

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY  
University Responses to Legislators' Questions for Higher Education Bus Tour

**1. PLEASE PROVIDE A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF YOUR BUDGET, BOTH REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES.**

**Budget Overview  
Wichita State University**

<u>Sources of Financing</u>	<u>FY 2014 Revised Estimate</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
State General Fund (Appropriation)	\$ 64,664,547	22.1%
General Fees (Tuition)	74,513,905	25.6%
Restricted Fees Fund	56,651,435	19.5%
Federal Grants	44,491,976	15.3%
Housing System Operation	6,455,023	2.2%
Student Health Fees	(see footnote) (1)	
Parking Fees	843,495	0.3%
Other Revenue:		
SEDIF - Aviation Infrastructure	6,152,515	2.1%
Aviation Research Grant	5,022,571	1.7%
Kan-Grow Engineering Fund	4,542,071	1.6%
Faculty of Distinction Matching Fund	29,958	0.0%
Deferred Maintenance Support	1,184,528	0.4%
CIBOR (Biomaterials Research)	1,681,418	0.6%
Infrastructure Maintenance Fund	1,378,545	0.5%
Sponsored Research Overhead	4,127,878	1.4%
State Educational Building Fund	7,780,939	2.7%
Gifts - spendable	(see footnote) (2)	
Scholarship Funds	11,500,000	4.0%
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>\$ 291,020,804</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

1) Included in Restricted Fees Fund

2) Included in Restricted Fees and Scholarship Funds

**Source:** FY 2015 Budget Request - DA 402's

<u>Expenditures by Program</u>	<u>FY 2014 Revised Estimate</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Instruction	\$ 70,625,651	24.2%
Academic Support	25,060,978	8.6%
Student Services	16,234,239	5.6%
Institutional Support	17,785,561	6.1%
Physical Plant/Central Services	22,605,759	7.8%
Research	60,173,210	20.7%

Public Service	19,553,511	6.7%
Scholarships and Fellowships	35,344,943	12.1%
Auxiliary Services	6,132,018	2.1%
Debt Service- Interest	1,707,290	0.6%
Capital Improvements	10,683,012	3.7%
Debt Service - Principal	5,114,632	1.8%
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 291,020,804</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Source: FY 2015 Budget Request - DA 402's

<u>Expenditures by Major Object</u>	<u>FY 2014 Revised Estimate</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Salaries and Wages	\$ 161,040,924	55.3%
Other Operating Expenditures	76,826,375	26.4%
Other Assistance	35,648,571	12.2%
Debt Service - Principal	5,114,632	1.8%
Debt Service - Interest	1,707,290	0.6%
Capital Improvements	10,683,012	3.7%
Total Expenditures	<u>\$ 291,020,804</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Source: FY 2015 Budget Request - DA 406/410's

## 2. DESCRIBE THE FUNDING SOURCES AND ALLOWABLE EXPENDITURES FROM:

- **State General Fund** – Appropriated by the legislature each year and used for general operating expenditures that support the mission of the university.
- **General Fees Fund (Tuition)** – KSA 76-719 provides that the Kansas Board of Regents has the authority to set tuition rates at each state university. Funds collected from tuition paid by students are deposited into this fund. This fund along with the state general fund is classified as general use and is used primarily for general operating expenditures that support the educational mission of the university.
- **Restricted Fees Fund** – KSA 76-719 allows for funds received for any student-activity fee or for any other fees or charges to be deposited into the restricted fees fund. Non-federal grants are additionally accounted for in the restricted fees fund. A listing of the authorized fees is included in the appropriation for each university. Slight variances occur between universities, based upon the varying missions of each institution. The funds statutorily approved must be used in a manner consistent with conditions attached to the receipt of the funds.
- **Federal Grants** – Funds awarded from federal agencies for sponsored research activity. Funds are restricted to the purposes approved by the awarding agency.
- **Housing System Operation** – KSA 76-762 allows for payments received from students for rents, boarding fees and other charges in connection with the operating of the housing system to be deposited into this fund. The funds are used to pay the expenses of operation of the housing system and for the repairs, maintenance and improvements of the buildings. This auxiliary enterprise must be self-sufficient and general use funds are not used to support housing operations.
- **Student Health Fees** – Student health fees are deposited into this fund along with other revenue collected for services provided. The funds are used to cover the operating and maintenance of the health center.

- **Parking Fees** – KSA 74-3213 provides that the Kansas Board of Regents may provide for the charging and collection of fees for the use of parking facilities and for campus transportation systems at the state university. The parking permit fees and fees for misuse of parking areas are deposited in this fund.
- **Debt Service** – The Kansas Development Finance Authority manages the university's revenue bond investments and establishes the required funds for each bond issuance. Revenue committed from the various funds is transferred to the debt service fund to pay the principal and interest expenses.
- **Other – Sponsored Research Overhead (SRO)** – KSA 76-753 allows revenues to be deposited into these funds based on the Facilities and Administrative Cost (F&A rate) agreement that is negotiated with the federal government. While this rate approaches 50% at most institutions, the actual amount received is typically negotiated by the granting agency and is now 0% on many grants. Negotiated rates are applied to the federal and non-federal sponsored program grants and then deposited in the SRO fund.

### **3. WHO DETERMINES THE PRIORITIES ON HOW THE MONEY IS DISTRIBUTED AND HOW ARE THESE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED?**

The president of the university makes the final determination on the distribution of budgeted funds. Priorities are established by the president and his executive team in accordance with the university's strategic plan, enrollment patterns, and any required expenditure increases due to changes in fringe benefit rates, changes in rates for utilities, equipment needs, etc.

### **4. WHAT IS THE PROCESS USED TO ALLOCATE INDIRECT COSTS TO THE DIFFERENT COST CENTERS?**

Research indirect costs are collected from various federal research grants at full indirect rates of 48% although some federal agencies only allow a maximum indirect rate of 8%. WSU allocates these funds based upon specific research thrusts and areas of focus important to maintain or grow the research infrastructure and faculty. These funds also fund the administration offices of the Office of Research and Technology Transfer (see question 7).

### **5. IDENTIFY THE MAJOR CATEGORIES AND EXPENDITURES FOR INSTITUTIONAL COSTS AND ARE THESE FUNCTIONS CENTRALIZED OR DISTRIBUTED TO THE MAJOR SCHOOLS OF STUDY.**

Most universities generally budget around the following functional categories:

- Instruction
- Research
- Public Service
- Academic Support
- Student Services
- Institutional Support
- Operation and Maintenance of Plant
- Scholarships and Fellowships
- Auxiliary Enterprises
- Debt Service
- Capital Improvements

Major categories for expenditures are:

- Salaries and Wages (Includes Fringe Benefits)
- Contractual Services
- Commodities
- Capital Outlay
- Other Assistance
- Capital Improvements

Generally, most expenses are distributed to the department level. Budgeted expenditures held centrally at WSU include:

- Lecturer/adjunct faculty budgets
- Service functions such as accounting and reporting, enrollment services, human resources, custodial services, routine maintenance, etc.
- Utilities

**6. WHAT IS THE PROCESS FOR DECIDING THE USE OF FOUNDATION OR ENDOWMENT FUNDS? EXPLAIN HOW THESE FUNDS ARE COORDINATED WITH THE INSTITUTIONS BUDGET?**

Most funds received from the WSU Foundation are restricted by the donor or the nature of the gift itself. Funds from the Foundation are budgeted in the WSU Annual Operating Budget at the department level. For example, there are donors who have established named professorships in a number of academic departments. The salary funding for this professor is budgeted part from tuition or State General Fund dollars and part from revenues from the WSU Foundation as directed by the donor's gift. Funds from the Foundation are transferred to the State Treasury to fund the respective salary. The same process is used for scholarships and other support provided from gifts to the WSU Foundation. This is an extremely vital source of revenue for the University's operating budget.

