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**Regents System Goal** (Click on Arrow to view selections) A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

**Institutional Goal 1:** Improve the effectiveness of ESU programs by increasing the efficiency and efficacy of program assessment and evaluation practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>3-Year Performance History</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mean rating on faculty involvement in program assessment, both breadth and depth. Scores range from 1 (lowest) to 4 highest. See the narrative below for details.</td>
<td>Mean for the lower performing cohort 2.08 Mean for the higher performing cohort 3.10</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Lower = 2.50 Higher n/a* Year 2: Lower n/a Higher =3.25 Year 3: Lower =2.75 Higher n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mean rating on Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices.</td>
<td>Mean for the lower performing cohort 2.14 Mean for the higher performing cohort 2.70</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Lower = 2.33 Higher n/a* Year 2: Lower n/a Higher =2.90 Year 3: Lower =2.60 Higher n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mean rating on using assessment to foster continuous improvement through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.</td>
<td>Mean for the lower performing cohort 1.57 Mean for the higher performing cohort 2.30</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Lower = 1.87 Higher n/a* Year 2: Lower n/a Higher =2.50 Year 3: Lower =2.17 Higher n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of ratings “at standard” or “above standard” across all assessment factors.</td>
<td>Lower performing cohort 27.2% Higher performing cohort 61.5%</td>
<td>Year 1: Lower = 40% Higher n/a* Year 2: Lower n/a Higher =69% Year 3: Lower =50% Higher n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Departments/programs submit evidence on an alternate 2 year rotation schedule

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1(Title Only): Improve the effectiveness of ESU programs by increasing the efficiency and efficacy of program assessment and evaluation practices.

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Mean rating on faculty involvement in program assessment.

Data Collection: All programs at ESU are required to provide biennial evidence of effectively engaging in 13 specific factors related to sound assessment practice to improve the effectiveness and efficiencies of academic programs. These factors are divided into 3 increasingly complex practice areas. Each is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard).

Every other year, departments report their Program Assessment of Student Learning (PASL) for each academic program; these were divided into lower & higher performing cohorts to encourage significant improvement in both groups. The alternate two-year rotation of these reports was done as it: 1) is a time-intensive process, 2) concentrates on those most in need first, 3) focuses specific resources on each cohort, 4) affords time to make changes, and 5) efficiently matches yearly resources with a large number of programs. The lower scoring cohort PASL is due in 2008 and in 2010. The higher scoring cohort PASL is due in 2009.

Key Performance Indicator #1 measures faculty involvement practice evidence (i.e., faculty input, alignment of outcomes with teaching & with professional standards).

Targets: The targets are different for each of the two cohorts to encourage each group to stretch to the next level. The lowest scoring group will have two reports due, first in 2008 (Target year 1 data) and then 2010 (Target year 3 data). The highest scoring group was relegated to 2009 (Target year 2 data).

We expect the highest target score increases here because faculty involvement is the cornerstone of any assessment program and it is necessary before success can be attained in Indicators 2 & 3. This is a stretch target because assessment is not popular in all departments and the diversity of our programs requires innovative assessment dedicated to each specific program. Although some cross fertilization is possible, most improvements are not easily replicated. This is a new & innovative evaluation system at ESU; it represents new skills for some faculty & administrators. The activities required to increase performance in these indicators demand considerable faculty time, development time, and financial resources so it is efficient. We are committed as we begin this process & expect it to become a model method of program evaluation.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Mean rating on Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices.

Data Collection: Key Performance Indicator #2 represents more complex assessment practices for faculty and administrators and is associated with data management and expanded assessment & evaluation designs to gauge student learning.

Targets: The largest yearly increase in this indicator should come in year 2 (for the lower performing cohort) and year 3 (for the higher performing cohort) because individual departments will have established more effective ways to track, store and retrieve data on student learning, and they will have increased the scope of their individual program evaluation designs. Target increments are set proportionately equal to those listed in indicator #1 and are stretch targets for the same reasons.
Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Mean rating on using assessment to foster continuous improvement through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.

**Data Collection:** Key Performance Indicator #3 represents the most advanced practices and is associated with using accurate and integrated methods of inquiry to improve the teaching-learning relationship (i.e., decision-based inquiry at the classroom and program levels).

