**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.</td>
<td>Mean for the lower performing cohort 2.50</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Higher =3.25 Lower n/a* Year 2: Higher n/a Lower =2.75 Year 3: Higher =3.30 Lower n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores range from 1 (lowest) to 4 (highest). See the narrative below for details.</td>
<td>Mean for the higher performing cohort 3.10</td>
<td></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 2.33</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Higher =2.90 Lower n/a* Year 2: Higher n/a Lower =2.60 Year 3: Higher =3.00 Lower n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean for the higher performing cohort 2.70</td>
<td></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 1.87</td>
<td>Means Year 1: Higher =2.50 Lower n/a* Year 2: Higher n/a Lower =2.17 Year 3: Higher =2.60 Lower n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean for the higher performing cohort 2.30</td>
<td></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 40.0% Higher performing cohort 61.5%</td>
<td>Year 1: Higher =69% Lower n/a* Year 2: Higher n/a Lower =50% Year 3: Higher =75% Lower 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:** Data is collected for all Goal 1 Performance Indicators via the Program Assessment of Student Learning (PASL). Every other year, departments report their PASL for each academic program. Based on our 2006 results, programs 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 again in 2010. The higher scoring cohort PASL is due in 2009 and 2011. Departments must provide actual evidence of performance in-line with the evaluation factors on the PASL.

Key Performance Indicator #1 measures faculty involvement practice evidence (i.e., development of learning outcomes/standards, faculty input/involvement, and alignment of outcomes with teaching & with professional standards). Each factor is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). Key Performance Indicator #1 is the average factor mean score. A description of each level of performance for each factor is given below:

**Factor 1-Professional Standards:** Programs at the "beginning" level have an assessment system that does not reflect professional standards/outcomes. If standards are present, they are not established by faculty and/or outside consultants. At the "developing" level, the program is based on professional standards/outcomes, but the faculty and the professional community were not involved. At the "at-standard" level, the assessment system is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND the professional community were involved. At the "above standard level" the assessment system goes beyond the previous level to demonstrate continuous improvement through systematic activities. For example, the department may have continuous involvement with professional groups, employ a departmental assessment committee that is synthesized with other university committees and involve student focus groups. This type of system will appear to be able to quickly respond to changing demands of the profession or the curriculum.

**Factor 2- Faculty Involvement:** Programs at the "beginning" level evidence no departmental assessment activities. At the "developing" level, faculty involvement consists of one or two individuals who work on program assessment needs and activities. Little or no communication is established with other faculty or professionals. At the "at-standard" level, faculty involvement consists of a small core within the department, but input from other faculty and professionals about assessment issues is evidenced. At the "above-standard" level, faculty involvement is widespread throughout the program or department. All faculty within the department have contributed (and continue to contribute) to the use and maintenance of an assessment plan. At the latter two levels, faculty will be increasingly involved in many of the activities of the plan including managing data, communicating performance to individual students, communicating results to colleagues, and embedding assessments into courses.

**Factor 3- Assessment Alignment:** At the "beginning" level, no alignment between faculty identified outcomes and assessments is evidenced. At the "developing" level, alignment exists with some outcomes and assessments but not others, OR the alignments are weak/unclear. At the "at-standard"
level, the alignment between outcomes and assessments is complete and clear. This is usually evidenced when a point-by-point comparison between individual subtest data (or even individual test item results) and the stated learning outcomes can be made. At the "above standard" level, the program courses are included in this alignment, which provides the ultimate mechanism for change.

3-Year Performance History: This campus-wide assessment program has been in place for two years with approximately half of the university units filing assessment reports each year on 13 factors related to improving academic programs. Since each group has undergone evaluation over two cycles, the process is relatively new but the expectations for improvement in the mean ratings have been set relatively high given the top possible rating of four and the number of units involved in the assessment reporting.

Targets: 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 relatively new and innovative evaluation system at ESU and it would be for many institutions in higher education; it represents new skills for some faculty and administrators. The activities required to increase performance in this indicator demand considerable faculty time, development time, and financial resources to become efficient. Establishing external professional input mechanisms takes time; getting consensus by faculty on what they deem valuable in their profession can be challenging; and developing faculty skills is resource intensive. Furthermore, some disciplines do not have professional standards outlined for them by an accrediting body. This means that they can only score as high as a "3" on factor 1. Similarly, some departments are too small (in faculty numbers) to establish the liaisons necessary to score a "4" on factor 2. In addition, it takes several feedback cycles to establish the alignment between outcomes, assessments and courses at the "point-by-point" level described in the narrative for factor 3 above.