**7. IDENTIFY BOTH REVENUE SOURCES AND EXPENDITURES ASSOCIATED WITH OBTAINING FEDERAL OR OTHER TYPE GRANTS AND THE RETURN ON THIS INVESTMENT TO THE UNIVERSITY.**

Data available for 2007-2013 – WSU research office operates primarily off of funds from sponsored research indirect returns (see chart below). The return on investment can be realized in the amount of research expenditures annually as reported by the NSF HERD survey. As reported, WSU had research expenditures totaling \$51.5M, \$63.5 and \$61.3M for 2010, 2011 and 2012, respectively.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Revenue:</b>							
Sponsored Research	2,562,886	2,265,594	2,321,473	2,913,361	3,154,446	3,071,415	3,240,859
GU	0	168,670	182,067	182,825	141,764	206,267	148,342
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,562,886</b>	<b>2,434,264</b>	<b>2,503,540</b>	<b>3,096,186</b>	<b>3,296,210</b>	<b>3,277,682</b>	<b>3,389,201</b>

**Expenses :**

Administrative	1,665,133	2,218,531	2,523,595	2,333,109	2,662,774	2,358,094	1,953,578
Faculty Startup Funding	0	0	685,466	418,114	438,752	633,921	1,156,482
Commitments							
Library/Internet2	75,000	75,000	140,742	185,000	142,000	143,600	191,353
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,740,132</b>	<b>2,293,530</b>	<b>3,349,802</b>	<b>2,936,223</b>	<b>3,243,525</b>	<b>3,135,615</b>	<b>3,301,412</b>
<b>Net Profit/Loss:</b>	<b>822,753</b>	<b>140,733</b>	<b>(846,263)</b>	<b>159,963</b>	<b>52,685</b>	<b>142,067</b>	<b>87,789</b>

**8. EXPLAIN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS IN REGARDS TO THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION FOR GROWING THE INSTITUTION AND HOW GROWTH IS FACTORED INTO THE BUDGET PROCESS.**

The president has set a goal of growing student enrollment from approximately 15,000 to 22,000 headcount; however when budgeting, we use credit hour production as our model for growth since it more accurately measures use at the campus. We have traditionally used the past year's credit hour production and trends to determine the next year's budget. We are currently reorganizing our admissions department to facilitate plans for growth. We expect to see increased credit hour production and headcount starting in the FY2015 budget cycle and the budget will reflect that expected growth.

WSU wants to become a private/public partnership campus with businesses located on campus using the research capabilities of WSU to help businesses be globally competitive. The research done on campus will add real world applications to student's educations allowing them to be more productive upon graduation. The businesses on campus will have a pool of potential employees, and a reduction in training costs since these students will have gained experience with that business due to the public/private partnership. This strategy is reflected in our new vision and mission statements:

**Vision**

*Wichita State University is internationally recognized as the model for applied learning and research.*

**Mission**

*The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.*

**9. EXPLAIN YOUR PURPOSE STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPING THE DIFFERENT SCHOOLS OF STUDY, AND WHY. WHAT SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS/PROGRAMS DOES THIS INSTITUTION PROVIDE?**

Currently, there are no plans to increase the number of schools of study at the undergraduate level at WSU. There are informal discussions at the state level regarding possible graduate schools, but no action is being planned or taken at this time.

**10. IDENTIFY BOTH REVENUE SOURCES AND EXPENDITURES ASSOCIATED WITH UNIVERSITY RESEARCH AND THE RETURN ON THIS INVESTMENT TO THE UNIVERSITY.**

See Question 7.

**11. WHAT IS THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF ANY PATENTS CREATED BY THE UNIVERSITIES AND HOW IS THE MONEY REINVESTED?**

The chart below highlights the current active patents obtained by WSU along with any net revenue received. As seen from this chart from the active patents at WSU, positive net monetary revenue for reinvestment has not been realized at this time.

IP Title	Patent Issued	Patent #	Net Revenue to WSU
Novel Serine Protease Inhibitors	1996	686,316	
1,2,5, Thiadiazolidin-3-One 1,1-Dioxide Derivatives	2002	6,420,401	
Sulfamide & Bis-sulfamide amino acid derivatives as inhibitors of proteolytic enymes (Enzyme Inhibitors)	2002	6,495,358	
Method of Obtaining Image Sequences at Ultra High Rates	2010	7,777,199	(\$45,534)
Protective Antigen Having Fluorinated Histidine Resides (Anthrax Technology)	2010	7,731,979	(\$21,623)
End Effector (Swept Spot "In Situ")	2013	8,444,040	(\$5,524)

**12. UNDERSTANDING THAT THERE ARE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TECHNICAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, WHAT IS THIS INSTITUTION DOING TO FORM RELATIONSHIPS WITH NEIGHBORING COMMUNITY COLLEGES?**

Wichita State University has strong and productive relationships with community colleges in neighboring areas and also with community colleges in distant parts of the state. WSU has worked with several community colleges to establish reverse transfer agreements, and has signed agreements with Butler Community College, Pratt Community College, and Barton Community College. We are working with the other community and technical colleges with the goal of signing reverse transfers agreements with them by the end of this academic year.

WSU has also developed major- or program-specific articulation agreements with several community colleges in discipline-specific areas, including Criminal Justice, Engineering Technology, Nursing, and Honors.

WSU has a Community College Coordinator who makes regular visits to the community colleges throughout the state. WSU advisors make several visits to neighboring and distant community and technical colleges to further communication with advising staff in the two-year institutions. WSU also sponsors a yearly conference, "Community College Day," in which advisors from around the state are invited to the campus for informal discussions and tours.

### **13. DOES YOUR UNIVERSITY HAVE A UNIQUE, DISTINCTIVE ROLE IN SERVING THE STATE? IF SO, WHAT IS THAT UNIQUE, DISTINCTIVE ROLE?**

In response to the University Engineering Initiative Act (UEIA), WSU's College of Engineering (CoE) plans to address the need for engineers in Kansas through a variety of programs that recruit, retain, and place engineering students in Kansas companies.

**Engineering Student Success Center** - As part of our enrollment growth and student success plan, WSU established an Engineering Student Success Center (ESSC) in 2012 that provides a consistent and friendly environment for undergraduate students to access needed information and resources primarily related to advising, registration, and graduation. The ESSC provides:

- Information on degree plans for each major,
- Various student needs such as questions about advisers, majors, and internships, and
- Location for students to register for classes.

ESSC also tracks at-risk students, manages retention efforts such as GradesFirst, and organizes recruitment efforts such as school visits and summer camps. In addition, it helps WSU to serve as the affiliate university for the State of Kansas for Project Lead The Way (PLTW).

**Student Recruitment** - ESSC is involved in two main strategies to increase the number of domestic students pursuing engineering degrees: motivating more elementary, middle, and high school students performing well in math and science to select engineering as their career choice, and better preparing students who are not doing well in math and science so that they can opt for engineering as a career choice.

**Student Retention** - According to the engineering education literature, engineering students tend to drop out of college primarily in their first two years due to the following reasons: (1) limited engineering involvement in the first two years and (2) student difficulty with calculus and physics. Based on these facts, the CoE WSU has implemented two programs: Great Expectations: Engineering Kansas Scholars (GEEKS) and Engineer of 2020. GEEKS tutoring/mentoring program was used by 785 students in 2012-13, while 106 students were placed in work based learning co-ops with 89 employers.

**CoE Cooperative Education** - The co-op program places students with Kansas and U.S. employers. In FY 2012, 106 students were placed with 89 employers. One hundred of these students participated in co-op experiences with 52 Kansas firms and 22 of these students received permanent job offers. A UEIA-funded co-op coordinator / job developer has been engaged in supporting the undergraduate students to find work based learning opportunities.

