

PITTSBURG 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 - FY 2014
Pittsburg State University**

| Sources of Financing | FY 2014 Revised Estimate | Percent of Total |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| State General Fund (Appropriation) | \$ 34,750,262 | 32.9% |
| General Fees (Tuition) | 34,473,602 | 32.7% |
| Restricted Fee Funds (1) | 10,490,487 | 9.9% |
| Federal Grants | 13,527,430 | 12.8% |
| Housing System Operation | 7,711,387 | 7.3% |
| Student Health Fees | 1,447,112 | 1.4% |
| Parking Fees | 691,725 | 0.7% |
| Other Revenue: | | |
| State Educational Building Fund | 1,247,829 | 1.2% |
| Sponsored Overhead Research | 100,000 | 0.1% |
| Faculty of Distinction | 643 | 0.0% |
| Deferred Maintenance | 246,948 | 0.2% |
| Overman Student Center | 451,883 | 0.4% |
| Student Health Center | 75,861 | 0.1% |
| Horace Mann Bond | 272,000 | 0.3% |
| Total Sources of Financing | \$ 105,487,169 | 100.0% |

(1) - Includes various fee funds.

Source: FY 2015 Budget Request - DA 402's

| Expenditures by Program | FY 2014 Revised Estimate | Percent of Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Instruction | \$ 35,839,221 | 34.0% |
| Academic Support | 9,037,189 | 8.6% |
| Student Services | 8,492,547 | 8.1% |
| Institutional Support | 7,834,980 | 7.4% |
| Physical Plant/Central Services | 9,887,402 | 9.4% |
| Research | 3,420,104 | 3.2% |
| Public Service | 2,504,468 | 2.4% |
| Scholarships and Fellowships | 12,869,714 | 12.2% |
| Auxiliary Services | 6,688,414 | 6.3% |
| Debt Service- Interest | 1,829,285 | 1.7% |
| Capital Improvements | 4,944,777 | 4.7% |
| Debt Service - Principal | 2,139,068 | 2.0% |
| Total Expenditures | \$ 105,487,169 | 100.0% |

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 | \$ 64,908,724 | 61.6% |
| Other Operating Expenditures | 18,813,044 | 17.8% |
| Other Assistance | 12,852,271 | 12.2% |
| Debt Service - Principal | 2,139,068 | 2.0% |
| Debt Service - Interest | 1,829,285 | 1.7% |
| Capital Improvements | 4,944,777 | 4.7% |
| Total Expenditures | <u>\$ 105,487,169</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?

Pittsburg State University has a well-developed planning process which provides departments the opportunity to request budget increases. The process identifies those departmental recommendations which are judged to have the most merit. The recommendations are forwarded to the appropriate vice president or president. Final decisions are made by the President in terms of identifying the institutional priorities which will be funded.

Source: Institutional Division of Administration & Campus Life

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

Pittsburg State University does not allocate indirect costs to different cost centers across the institution. Costs such as utilities, facility maintenance, equipment, administration, etc. are all centrally funded. However, the university has established a policy that allocates indirect overhead revenue received through research grants or contracts. The distribution is executed in the following way: 55% to the university; 15% to the principal investigator's college or division; and 30% to the principal investigator's academic department or administrative unit. The university uses this indirect overhead revenue to cover a portion of indirect costs and to pay the bond payments associated with the Tyler Research Center. The college/division or department/unit utilizes the indirect overhead revenue to support those costs of research that are not otherwise covered.

Source: Institutional Office of Graduate & Continuing Studies and Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

The major categories of expense are those established by reporting authorities for higher education. There are a multitude of departments for each major expense category. For example, the College of Arts and Sciences has thirteen academic departments. The college would represent a sub-total of the overall instructional budget. Pittsburg State operates on a de-centralized mode of operation with management decisions occurring at each appropriate level.

Within each major unit on the campus, expenses are tracked by unclassified salaries (faculty and professional administrative staff), classified salaries (clerical and physical plant staff), student employees (graduate teaching assistants and hourly), employee fringe benefits, and non-salary expenditures (supplies, library books, equipment, and utilities). Management within the individual units has the authority to adjust internal budgets as necessary as they progress through a fiscal year.

Source: Institutional Budget Office

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

At the time an endowment is created by the Pittsburg State University Foundation using funds made available by a private donor, a gift agreement is executed that specifies the donor's intended use of those funds and the investment revenue generated by that endowment. The PSU Foundation takes very seriously its fiduciary responsibility to utilize private funds in strict accordance with donor wishes. No foundation funds may be spent for any purpose other than that designated by the donor. Random testing of expenditures each year by the foundation's external auditor ensures compliance with this principal. During the last ten years, no instance of foundation funds being used for a purpose not in keeping with the donor's intent has been identified by the external auditor.

Unrestricted funds (those received with no donor designation) are allocated through the PSU Foundation's budget process, which includes input from the university president and senior administrators. Unrestricted funds represent a very small portion of the total private dollars received by the PSU Foundation in any given year. For example, in FY 2012, the PSU Foundation received \$15.5 million in private gift support. Of that amount, approximately \$200,000 was unrestricted (1.2% of all funds received). The other 98.8% of gifts received were designated by the donors for specific endowments, programs, or capital construction projects on the campus of Pittsburg State University.

Private gifts are not solicited nor are they used to reinforce the university's operating budget. Rather, they provide the margin of excellence above and beyond what is provided by state appropriations and tuition revenue. Because of that philosophy, embraced nationwide by public universities and their affiliated foundations, there is no direct coordination of private funds raised and the institution's operating budget.

There is, however, close coordination between the university and foundation in regard to fundraising priorities. The university president identifies projects that could benefit from private gifts. Fundraising by university personnel and volunteers is limited to those pre-authorized projects (i.e., scholarships, program support, capital construction projects, etc.). This ensures that all private funds solicited can be used for a purpose that is aligned with the university's strategic priorities. Funds offered by a donor that are not for a pre-authorized strategic priority are thoughtfully considered and then either accepted and used in keeping with the donor's intent, or diplomatically declined.

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

In the last ten years, Pittsburg State University has received federal grants from the National Institute of Health, National Science Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Naval Research, NASA, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and U.S. Department of Energy. Since 2007, Pittsburg State University has received \$11.9 million in federal grant revenue.

Expenditures related to seeking these grants in the last ten years include contracts with government relations specialists and a proposal development service, access to databases, and the time of Pittsburg State University faculty and staff in developing grant proposals and building relationships with decision makers in federal agencies and departments. While some expenditures are easily identifiable, others expenses, particularly staff time, are difficult to quantify.

Source: Institutional Budget Office

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.

With the development of each new strategic plan, the institution engages in environmental scanning to complete a thorough S.W.O.T analysis to guide the goals of the institution, including goals related to the area of growing the institution. On an annual basis, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviews unit level plans to identify emerging plans and promising programs. The president has ultimate responsibility for decisions related to budget and takes these data into account. For the past several years, one percent of any tuition increase has been allocated to emerging areas.

Source: Institutional Office of the President and Institutional Division of Administration & Campus Life

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

Pittsburg State University has deliberately chosen to offer a wide variety of programs that appeal to a broad range of students. In part this is because close to 25% of our students are from Crawford County and the surrounding nine counties and we are the only comprehensive four-year institution in this area of the state. The university develops new programs based on emerging market trends related to workforce demands. Existing programs are modified in relation to business and corporate needs, primarily through extensive use of advisory boards as well as a robust Program Review process to evaluate viability of existing programs. In particular, the programs in our College of Technology are uniquely linked to contemporary industry needs in the state, region, and nation. Examples of recent additions to specialized schools and programs include the School of Construction within the College of Technology and School of Nursing (within the College of Arts & Sciences and closely related to the highly successful preparation of pre-health professions students), as well as minors in Internal Auditing, Fraud Examination, Public Health, and Innovation Engineering.

Source: Institutional Office of the Provost

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

Over the last ten years, Pittsburg State University has received research revenue from the federal government (National Institute of Health, National Science Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Naval Research, NASA, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and U.S. Department of Energy), state government (Kansas Department of Commerce, Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation, and Kansas Bioscience Authority), and private industry (Cargill, United Soybean Board, MGP Ingredients, Certainteed, and many others).

Expenditures associated with university research include all or part of specific faculty and research scientists' salaries and benefits, graduate research assistants, equipment, supplies, faculty research incentives, matching funds on proposals submitted, and legal fees. Research expenditures at PSU have been relatively consistent over the past five years as demonstrated in the followed chart:

| | <u>FY2009</u> | <u>FY2010</u> | <u>FY2011</u> | <u>FY2012</u> | <u>FY2013</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Research Expenditures | \$2,277,968 | \$2,248,902 | \$2,088,318 | \$2,023,330 | \$1,945,223 |

While it is difficult to quantify return on investment for faculty research, the ROI on the applied research being conducted at the Kansas Polymer Research Center can be calculated. Using the formula (KPRC Total Research Funds - Total Funds Received from a Specific Source) / KPRC Total Research Funds, the ROI for federal research dollars over the last ten years is 2.87; for state funds it is 2.89, and for the university's investment in research, the return is 13.41.