**Targets:** Although the final mean rating for this indicator is slightly below 3.0, it represents the largest expected increase of all the key indicators. It is also the area that involves the most advanced practices (i.e., most difficult to achieve).

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Percentage of ratings “at standard” or “above standard” across all assessment practices.

**Data Collection:** The percentage of ratings of “3” or higher is calculated from the set of all practice ratings. This indicator measures the overall university performance with respect to sound assessment practice. It will give us a picture of the number of practice areas that evidence the standard (or above standard) performance, and it is not inflated by the highest ratings (i.e., 4).

**Targets:** We expect to increase the percentage of overall practice ratings achieving an “at standard” or “above standard” rating from a baseline of 27.2% for the lower scoring cohort (2008 Cohort) to 50% by the final of target year 3. We expect to increase the percentage of overall practice ratings achieving "at standard" or "above standard" rating from 61.5% at baseline for the higher scoring cohort (2009 Cohort) to 69% by the end of target year 2; this higher-performing cohort has less potential for improvement given its high baseline. It is important to note the percentages reflected in the baseline and targets are based on criteria with high expectations in the tradition of assessment at ESU; it is inappropriate to infer any type of letter grades for these indicators from these percentages.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Comments:** Although it may appear as though the university is just beginning an assessment program by viewing this goal and its indicators, it is important to note this goal and its indicators relate to assessment of individual academic programs; it does not relate to any assessment of the General Education Program or overarching assessment of basic skills such as reading, writing, or mathematical and quantitative reasoning. The goal and indicators featured here represent an expanded emphasis on a culture of assessment at ESU.

Each department is rated independently by the assessment director and by the Teaching, Learning, Assessment Committee.

All departments are engaged in assessment but some have practiced assessment longer and are more advanced. In the past, assessment was done by a few and now all members of each department are responsible. This is a 5 year plan so by the third assessment of the lower half of departments (Year 5), all are expected to be within the standard or above standard categories as they have had two cycles to raise their ratings. The division of the departments should be thought of as a normal curve where half are above and half are below.

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)  B: Improve Learner Outcomes
### Institutional Goal 2: Expand student learning, use, and performance in quantitative and mathematical reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>3-Year Performance History</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percentage of students who demonstrate the expected rate of progress or above based on linkage analysis of ACT-CAAP scores in quantitative and mathematical reasoning ability.</td>
<td>2003 - 2006 89.5% Average</td>
<td>Target yr 1: 89.7%  Target yr 2: 89.9%  Target yr 3: 90.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Program Quantitative Reasoning Index (PQRI)</td>
<td>2007 = 100</td>
<td>Target yr 1: 101  Target yr 2: 102  Target yr 3: 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Student Quantitative Reasoning Index (SQRI)</td>
<td>2007 = 100</td>
<td>Target yr 1: 101  Target yr 2: 102  Target yr 3: 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of students recognized for superior performance in mathematical and quantitative reasoning with a top quartile performance on the math and quantitative section(s) or CAAP = 60+, GATEWAY = 100, GMAT = 45+, GRE = 720+, PPST = 184+</td>
<td>2004 174  2005 180  2006 177</td>
<td>Target yr 1: 180  Target yr 2: 181  Target yr 3: 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): Expand student learning, use, and performance in quantitative and mathematical reasoning.**

**Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):** Percentage of students who demonstrate the expected rate of progress or above based on linkage analysis of each student's decile ranking on the math section of the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) with the same student's ACT math decile.

**Data Collection:** All ESU undergraduate students are required to demonstrate competency in quantitative & mathematical reasoning. The vast majority do this by their performance on a nationally standardized assessment (e.g., CAAP or PPST); most CAAP data shows scaled scores with local & national percentiles, or they can be imputed. National percentiles are converted to deciles for comparison with the same student's ACT math decile. ACT scaled scores in math come to ESU as part of admission via high school transcripts or electronically from ACT; they are converted to deciles using 2003-06 cumulative frequencies of ACT scaled scores in math. Using ACT's format, the data analysis involves comparing the ACT decile of each student with his/her CAAP decile; the CAAP is typically taken by juniors or seniors at ESU. ACT has established a specified relationship between ACT (i.e., pre-test) & CAAP (i.e., post-test). According to ACT: "The CAAP test requires greater knowledge and more
complex cognitive skills than the ACT assessment. Therefore, students scoring at the same 'level' on both tests must have increased their knowledge and cognitive skills." (ACT Linkage Reports ACT CAAP 2001-2002, p. 3).