**Research** - According to the National Science Foundation's Higher Education Research and Development Survey, Wichita State University ranks third in aeronautical engineering research and development expenditures for FY 2011, with a total of \$53 million. When these numbers are broken down by funding source, WSU ranks 1<sup>st</sup> in industry-funded aeronautical engineering R&D expenditures with a total of \$23 million. WSU's closest competitor, Georgia Institute of Technology, ranks above WSU in overall expenditures, but has a total of only \$6 million in industry-funded aeronautical R&D.

**Accelerated Nursing Program** - In its continuing efforts to meet both student and work-force demands, Wichita State University approved an accelerated baccalaureate nursing program in the School of Nursing, College of Health Professions. The first cohort of students began classes on May 19, 2008 and eighteen students were admitted to the full-time program. The second cohort of 15 students began in May, 2009. There were 28 students admitted in May, 2010, and May, 2011. In May, 2012 and 2013, the program target was met with 30 students admitted to the program. The program continues to be capped at 30 students.

The accelerated program mirrors WSU's traditional baccalaureate program in curriculum. In the traditional program, the 60 students admitted for fall would graduate after 20 months. The 60 admitted for spring would graduate after 20 months. Minor changes were made in the program, so that students in the accelerated program now graduate in 13 months instead of 15 months.

The impetus for the development of the accelerated program was the continuing shortage of nurses locally and nationally, and the fact that, in spite of recent expansions in WSU's baccalaureate nursing program, the nursing program continues to have waiting lists.

**National Institute for Aviation Research (NIAR)** - At the university, NIAR supports the aviation industry by providing research, development, and testing and certification services to manufacturers, government agencies and education entities. NIAR gives University students access to more than 18 cutting edge laboratories. In 2009, the University was ranked second among U.S. universities in money spent on aerospace research and development. Through a contractual relationship with Cisco Systems, the University features one of the most advanced networking research centers in the United States.

- WSU is working with business (over 180 private research contracts) to help provide the research and testing necessary for these firms to be globally competitive.
- WSU provides research opportunities for our students to work on these private research contracts.
- WSU students have the applied learning necessary to become productive employees of these companies when they graduate.
- WSU has a higher percentage of students pursuing professional degrees
  - Compared to KBOR peers and other Kansas research universities, WSU has a higher percentage of students in the engineering and health fields.
  - Business majors are typical for KBOR peers, but WSU's percentage is higher compared to other Kansas research universities.
  - Among research universities in Kansas, a higher percentage of WSU graduates remain in-state as productive members of the community.

### **Vision**

*Wichita State University is internationally recognized as the model for applied learning and research.*

### **Mission**

*The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.*

### **Values**

- *Seizing opportunities*
- *Success for all stakeholders*
- *Diversity of culture, thought, and experience*
- *Adaptive approaches*
- *Teamwork*
- *Positive risk-taking*

### **Big Audacious Goals**

- Goal 1: Guarantee an applied learning or research experience for every student by each academic program.
- Goal 2: Pioneer an educational experience for all that integrates interdisciplinary curricula across the university.
- Goal 3: Capitalize systemically on relevant existing and emerging societal and economic trends that increase quality educational opportunities.
- Goal 4: Accelerate the discovery, creation, and transfer of new knowledge.
- Goal 5: Empower students to create a campus culture and experience that meets their changing needs.
- Goal 6: Be a campus that reflects—in staff, faculty, and students—the evolving diversity of society.
- Goal 7: Create a new model of assessment, incentive, and reward processes to accomplish our vision and goals.



**14. WHAT ARE THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR THE UNIVERSITY? (PLEASE INCLUDE A 10 YEAR HISTORY FOR REFERENCE)**

**A. Enrollment (Headcount)**

*Total 12-month enrollment, unduplicated*

	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Total Enrollment	19,929	19,086	18,958	18,702	18,716	18,522	18,529	18,860	19,269	18,594

**Source:** 2004, Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Report

**Source:** 2005-2013, Kansas Higher Education Data System (KHEDS)

The KHEDS system began collecting data in 2005.

**A-1. Undergraduate students**

*Fall 20<sup>th</sup> Day Enrollments*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Resident	10,777	10,292	10,055	10,282	10,253	10,367	10,586	10,620	11,011	10,887
Non-Resident	359	365	380	361	389	452	447	461	470	478
Foreign National	556	542	540	560	681	781	671	682	762	827
Total Enrollment	11,692	11,199	10,975	11,203	11,323	11,600	11,704	11,763	12,243	12,192

**Source:** Institution Fall Census

**A-2. Graduate students**

*Fall 20<sup>th</sup> Day Enrollments*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Resident	2,288	2,264	2,347	2,295	2,293	2,202	2,228	2,188	2,074	1,949
Non-Resident	146	173	188	203	223	226	260	255	246	252
Foreign National	770	661	566	597	603	584	631	600	537	505
Total Enrollment	3,204	3,098	3,101	3,095	3,119	3,012	3,119	3,043	2,857	2,706

**Source:** Institution Fall Census

**A-3. FTE & head count enrollment of online classes**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Student credit hr	<i>Data not available</i>			1,352	3,366	3,628	4,083	7,733	10,967	12,652
Headcount	<i>Data not available</i>			405	958	1,010	1,172	2,172	2,977	3,235

**Source:** University

**A-4. Number of students living on campus vs. students living off-campus**

*Percentage of Total Enrollment Living in University Owned Housing\**

<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>	<u>Fall 2012</u>
7.3%	7.6%	8.0%	8.0%	9.3%	8.0%	7.5%	7.3%	7.6%	7.4%

\*University owned housing is defined as residence halls, student apartments, and co-op housing, and does not include fraternity or sorority housing that may be located on a university campus

**Source:** KBOR State University Data Book, derived from WSU Table A

**A-5. For those living off-campus; the number with a zip code further than 30 miles**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Total		<i>Data not available</i>			4,727	4,818	4,905	5,038	5,010	5,079

Source: University

**A-6. How many undergraduate students transfer in from another post-secondary in Kansas?**

*Number of Transfers from Another Kansas Post-Secondary Institution*

<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2005</u>	<u>Fall 2006</u>	<u>Fall 2007</u>	<u>Fall 2008</u>	<u>Fall 2009</u>	<u>Fall 2010</u>	<u>Fall 2011</u>	<u>Fall 2012</u>
1,010	1,094	962	1,019	1,041	963	1,040	1,058	1,168	1,174

Source: KBOR KHEER Collection

**A-7. Of those students, what percent receive a bachelor degree?**

*Percentage of Transfer Students who began in Fall 2006 and Graduated from Wichita State University:*

- 4 Years – 49.4%
- 6 Years – 57.3%

Source: "College Portraits" data for transfer students that began in the fall of 2006, available at <https://www.collegeportraits.org/> "College Portraits" only includes data for the fall 2006 cohort of students.

**B. Income and Expense (Fiscal Year)**

**B-1. What is the total state appropriation?**

Information in the table below shows the final State General Fund approved appropriation for each fiscal year as reported by the Kansas Legislative Research Department at the end of the legislative session preceding the start of the fiscal year. In the subsequent legislative session, the appropriation may be amended.

*SGF Appropriations (Approved)*

<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
\$64,535,032	\$68,810,586	\$70,882,725	\$71,277,946	\$76,173,199
<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
\$67,631,438	\$67,825,287	\$66,750,206	\$66,609,661	\$64,664,547

Source: Kansas Legislative Research Department (Appropriation Reports 2003-2013)

**B-2. What is the total revenue?**

Information in the table below shows the final All Funds approved appropriation for each fiscal year as reported by the Kansas Legislative Research Department at the end of the legislative session preceding the start of the fiscal year. In the subsequent legislative session, the appropriation may be amended.