Source: Institutional Office of Graduate & Continuing Studies and Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

Over the last decade, Pittsburg State University faculty and staff have created twelve patents, all of them originating from the Kansas Polymer Research Center. The scientific research that led to these patents has been conducted in partnership with industry. Using the intellectual property generated on the campus of Pittsburg State University, the industry partner commercializes a product, creating jobs and income for the corporation and its regions of operation. Because our industry partners are scattered across the nation and even internationally, it is difficult to calculate the economic impact of patents created at Pittsburg State University. Locally, the research carried out by the scientists at the Kansas Polymer Research Center has created jobs for additional scientists and support personnel working in the Tyler Research Center.

As for how the money is reinvested, royalty or licensing revenue received from a commercialization partner is first used to reimburse the Kansas Polymer Research Center for upfront research costs. Once those costs have been refunded, any future royalty revenues are split 50/50 by the scientists involved in the research and Pittsburg State University. At this time, the university utilizes their half of the royalty revenues to make the bond payments on the construction of the Tyler Research Center. Since 2003, the Kansas Polymer Research Center has received \$530,000 in royalty and licensing revenue.

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

Pittsburg State University has had a long and successful history of working with area community colleges. With six two-year institutions in our service area, these efforts have paid significant dividends to students. At the present time, we have over 50 articulation agreements and 10 reverse transfer agreements with community colleges throughout the region and state. In addition, nine years ago, we developed a baccalaureate degree that provides a transition from Associate of Applied Science degrees offered by community and technical colleges. This provides a pathway for the two-year technical degree student to earn a four-year degree without a loss of credits.

The Pittsburg State University-Fort Scott Community College partnership is one of the most robust such partnerships in the country. As an example, PSU and FSCC, through their combined efforts, have developed programs with corporate partners such as John Deere and Harley Davidson. Over the years, PSU has spun off several technical programs to FSCC, and those programs continue to serve the citizens of southeast Kansas. One of the most unique and successful programs to emerge from the PSU-FSCC partnership is referred to as the QA Program. For students who do not meet regents' Qualified Admissions (QA) standards that would allow entry to PSU, they can enroll in FSCC classes that are actually offered on the PSU campus.

While our strongest partnership is with FSCC, PSU has also created an arrangement with Neosho County Community College (NCCC) that has its own set of unique attributes. Through this partnership, NCCC has taken over the instruction of developmental math courses at PSU. As an example, this fall PSU is not offering a single course that is completely developmental in nature. NCCC is offering three developmental math sections on the PSU campus using PSU classrooms, and those three sections are serving a total of 60 students. It is clear that NCCC has developed an effective approach to developmental math instruction, and this partnership is serving students deficient in mathematics well.

Source: Institutional Office of the Provost

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

Pittsburg State University is described as a 'comprehensive regional university' in its mission statement, and it is evident from our longstanding success across a variety of disciplines that we are fulfilling this role. In addition, the mission statement identifies two key areas of statewide commitment and responsibility. Those focal areas are technology and economic development.

Primarily, we meet the obligation to serve the state's technology needs through the programming, faculty, and staff of the College of Technology. Located in the Kansas Technology Center (KTC), the college offers a unique set of programs that lead to immediate employment in high-salaried jobs across the state and region. Those programs include areas such as construction, environmental safety, manufacturing, mechanical, graphics and imaging, plastics, automotive and diesel/heavy equipment. Corporate support through a variety of partnerships and advisory councils routinely affirms the importance and relevance of these programs.

Not only have the technology programs served state and regional businesses and industries over past years, they continue to be areas of key curricular innovation and represent new opportunities for university growth. In the past few years, the state has provided targeted funding for the plastics/polymer programs as well as the fast growing construction program. Because of the opportunities we see ahead for technology, we have begun to envision and plan for the first expansion of the KTC since its completion in 1997.

To serve as a catalyst for the growth and expansion of the state and regional economy, we operate a number of centers and business development services. Most importantly, the university has established the Kansas Polymer Research Center (KPRC), building on the longstanding success in the plastics technology program. This center, with its focus on bioscience research, produces patentable and commercializable outcomes through a focus on applied research and development. The KPRC uniquely separates the university from other state institutions and positions us well to have a direct impact on the Kansas economy.

While these statewide roles are clearly identified in our mission statement, other campus characteristics serve to clearly distinguish the institution from the other regional campuses as well, including:

- Largest enrollment of on-campus, Kansas students
- Largest housing system, regularly reporting 100%+ occupancy
- Highest ratio of FTE to student head count, indicating a higher efficiency of space utilization
- Highest proportion of male students
- Highest 4-year, 5-year and 6-year graduation rates

Source: Institutional Office of the President

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 | 8,604 | 8,396 | 8,545 | 8,609 | 8,757 | 8,852 | 8,917 | 8,789 | 8,870 | 8,584 |

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 20th 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 | 4,451 | 4,279 | 4,246 | 4,302 | 4,334 | 4,315 | 4,347 | 4,278 | 4,403 | 4,430 |
| Non-Resident | 847 | 952 | 1,039 | 1,120 | 1,213 | 1,212 | 1,260 | 1,301 | 1,356 | 1,444 |
| Foreign National | 233 | 262 | 258 | 324 | 325 | 336 | 327 | 312 | 317 | 292 |
| Total Enrollment | 5,531 | 5,493 | 5,543 | 5,746 | 5,872 | 5,863 | 5,934 | 5,891 | 6,076 | 6,166 |

Source: Institution Fall Census

A-2. Graduate students

Fall 20th 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 | 727 | 636 | 623 | 688 | 782 | 811 | 887 | 799 | 742 | 732 |
| Non-Resident | 313 | 275 | 334 | 297 | 292 | 255 | 286 | 280 | 276 | 246 |
| Foreign National | 160 | 133 | 128 | 128 | 141 | 198 | 170 | 160 | 181 | 145 |
| Total Enrollment | 1,200 | 1,044 | 1,085 | 1,113 | 1,215 | 1,264 | 1,343 | 1,239 | 1,199 | 1,123 |

Source: Institution Fall Census

A-3. FTE and 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 | 306 | 1,038 | 1,320 | 1,763 | 2,341 | 2,547 | 2,881 | 3,501 | 4,054 | 5,830 |
| Headcount | 90 | 272 | 330 | 423 | 570 | 638 | 753 | 865 | 993 | 1,369 |

Source: Institution Fall Census

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> |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 14.0% | 15.0% | 15.9% | 16.2% | 16.1% | 15.6% | 14.9% | 17.5% | 18.1% | 17.8% |

*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 PSU Table A

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

The University does not track students on a thirty mile radius. We do track students in terms of commuting to campus as compared to living in the community, as indicated below.

| | <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> |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| # of Commuters | 2,028 | 1,998 | 2,058 | 2,113 | 2,168 | 2,164 | 2,272 | 2,554 | 2,884 | 2,469 |
| Percentage | 30.1% | 30.6% | 31.1% | 30.8% | 30.6% | 30.4% | 31.2% | 35.8% | 39.6% | 37.9% |

Source: Institutional Census

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> |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 446 | 401 | 385 | 422 | 410 | 397 | 424 | 408 | 394 | 401 |

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 Pittsburg State University:

- 4 Years – 60.3%
- 6 Years – 68.5%

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> |
| \$32,866,166 | \$33,570,974 | \$34,583,136 | \$36,271,993 | \$37,606,146 |
| <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> |
| \$34,965,104 | \$34,521,824 | \$34,697,387 | \$35,111,649 | \$34,750,262 |

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> |
| \$71,598,632 | \$75,182,021 | \$75,254,839 | \$85,128,045 | \$84,863,121 |
| <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> |
| \$85,645,096 | \$90,086,467 | \$93,625,370 | \$100,210,262 | \$102,186,562 |

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 |
| \$1,647 | \$1,781 | \$1,895 | \$2,030 | \$2,161 | \$2,296 | \$2,424 | \$2,581 | \$2,747 | \$2,953 |

Includes fees, for a student taking 15 hours

Source: KBOR State University Data Books, derived from Table 2.1a

Pittsburg State is one of the two remaining universities in Kansas to offer a student-friendly, flat-rate tuition plan. This plan allows students enrolled in 10 or more hours to take additional courses at no additional cost.