**Targets:** The baseline was established by analyzing the 1045 ESU students for whom we have both the ACT & CAAP math data. The baseline includes students taking the CAAP between 2003 & 2006. Of these students, 89.5% were either in the expected progress or more than expected progress ranges delineated by ACT. Although we have been ahead of national norms in this area, the targets were set with small increases as we are trying to reverse the downward trends at ESU and nationally from comparable data in 1999-2002; it is challenging to reverse a decline. Also, considerable ceiling effects exist with our high baseline; small improvements will take far more effort than if we began with a low baseline. Achieving our targets will take persistence, especially since many students struggle with mathematical and quantitative reasoning and have considerable anxiety in this area. Assessment is more complex than a single factor can fully reveal. Evaluating all indicators together facilitates a comprehensive perspective of our efforts to expand and enhance mathematical and quantitative reasoning in creative ways in an array of courses and disciplines.

**Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): The Program Quantitative Reasoning Index (PQRI)**

**Data Collection:** The PQRI is a measure of the intensity of quantitative & mathematical reasoning required in ESU courses. Classification is based on assessment of student learning in quantitative & mathematical reasoning where Level 1 (L1) courses indicate moderate performance requirements, Level 2 (L2) courses indicate expanded performance requirements, & Level 3 (L3) courses indicate intensive performance requirements. Classification of course depth levels is determined by guidelines specifically designed for this assessment.

Each course/section is weighted by the number of credit hours if it has significant quantitative or mathematical depth (1-3 scale). The format of this document does not currently permit the input of a formula. However, each course is classified by depth (1=moderate, 2=expanded, 3=intensive), and multiplied by its course credit hours. These values are then summed & divided by current level values (using the same formula) for the baseline year 2007. Since the numerator (current offerings) and denominator (2007 values) are the same at baseline, the beginning PQRI equals 1.00*100 =100. A higher PQRI indicates improvement.

**Targets:** The targets represent increases in the intensity of quantitative and mathematical reasoning required of students. They represent significant expansion in areas where quantitative reasoning can be applied. These goals effectively require faculty to increase their expectations as illustrated on their assessment of students' learning instruments (i.e., exams, quizzes, assignments, labs) with respect to mathematical and quantitative reasoning as appropriate. We need substantial improvement to achieve them and some uncontrollable factors could cause unexpected annual fluctuations. The baseline for the PQRI (2007) is 100.

**Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): The Student Quantitative Reasoning Index (SQRI)**

**Data Collection:** The Student Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning Index (SQRI) is based on the intensity of quantitative & mathematical reasoning in each student's individual program; this included 3,388 degree seeking undergraduates in the 2007 spring semester. The key performance indicator is the mean for our undergraduate student population as an index number. The data classification follows the same classifications & weights as performance indicator #2; this forms the numerator for each student in comparison with Level 0 (L0) courses that do not assess substantive quantitative and mathematical reasoning ability in the denominator; this coefficient is between 0 & 1. The aggregate means for the measured year & the base year form an index number, which is 100 in the base year. This indicator is thorough since it captures the mathematical and quantitative intensity of each student's individual program.
Targets: This indicator is a more challenging one than Indicator 2 since students can attempt to avoid programs & courses involving more intense quantitative and mathematical reasoning. The mean SQRI provides a clearly identifiable target. This index, which is the ratio of the means of mathematical & quantative and mathematical reasoning for a given year, is 100 for the baseline 2007. The targets represent virtually the entire undergraduate student body of degree seeking students, and since there is less opportunity for students who are near graduation to take more quantitatively intense courses, the targets require a disproportionate change for students who are taking more General Education courses. This means the targets are set to achieve progress consistent with significant improvement. All three indicators together should provide a more comprehensive perspective of achieving the goal of expanding student learning, use, and performance in mathematical and quantitative reasoning than a single indicator.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Student Superior Performance

Data Collection: Scaled scores are typically referenced with norms and can be converted to identify students performing in the highest quartile. For example, a scaled score of 60 was at the 75th percentile nationally in the latest CAAP assessment, and this scaled score historically has been approximately the lower boundary of the top quartile; it indicates a superior performance in mathematical and quantitative reasoning. Students who take multiple tests, or repeat the same test, are recognized for superior performance on only one test.