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.

Each factor is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). Key Performance Indicator #2 is the average factor mean score. A description of each level of performance for each factor is given below:

Factor 4: Assessment Structure: The assessment plan has to have all three of the following attributes to be at the "above standard" level: 1) have multiple direct and indirect assessments, 2) use assessments on a regular basis, 3) employ some assessments that provide comprehensive information on student performance at each stage of their program. An "at-standard" level program has two of these three attributes, a developing" level program has only one of these aspects, and a "beginning" level program has none of them.

Factor 5: Data Management: A "beginning" level program has no data management system at all. Programs at the "developing" level have one in place to collect and store data, but it does not have the capacity to store and analyze data from ALL students over time (longitudinally). The "at-standard" data management system can store and process most student performance data over time. The "above standard" data management system goes beyond level three by being able to analyze and report data in user-friendly formats. At this level, data can easily be accessed by all faculty and, in some cases, students.

Factor 6: Data Collection Points. At the "beginning" level, data are not collected across multiple points and do not predict student success. At the...
"developing" level, data are collected at multiple points but there is no rationale regarding their relationship to student success. At the "at-standard" level, data are systematically collected at multiple points and there is strong rationale (e.g., research, best practice) regarding their relationship to student success. At the "above standard" level programs go beyond the rationale and provide statistical evidence for the predictability between the assessments and student success.

Factor 7: Data Collection Sources. At the "beginning" level data are collected from applicants, students and faculty only. At the "developing" level, data is additionally collected from graduates. At the "at-standard" level, data is additionally collected from other professionals. At the "above standard" level, the data collection is from multiple sources for all of these groups.

Factor 8: Program Improvement. At the "beginning" level, the assessment system consists of measures that are neither comprehensive nor integrated. At the "developing" level, the assessment system includes multiple measures, but they are not integrated or they lack a scoring/cut-off criteria. At the "at-standard" level the scoring/cut-off criteria are established. At the "above standard" level, the scoring/cut-off criteria are examined for validity and utility, resulting in program modifications as necessary.

3-Year Performance History: This campuswide assessment program has been in place for two years with approximately half of the university units filing assessment reports each year on 13 factors related to improving academic programs. Since each group has undergone evaluation over two cycles the process is relatively new but the expectations for improvement in the mean ratings have been set relatively high given the top possible rating of four and the number of units involved in the assessment reporting.

Targets: These targets are stretch targets for many of the reasons stated in the data collection section for Performance Indicator 1. Additional reasons exist specifically for this indicator, however. First, not all programs have the resources to employ multiple direct and indirect measures, nor do all programs have assessment entry points (e.g., courses) that would give them clean data. This reduces their ceiling score to a maximum level 3 (at-standard) for factor 4. As discussed above, it takes time to complete a "target---data collection---decision making---revision" evaluation cycle, and this problem is compounded when using multiple direct and indirect assessments. Providing data for individual student performance as they progress through the program requires many other factors (e.g., data management, data collection points) to be more fully developed. Data management is an area that is challenging for many universities and even purchasing a commercially available system requires several years for implementation, integration, and faculty training.

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).

Each factor is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). Key Performance Indicator #3 is the average factor mean score. A description of each level of performance for each factor is given below:

Factor 9: Program Improvements. For the "beginning" level program, data are only generated for external accountability reports. At the "developing" level some of the generated data are based on internal standards and are used for program improvement. However, they are available only to administrators "as needed." For a program "at-standard," an ongoing, systematic, objectives-based process is in place for reporting and using
data to make decisions and improve programs within the department. At the "above standard" level, this data is additionally used to make decisions university-wide.

Factor 10: Monitoring Student Progress & Managing and Improving Operations and Programs. For the "beginning" level program, measures are used to monitor student progress, but are not used to manage and improve operations and programs. At the "developing" level, measures are used to monitor student progress and manage operations and programs, but they are not used for improvement. At the "at-standard" level, all of these criteria are evidenced. At the "above standard" level, changes based on data are evidenced.