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 | \$5,188 | \$5,265 | \$5,931 | \$6,294 | \$6,272 | \$6,266 | \$6,392 | \$6,286 | \$6,407 | \$6,616 |
| Graduate | \$10,376 | \$10,530 | \$11,863 | \$12,589 | \$12,544 | \$12,532 | \$12,784 | \$12,572 | \$12,814 | \$13,232 |

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 following table.

Total Cost for an Undergraduate

| Academic Year | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|----------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Tuition | \$1,940 | \$2,350 | \$2,632 | \$2,850 | \$3,036 | \$3,234 | \$3,420 | \$3,652 | \$3,868 | \$4,132 |
| Campus Activity Fee | \$594 | \$612 | \$662 | \$712 | \$754 | \$826 | \$902 | \$940 | \$980 | \$1,030 |
| Room & Board | \$4,006 | \$4,166 | \$4,334 | \$4,550 | \$4,844 | \$5,088 | \$5,394 | \$5,744 | \$6,016 | \$6,288 |
| Books & Supplies | \$800 | \$800 | \$800 | \$800 | \$900 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Transportation | \$664 | \$780 | \$780 | \$780 | \$780 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Other Living Expenses | \$1,722 | \$2,092 | \$2,092 | \$2,096 | \$2,096 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | \$2,299 | \$2,170 | \$2,268 |
| Student Total Cost of Attendance | \$9,726 | \$10,800 | \$11,300 | \$11,788 | \$12,410 | \$13,248 | \$13,816 | \$14,635 | \$15,034 | \$15,718 |

PLUS

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| State General Fund Per Student | \$5,097 | \$5,169 | \$5,457 | \$5,733 | \$5,646 | \$5,728 | \$5,451 | \$4,990 | \$5,041 | \$4,974 |
| TOTAL STUDENT + STATE COST | \$14,823 | \$15,969 | \$16,757 | \$17,521 | \$18,056 | \$18,976 | \$19,267 | \$19,625 | \$20,075 | \$20,692 |

Source: University Financial Aid Office

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.

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Student/Parents | 65.6% | 67.6% | 67.4% | 67.3% | 68.7% | 69.8% | 71.7% | 74.6% | 74.9% | 76.0% |
| State | 34.4% | 32.4% | 32.6% | 32.7% | 31.3% | 30.2% | 28.3% | 25.4% | 25.1% | 24.0% |

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

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| All Funds* | \$4,066 | \$4,219 | \$4,491 | \$4,678 | \$4,820 | \$4,777 | \$4,849 | \$4,741 | \$4,744 | \$4,986 |
| General Use** | \$3,781 | \$3,800 | \$4,279 | \$4,458 | \$4,427 | \$4,420 | \$4,485 | \$4,394 | \$4,444 | \$4,633 |

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* | \$1,026 | \$1,060 | \$1,164 | \$1,376 | \$1,374 | \$1,408 | \$1,380 | \$1,341 | \$1,356 | \$1,457 |
| General Use** | \$970 | \$993 | \$1,109 | \$1,269 | \$1,277 | \$1,271 | \$1,272 | \$1,234 | \$1,203 | \$1,259 |

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* | \$810 | \$826 | \$825 | \$834 | \$802 | \$988 | \$1,021 | \$1,472 | \$1,257 | \$1,725 |
| General Use** | \$544 | \$575 | \$602 | \$618 | \$614 | \$657 | \$723 | \$743 | \$800 | \$797 |

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* | \$710 | \$696 | \$801 | \$828 | \$840 | \$893 | \$922 | \$970 | \$992 | \$972 |
| General Use** | \$651 | \$622 | \$715 | \$753 | \$765 | \$798 | \$853 | \$869 | \$906 | \$872 |

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)?

Assuming space is available (as each additional enrollment depends upon the academic discipline selected), adding one more student would most likely not impact overall costs. However, there is a limit as to how many additional students can be educated before costs increase (and the number of additional students would vary based on the academic courses of study desired). The average PSU cost per student credit hour for FY12 was \$256, using this credit hour cost the following incremental cost calculation may be made (*This calculation is based upon general use educational expenditures (financed with State General Fund and Tuition) and would not include any assessment for physical plant costs.*):

- \$252 per credit hour x 30 credit hours for an academic year = \$7,560 per student
- \$7,560 per student x 100 new students = \$756,000

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

Students enrolled in online courses at PSU pay \$18 per credit hour in addition to the regular rate for tuition and fees. This additional fee generated \$481,263 in revenue in FY2013. This additional revenue is used to defray costs associated with IT and distance education technologies.

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* | \$710 | \$696 | \$801 | \$828 | \$840 | \$893 | \$922 | \$970 | \$992 | \$972 |
| General Use** | \$651 | \$622 | \$715 | \$753 | \$765 | \$798 | \$853 | \$869 | \$906 | \$872 |

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-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 | 1,076 | 1,018 | 956 | 1,039 | 1,107 | 1,058 | 1,130 | 1,084 | 1,131 | 1,150 |
| Advanced* | 432 | 382 | 301 | 337 | 421 | 411 | 446 | 475 | 456 | 488 |
| Total | 1,508 | 1,400 | 1,257 | 1,376 | 1,528 | 1,469 | 1,576 | 1,559 | 1,587 | 1,638 |

*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> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Average financial aid a student receives per year during matriculation | \$6,439 | n/a | \$6,785 | \$6,890 | \$7,109 | \$7,699 | \$9,390 | \$9,900 | \$8,076 | \$8,174 |

Data source is Common Data Set. Averages represent average financial aid package for degree-seeking, full-time, undergraduate students who filed a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FASFA) and were determined to have financial needs. Averages do not reflect any aid offered to cover a student's calculated Expected Family Contribution (EFC).

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> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| | - | \$10,348 | \$10,742 | \$11,502 | \$15,776 | \$15,643 | \$18,516 | - | \$21,377 | \$20,808 |

*Institution did not report data

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 20% 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> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 4.2% | 4.8% | 3.4% | 4.1% | 5.0% | 5.7% | 6.6% | 6.5% | 7.8% | N/A |

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.

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

| | |
|---|---------|
| Percent of students who graduate with loan debt | 42.7% |
| Non-graduate average loan debt | \$4,918 |

Source: Institutional Office of Student Financial Assistance

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 | 38.4% | 37.3% | 37.0% | 34.3% | 35.0% | 35.7% | 34.7% | 38.4% | 43.4% | 44.5% |
| Average amount | \$2,466 | \$2,450 | \$2,475 | \$2,512 | \$2,558 | \$2,752 | \$3,200 | \$3,868 | \$3,934 | \$3,831 |

Source: Institutional Office of Student Financial Assistance. The percent is based on all students who filed the FAFSA, and received some type of award, versus the number who received Federal Pell Grant funding.

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

There are multiple tuition rates (discounts) applied to individual student accounts depending upon various agreements. All changes from the standard rates are authorized from appropriate entities (i.e., Kansas Legislature, Kansas Board of Regents). Examples would include the discounts as allowed by state statutes, special rates for international exchange programs, and rates as established for participation in the Midwest Student Exchange Program.

Source: Institutional Division of Administration & Campus Life

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 | 19.5 | 19.7 | 20.1 | 20.7 | 19.9 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 20.4 | 19.8 | 20.2 |
| Non-resident | 20.9 | 19.9 | 20.7 | 20.1 | 20.3 | 20.1 | 20.8 | 20.3 | 20.4 | 20.8 |

Source: Institutional Census

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 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Non-resident | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |

Source: Institutional Census

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

Four Year Graduation Rate of First-Time, Full-Time Freshman 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> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 25.2% | 25.6% | 27.3% | 28.6% | 26.7% | 29.7% | 25.8% | 26.8% | 24.8% | 28.1% |

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 Rate of First-Time, Full-Time Freshman 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 | - | 29.0% | 31.3% | 32.1% | 28.1% | 33.3% | 27.6% | 32.0% | 27.6% | 30.4% |
| Non-resident | - | 23.0% | 25.3% | 23.6% | 24.9% | 25.4% | 26.3% | 17.7% | 23.0% | 22.2% |

Source: Institutional Completion File

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

Six Year Graduation Rate of First-Time, Full-Time Freshman 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> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|
| 45.7% | 50.2% | 50.2% | 50.3% | 52.2% | 50.2% | 54.0% | 49.5% | 51.7% | <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 Rate of First-Time, Full-Time Freshman 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 | - | 51.3% | 51.9% | 54.3% | 51.8% | 57.5% | 50.5% | 53.7% | <i>Not available for these cohorts yet</i> | |
| Non-resident | - | 48.3% | 45.2% | 43.4% | 40.1% | 45.9% | 50.2% | 43.9% | <i>Not available for these cohorts yet</i> | |

Source: Institutional Completion File

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> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 21.7 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 21.5 | 21.9 | 21.7 | 21.9 |

Source: Institutional Completion File

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

| Degree | Credit Hours |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Music | 144 |
| Chemistry (BSEd) | 135* |
| English (BSEd) | 137* |
| History/Government (BSEd) | 138* |

*Includes teacher certification

Source: KBOR Program Inventory Data

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

Student learning is measured in a number of ways. Two standardized tests, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) have been used at the institutional level for a number of years. Assessment of student learning also occurs at: the program level (e.g. embedded course assessments, Major Field Tests, licensure pass rates, supervisor ratings) with programs required to submit annual assessment reports; in the area of general education and in co-curricular areas (i.e. learning that occurs outside the classroom in non-academic or student support areas).