*All Funds (Approved)*

<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
\$162,511,937	\$167,488,579	\$181,185,577	\$195,382,204	\$209,305,210
<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
\$206,671,325	\$225,146,434	\$236,467,455	\$253,999,799	\$267,099,565

**Source:** Kansas Legislative Research Department (Appropriation Reports 2003-2013)

**B-3. What is the tuition per student?**

*Undergraduate Tuition and Required Fees Per Semester*

AY 2005	AY 2006	AY 2007	AY 2008	AY 2009	AY 2010	AY 2011	AY 2012	AY 2013	AY 2014
\$1,954	\$2,116	\$2,258	\$2,402	\$2,542	\$2,734	\$2,945	\$3,095	\$3,204	\$3,463

\*Includes fees, for a student taking 15 hours

**Source:** Table 2.1a from the State University Data Books, derived from the Kansas Board of Regents Comprehensive Fee Schedule

**B-4. What are the total expenditures per undergrad student and per graduate student?**

The table below describes average General Use expenditures for the Educational Program (Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, and Institutional Support) per Fall FTE Student. For purposes of this question to estimate expenditures per undergraduate and graduate student, a calculation was made to assign expenditures to undergraduate and graduate students based on the weighted percentage of each type of student. The data in this table is not weighted by academic discipline.

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Undergraduate	\$5,745	\$6,224	\$6,782	\$7,118	\$7,823	\$8,036	\$7,162	\$7,064	\$6,885	\$7,195
Graduate	\$11,490	\$12,448	\$13,564	\$14,237	\$15,646	\$16,073	\$14,324	\$14,128	\$13,771	\$14,389

**Source:** Derived from the KBOR State University Data Book Table 1.40—Gross General Use (state general fund + tuition) Educational Expenditures per Fall FTE Student

**B-5. What is the average total cost for an undergraduate to attend the university for one year?**

Annually colleges and universities compute a total cost of attendance. A total cost of attendance computation is used to determine eligibility for financial aid, the total amounts of which a student may qualify, and the expected family contribution of a student or family. The amounts per individual vary widely. The calculated total cost of attendance for a resident undergraduate is outlined in the table below.

*Total Cost for an Undergraduate*

Academic Year	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tuition	\$2,866	\$3,150	\$3,433	\$3,912	\$4,144	\$4,497	\$4,722	\$5,006	\$5,005	\$5,205
Campus Activity Fee	\$640	\$758	\$797	\$892	\$940	\$970	\$1,168	\$1,185	\$1,184	\$1,237
Room & Board	\$4,620	\$4,900	\$5,070	\$5,580	\$5,860	\$6,060	\$6,200	\$6,350	\$6,350	\$6,460
Books & Supplies	\$892	\$895	\$900	\$900	\$945	\$975	\$975	\$975	\$975	\$975
Transportation	\$1,612	\$1,357	\$1,422	\$1,332	\$1,620	\$1,620	\$1,657	\$1,711	\$1,711	\$1,725
Other Living Expenses	\$1,612	\$1,357	\$1,422	\$1,583	\$1,661	\$1,657	\$1,657	\$1,725	\$1,725	\$1,725
Student Total Cost of Attendance	\$12,242	\$12,417	\$13,044	\$14,199	\$15,170	\$15,779	\$16,379	\$16,952	\$16,950	\$17,327

**PLUS**

State General Fund Per Student	\$5,734	\$5,922	\$6,424	\$6,875	\$6,954	\$6,902	\$6,581	\$5,779	\$5,838	\$5,571
TOTAL STUDENT + STATE COST	\$17,976	\$18,339	\$19,468	\$21,074	\$22,124	\$22,681	\$22,960	\$22,731	\$22,788	\$22,898

**Source:** Common Data Set

**B-6. Considering the above listed total cost, how much is borne by the student (or parents) and how much is borne by the state?**

Based on the above listed total cost of attendance, which does not take into account student financial aid, and the State General Fund financing, the table below displays the percentage borne by students/parents and the State.

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Student/Parents	68.1%	67.7%	67.0%	67.4%	68.6%	69.6%	71.3%	74.6%	74.4%	75.7%
State	31.9%	32.3%	33.0%	32.6%	31.4%	30.4%	28.7%	25.4%	25.6%	24.3%

**B-7. What are the instruction expenditures, academic support expenditures, and student support expenditures on a per student basis?**

*Per FTE Student Expenditures for Instruction*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
All Funds*	\$4,482	\$4,406	\$4,689	\$5,034	\$6,693	\$6,446	\$4,885	\$5,186	\$4,911	\$5,237
General Use**	\$4,245	\$4,302	\$4,692	\$4,996	\$5,776	\$5,946	\$4,809	\$4,445	\$4,499	\$4,665

*Per FTE Student Expenditures for Academic Support*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
All Funds*	\$1,593	\$1,944	\$2,174	\$2,211	\$2,235	\$2,286	\$2,185	\$2,098	\$2,103	\$2,220
General Use**	\$1,331	\$1,693	\$1,794	\$1,882	\$1,836	\$1,815	\$1,828	\$1,810	\$1,654	\$1,797

*Per FTE Student Expenditures for Student Support*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
All Funds*	\$1,082	\$1,132	\$1,244	\$1,362	\$1,390	\$1,412	\$1,417	\$1,425	\$1,501	\$1,526
General Use**	\$614	\$608	\$711	\$781	\$841	\$851	\$836	\$861	\$905	\$957

*Per FTE Student Expenditures for Institutional Support*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
All Funds*	\$882	\$986	\$1,072	\$1,141	\$1,200	\$1,264	\$1,296	\$1,278	\$1,368	\$1,294
General Use**	\$830	\$911	\$997	\$1,017	\$1,084	\$1,205	\$1,240	\$1,483	\$1,256	\$1,212

All higher education institutions use common functional expense categories to classify expenditures. The institutional support category consists of activities carried out to provide for both the day-to-day functioning and long-term viability of the institution as an operating organization; such activities include executive management; fiscal operations; administrative information technology; general administrative services such as personnel, space management, purchasing, campus-wide communication and transportation services, and activities concerned with community and alumni relations.

\***Source:** Data obtained by dividing the costs for institutional support indicated for each institution on Table C in their Institutional Profile in the State University Data Book by the total FTE enrollment indicated on Table A for each institution in the Data Book.

\*\***Source:** Data obtained by dividing the costs for institutional support indicated for each institution on Table D in their Institutional Profile in the State University Data Books by the total FTE enrollment indicated on Table A for each institution in the Data Book.

**B-8. What is the incremental cost of a new student (or hundred students)?**

The marginal cost of an additional student is totally dependent on the situation. If an additional student registers for a lecture class that is not at capacity, the cost is minimal involving such things as additional copies of tests and materials, etc. If the student enters a class with high usage of materials (such as chemistry) the cost is higher. If the student attempts to register for a class in which there are limits (such as nursing) and that course is full, the cost can be significant since one would need to open an entire new section for the student. In the extreme, in a program that is at full capacity and where facilities are at capacity, the marginal cost would be very, very high since it would require additional construction of laboratory spaces. An additional consideration involves students who register for courses

with clinical requirements. Accreditation often places limits on the number of clinical students a faculty member can supervise. If the program were full, and additional students would require hiring an additional faculty member. If the local clinical sites are at capacity, there would be a necessity to secure clinical sites at a distance. This would significantly increase supervision and travel costs.

**B-9. What is the difference in cost of providing online vs. brick and mortar class instruction?**

Most studies of on-line courses show that the cost is comparable to or higher than equivalent traditional courses. These studies take account of the cost of preparation, cost of support services, and cost of instruction. The actual cost depends on the level of the course, prior investment in distance education infrastructure, and the nature of the course. Generally, because of the number of people involved (e.g., technical staff, web staff, and faculty), the cost of developing an on-line course is substantially higher than the cost of a traditional class.