Factor 11: Assessment data usage by faculty. For the "beginning" level program, data are not shared with faculty. At the "developing" level, assessment data is shared, but no guidance for reflection or improvement is evidenced. For the "at-standard" level, guidance for reflection and improvement is evidenced. At the "above standard" level, remediation opportunities are made available (e.g., course development, program development, operation changes).

Factor 12: Assessment Data Shared with Students. At the "beginning" level, program data are not typically shared with students and sharing individual student performance data is not fully present. At the "developing" level, program assessment data are shared with students, but it is not used for guidance, reflection or improvement. At the "at-standard" level, program data are shared with guidance, reflection and improvement. At the "above standard" level, data are shared with guidance, reflection and improvement. Individual performance data is fully used to inform students of their strengths and weaknesses. Remediation opportunities are made available to the student as necessary.

Factor 13: Fairness, Accuracy and Consistency of Assessments. At the "beginning" level, no steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy and consistency of assessments. At the "developing" level, the assessments have undergone tests of "face-validity" only. At the "at-standard" level, preliminary steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments. At the "above standard" level, fairness, accuracy and consistency have been statistically established through data analysis. ####

3-Year Performance History: This campuswide assessment program has been in place for two years with approximately half of the university units filing assessment reports each year on 13 factors related to improving academic programs. Since each group has undergone evaluation over two cycles the process is relatively new but the expectations for improvement in the mean ratings have been set relatively high given the top possible rating of four and the number of units involved in the assessment reporting.

Targets: Although the final mean rating for this indicator is slightly below 3.0, it represents the characteristics that will mature last. It is also the area that involves the most advanced practices (i.e., most difficult to achieve). In addition to the reasons provided in the data collection section for Performance Indicator 1, this is also a stretch target because few programs can collect data that will have a university-wide impact (factor 9). This provides a level 3 ceiling on this factor for most programs. Similarly, few departments at any university will have the resources to establish statistical reliability and validity with their assessments (beyond using commercially available, standardized tests). Again, this provides a level "3" ceiling. In addition, some programs are limited in design so that many of their assessments have to be summative (at the end of a program). For these programs, their opportunity to provide assessment data to students is more limited, as is their ability to provide remediation. Even if this is possible within a program currently using summative assessments, it represents a significant change in their assessment/evaluation design. ####

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). It is also more sensitive in measuring program performance in departments facing possible evaluation ceilings as explained in the "Targets" sections above.

**3-Year Performance History:** This campuswide assessment program has been in place for two years with approximately half of the university units filing assessment reports each year on 13 factors related to improving academic programs. Since each group has undergone evaluation at least once (and in some cases, twice), the process is relatively new but the expectations for improvement in the mean ratings have been set relatively high given the top possible rating of four and the number of units involved in the assessment reporting. 

**Targets:** We expect to increase the percentage of overall practice ratings achieving an “at standard” or “above standard” rating from a baseline of 40% for the lower scoring cohort (2009 Cohort) to 50% by the final of target year 2. 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 75% 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:**

**3-Year Performance History:**

**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, and 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 4), 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)</th>
<th>B: Improve Learner Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Goal 2: Improve undergraduate skills in critical thinking and written communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
</table>
1. Performance Task Score from Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
   None
   Target yr 1: 1067
   Target yr 2: 1088
   Target yr 3: 1110

2. Analytical Writing Task Score (CLA)
   None
   Target yr 1: 1114
   Target yr 2: 1136
   Target yr 3: 1159

3. ESU's average National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) score on the number of written reports between 5 and 19 pages
   2005: 2.50
   2006: 2.43
   2007: 2.55
   Target yr 1: 2.56
   Target yr 2: 2.59
   Target yr 3: 2.64

4. ESU's average NSSE score on the amount of coursework that emphasizes making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
   2005: 2.83
   2006: 2.99
   2007: 3.13
   Target yr 1: 3.14
   Target yr 2: 3.15
   Target yr 3: 3.16

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): Improve undergraduate skills in critical thinking and written communication**

**Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Performance Task Score from CLA**

**Data Collection:** The CLA will be administered to a cohort of senior students

**3-Year Performance History:** None

**Target:** ESU does not have a performance history with CLA having only recently selected it as an assessment instrument for our campus. We have set the target in year 1 to be the mean score for senior students minus one standard deviation from the CLA 2006-2007 report. The target for year two represents a 2% increase. The target in year three is a 2% increase of the year 2 target.

**Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Analytical Writing Task Score from CLA**

**Data Collection:** The CLA will be administered to a cohort of senior students.

**3-Year Performance History:** None

**Targets:** ESU does not have a performance history with CLA having only recently selected it as an assessment instrument for our campus. We have set the target in year 1 to be the mean score for senior students minus one standard deviation from the CLA 2006-2007 report. The target for year two represents a 2% increase. The target in year three is a 2% increase of the year 2 target.

**Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Average score of ESU students on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) question about the number of written reports between 5 and 19 pages.**

**Data Collection:** This instrument is administered to graduating seniors. It is a national instrument in which students rate numerous aspects of their
academic career. The students are asked to rate the number of written papers between 5-19 pages in length using the scale, 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much. A mean score is then computed.

3-Year Performance History: ESU's three year average score on this item is 2.49, while the mean for our peer institutions as reported by NSSE is 2.48, and the national mean is 2.61. Compared to our peers ESU's results are average. Since ESU's score is slightly below average, our target in three years is to rise above the national average.

Targets: The target set for each year shows an annual increase in this category. Our goal is to rise above the national average (2.61) over a three year period.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only): ESU's average NSSE score on the amount of coursework that emphasizes making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods

Data Collection: This instrument is administered to graduating seniors. It is a national instrument in which students rate numerous aspects of their academic career. The students are asked to rate how much their coursework emphasized the mental activity of making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods using the scale, 1= very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4= very much.

3-Year Performance History: ESU's average score over three years is 2.98 compared to an average of 2.97 for our peers and 2.96 for the national average over three years. So we are currently slightly above average in this area. To further improve is a stretch goal.

Targets: The goals in this category represent significant "stretch" for ESU. ESU is currently above the national average in this category. Continuing to increase each year will require focused attention in this area.

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

<p>| Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access |
| Institution Goal 3: Provide access to higher education and retention and graduation of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. |</p>
<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(undergraduate and graduate, full and part time) from diverse ethnic backgrounds enrolled.</td>
<td>2005: 524 2006: 544 2007: 541</td>
<td>Yr 1: 520* Yr 2: 530 Yr 3: 535</td>
<td>* (lower initially due to massive Tyson cutbacks in Emporia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Percentage of full time ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained from freshman to sophomore year. | 2005: 70.2%  
2006: 68.1%  
2007: 69.6% | Yr 1: 65%*  
Yr 2: 68%  
Yr 3: 69%  
* lower initially due to massive Tyson cutback |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Degree completion count of ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. | 2005: 72  
2006: 75  
2007: 78 | Yr 1: 79  
Yr 2: 80  
Yr 3: 81 |
| 4. Number of participants in programs for K-12 students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. | 2007: 1675 | Yr 1: 1725  
Yr 2: 1775  
Yr 3: 1825 |
| 5. Number of students participating in support programs for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. | 2007: 358 | Yr 1: 408  
Yr 2: 458  
Yr 3: 508 |

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): Provide access to or awareness of higher education for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Number of enrolled ESU students (undergraduate and graduate) from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

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.

3-Year Performance History: ESU’s performance shows a slight increase over the three year period. Due to the massive Tyson layoffs in Emporia in 2008, ESU will suffer a setback in our enrollments of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. However factoring this into our targets ESU intends to increase each year after a significant setback initially.

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. The targets are a stretch even though the initial targets seem low because ESU will be recovering from the effects of the massive Tyson cutback in Emporia for the next few years.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Percentage of fulltime ESU students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained.
Data Collection: The retention percentage of fulltime students from diverse ethnic backgrounds is calculated by comparing the enrollment figures for students in this group in the current fall semester with the enrollment figures from the previous fall semester. This indicator is based on percentage as the university retention is reported and analyzed in terms of percentage.

3-Year Performance History: Again ESU's performance in retention is fairly stable, averaging about 69% over the last three years. Due to the Tyson layoff, an initial setback in retention is expected but ESU intends to show a significant improvement in each subsequent year.