Source: Institutional Assessment

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

| <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> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 98% | 96% | 97% | 96% | 85% | 76% | 90% | 90% | 95% | 93% |

Percent of graduates employed, in graduate/professional school or not seeking employment.

Source: Institutional Career Services Survey

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

Pittsburg State University has traditionally tracked employment in general, although we are currently implementing efforts to begin tracking employment within field. It is challenging to define who will make the distinction as to whether a particular job title matches a graduate's major. Pittsburg State University collects data from the graduate, from faculty and departmental records, and occasionally from parents or spouses. Ideally the graduate should define whether they are employed within their field, but Career Services does not have the opportunity to personally visit with each student.

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

Although graduates are asked to self-report salary data, only a very small number of graduates volunteer this information. Since graduates were first asked to provide salary data in summer 2005, only 15.4% of graduates have responded to this request. Because of the low response rate, the following table shows 2012 salary aggregated by college rather than major. Graduates are asked to report salary as a range, using the following scale:

| | | | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1 | \$15,000 | \$22,999 | 5 | \$39,000 | \$44,999 |
| 2 | \$23,000 | \$27,999 | 6 | \$45,000 | \$47,999 |
| 3 | \$28,000 | \$33,999 | 7 | \$48,000 | \$53,999 |
| 4 | \$34,000 | \$38,999 | 8 | \$54,000 | \$59,999 |
| | | | 9 | \$60,000 | + |

| | <u>Arts and Sciences</u> | <u>Business</u> | <u>Education</u> | <u>Technology</u> |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Average Reported Range | 3.34 | 5.01 | 3.89 | 5.99 |
| Approx. Average Salary Range Equivalent | \$28,000-33,999 | \$39,000-44,999 | \$34,000-38,999 | \$45,000-47,000 |

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

Yes. There are two ways that majors can be eliminated. Departments may initiate the process to eliminate a program at any time. More importantly, all programs undergo a formal review every seven years, as required by the Kansas Board of Regents. During this review, all programs must address Regents' minima, including enrollment in the major and numbers of graduates. This Program Review process can result in the recommendation to eliminate majors for a variety of reasons, including low enrollment. Departments undergoing Program Review submit a self-study to a committee consisting of faculty, chairs, and a dean. This committee makes recommendations to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, who makes the final decision about implementation of committee recommendations. If a program is considered to have insufficient enrollment, then the committee typically recommends either closure or interim review to provide opportunity for the department to effectively remedy the issue.

Source: Office of the Provost

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

| Program | Date of Closure |
|--|------------------------|
| BA French | Pending KBOR approval |
| BA Spanish | Pending KBOR approval |
| MA Art | May 2012 |
| BST with a Major in Management | December 2011 |
| BSEd Physical Science | January 2011 |
| BAS PSU Harley Davidson Program | September 2010 |
| BSEd Art | June 2010 |
| BA Sociology | June 2010 |
| BS Computer Science | February 2010 |
| Educational Technology (Technology Facilitator (Industrial Setting) emphasis) | May 2009 |
| Educational Technology (Technology Facilitator (Educational Setting) emphasis) | May 2009 |
| General School Administration | April 2009 |
| MS Justice Studies & Administration | December 2008 |
| Nursing (Family Health Gerontology Emphasis) | December 2008 |
| Field Biology emphasis | December 2008 |
| Environmental Management minor | November 2008 |
| English (Teaching English in Community College Emphasis) | December 2008 |
| Chemistry Option I, Chemistry Option II, Chemistry (pre-pharmacy), Chemistry (pre-engineering) | April 2008 |
| MS Technology Education | June 2007 |
| Teaching (Early Childhood Emphasis) | November 2006 |
| Early Childhood Education minor | November 2006 |
| Construction Management (Environmental Management Emphasis) | March 2005 |
| Counseling (Marriage and Family emphasis) | March 2005 |
| Psychology (Business/Technology Emphasis) | March 2005 |
| Physical Education (Coaching emphasis) | July 2004 |
| Physical Education (Elementary Physical Education emphasis) | May 2004 |

Source: Office of the Provost

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

No formal study on grade inflation has been completed in recent years. However, the following table of end-of-semester average GPA of undergraduate students from 2005-2012 shows no evidence of grade inflation, with average GPA remaining highly stable across the past several years.

| Term | Average GPA |
|-------|-------------|
| 05/WF | 3.00 |
| 06/WF | 3.02 |
| 07/WF | 2.99 |
| 08/WF | 2.98 |
| 09/WF | 2.96 |
| 10/WF | 2.95 |
| 11/WF | 2.93 |
| 12/WF | 2.95 |

Source: Office of Analysis, Planning, and Assessment

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.

Pittsburg State University has a long-standing practice of very limited involvement in remedial offerings and our efforts are focused on coursework that is truly at the collegiate level. We address remediation through innovative partnering with area community colleges. This is primarily accomplished through the Qualified Admissions program with Fort Scott Community College. Students not meeting Pittsburg State University admission standards enroll through Fort Scott to meet qualifications to enter Pittsburg State as transfer students. Many of these students are required to enroll in remedial courses at no cost to Pittsburg State University other than provision of campus facilities for the courses. In addition, since 2009, Pittsburg State has had a Memorandum of Understanding with Neosho Community College to provide remedial math classes to students at Pittsburg State. The agreement provides that Neosho County Community College be reimbursed at the community college tuition rate. The total reimbursement by academic year has been as follows:

| | AY2010 | AY2011 | AY2012 | AY2013 |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| AY reimbursements | \$15,600 | \$15,812 | \$20,140 | \$16,200 |

In addition to these community college partnerships, the PSU math department provides a five-credit algebra course with review, two of those credits being remedial in nature. The cost of these remedial math courses is minimal, representing only five out of the nearly 350 sections of general education offerings taught by Pittsburg State faculty during Fall 2013 (less than 2%) having a remedial component.

Source: Office of the Provost

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

Given the relatively recent nature of the Memorandum of Understanding with Neosho County Community College, graduation data for those students is not yet available. Of the 1,106 bachelor-level graduates in AY 12-13, 351 (31.7%) had taken at least one remedial course from some institution during their matriculation.

Source: Office of Analysis, Planning, and Assessment

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

For lower division (0-499) courses, low enrollment is defined at the institutional level as nine or fewer students. For upper division courses (500-699) low enrollment is defined at the institutional level as four or fewer students. We distinguish between upper and lower level undergraduate courses because we expect upper-level course sections to have fewer students, given their more specialized topic matter.

Source: Office of the Provost

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.)?

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Professor | 107 | 111 | 110 | 105 | 109 | 106 | 103 | 110 | 111 | 113 |
| Associate | 67 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 65 | 68 | 65 | 63 | 64 |
| Assistant | 53 | 58 | 57 | 64 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 66 | 72 | 74 |
| Instructor | 58 | 50 | 49 | 52 | 57 | 65 | 75 | 67 | 67 | 65 |

Source: Table 4.3 of the State University Data Book

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 |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| College of Arts and Sciences | 134 | 133 | 137 | 143 | 144 | 149 | 147 | 152 | 154 | 151 |
| College of Business | 34 | 34 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 35 | 34 |
| College of Education | 51 | 53 | 53 | 54 | 54 | 56 | 54 | 52 | 51 | 51 |
| College of Technology | 54 | 56 | 57 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 65 | 56 | 68 |
| Instructional Media | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Library | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Total | 284 | 285 | 291 | 300 | 301 | 312 | 308 | 313 | 305 | 313 |

Source: State University DBTF reports, section 9

With regard to faculty responsibilities, see Question E-4.

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

| | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Professor | \$63,283 | \$65,045 | \$68,177 | \$70,009 | \$71,734 | \$73,083 | \$76,270 | \$76,536 | \$75,749 | \$76,164 |
| Associate | \$53,598 | \$54,157 | \$55,052 | \$56,139 | \$57,984 | \$57,927 | \$59,767 | \$57,988 | \$58,064 | \$59,030 |
| Assistant | \$43,933 | \$44,150 | \$45,823 | \$47,395 | \$48,320 | \$50,926 | \$52,135 | \$51,839 | \$52,747 | \$54,705 |
| Instructor | \$35,613 | \$36,127 | \$38,017 | \$39,922 | \$40,336 | \$40,715 | \$44,128 | \$45,218 | \$44,780 | \$45,388 |

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?