A cost not generally considered in on-line education involves the substantially higher drop-out rate compared to traditional courses. Incompletions add to the effective cost, though this cost is not normally calculated or considered.

Delivery of on-line courses also tends to be more labor intensive for the faculty member and studies show that many, if not most, institutions reduce teaching loads of faculty members engaged in distance education and often pay an additional stipend. These costs also are often not fully considered in studies of distance education.

It also is clear that there are significant differences in the efficacy of distance education courses by type of student. For traditional aged undergraduates, face-to-face education and hybrid courses tend to produce the best completion rates. Older adults who need the course to support their careers or professions tend to have the highest completion rates.

According to a very recent study of distance education in Texas, some programs lend themselves to cost-effective distance education delivery; others do not. Moreover, because the actual delivery models have such different cost components, it is not yet possible to accurately compare the two broad modes of delivery.

**B-10. What is the general use operating spending on institutional support per FTE?**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
All Funds*	\$882	\$986	\$1,072	\$1,141	\$1,200	\$1,264	\$1,296	\$1,278	\$1,368	\$1,294
General Use**	\$830	\$911	\$997	\$1,017	\$1,084	\$1,205	\$1,240	\$1,483	\$1,256	\$1,212

All higher education institutions use common functional expense categories to classify expenditures. The institutional support category consists of activities carried out to provide for both the day-to-day functioning and long-term viability of the institution as an operating organization; such activities include executive management; fiscal operations; administrative information technology; general administrative services such as personnel, space management, purchasing, campus-wide communication and transportation services, and activities concerned with community and alumni relations.

**\*Source:** Data obtained by dividing the costs for institutional support indicated for each institution on Table C in their Institutional Profile in the State University Data Book by the total FTE enrollment indicated on Table A for each institution in the Data Book.

**\*\*Source:** Data obtained by dividing the costs for institutional support indicated for each institution on Table D in their Institutional Profile in the State University Data Book by the total FTE enrollment indicated on Table A for each institution in the Data Book.

**B-11. How many bachelor's and advanced degrees are granted each year?**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Bachelor's	1,760	1,806	1,870	1,827	1,755	1,692	1,691	1,972	1,958	1,974
Advanced*	809	927	870	798	766	813	709	843	851	878
Total	2,569	2,733	2,740	2,625	2,521	2,505	2,400	2,815	2,809	2,852

\*Advance degrees include Master's and Doctoral Degrees

**Source:** Data obtained from Table A of each institution's Institutional Profile in the State University Data Book, derived from the IPEDS Completions Survey

**C. Tuition and Fees (Fiscal Year)**

**C-1. What is the average aid a student receives during four years of matriculation?**

<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
\$4,648	\$6,305	\$2,514	\$4,775	\$6,330	\$7,257	\$6,676	\$7,134	\$9,308	\$4,231

**Source:** Common Data Set, first-time full-time freshmen.

**C-2. What is the average debt acquired during that same 4 year period?**

<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
-	\$18,510	\$18,840	\$21,368	\$20,875	\$22,116	\$15,769	\$15,847	\$21,738	\$21,068

**Source:** Data obtained from The Institute for College Access & Success, College InSight, <http://www.college-insight.org>  
Most college-level data are taken directly from U.S. Department of Education sources and the Common Data Set (CDS).  
(Note: Applies only to those students with debt. In 2011, approximately 40% of the total enrollment has no debt.)

**C-3. What is the default rate?**

<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
-	4.70%	3.40%	3.10%	5.40%	4.8%	4.2%	4.3%	5.2%	-

**Source:** The above default rates represent the most "official" 2-year cohort default rate as calculated by the U.S. Department of Education for borrowers under the Federal Family Education Loan Program and/or the Federal Direct Loan Program who attended the University. Official cohort default rates typically are announced in September. <http://studentaid.ed.gov/about/data-center/student/default>

**C-4. What percentage of students with student loan debt actually graduate and what is the average debt of non-graduates?**

For IPEDS-based first-time full-time freshmen cohort of year 2005, 61% of those with loan debt graduated versus 39% with no loan debt. Of those who had loans, those who graduated had \$8,092 in loans versus non-graduates with \$4,942.

**Source:** University

**C-5. What percent of students receive Pell grants? And what is the average amount received?**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Percent	27%	29%	27%	27%	n/a	24%	24%	29%	39%	37%
Average amount	\$1,530	\$2,998	\$2,983	\$2,987	n/a	\$2,684	\$3,000	\$4,246	\$4,291	\$3,843

**Source:** IPEDS Financial Aid Survey, first-time full-time freshmen.

**C-6. Is tuition ever discounted, if so, how much and for what criteria?**

Standard KBOR defined tuition discounts apply (in-state rates for non-residents, tuition remission for GTA, senior citizen discount and Kansas Teacher of the Year) and can be found in KBOR's policy and procedures. For fall 2012 there were \$732,422 tuition discounts.

**D. Academic Performance (Academic Year)**

**D-1. What is the average ACT score of incoming freshmen (resident & non-resident)?**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Resident	22	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
Non-resident	23	23	22	21	22	22	22	22	23	23

Source: University

**D-2. What is the average HS GPA of incoming freshmen (resident & non-resident)?**

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Resident	3.20	3.28	3.34	3.35	3.41	3.39	3.38	3.44	3.46	3.44
Non-resident	3.22	3.35	3.33	3.39	3.49	3.31	3.41	3.37	3.47	3.49

Source: University

**D-3. What is the 4 yr. graduation percentage (of the cohort entering as freshmen) (resident & non-resident)?**

*Four Year Graduation Rates of First-time, Full-time Freshmen By Cohort*

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
	14.6%	13.5%	16.9%	17.4%	15.0%	16.9%	20.3%	16.8%	20.8%	19.5%

Source: Table 3.7 of the KBOR State University Data Books, derived from the KBOR Graduation and Retention Rates Report submitted by each university.

*Four Year Graduation Rates of First-time, Full-time Freshmen By Cohort  
(Resident/Non-resident)*

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Resident	15.4%	14.4%	17.5%	18.1%	15.7%	17.3%	19.8%	17.6%	21.4%	20.2%
Non-resident	21.0%	13.8%	13.6%	15.0%	12.9%	18.9%	25.9%	11.3%	22.2%	13.2%

Source: University



**D-4. What is the 6 yr. graduation percentage (of the cohort entering as freshmen) (resident & non-resident)?**

*Six Year Graduation Rates of First-time, Full-time Freshmen By Cohort*

<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
36.8%	37.1%	35.1%	41.3%	38.4%	41.1%	41.2%	43.4%	46.1%	<i>Not available for these cohorts yet</i>	

**Source:** Source: Table 3.7 of the KBOR State University Data Books, derived from the KBOR Graduation and Retention Rates Report submitted by each university.

*Six Year Graduation Rates of First-time, Full-time Freshmen By Cohort  
(Resident/Non-resident)*

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Resident	38.0%	36.1%	41.3%	40.2%	41.2%	41.9%	43.0%	41.1%	<i>Not available for these cohorts yet</i>	
Non-resident	35.8%	32.2%	44.5%	29.2%	41.2%	40.5%	47.3%	41.5%		

**Source:** University

**D-5. What is average ACT score of those students who receive a bachelor’s degree?**

<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
22	22	22	22	22	22	23	23	23	23

**Source:** University

**D-6. What are the Bachelor degree programs that require more than a 4 year course of study?**

Degree	Credit Hours
Music	146
Medical Laboratory Sciences	131
Aerospace Engineering	135
Bioengineering	137
Mechanical Engineering	134

**Source:** KBOR Program Inventory Data

**D-7. How is student achievement measured, i.e. College Learning Assessment or something else?**

WSU utilizes the College Learning Assessment (CLA), National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and internal assessment instruments such as the required exit survey of all students who complete a degree. These instruments allows us to measure and assess critical thinking and problem solving skills, effective communication skills, preparation for career in their chosen field, global mindedness and forward thinking and collaboration and service within communities.