Targets: The baseline was formed from a three-year moving average of superior performances. Moving averages are used because students have considerable latitude in when they take these exams. Historically, ESU has improved from comparable numbers in 2002 and 2003, which were 136 and 163 respectively. However, we have seen recent declines in this indicator since its peak in 2005. Part of this may be attributable to an increase in students taking the CAAP exam in recent years; it contains more advanced mathematical problems than the alternative nationally-normed exam some programs specifically required (e.g., the PPST for some programs in The Teachers College). Obviously, the reason many students elect to take the CAAP is not because it has challenging problems; the CAAP exam is far less expensive (e.g., the fee charged by ACT for the CAAP math test taken by itself is $25, whereas the PPST math test is $80). As we expect a larger proportion of undergraduates taking the CAAP in the future, it makes higher targets far more challenging to achieve. Moreover, the incentive to perform in the top quartile nationally for students taking the CAAP is almost exclusively associated with personal pride.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments: The format of this document does not allow for the input of the formulas used for the PQRI and SQRI. They follow the narrative above. The first three indicators are part of a bold new comprehensive endeavor to improve quantitative and mathematical reasoning that ventures across the curriculum.

The scope of this endeavor is exceptionally wide; it is like mathematical and quantitative reasoning across the curriculum. For example it includes virtually all of the full-time degree-seeking undergraduate student body in Indicator #2 above.

The scope in Indicator #1 is wider than might be recognized by looking at the numbers cited above. So far in 2007, 581 ESU students have taken the CAAP math test on the ESU campus, which is an ACT testing site; ACT administers the CAAP at ESU and at other venues around the United States.
Students can take this and other nationally-normed exams at any testing center and have their scores sent to ESU. While 581 so far may not seem large relative to our undergraduate population, most students only take these tests once in an undergraduate career, so we would expect far less than one-fourth of our undergraduates taking one of these exams in any given year. Since most students may take any nationally-normed exam for which there is concordance with the CAAP, the scope of the initiative is large even if we cannot use some of the data because it does not conform to the criteria established by ACT for a linkage study. We strive to be efficient and make every attempt to avoid duplicate testing; it is expensive to the student, time consuming, and adds relatively little value in assessment of this already large magnitude. For example, forcing transfer students, who took the SAT before first matriculating at another university, to go back and take an ACT math test is not only inefficient, it is inappropriate for a linkage study because they have already completed significant collegiate-level work; taking the ACT, which is a college admissions test, would no longer take on the characteristics of a pre-test for our purposes. We are comfortable with the relatively large size of the sample where we have all the necessary information to conduct this linkage study. It is far larger than what most universities have, especially as a proportion of the undergraduate population, and it allows us to put this forth as a broad-based performance agreement. This is a bold initiative in an extraordinarily challenging area where many if not most universities in the United States have been searching for solutions.

The comprehensive assessment elements used in this initiative involve some new and sophisticated approaches to assessment. The university has been recognized nationally for its effective assessment. Parts of the program began decades ago when the university was one of the first in the United States to embark on a broad-based assessment of all of its undergraduate students in reading, writing, and quantitative reasoning. The American Productivity and Quality Center (APQC) cited ESU as a "Best Practice" organization in 1998 for its assessment of student learning. We think this initiative continues in this tradition.

Collectively, the first three indicators form a cohesive and measurable way of verifying the goal of improving mathematical and quantitative reasoning. The importance of viewing these individual indicators as a comprehensive model of assessment cannot be overstated.

### Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)  D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access

#### Institutional Goal 3: Provide access to higher education and retention and graduation of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>3-Year Performance History</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds enrolled.</td>
<td>2004 495</td>
<td>Yr 1: 545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005 524</td>
<td>Yr 2: 550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 544</td>
<td>Yr 3: 555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percentage of ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained.</td>
<td>2004 56.0%</td>
<td>Yr 1: 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005 70.2%</td>
<td>Yr 2: 62.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 61.3%</td>
<td>Yr 3: 63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Degree completion count of ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>2004 68</td>
<td>Yr 1: 76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005 72</td>
<td>Yr 2: 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006 75</td>
<td>Yr 3: 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Performance Indicator 1

#### Data Collection:
The number of enrolled students from ethnically diverse backgrounds is self reported. Ethnically diverse backgrounds are defined as: Black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islanders, and American Indian or Alaskan Native. Consistent with United States government guidelines, hispanic individuals may be of any race; obviously, they are counted only once so no duplication exists. Similarly, those of mixed races are counted only once.