Requirements for faculty productivity are a negotiated aspect of employment and are outlined in the KBOR-PSU/PSU-KNEA Agreement. Faculty are expected to meet minimum requirements in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service. Teaching is identified as an institutional priority, with normal teaching load defined as 12 credit hours of undergraduate coursework per semester or nine credit hours of graduate coursework per semester. Faculty are evaluated on an annual basis by their department chair to ensure satisfactory performance in the three areas. In addition, tenure and promotion processes involve more extensive evaluation of faculty productivity in each of the three areas, with many departments and/or colleges further quantifying minimum requirements.

Source: Office of the Provost

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?

Conditions under which Pittsburg State University receives licensing or royalty revenue are negotiated on a case-by-case basis with industry partners. At the point in the research relationship that either the university or the industry partner identifies intellectual property that has commercial potential, a joint development agreement is negotiated and signed by both parties. A key element of every joint development agreement is the specific royalty or licensing fee that will be paid to one or both partners. The amount of royalty revenue received by the university depends on the level of involvement and contribution of Pittsburg State University faculty or scientists in developing the intellectual property that has commercial appeal. Every joint development agreement is different and is based on the relationship with the industry partner and each party's level of participation in the research efforts.

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

| | <u>2003</u> | <u>2004</u> | <u>2005</u> | <u>2006</u> | <u>2007</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| All funds* | \$1,914,196 | \$2,047,717 | \$2,498,458 | \$2,745,211 | \$2,536,109 |
| General Use** | \$58 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

| | <u>2008</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| All Funds* | \$2,479,349 | \$2,287,511 | \$2,542,895 | \$2,010,575 | \$1,815,188 |
| General Use** | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

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?

Since 2003, Pittsburg State University has received \$530,000 in royalty and licensing revenue. This amount fluctuates each year depending on sales of goods that contain some element of intellectual property developed at our institution (i.e., the sale of furniture that utilizes the BioH brand of flexible foam manufactured by Cargill using technology developed at Pittsburg State University).

Over the last ten years, royalty and licensing revenues have ranged from a low of \$25,000 in FY 2004 to a high of \$89,000 in FY 2008. Currently, 100% of royalty and licensing revenue received by Pittsburg State University is a direct result of the commercialization of intellectual property generated at the Kansas Polymer Research Center.

| <u>FY 2004</u> | <u>FY 2005</u> | <u>FY 2006</u> | <u>FY 2007</u> | <u>FY 2008</u> | <u>FY 2009</u> | <u>FY 2010</u> | <u>FY 2011</u> | <u>FY 2012</u> | <u>FY 2013</u> |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$30,708 | \$36,208 | \$89,113 | \$81,243 | \$59,682 | \$74,024 | \$69,084 | \$40,774 |

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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

Yes. Currently, the only source of royalty or licensing revenue for Pittsburg State University is through the Kansas Polymer Research Center. This revenue is received by the KPRC as a result of joint development agreements with industry partners. The income received from royalties is first used to reimburse the Kansas Polymer Research Center for upfront research costs. Once those costs have been refunded, any future royalty revenues are split 50/50 by the scientists involved in the research and Pittsburg State University. Kansas Board of Regents policy mandates a minimum of 25% revenue sharing with the scientists involved in a patent that is commercialized. Pittsburg State University has intentionally structured its revenue sharing agreement to encourage retention of talented and successful faculty and scientists at the institution. At this time, the university utilizes their half of the royalty revenues to make the bond payments on the construction of the Tyler Research Center.

Source: Institutional Division of University Advancement

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 (IOR) | 42 |
| Total Course Sections Taught | 398 |
| Percentage Taught by GTA's | 10.55% |

Percent of Total Credit Hours Taught by GTAs

| | Fall 2012 |
|---|------------------|
| Number of Credit Hours Taught by GTA (IOR) | 2,726 |
| Total Credit Hours Taught | 30,967 |
| Percentage Taught by GTA's | 8.80% |

Source: Obtained from the Enrollments in Courses with Course Level 000-199, End of Fall 2012 Term.

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

IOR: Instructor of Record

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)?

Based on enrollments from 2010, 2011, and 2012 fall semesters, Nursing, Early/Late Childhood, Management, Psychology, Biology, Communication and Construction Management consistently are the most popular majors for incoming transfer students. Specifically, in fall 2012, the following majors had 30 or more new transfer enrollments: Biology, Communication, English, Social Work, Nursing, Management, Psychology and Early/Late Childhood. Similar results can be found when using graduation rates as the measure. Based on the new transfer fall 2010 cohort, Early/Late Childhood, Construction Management, Accounting, Communication, and Psychology were the most popular majors.

Pittsburg State University has articulation agreements with numerous community and technical colleges and the Logan College of Chiropractic. These agreements include the following degree programs and vary by institution:

- Bachelor of Science in Early/Late Childhood
- Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education
- Bachelor of Applied Science
- Bachelor of Science in Workforce Development
- Bachelor of Science in Biology
- Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art
- Bachelor of Arts in History
- Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
- Bachelor of Science in Social Work
- Bachelor of Science in Recreation
- Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

(Please note: The information above represents all transfer students and not just students transferring from a community college).

Source: Institutional Admissions Office

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> | | | | | | | 21.69% | 23.38% | 21.98% |

* 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?

- Fort Scott Community College
- Labette Community College
- Johnson County Community College
- Crowder College
- Coffeyville Community College

Source: Institutional Census, New Transfer files for past 5 years

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?

We have not conducted a specific study that would answer this question for our university; however, studies including an August 2013 study by the National Student Clearing House Research Center have found that success rates are high among students who begin in two-year institutions and transfer to a four-year institution.

The report "Baccalaureate Attainment: A National View of the Postsecondary Outcomes of Students Who Transfer from Two-Year to Four-Year Institutions" can be found online at:
http://www.studentclearinghouse.info/signature/5/NSC_Signature_Report_5.pdf

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?

Pittsburg State University has a very long history of working in tandem with area community colleges to the benefit of area students and the local economy. One of the best examples of this is the shared library system that is housed and maintained by Pittsburg State University, and through a consortium approach, used by students at Fort Scott Community College and a number of schools and community libraries in the area. Each member of the consortium pays a fraction of what a system of this scale would normally cost, and their students have access to all other consortium member holdings. This is a clear example of multiple entities pooling their resources and deriving enormous financial benefits through a strong strategic partnership.

As previously noted, the PSU/FSCC partnership is unique in its configuration and notable in the benefits reaped by the institutions and the students they serve. However, both institutions now recognize this partnership is poised to become even stronger. To that end, senior leadership teams of both campuses have been meeting over the past six months to consider a conceptual model that would redefine the partnership. Currently, both the Pittsburg State campus and the community of Fort Scott are considering how far this partnership can be expanded. A potential outcome, and one that is being discussed, would be a merger of the two institutions. At the heart of these efforts, is a desire to achieve cost savings, efficiencies, improved access, and quality of the educational experience. This innovative effort is challenging old norms and assumed ways of doing business in Kansas postsecondary education as we seek to define a new, more efficient model for higher education governance. There are many challenges to these efforts, but we believe there has not been a better time to thoroughly explore taking our partnership to a new and higher level.

Source: Institutional Office of the President

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?

All recommendations have been examined and the vast majority have been implemented with accompanying cost savings. The recommendations and institutional responses are listed below.

***Pittsburg State University- LPA State University Efficiency Audit Response
Prepared for KBOR, December 2009***

Recommendations and Additional Steps To Address Issues

Recommendation One: Eliminating or Combining Low Enrollment Sections

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Identify legitimate exceptions

Ways to code legitimate exceptions within the student information system so that they do not appear as organized classes will be explored. The examples cited above give some indication of these courses (e.g., faculty overload taught as independent study but coded as organized class).

Establish a Low Enrollment Policy

A University policy for the review of low enrollment, organized classes taught “in load” by faculty will be developed. Elements of this policy may include minimum class size by level, timeline for review of low enrollments, review and approval by an academic dean of courses to be conducted with low enrollment, and alternative assignments that may be made for faculty members whose courses may have been cancelled for low enrollment.

Institutional Response: Each of the four colleges (Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, and Technology) was charged with a review of low enrollment courses. Each college has implemented a procedure to review all low enrollment courses. This has resulted in not offering courses or postponement of specific courses, as well as re-assigning faculty with low enrollment numbers to additional duties. Managing low enrollment at the college level has proved effective to date and has not resulted in a need to code legitimate exceptions within the student information system.