Targets: ESU has a good track record in retaining students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. However external forces such as socio-economic barriers and first generational student challenges are particularly significant for this population. Thus further improvement in this area will require a dedicated effort. Again initial targets are a stretch given the impact of the Tyson cutbacks on ESU.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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.

3-Year Performance History: The 3-year history shows a slight improvement in this area and we intend to continue this improvement. Given the Tyson layoffs and the downturn in economic conditions, even slow growth will take a careful attentiveness to the issue of improving the number of degree completions.

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. 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): Number of participants in programs for K-12 students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The collection of data is based on the number of participants in our K-12 outreach programs for students from diverse backgrounds.

3-Year Performance History: ESU has a strong record in the area of outreach programs for underrepresented populations. We intend to maintain the programs we have and continually improve and expand the numbers reached.

Targets: Targets are set based upon the resources available to implement the programs. In being effective stewards of financial resources it will be important to only maintain programs of high quality. If a program is not deemed effective the university will act to replace it with a more productive effort.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): Number of students participating in support programs for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The number of participants in support programs designed to specifically provide access and assistance for students from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds.
3-Year Performance History: ESU has a significant number of student support programs for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. ESU is committed to expanding the participation in these programs.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the participation in a 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.

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)</th>
<th>B: Improve Learner Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Goal 4: Enrich the undergraduate learning experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>2. Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have successfully completed a research, scholarly, or creative activity.</td>
<td>2007: 35% (with a rubric score of 2 or 3)</td>
<td>Yr 1: 37%  Yr 2: 39%  Yr 3: 41% (with a rubric score of 2 or 3)</td>
<td>Performance Outcome</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have significantly participated in civic engagement/community service activities.</td>
<td>2007: 23% (with a rubric score of 2 or 3)</td>
<td>Yr 1: 25%  Yr 2: 27%  Yr 3: 29% (with a rubric score of 2 or 3)</td>
<td>Performance Outcome</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have successfully completed an internship or practicum experience.</td>
<td>2007: 31%</td>
<td>Yr 1: 32%  Yr 2: 34%  Yr 3: 36%</td>
<td>Performance Outcome</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4(Title Only): Enrich the undergraduate learning experience

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Number of students participating in a first year enrichment program
Data Collection: The enrollment in first year experience programs will be obtained from ESU's Institutional Research Office (by adding enrollment figures from those departmental courses identified as a first year experience class). These programs provide students with valuable information about career opportunities in their field, internship opportunities, study tips, and campus resources. Students also will meet many faculty members in their discipline early in their program. Such an experience also facilitates the early formation of study groups of students who will be taking many of their future courses together.

3-Year Performance History: Over the period of 2005-2007, the number of students in a first year experience class has grown with particular growth in the last year. The goal of 10% growth has been set to demonstrate ESU's commitment to assisting students in adjusting to college life.

Targets: Several academic departments have developed a first year experience course into their curriculum. Due to the positive feedback from these efforts, ESU will expand these offerings. The target numbers for each year represent approximately a 10% growth from the number in the previous year.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a research, scholarly, or creative activity

Data Collection: This data will be collected from individual academic departments. Department chairs will submit this information to their respective deans.

3-Year Performance History:

Targets: Participating in a research, scholarly, or creative activity is a real-world validation of a student's academic accomplishment. While requiring significant individualized faculty time with students it is a stretch to expand what is already taking place. However this type of mentoring of students is essential. The student performance will be rated using a three point rubric system.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a civic engagement/community service activity

Data Collection: This data is collected from various offices on campus such as the Center for Student Involvement, the Office of Strategic Partnerships and Student Life, and the Associated Student Government. The extensiveness of the student work will be rated using a three point rubric.

3-Year Performance History:

Targets: The university community values its responsibility for civic engagement and public service. The targets for each succeeding year increase by 2%. However due to the large number of ESU students employed for a significant number of hours per week, the goal for increasing student participation in civic engagement or community service is a stretch goal.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in an internship or practicum experience.

Data Collection: This data will be collected from ESU Career Services Office as well as individual academic departments involved in monitoring internship/practicum activities.
3-Year Performance History:

**Targets:** The value of participating in an internship or practicum experience is increasingly recognized by both students and future employers.

**Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):**

**Data Collection:**

3-Year Performance History:

**Targets:**

**Comments:** ESU reported on this area in its 2007 report, where it was noted that this goal was to be retired in the next reporting cycle. However, the University realizes that first year experiences, research and creative works, community service activities, and internship/practicum participation greatly enriches an undergraduate's educational experience and also serves to better prepare them for their lives after graduation.

Rubric for KPI 2: 3= publication or presentation of a scholarly/research/creative activity at a state, regional, or national professional conference, 2= presentation of a scholarly/research/creative activity at a university sponsored forum or development of a scholarly/research/creative product which required the dedication of a concerted effort over the course of the period of a semester or summer and evaluated at a B or above level, 1= presentation in a classroom setting or completion of a minor research/creative project

Rubric for KPI 3: 3=civic engagement/community service of 100 or more hours, 2=civic engagement/community service ranging between 50 and 99 hours, 1=civic engagement/community service of less than 50 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections)</th>
<th>Institutional Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Goal 5: Expand international educational opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>
</table>
| 1. Number of international students attending ESU. | 2005: 177  
2006: 337  
2007: 375 | Yr 1: 413  
Yr 2: 454  
Yr 3: 500 | | |
| 2. Number of ESU students who have successfully completed a study abroad experience. | 2005: 55  
2006: 52  
2007: 53 | Yr 1: 70  
Yr 2: 81  
Yr 3: 93 | | |
| 3. Number of ESU faculty who have successfully completed an international academic activity. | 2005: 7  
2006: 5  
2007: 14 | Yr 1: 16  
Yr 2: 18  
Yr 3: 20 | | |
| 4. Number of participants in programs focused on international cultural experiences. | 2007: 488 | Yr 1: 575  
Yr 2: 650  
Yr 3: 725 | | |
NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5 (Title Only): Expand international educational opportunities

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only): Number of international students attending ESU

Data Collection: The Office of International Education will report annually on the number of international students attending ESU. ESU greatly values the educational opportunities provided by interactions between our domestic and international students. All students profit from this opportunity and are better prepared to participate in today's global society. This is a key component in ESU's Strategic Plan currently under development.

3-Year Performance History: ESU is growing in this area and intends to continue this growth.

Targets: The first year target is based on a 10% growth from our 2007 result. Subsequent targets are set at a 10% growth from the previous year.

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only): Number of ESU students who have participated in a study abroad experience

Data Collection: The Office of International Education will report annually on the number of ESU students who have participated in a study abroad program.

3-Year Performance History: The number of students studying abroad was relatively stable over the period of 2005-2007. We view these numbers as below average. ESU will be more active in motivating students to have some form of a study abroad experience. ESU intends to significantly improve in this area.

Targets: Our target for study abroad participation in 2009 will be 70 students. In subsequent years we have targeted for 15% growth.

Key Performance Indicator 3 (Title Only): Number of ESU faculty participating in an international academic activity

Data Collection: Data is obtained from the Office of International Education and the Academic Deans

3-Year Performance History: Our performance was below average in years 2005 and 2006. The university is committed to increasing the involvement of its faculty in international educational efforts. The faculty number in 2007 was almost three times the faculty number for 2006.

Targets: The target has been set so that the number of faculty involved in international initiatives will increase each year. The goal is to increase the baseline number in 2007 by 40% in three years.

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only): Number of participants in programs focused on international cultural experiences

Data Collection: Data is obtained from the Office of Multicultural Programs and Services, the Office of International Education, and the Office of Strategic Partnerships and Student Life.

3-Year Performance History: ESU's campus has offered a number of special international cultural experiences. We intend to expand these opportunities.

Targets: The targets represent an increase of approximately 75 students per year. As the numbers of international students on ESU’s campus grow, these programs will foster global awareness among our student population.

Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:
NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6 (Title Only):  

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Title Only):  
Data Collection:  
3-Year Performance History:  
Targets:  

Key Performance Indicator 2 (Title Only):  
Data Collection:  
3-Year Performance History:  
Targets:  

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

Key Performance Indicator 4 (Title Only):  
Data Collection:  
3-Year Performance History:  
Targets:  
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3-Year Performance History:
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Key Performance Indicator 5 (Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBOR use only: Institution Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>