#### Targets:
Targets are set based upon expanding beyond our historical averages of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. We closely reviewed our historical data, our target population constrained through geographic jurisdiction, and a review of K-12 programs, to set stretch targets that accurately reflect our demographic profile and constituencies. Our target may appear low relative to the growth in number of high school students graduating from ethnically diverse backgrounds; however, the absence of growth in the number of those students who are academically prepared with a college preparatory curriculum keeps it lower. Moreover, the increasing financial challenges facing those from less affluent backgrounds may diminish the potential number of students from diverse backgrounds. There is increasing competition from all higher education sectors for these academically prepared students. This is even a larger stretch target as it appears there may be a decrease in diverse students for fall 2007.

### Key Performance Indicator 2

#### Data Collection:
The percentage of returning students from diverse ethnic backgrounds is calculated by comparing the fall semester with the previous fall semester. This indicator is based on percentage as all university retention is reported and analyzed in terms of population percentage. The denominator for each year will differ based on the number of entering first time ethnically diverse students.

#### Targets:
Targets are set based upon increasing the historical averages of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained. We closely reviewed our historical data and our internal programs to set targets that accurately reflect our possibilities. These are stretch targets as baseline percentages are high and retention rates are affected by external forces such as socio-economic barriers and barriers associated with first generational student populations that are typical of our student population. These retention rates are at or above averages of similar schools. Driving the success of this target are the resources available to implement and expand a variety of retention programs. The quality of retention programs is important to the success of this target. Some current programs under review may be discontinued depending upon the assessment of the program's effectiveness. Other new approaches will be added.

### Key Performance Indicator 3

#### Key Performance Indicator 3: Improve degree completion count of ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.
Data Collection: The collection of data is based on the number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds completing degrees. We closely reviewed historical data, internal programs, as well as external opportunities and threats to set targets that accurately reflect the number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds completing degrees. The numbers reflect a dependence on past practice; this means the target goals set in Indicator #1 and Indicator #2 do not have time to impact Indicator #3. This severely constrains our ability to increase this number. This is a number rather than a percentage because our (successful) efforts in Indicator #1 would mathematically decrease this Indicator #3. It is important to note, the economic hardship many in this group face is largely beyond our immediate control. In addition many are first generation college students which exacerbates their ability to chart a path consistent with their academic success. We are committed to improving their opportunities to be academically successful. Otherwise, we would expect a significant decrease in these indicators.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Increase the number of campus programs offered to ESU students and faculty related to fostering success for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The collection of data is based on the number of programs created and offered to ESU students and faculty related to multicultural education and the success of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the number of campus educational opportunities associated with the need to increase campus awareness of issues impacting students from diverse ethnic backgrounds success and persistence in a four year higher education institution. Driving the success of this target are the resources available to implement and expand a variety of new educational opportunities that engage the campus in greater awareness of related multicultural education. These targets are stretch targets as baseline numbers are obtained from the past practice of decentralization of training opportunities. This indicator calls for greater campus collaboration and resource management. This would, at minimum, affect the number of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds but also majority students who may also participate.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): Develop and implement access and retention programs specific to all ESU students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The number of programs implemented and maintained that are designed to specifically provide access and assistance for students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the number of campus and non-campus programs hosted by Emporia State University that provide awareness of higher education opportunities as well as assistance in retention of students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Quality of the programs as well as an increase in the number of programs and the population served is dependent upon the resources available as well as the quality and effectiveness of the programs. These factors coupled with the target populations' constraints through geographic jurisdiction as well as the target populations' participation in the curriculum necessary to gain access to higher education define this as a stretch goal. This would, at minimum, affect the number of students and potential students from ethnically diverse backgrounds but also majority students who may participate.

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)</th>
<th>A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Goal 4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</td>
<td>3-Year Performance History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)  A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>3-Year Performance History</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</table>

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5:
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Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</th>
<th>3-Year Performance History</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Performance Outcome</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6(Title Only):

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):
Data Collection:
Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):
Data Collection:
Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):
Data Collection:
Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):
Data Collection:
Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):
Data Collection:
Targets:
Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBOR use only: Institution Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation and Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

561.09