Recommendation Two: Eliminating or Combining Academic Departments or Degree Programs

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Computer Science and Information Systems

Currently, two major reorganizations are being discussed that could change the academic landscape of the campus. Based on program review and follow-up study, the President has directed the Provost to discontinue Computer Science and Information Systems as a free standing academic department. The proposal calls for faculty resources to be reassigned to strengthen two high priority departments. Information systems faculty positions will be reassigned to the Department of Accounting and the computer science faculty will be reassigned to the Department of Engineering Technology in the College of Technology. This reorganization will allow the University to phase out low demand programs and reallocate faculty to already strong programs needing additional resources to develop and implement new areas of study.

College of Arts and Sciences

Second, the College of Arts and Sciences is currently reviewing its organizational structure and a recommendation is to be forthcoming in the spring. One possible outcome of this review could be a reduction in the number of academic departments in the college from the current fourteen. Such a move could result in some administrative cost savings. The goal of any potential reorganization is not only a possible reduction in administrative costs, but bringing together faculty from related disciplines in ways that will provide synergy for creative endeavors in curriculum, instruction and research.

Institutional Response: Restructuring is an ongoing process but several departments have already been combined (including: Computer Science and Information Systems with Accounting (May, 2010); History with Social Sciences (November, 2010)); and, Curriculum and Instruction with Special Services and Leadership Studies (October, 2011);. This has resulted in reduction of full-time department chairs, faculty lines, and support staff. In addition, targeted departments in the College of Arts and Sciences have had chair appointments reduced from 12 months to 10 months, with the dean providing oversight during the remaining two months. This has resulted in additional salary savings. The creation of these new, combined departments has led to faculty working together to capture commonalities in their disciplines that has allowed for the creation of new programs, such as the Fraud Examination minor in the Department of Accounting and Computer Information Systems. In addition, creation of inter-disciplinary degree programs and minors, most notably the Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS), has further resulted in bringing faculty together from related disciplines.

Recommendation Three: Collaborating with Other Universities to Share Course Content, Teachers, and Instructional Programs

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

PSU's record of success in collaborating with postsecondary institutions across the State provides a successful model for additional joint ventures within the PSU campus with other Kansas institutions. Throughout its history, but at no time greater than now, partnerships forged by PSU have provided access to educational opportunities to students in geographic areas where they would have not been possible otherwise.

PSU will continue to develop collaborations that enhance as well as strengthen its mission and vision.

Teacher Education Programs

After our successful articulation initiatives through the College of Technology, we are focusing this year on developing articulation agreements for teacher education programs. Our goal is to enter into agreements with nine Kansas community colleges over the next year.

Library System Acquisition

We are seeking to identify resources to implement the planned new library system as soon as possible. We will endeavor to identify two-year college partners who can both share a portion of this cost and then have access to a system that would better serve their students and faculty and might otherwise be beyond their financial capacity.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State is highly committed to development of collaborative partnerships and has actively fostered relationships with other institutes of higher education in the State of Kansas. The most significant of these partnerships is the Qualified Admissions program with Fort Scott Community College (implemented in Fall, 2001) and the MOU for delivery of remedial math with Neosho County Community College (implemented Fall, 2009).

A key Performance Indicator for 2008-2010 was to create greater efficiencies and seamlessness in the Kansas Postsecondary System through partnerships with community and technical colleges. This resulted in an increase of articulation agreements from 10 to 47 as well as an increase in number of courses offered at the Pittsburg State campus by other community/technical colleges from 33 (3-year baseline mean) to 63 in a three-year period. During the same period, the number of integrated electronic and shared learning systems with high schools and community/technical colleges increased from four to 14. Additionally, for the 2011-2013 Performance Agreement, increasing the number of Reverse Transfer programs in cooperation with two-year college partners was a key performance indicator, with 11 current such programs already developed.

Current conversations with Fort Scott Community College are underway to explore a significantly expanded partnership between the two institutions. This has significant potential to create a model for the state in providing a seamless educational experience for students, while at the same time producing major administrative cost savings to the institutions.

Recommendation Four: Increase the Number of Courses and Programs Offered Online or Through Distance Learning

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Marketing of Hybrid Classes

The University will devise a strategy to better identify in the class schedule and then market courses that employ a hybrid format. To date, enrolled students may not always be aware of the class format until the first class meeting, and others might have enrolled had they known the format in advance.

Institutional Response: This has been implemented. Students can clearly identify in the Course Schedule whether the modality of a class is online or hybrid.

Professional Development

The University will continue identification of systems such as Tegrity and other technological software that enhance and personalize the online instructional experience. Training and development to prepare and encourage faculty to use merging technologies will be enhanced and expanded to meet growing demand.

Institutional Response: The Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology provides ongoing professional development activities focused on improving the use of Canvas, Camtasia Relay (replacement for Tegrity), and other available software for online courses as well as best practices in general curriculum delivery. The Center has added instructional designers who assist faculty in course development and provide training for online course delivery. An e-Learning Academy was established in the spring of 2012 that will more specifically define and categorize faculty professional development activities. Faculty earn professional development funds through participation in these activities as well as providing evidence of incorporation of new skills into courses. The e-Learning Academy will provide professional development for a group of faculty each year to design or redesign an online course to meet the nationally recognized Quality Matters standards. These faculty will also receive training and support for improving the facilitation and delivery of an online course.

Expanded Offerings

The University will continue to add both individual courses and full degree programs online as needs arise through increased student demand.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University began offering its first fully online degree program in Spring, 2006. The University now offers thirteen fully online degree programs and continues to add online courses with student demand/need. Students now can complete general education requirements online, with the exception of four courses.

Recommendation Five: Increasing Faculty Workloads

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

The University administration views our faculty as extremely hard-working, having done more with less for some time. In general, a twelve hour teaching load or equivalent combination of teaching, sponsored research and administrative duties serves the faculty and students well and is consistent with that of regional and national peers. Also, as noted in President Scott's letter to President Robinson of KBOR on August 12, 2009, any issue related to faculty load is a negotiated issue at Pittsburg State, and this will influence any action that might be considered on this issue. Based on concerns raised in the LPA, however, we will continue to be vigilant in this area.
Faculty Release Time Policy

The University will pursue a University level position on faculty release time. No such policy now exists and decisions are made on an ad hoc basis. We will convene a committee of faculty and administrators to develop policies and procedures in this area.

Institutional Response: After considerable discussion between the provost and the college deans, the decision was made that it was in the best interest of the institution to continue with an ad hoc approach to faculty release time due to the complexity of this issue. However, all release time is given close scrutiny at the level of the provost.

Recommendation Six: Reducing or Eliminating Remedial Courses, or Changing Who Teaches Them

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Remedial Math Review

A longitudinal evaluation of student success in subsequent math courses compared with that of students who took remedial math from PSU will be undertaken as one factor in determining the continuation of this arrangement

Institutional Response: As noted earlier in this document, since Fall 2009, Pittsburg State has contracted with Neosho County Community College to provide instruction in intermediate algebra (roughly equivalent to high school Algebra II) to students in need of remediation in mathematics. Neosho was chosen to provide this instruction after careful review of their use of best practices in developmental education. After the second year of the program, an evaluation was undertaken to determine whether students taking the Neosho math course enrolled in a subsequent Pittsburg State math course and what their success rate was. These results were compared with those for students who had taken the course the previous year through Pittsburg State University. The data showed either slight improvement or no significant difference on students' performance variables compared with the Pittsburg State instruction. The arrangement remains in place bringing the community college's expertise in developmental education to our students who need remediation, while freeing Pittsburg State University math faculty to focus on university level courses.

Recommendation Seven: Maximizing the Use of Existing Classroom and Laboratory Space

Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

East Campus Scheduling

A limited number of general education sections at the Kansas Technology Center and/or Student Recreation Center will be scheduled each semester.

Institutional Response: The physical distance between the central campus and the East Campus (the Kansas Technology Center and the Student Recreation Center, which has offices, classrooms and labs for HHPR Department) sometimes creates challenges for students who need to schedule both major courses and general

education courses throughout their day. Offering a limited number of general education courses in East campus facilities has reduced this challenge for students. Courses from departments such as English and Communication have been taught on the East campus.

Enhanced Mediation

Classrooms that are not mediated and underutilized for that reason will be given a high priority in the master facilities planning process. (e.g., 301 Russ seats seventy-two but is not mediated).

Institutional Response: The University continues to mediate additional classrooms and update those already mediated as funds are available. Last year, an ad hoc committee created by the provost studied the current state of campus mediation and made recommendations to the provost for future planning. For example, the committee recommended greater standardization of mediation across the campus, which will facilitate assignment of classes to rooms based on capacity rather than type of media available and thus make for more efficient use of classroom space.