**D-8. What is the percentage of graduates employed within six months of graduation?**

98.2% of undergraduates and 97.2% of graduate students were employed with six months of degree completion.

**Source:** University 6 month post degree exit survey

**D-9. What is percent of graduates who are employed within their field at graduation (or shortly thereafter) (by college within each university)?**

Undergraduates	2012-2013
<b>Total</b>	<b>78.8%</b>
Business	81.1%
Education	88.6%
Engineering	87.0%
Fine Arts	55.6%
Health Professions	79.3%
LAS Humanities	40.0%
LAS Nat Science & Math	33.3%
LAS Social Sciences	75.6%

Source: University six-month post degree exit survey

**D-10. What is the average salary of graduate by major?**

	Undergraduate	Graduate
<b>Total</b>	\$30,385	\$49,781
Business	\$31,346	\$50,227
Education	\$28,309	\$42,679
Engineering	\$52,500	\$62,500
Fine Arts	\$27,500	\$27,500
Health Professions	32,500	\$62,500
LAS Humanities	n/a	n/a
LAS Nat Science & Math	n/a	\$27,500
LAS Social Sciences	\$23,971	\$32,500

Source: University six-month post degree exit survey

**D-11. Is there a process for eliminating majors that have very few students?**

Each program is reviewed every seven years as per KBOR Review Process.

**D-12. Over the last 10 years, what is the history of eliminating degree programs?**

Every year during the program review cycle, if programs are triggered for low activity and are not meeting minimum standards they are subject to elimination per KBOR requirements.

**D-13. Is grade inflation an issue... has a study of grade inflation been completed?**

For degree bound undergraduates, institutional GPA levels have seen little upward movement over the last 30 years and parallels increases in student's standardized tests.

Year of Fall Census	<u>1980</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2013</u>
Institutional GPA	2.74	2.69	2.73	2.83	2.91	2.96	2.92	2.97
ACT score	19.49	19.24	19.64	20.75	21.55	22.03	22.68	22.86

Source: University

**D-14. How much money is spent on remedial classes; can the cost be split between resident and non-resident students?**

No state general funds are expended on remedial courses delivered by the state universities, except as authorized in K.S.A. 76-7,151(a)(2) for students who are in military service, students who are 21 years of age or older, and international students who are enrolled in ESL courses.

The amount of money (all sources) spent on a given remedial class will depend on a number of factors: The number of students in the class; who is teaching it; whether it is a one, two or three hour course; etc. The average cost of delivering remedial courses is generally the same as the average cost of delivering freshman/sophomore level liberal arts courses, which was approximately \$287 per credit hour, as of Fiscal Year 2012.

The tuition rates for a remedial course credit hour are the same as the tuition rates for any other basic liberal arts and sciences course credit hour. Nonresidents would pay the nonresident credit hour rate and residents would pay the resident credit hour rate.

**Source:** KBOR State University Data Book, Table 1.40

**Note:** Expenditures per credit hour consist of Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services and Institutional Support. This comparison allows analysis of change in those expenditures on a per student basis. It is noteworthy that change in expenditure per student may result from either budgetary adjustments or enrollment change. This comparison makes no distinction on variance by educational level or academic discipline.

**D-15. What percent of students taking a remedial course end up receiving a bachelor degree?**

For first-time full-time freshmen cohorts, among those who took a remedial class at WSU, the percent who attained a Bachelor degree by residency:

Fall Cohort year:	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>
Resident	48.6%	50.1%	48.1%	44.6%	46.6%
Non-resident	43.8%	44.4%	55.7%	41.9%	43.1%

**Source:** University

**D-16. What are the criteria for a class qualifying as a low-enrollment class?**

The general rule for undergraduate courses is 15, and for graduate courses it is 5; anything less than that the course is supposed to be canceled. This is administered by the colleges and decisions are made based on department/major needs.

E. Faculty and Staff

**E-1. What is the number of faculty and rank in each college at the university (tenure, tenure-track, adjunct, etc.)?**

*College of Business*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					32	33	35	35	37
Earning Tenure						15	12	9	10	8
Not Tenure Eligible						14	15	16	17	17

*College of Education*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					28	24	23	23	24
Earning Tenure						14	11	10	11	16
Not Tenure Eligible						18	20	23	22	21

*College of Engineering*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					34	36	35	36	33
Earning Tenure						13	10	11	14	14
Not Tenure Eligible						6	6	7	9	9

*College of Fine Arts*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					43	40	37	38	38
Earning Tenure						15	14	14	13	15
Not Tenure Eligible						25	21	23	25	25

*College of Health Professions*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					33	32	30	34	34
Earning Tenure						16	13	12	8	8
Not Tenure Eligible						35	42	44	52	55

*College of Liberal Arts*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					141	138	137	135	137
Earning Tenure						45	36	28	29	32
Not Tenure Eligible						82	70	72	78	73

*Library*

	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenured	<i>Data not available</i>					7	8	7	8	9
Earning Tenure						8	7	7	7	5
Not Tenure Eligible						3	2	2	2	1

**Source:** University (as of November 1, 2013)

**E-2. What is the number of faculty by position in each college at the university (administration, class room, research, etc.)?**

*Number of Faculty by College*

College	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Barton School- Business	48	50	53	55	53	56	52	52	56	56
College of Education	54	59	46	46	43	43	42	42	44	48
College of Engineering	43	45	45	45	43	47	42	43	46	44
College of Fine Arts	58	60	58	59	58	55	53	55	53	55
College of Health Professions	49	46	55	61	63	62	61	59	64	69
College of Liberal Arts	215	209	210	214	216	209	198	183	182	187
Total	467	469	467	480	476	472	448	434	445	459

Source: State University DBTF reports, section 9

**E-3. What is the average salary by rank?**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Professor	\$75,951	\$78,971	\$82,036	\$86,179	\$90,240	\$94,426	\$93,041	\$92,403	\$95,090	\$96,378
Associate	\$60,337	\$62,744	\$65,242	\$67,363	\$69,689	\$70,228	\$69,272	\$69,966	\$70,018	\$70,168
Assistant	\$51,860	\$52,597	\$54,964	\$56,613	\$58,501	\$60,805	\$60,433	\$58,118	\$61,473	\$59,565
Instructor	\$36,704	\$38,724	\$40,437	\$41,451	\$42,708	\$43,952	\$44,460	\$45,022	\$49,333	\$44,140

Source: Table 4.3 of the KBOR State University Data Books

**E-4. How does the university measure faculty productivity; is there a minimum requirement for each category?**

Minimum criteria are set by academic departments in consultation with academic affairs, national associations and accreditation bodies. Criteria vary based on the discipline and the mission of the academic department. In general faculty performance is assessed on the basis of research (40%), teaching (40%) and service (20%).

**E-5. What are the criteria and the process for the university (or the state) to receive a royalty or a licensing fee for the results of any completed research?**

In order for the university to receive a royalty or licensing fee, there must first be a demand for that intellectual property. There are a number of variables that impact the ability of the university to commercialize its intellectual property and receive royalties and licensing fees and a process is defined to determine which technologies are pursued. As seen from response to question 11, WSU royalties and licensing fees are still not yet in a positive net monetary revenue position.

**E-6. How much money does the university (from state funds) spend on research?**

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
All Funds*	\$14,879,095	\$17,639,066	\$18,336,722	\$28,240,305	\$26,433,844
General Use**	\$1,487,901	\$1,582,246	\$1,462,643	\$3,127,808	\$3,813,661

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
All Funds*	\$32,970,295	\$40,281,864	\$47,679,955	\$47,775,182	\$49,684,791
General Use**	\$1,620,503	\$3,833,396	\$1,513,248	\$1,562,297	\$1,620,664

**Note:** These funds do not include spending by any private research corporation belonging to the university.

**\*Source:** Data obtained for each institution on Table C in their Institutional Profile in the KBOR State University Data Books.

