 2. rarely 3. occasionally 4.	1.	0	0.0	1	.6	0	0.0	1	.6		
	2.	4	2.4	2	1.2	2	1.2	3	1.8		
	3.	41	24.2	40	24.6	47	28.7	40	24.6		
	4.	77	45.6	88	54.3	79	48.2	87	53.4		
	5.	47	27.8	31	19.1	36	21.9	32	19.6		
5. Number and Percent of Students Reporting Problems with the English Language Ability of the Person Teaching the Class by undergraduate class and response category (1. in 8 or more 2. in 5-7 courses 3. in 2-4	1.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.6	2	1.2		
	2.	3	1.8	4	2.5	5	3.1	6	3.7		
	3.	32	19.0	67	41.6	60	36.6	75	46.3		
	4.	63	37.5	49	30.4	51	31.1	43	26.6		
	5.	70	41.7	41	25.5	47	28.6	36	22.2		
6. Number and Percent of Students Reporting Problems Developing a Course Schedule because Needed Courses Were Not Offered or Were Already Closed by undergraduate class and response category (1. very frequently been a problem frequently been a problem 3. occasionally been a problem 4. rarely been a problem	1.	18	10.	24	14.	13	7.9	11	6.7		
	2.	22	6	32	8	36	22.	21	12.		
	3.	49	13.	61	19.	50	0	62	9		
	4.	51	0	31	8	43	30.	36	38.		
	5.	29	29.	14	37.	22	5	33	0		
			0		7		26.		22.		
			30.		19.		2		1		
			2		1		13.		20.		
			17.		8.6		4		3		
			2								

5. never been a problem)									
--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

C. Campus Commentary - Assessment of student satisfaction with the undergraduate experience is conducted every other year.

D. Source: *Student Perceptions Survey*

VI. Indicator - Utilization of Instructional Building Space (Average Hours/Week in the Fall Semester)

1. Policy Priorities Addressed - The state has made an extensive investment in space to build, condition, and maintain. It is important to monitor the use of classrooms and laboratories so that the investment in space is used wisely.

B.

Performance Data (Lawrence and KUMC)	Fall 1997	Fall 1998	Fall 1999	Fall 2000	Goal Fall 2001
1. Utilization of Instructional Building Space (Average Hours/Week in the Fall Semester)					
a. Classrooms - Lawrence - KUMC	30.94 N/A	30.55 29.10	31.50 N/A	29.89 27.60	Continue to exceed Regents guideline of 30.0
b. Teaching Laboratories - Lawrence	18.83	19.47	19.90	18.95	Reach Regents guideline of 20.0

C. Campus Commentary

D. Source: *Board of Regents Inventory of Physical Facilities and Space Utilization*

VII. Indicator - Graduate and Research Programs

A. Policy Priorities Addressed - A critical aspect of the mission of a research university is the graduate and research programs of the institution. This indicator provides an assessment of the vitality of the research program which enhances and supports the graduate education mission.

B.

Graduate and Research Programs (Lawrence and KUMC)	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	Goal FY 2000	Goal FY 2002
1. Proposals Submitted to External Funding Agencies (All Disciplines)					
a. Number of Proposals	1,533	1,454, est.	1,553	1,550	1,600
b. Dollar Value Expressed in Millions	\$196.26	\$211.16	\$232.97	\$240.00	\$245.00
2. Total Research Expenditures in Science and Engineering					
a. Millions of Dollars	\$108.89	\$117.12	\$132.75	\$110.00	\$120.00
b. National Ranking (of 500 Total)	81/531	77/531	75/531	70/500	70/500
c. National Ranking Among Public Universities	55/354	54/354	52/354		
3. National Ranking on Federally-Financed Research					
a. Ranking Among All Universities	93/521	93/521	83/521	85/500	85/500
b. Ranking Among Public Universities	60/349	60/349	53/349		

C. Campus Commentary - Because there is a synergistic relationship between graduate education and the conduct of research, KU continues to work for the expansion of research funding from external sources. These funds provide specialized training for graduate students and underwrite the multimillion dollar requirements for pursuing internationally recognized research.

D. Source: *National Science Foundation Survey on Academic Science and Engineering: Research and Development Expenditures*