Classroom Scheduling

A focus will be given to improve the matching of classroom size with course capacity needs. Courses capped at more than 20 seats under room capacity will be reviewed for reassignment, freeing campus space for larger classes.

Institutional Response: The Registrar's Office reviews classroom requests and works to ensure that rooms are available to accommodate the departmentally allowed capacity. This may involve changing room assignments after enrollment has begun if there is unexpected demand. A provost appointed committee is currently charged with reviewing existing scheduling guidelines and proposing a more formal policy that emphasizes not only matching room size with capacity, but also with spreading classes across a wide range of meeting times to give students the best chance to schedule a full course load while meeting obligations they may have to work and family. This committee's recommendations are due by December 2013.

Classroom Expansion

Facilities Planning will be asked to identify smaller classrooms that could be expanded to one larger classroom by removing walls or rooms where capacity could increase based on square footage with an additional exit. Consideration will be given to renovations with input from affected academic departments and as budget permits. It should be noted, however, that with student success being the overarching priority at Pittsburg State University, all future remodeling projects will focus on a balance between the need to expand the size of a classroom compared to the loss in student/faculty interaction.

Institutional Response: Renovations take place each summer as funding allows. We are often limited by funding each year and prioritize accordingly. Projects may include upgrading teaching labs or adapting a classroom to evolving pedagogical needs. To date, expanding room size has not been a priority. A space utilization study, conducted in 2001-2012, by planning consultants gave us possibilities for expansion by remodeling, but they also emphasized that we should make efficient use of existing space. The mediation and scheduling committees noted above were formed to explore the latter recommendation.

Recommendation Eight: Consolidating or changing administrative functions or processes
Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

State Accounting System

The implementation of the new state accounting system will not directly benefit the university, but will hopefully result in efficiency in processes at the state level, such as workflow processing and online travel and reimbursement processing. The university will continue to interface data into the new state system. All interfaces must be re-written and in some cases data files reconfigured to tie into the new system. The university's ability to extract data from the new system will be enhanced with the creation of a data warehouse. It is anticipated that the new system will be much more user friendly and provide the university with the ability to monitor payments made through the state system in a much more efficient manner. Implementation of the new state system will be complete July 1, 2010. The university is currently participating in the interface development and testing stages.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University participated in the implementation of the new state accounting system put into effect July 1, 2010. Although the efficiencies gained were not as significant as originally hoped, the new system does provide enhanced access to agency financial data. The university has access to various reporting tools available in the new system and receives daily interface files of financial information to reconcile state funds and monitor vendor payments completed in the state system. A complete interface of the new state system to the university's existing financial system was not effective due to the age and complexity of the university financial system. The efficiencies in processes and interfaces may be completed with implementation of a new financial system at the university.

New Accounting System

The university has been monitoring the movement of other Kansas Board of Regent's institutions to new accounting systems and investigating systems available including, Quali, an open-source administrative software for higher education. The University has much to gain from a new system, including workflow processing, enhanced reporting functionality and the opportunity to provide campus departments with the ability to function within the system, rather than maintaining secondary accounting systems at the department level. A new accounting system will provide greater efficiencies but will require significant financial resources to purchase and implement.

Institutional Response: The University is actively engaged in a project to replace the existing administrative system. The first phase of this project is to replace the Financial and HR/Payroll systems. A project team from the areas of Finance, HR/Payroll, Student Services and IT, in conjunction with more than 40 campus stakeholders, have worked to identify system features and review options for replacing our 30 year old administrative system. After much research of existing technology and system features, a Request for Proposal was issued with on-campus vendor demos occurring later this year. The university's anticipated timeline for implementation of a new financial system is currently July 1, 2015.

New Library System

The university is in need of a new system to manage its library resources. The current system is no longer fully supported by the vendor. A new system will not only enhance features necessary for effective management and access of library resources on the campus, but will provide the university with opportunities for further collaborative efforts with area community based libraries as well as those of the community colleges in the region to manage their collection. The collaborative efforts improve access to larger resources for both the university community as well as the region served by the university. A new library will provide greater efficiencies and service but will require significant financial resources to purchase and implement. The university will look for partnerships with area community libraries as well as community college libraries to assist to defray the implementation cost.

Institutional Response: An Integrated Library System vendor has been identified and a contract has been signed and is ready to be sent to the State for approval. Pittsburg State University has partnered with Fort Scott Community College, four public libraries, and the six library units within U.S.D. 250 in a consortium to defray costs of implementation and ongoing maintenance while at the same time improving access to a larger collection of resources for both the University and the region.

Full implementation of online textbook adoption by academic departments To obtain textbook information from instructors, textbook adoption forms are currently printed and distributed across campus prior to the beginning of every semester. Over two thousand paper forms are distributed each year. The adoption system maintained by the university bookstore provides capability for academic departments to submit textbook adoption information electronically. The university seeks to have textbook adoption submissions to be submitted exclusively online by Fall 2011, saving a great amount of time and resources. Training sessions will be offered, beginning with the Spring 2010 semester, to assist departments with this process. Conservatively, the university estimates the cost of processing a transaction from inception through completion to be approximately \$10 each. The implementation of online textbook adoption process is estimated to save the both the university and the bookstore contractor each \$10,000 per year.

Institutional Response: With limited exception, all textbook adoptions are submitted via on-line adoption process through the *FacultyEnlight*[™] section of the Barnes and Noble web site dedicated to serving and supporting the textbook adoption process for faculty (<http://www.facultyenlight.com/?storeNbr=403>). The current system and the Faculty Enlight page is actually the second generation of our online adoption process implemented originally in Fall 2011, providing a one-stop source for researching, adopting, and sharing insights about textbooks and course materials. The goal is to help faculty choose the best materials for their courses in order to maximize students' learning experiences.

Recommendation Nine: Outsourcing non-academic functions
Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Campus Office Supply Store outsourcing

The university currently operates an office supply store available to campus departments through the online ordering system or by walk-in request. Storeroom personnel fill office supply orders on a daily basis. Elimination of the Campus Office Supply Store and contracting with an outside vendor to provide all office supplies is under consideration. A benefit of closing the office supply store and offering the service through a contracted vendor would be that all items ordered from the vendor would be delivered to the individual offices improving time-efficiency among office personnel. Eliminating the operation of an office supply store is projected to save \$20,000 in overhead investment necessary to maintain inventory by outsourcing the function to a private vendor. Elimination of the function would likely result in reduction in workforce by 1.5 positions yielding a savings in salary and fringe benefits of approximately \$44,000. Implementation could be within the next one to two years.

Institutional Response: The Campus Office Supply Store was closed in 2010. Since that time, the campus has transitioned to buying all office supplies through a contract with Staples. This contract allows for desktop delivery of supplies. The savings associated with this change have been threefold: staffing to run the store has been eliminated; the price of office supplies has gone down, and departmental staff save time by not having to walk across campus to pick up supplies.

Snow removal

The necessity to remove snow effectively from parking lots as well as streets around the campus requires either significant investment in equipment that would otherwise remain idle or securing a contract with outside vendor to provide removal. The University is currently in bid to secure a contractor to provide this service. The contractor(s) would be responsible for clearing parking lots and streets while the Physical Plant staff would address sidewalks and

building entrances. The primary benefit to contracting parking lots and street clearing is the ability to effectively maintain or restore operation of the university in a timely manner. Additionally, safety for students, faculty and staff is a significant benefit. While removal of a four-inch snow event is projected to cost approximately \$5,000, the savings in not having to invest in equipment is considerable.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University has contracted with two local Pittsburg companies to aid us in snow removal; Heckert Construction and Hipfl Construction since December 2009. Heckert Construction is a large equipment contractor and does snow removal on our streets and large parking lots. They use two to three graders, a large loader and large dump trucks in most snow events. Hipfl Construction utilizes ¾ ton and 1 ton vehicles with blades and a backhoe to clean smaller lots and drives. The arrangement of using these two contractors has been very successful in getting the university back open quickly and safely after significant snow accumulation. Since December 2009, we have only had to use these contractors approximately twice per year.

Faculty/staff email server

Based on the success of the PSU/Google email partnership for student email services, consideration of moving faculty/staff to Google mail is in process. The university has not been able to provide a quality web email client solution to faculty/staff. It is believed that this partnership may solve the issue. Savings in staff resources will be realized from outsourcing this function, allowing for reallocation and reassignment to other priority activities. A final decision concerning this project has been deferred until a new Chief Information Officer for the university is appointed.

Institutional Response: Faculty and staff email and calendaring were moved from legacy products to a modern and robust collaboration suite which was implemented July 19, 2012. Although at one time the ambition was to move faculty and staff to Google email, best practices in regard to the location of Google servers at the state level during the time of the new adoption prohibited this goal. The new suite consists of email, calendaring, repository tools, task list options, and more. With the adoption of this open source product we were able to merge multiple products into one, saving the university dollars, and utilize existing server space and storage techniques vs. purchasing new hardware. In addition, we moved all email and calendaring from a traditional server to a virtual server, which has a smaller footprint and consumes less energy.