**\*\*Source:** Data obtained for each institution on Table D in their Institutional Profile in the KBOR State University Data Books.

**E-7. How much money per annum does the university (or the state) receive as royalty or licensing fees?**

WSU	FY 2012	FY 2013
License Revenue / Royalties Received	35,000	10,000

**E-8. Do faculty receive a royalty or licensing fee for the results of completed research?**

WSU does distribute funds to faculty if there is positive net revenue to distribute. The distribution of net revenues (if any) is determined using the following formula: Gross Revenue – Direct Costs = Net Revenue. WSU distributes 50% of positive Net Revenues to the inventor(s), 25% to the college/department generating the intellectual property and 25% to the Research and Technology Transfer Office.

**E-9. What percent of class time is taught by graduate students?**

*Percent of Course Sections Taught by GTAs*

	Fall 2012
Number of Sections Taught by GTA	155
Total Course Sections Taught	568
Percentage Taught by GTA's	27.29%

*Percent of Total Credit Hours Taught by GTAs*

	Fall 2012
Number of Credit Hours Taught by GTA	11,667
Total Credit Hours Taught	48,535
Percentage Taught by GTA's	24.04%

**Source:** Obtained from the Enrollments in Courses with Course Level 000-199, End of Fall 2012 Term. The university did not distinguish in its report between GTA-Instructor of Record and other GTAs.

**Note:** Freshmen level courses 000 thru 199 may have any student class from freshmen to graduate standing enrolled. Instructor Type: Faculty = tenure and tenure-track; GTA = graduate teaching assistantship; Other = lecturer, instructor, unclassified professional. n/a letter grade is not assigned.

**GTA:** Graduate Teaching Assistant, Graduate Teaching Associate

F. Community College Partnerships

**F-1. What degrees/certificates/courses of study are the most popular in your strategic partnership(s) with community colleges (by enrollment and by graduation rates)?**

Business  
Curriculum and Instruction  
Psychology  
Accounting  
Nursing

**F-2. What percent of your graduates are community college transfers?**

<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
<i>Data not available</i>							28.27%	28.80%	31.11%

\*KBOR started collecting transfer student data in 2005. Therefore, to give these students time to graduate, the percentages are based on 2010, 2011, and 2012 graduates.

Source: KBOR KHEDS AY Completions and Transfers Files

**F-3. From which community colleges do the majority of the transfers originate?**

The top 3 are Butler Community College (45%), Hutchinson Community College (14%) and Cowley Community College (15%).

**F-4. How do the graduation rates of the community college transfer students compare to the graduation rates of the institution's graduate rates at large and to non-community college transfer students?**

Data available for the Fall 2006 cohort (SIS changed to Banner in 2006).

Cohort type	Fall 2006 Cohort 6 Year Graduation Rate
IPEDS-based first-time full-time freshmen	46.1%
Transfer first-time full-time freshmen non community college	53.3%
Transfer first-time full-time freshmen community college	38.8%

**F-5. What strategies has the institution utilized in order to expand community college partnerships to achieve cost savings, efficiencies, and expanded customer service to students and communities?**

See Question 12.

**15. AN LPA STUDY WAS DONE IN 2007. HAVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2007 STUDY BEEN IMPLEMENTED? IF SO, HOW SUCCESSFUL HAVE THEY BEEN AT REDUCING COSTS? IF RECOMMENDATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED, WERE THE RECOMMENDATIONS EXAMINED & WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR NOT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS?**

**Recommendation No. 1: Eliminating or combining low enrollment course sections.**

As part of the annual course scheduling process, the university actively evaluates multiple section courses to determine efficacy, which resulted in the elimination of duplicate course sections where possible, cross-listing of courses and cross-teaching across departments.

**Recommendation No. 2: Eliminating or combining academic departments or degree programs.**

There were 3 recommendations from the LPA:

- Combine Sociology with Anthropology (previously considered and rejected)
- Combine Curriculum & Instruction with Educational Leadership (previously considered and currently under consideration)
- Combine Physical Therapy with Kinesiology & Sports Studies (under active consideration as part of the Academic and Research Division reshaping process)

If WSU does not implement a recommendation it will be because a determination has been made that the result will not enhance academic quality, more effectively project the university mission and/or affect real savings.

**Recommendation No. 3: Collaborating with other universities to share course content, teachers and instructional programs.**

WSU will continue its practice of exploring avenues for jointly offering academic programs with other universities when such collaborations do not diminish the urban serving research mission of the university, which is important to south central Kansas, and where program quality is not affected. Some examples of how WSU has collaborated with other Regent universities:

- KU for an on-line restricted licensure program for Functional Special Education
- Fort Hays for an on-line alternative certification licensure program
- KU and K-State using WSU's urban art gallery Shift Space featuring artworks by student and faculty
- Joint nurse practitioner program with KU, Fort Hays and Pittsburg State
- Participation in the Core Outcomes Project which is a statewide coordination of the core outcomes for all general education courses

**Recommendation No. 4: Increasing the number of courses and programs offered online or through distance learning.**

Online or distance education has continued to grow at WSU, and WSU had developed 4 on-line degree programs at the time of the response to the audit. Since that time, 2 more on-line degree programs have been developed, and WSU intends to continue to grow on-line and distance education offerings as resources permit.

**Recommendation No. 5: Increasing faculty workload.**

The LPA mainly looked at teaching as the main product of the faculty workload, however, research and public service are also important components of faculty workload, especially at a high-research university such as WSU. Within Kansas, WSU faculty have the highest teaching load among the 3 research universities, and over 82% of WSU ranked faculty teach more than 12 credit hours a year. WSU declined to implement an across-the-board



increase in teaching load, however, WSU is meeting the LPA recommendation by eliminating positions, elimination of small sections, and enrollment increases coupled with college-level strategic planning. WSU also carefully tracks faculty and staff work assignments and links those to the university budget through its Accountability Planning Matrix.

**Recommendation No. 6: Modifying the delivery of remedial courses.**

The total number of students taking remedial courses at WSU is small compared to the size of the student body (less than 5%), and the number of remedial sections declined by 17.9% from fall 2008 to fall 2009. WSU will continue to offer remedial courses to students where such support is likely to improve success and ultimately lead to higher retention and graduation rates.

**Recommendation No. 7: Maximizing the use of existing classroom and laboratory space.**

The LPA examined space use only for the time periods of 7:30 am to 5:30 pm; however, WSU classroom space is heavily used after 5:30 for evening courses. WSU administration continues to examine the use of laboratory space, which has not been meeting KBOR expectations.

**Recommendation No. 8: Consolidating or changing administrative functions or processes.**

Wichita State University has achieved greater efficiency by consolidating a number of administrative functions and structures, including the following:

- Budget management functions were consolidated for Campus Life and University Relations.
- Consolidation of advertising print services.
- University-wide process improvements were implemented by selecting a comprehensive ERP system for Student, Finance, Human Resources, Financial Aid, etc. Enhancements to these processes continue today.
- Selected and implemented a common provider for all credit card and online payment processing.
- Continued to move additional departments to a paperless environment through the use of document imaging software.
- Installed digital display messaging boards in all campus buildings to ensure consistent communication of information in the event of an emergency.
- Consolidated oversight of sponsored research accounting functions with the Office of Financial Operations.
- Automated the drawdown of funds from federal and state agencies to eliminate the handling and processing of paper checks.
- In order to provide focus on the research mission of the University, the position of Vice President of Research and Technology Transfer was created.
- To maintain consistent administration of the Student led organizations, these groups now work directly with the Rhatigan Student Center for meetings, event scheduling and guidance.

**Recommendation No. 9: Outsourcing Non-Academic Functions.**

Wichita State University had previously reported outsourcing its vending, dining services, campus pest control, elevator servicing, document shredding, background checks, and custodial services for our west and south campuses. In the past 2 years, WSU also outsourced the printing and copy service centers. Additionally, WSU has extended the efficiency of its facilities operation by outsourcing certain remodeling/renovation projects through use of on-call contractors. This has allowed timely completion of construction projects.

**Recommendation No. 10: Reducing energy costs, improving recycling efforts.**

Wichita State University previously reported several energy saving initiatives and that effort has continued.

New improvements include:

- Recycling efforts were enhanced by allowing for the placement of all types of recyclable products in single containers across campus.
- Several buildings (Duerksen, Engineering Research Building, and Wilner Auditorium) received upgraded HVAC equipment over the past few years. As additional building improvements are approved, HVAC renovations will continue.
- Double-paned windows were installed in various buildings (including Jardine and Lindquist Halls), resulting in energy savings.

Continued to realize savings from the 2007 campus-wide Energy Performance Contract.

**16. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE BREAKDOWN OF YOUR INSTITUTION’S FUNDING STREAMS (STATE FUNDS, FEDERAL FUNDS/GRANTS, STUDENT TUITION & FEES, FOUNDATIONS, GIFTS, ETC) IN PERCENTAGES AND DOLLAR AMOUNTS AS WELL AS THE PRIMARY EXPENDITURES EARMARKED FOR EACH FUNDING SOURCE.**

<b>Sources of Financing</b>	<b>FY 2014 Estimate</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Primary Expenditures</b>
State General Fund	\$64,664,547	22.2%	For general operating expenditures
General Fees (Tuition)	74,513,905	25.6%	For general operating expenditures
Restricted Fee Funds	56,651,435	19.5%	For restricted expenditures consistent with conditions attached to the receipt of the restricted use funds
Federal Grants	44,491,976	15.3%	For restricted expenditures consistent with the purposes approved by the awarding federal agency
Housing System Operation	6,455,023	2.2%	For restricted expenditures related to the operation of the housing system and for the repairs, maintenance and improvements of the housing system buildings.
Student Health Fees		0.0%	For restricted expenditures related to the operation and maintenance of the health center.
Parking Fees	843,495	0.3%	For restricted expenditures related to operation and maintenance of parking facilities and for campus transportation systems.
All Other	43,400,423	14.9%	
<b>Total Sources of Financing</b>	<b>\$291,020,804</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

## **17. WHAT ARE THE INSTITUTIONS PLANS TO REDUCE TUITION COSTS TO MAKE KANSAS VERY COMPETITIVE (ATTRACT THE BRIGHTEST WITH DISCOUNT TUITION, GRANTS)?**

This question is based on an assumption that low tuition drives parents and students college choices, especially when they are considering out-of-state institutions. Marketing studies of college choice decisions do not support that assumption. Recent studies show that college choice was traditionally based on the family's perception of institutional quality. More recent studies show that **value, not cost** is the most critical and common criterion. Students and parents will pay a fair price for high quality. It is this value proposition, not cost per se, which is the basis of most parental and student decisions. According to an on-going survey of freshmen students conducted annually by UCLA, academic reputation is most important (62 percent of students), followed by "this college's graduates get good jobs" (53.3 percent).

The second assumption underlying this question is that tuition and fees in Kansas are high and non-competitive. Generally, tuition in Kansas is competitive to low. As examples:

- In-state tuition and fees at the University of Illinois ranges from \$15,258 to 20,178 depending on academic program.
- Tuition and fees at UCLA for in-state students was \$14,010 in 2012-13.
- Tuition and fees at Michigan State University was \$13,211 in that same academic year.
- Tuition and fees at the University of Colorado at Boulder is \$6,261 per semester for a newly enrolled student (for a total of \$12,522).

Cost differences by state will affect where and how the university recruits out-of-state students. We currently are analyzing key markets where costs and access to specific programs suggest that WSU should be able to recruit substantial numbers of out-of-state students. Such recruiting efforts need to be targeted and focused if they are to be successful. Therefore, WSU is developing a sophisticated geo-marketing approach to recruiting out-of-state students.

In addition to cost, program access is becoming a major issue in many states. For example, at Texas A&M, there are limited numbers of slots for freshmen. According to their webpage, they received more than 10,000 applications for 1,600 slots available to freshmen who wish to major in engineering. There also are limits for engineering programs in several University of California institutions. Regardless of cost, many good students will not have access to majors that they desire in other states. They become potential recruits.

WSU has a two part plan to address this issue. First, we want to "right price" our institution for the type of education and research we provide and second, we are reorganizing our scholarship program to make sure we are attracting the students we want at WSU and to expedite the award letters to potential students.

### ***Right Pricing WSU:***

WSU is located in one of the largest aviation clusters in the world. Wichita has the third largest population of engineers per capita in the country. Wichita is also home to a large regional medical cluster. The largest and second largest privately held companies are located in Wichita. Graduates with professional degrees are needed to meet the needs of this economy and the WSU student body reflects this demand. WSU has a higher percentage of its students in engineering and health professions than our KBOR and Kansas peers, and our business school majors are typical when compared to our KBOR peers but higher when compared to other Kansas universities. We believe the applied learning provided at WSU provides an educational experience that few universities can match. WSU currently contracts with over 180 private sector companies to provide research. This offers students valuable applied learning opportunities. WSU's tuition is low compared to our peers and below the national average for public universities. WSU is undervalued and is looking to be a competitively priced public research university.

***Scholarships:***

WSU is currently restructuring our scholarship program to achieve two outcomes. The first is to speed up the time from application to scholarship awarding. The second step is to tier the scholarships so that awards reflect the student's achievement and preparation in the fields that meet the needs of the Kansas economy.

WSU wants to keep more of the brightest Kansas kids in Kansas and attract the brightest from other states and countries to study here. We know that graduates tend to stay close to where they graduate, when they have friends in the community, have met their spouse in the community and where there are good job opportunities. When our kids leave our community and state, few return for the same reasons.

**18. WHAT ARE THE INSTITUTIONS PLANS TO REDUCE FIXED COSTS AND STAFF COSTS IN LIGHT OF DECLINING ENROLLMENT?**

The true measure of growth or decline in a university is credit hour production. Over the years WSU has seen a decrease in headcount but an increase in credit hour production. That is because more students attending WSU are full time students taking 12 hours or more per semester. So while there are fewer students the university is actually growing to meet the needs of a changing student body.

WSU has contracted with a company to do an effectiveness and efficiency study. It will look at ways to improve systems, cut costs, and redirect spending from low priority programs to programs that will grow enrollment and help grow the Kansas economy.

**19. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF KIDS COMING TO COLLEGE WHO ARE NOT EMOTIONALLY AND ACADEMICALLY READY? DOES THE INSTITUTION CURRENTLY HAVE ANY ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS IN PLACE?**

We are unaware of any test or other reliable and valid approach to assessing "emotional maturity" that could reasonably be expected to withstand legal challenge. Therefore, WSU does not utilize an assessment tool to determine the emotional readiness of students prior to their enrollment. We do have very strong support services once they arrive in case issues arise. The residence hall programming helps students make the transition to college so they can deal with homesickness and the stress of being on their own. In the event a student needs more support, the Counseling & Testing Center can offer many forms of assistance ranging from formal tests to general counseling. We also utilize our Disability Services Office for students who need to be tested for learning disabilities. Often, what seems like an emotional issue has underlying issues related to learning disabilities that create an academic deficiency that has never been diagnosed before arrival at WSU. Proper testing and diagnosis can greatly assist students and create an environment where they can be successful.

Academic readiness is assessed through detailed examination of the student's record. Additionally, this academic year we are beta testing an advising software package that strongly predicts student potential success in any particular course based on academic record. This package will be used with all students, not just freshmen as a means of assisting in advising.