Providing 1098T to students

The university currently provides printed and electronic 1098T forms to students. The 1098T is a tax statement providing tuition billed and scholarships and grants paid to the student for the calendar year for tax purposes. The institution currently has a process in place to produce the paper statements that are mailed to all students annually and provides an electronic version in the student web portal. Internal Revenue Service regulations allow the university to provide only the electronic version with the consent of the student. The university would like to explore the more environmentally friendly electronic option, but first must determine a method of appropriately gaining the student's consent. Overall the cost of producing and distributing the 1098T for students is approximately \$6,000 annually. Most of the other Kansas Board of Regents institutions are outsourcing this service. The cost for outsourcing this service by joining another Kansas contract is \$7,200. Not reflected in the \$6,000 cost for the current process, is labor by a computer programmer to annually prepare the forms and electronic file for submission to the Internal Revenue Service.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University opted to continue to produce the 1098T forms without the assistance of an outside vendor. If the production of the forms was outsourced, university staff would still have to maintain a working knowledge of the process, and prepare the data to send to the outsourced firm. The university had already developed the student web portal and in 2010 presented the information to the

student in electronic form. The cost savings to be gained were from a reduction in the printing and postage costs. The university currently offers and encourages the option of electronic only presentation of the form to be environmentally friendly and to eliminate mailing and production costs. As students have accepted electronic presentation of the form, costs have dropped accordingly. The electronic only presentation option selected by students had the following participation rates for tax year: 2010 50%; 2011 60% and 2012 56%. Those students still requesting a printed form resulted in the following printing and postage costs for tax year: 2010 \$2,709.86; 2011 \$2,627.35 and 2012 \$2,359.81. Costs have dropped substantially by offering an electronic only option and are significantly less than outsourcing at the current time.

Recommendation Ten: Reduce energy costs, improving recycling efforts and sustainability improvement
Additional steps the University plans to address this issue

Residence hall renovation and new construction

The university will begin and complete renovation of Trout Hall during summer 2010. As noted earlier, all the doors and windows in the building were replaced in Summer 2009. The renovation will include motion sensor light controls placed in public restrooms and laundry facilities, the use of low emission VOC content in adhesives and paints, and the use of environmentally friendly floor covering in the lounge and hallways. These improvements should increase efficiency and reduce energy costs. Renovation of four remaining residence halls will continue over the next three years. Construction of a new housing project will be completed in July 2010. The project includes 5 buildings with apartment style living. Each apartment will include 3 or 4 private bedrooms with a shared common living area, kitchenette and bathroom. The new project will accommodate 205 students. The project will also include a commons area that will house a lounge area, student room, recreation area and office. The new project will include energy efficiency and sustainability where economically feasible. The project will include efficient heating and cooling units and efficient windows. Motion sensors will be used in proper locations. The project will also use low emission VOC content in adhesives and paints.

Institutional Response: Construction of a new five building, 205 bed, modified apartment style facility was completed in July 2010, and included energy efficiencies heating/cooling units and windows along with sustainable products such as polished concrete floors throughout the facilities. Motion sensors controlling heat and air for times of occupancy were installed and low emission VOC content in adhesives and paints were used. Since Summer 2009, a project has been underway to completely renovate all existing residence hall space. All facilities have been completed with the exception of Nation/Mitchell Hall. Current plans call for 50% of that facility to receive renovation during the Summer 2014 and the remaining portion renovated during summer 2015. The renovations have included motion sensor light controls in public restrooms and laundry facilities, motion sensors in sleeping room controlling temperature levels and fan functions relative to occupancy, use of low emission VOC content in adhesives and paints, and the use of environmentally friendly floor covering the lounges and hallways.

Future energy conservation projects

All future projects will be evaluated for potential energy conservation design. The University will most likely conduct another investment grade audit to identify additional energy conservation projects. Energy and resource conservation will be one of several environmentally sound practices and design concepts that will be evaluated for potential inclusion in all future projects. Sustainable, green, or LEED building design concepts can provide energy conservation when including project designs.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University conducted a second investment grade audit to identify additional potential energy savings. As a result of the audit, a \$4.7 million contract was executed in December 2011 with Energy Solutions Professionals to capture future energy savings. The construction work

was primarily accrued during FY12. The results of the first full year (FY13) in terms of energy savings were in line with our original projections.

Full utilization of capabilities of new copy machines

The new copiers just installed on campus have many features that can save the university time and money. Networking all copiers would allow staff to print directly to the copy machines, eliminating the need to purchase printers and scanners. The copiers' functionality allows them to be set to default to duplex printing, yielding significant reduction in paper and toner consumption. Additionally, the copier contract provides free toner supplied by the contractor. Utilizing the copier as a printer, the departments would save money by not having to buy toner for laser printers.

Institutional Response: Of the 68 copiers currently on campus, 44 have been networked. The bulk of the networking occurred in 2010 and 2011. Most of the copiers that have not been networked either do not have the capability or usage is too high. (Some of the smaller copiers do not have network capabilities. Networking a large, high use copier can interfere with efficient use of the machine).

Implementation of a green purchasing program

By implementing a program to utilize recycled content office supplies, the carbon footprint of the campus could be reduced. A program to purchase all recycled content office supplies will not save the university money but it will make the university more environmentally responsible.

Institutional Response: In April 2010, the university adopted Sustainable Procurement Guidelines. As part of that adoption, a push to buy recycled office supply products has taken place. Although purchase of recycled products is not a requirement on campus, many departments opt to buy more environmentally friendly products. For example, without implementing a mandatory plan to buy recycled paper, the university has gone from buying almost no paper with recycled content to currently buying 99% of its paper with recycled content. Other office supplies have followed a similar pattern, with almost all office supplies currently purchased by the university having recycled content.

Pursuit of more fuel efficient and environmentally friendly university vehicles

The university would like to see a gradual increase in the number of vehicles within the campus fleet that get 30+ mpg. Although some vehicles that get better gas mileage or have lower emissions cost more at the beginning, many do not end up costing more over the life of the vehicle when the price of fuel is included in the analysis. Furthermore, even if the overall cost of operation is no less, vehicles with lower emissions and better gas mileage put less of a strain on the environment.

Institutional Response: Pittsburg State University purchased two Ford Fusion Hybrids in FY2011 as replacement vehicles in the campus motor pool and the president's vehicle is a hybrid. In all these cases, the vehicles have performed at a level which meets or exceeds our expectations. As we replace future motor pool vehicles we intend to continue to invest in hybrid technology.

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.

| Sources of Financing | FY 2014 Estimate | Percent of Total | Primary Expenditures |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| State General Fund | \$34,750,262 | 32.9% | For general operating expenditures |
| General Fees (Tuition) | 34,473,602 | 32.7% | For general operating expenditures |
| Restricted Fee Funds | 10,490,487 | 9.9% | For restricted expenditures consistent with conditions attached to the receipt of the restricted use funds |
| Federal Grants | 13,527,430 | 12.8% | For restricted expenditures consistent with the purposes approved by the awarding federal agency |
| Housing System Operation | 7,711,387 | 7.3% | 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 | 1,447,112 | 1.4% | For restricted expenditures related to the operation and maintenance of the health center. |
| Parking Fees | 691,725 | 0.7% | For restricted expenditures related to operation and maintenance of parking facilities and for campus transportation systems. |
| All Other Revenue | 2,395,164 | 2.3% | |
| Total Sources of Financing | \$105,487,169 | 100.0% | |

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

The following table reflects the tuition rates paid by Pittsburg State University students in comparison to the MIAA conference. The university annually reviews this data set to ensure our tuition rates are competitive. There is an obvious balance between access and quality that we attempt to maintain. As demonstrated in the efficiency reports as part of the response to Legislative Post Audit, the university is continually looking for ways to achieve cost savings.

| MIAA Institution | 2013-2014 Undergraduate Resident Tuition & Fees (Fall semester) |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Northwest Missouri State University | \$3,994 |
| Truman State University | \$3,684 |
| University of Central Missouri | \$3,632 |
| Washburn University | \$3,598 |
| Lincoln University | \$3,419 |
| University of Nebraska at Kearney | \$3,261 |
| Missouri Western State University | \$3,249 |
| Pittsburg State University | \$2,953 |
| Missouri Southern State University | \$2,861 |
| Emporia State University | \$2,807 |
| University of Central Oklahoma | \$2,718 |
| Northeastern State University | \$2,496 |
| Fort Hays State University | \$2,179 |

Source: Institutional Division of Administration & Campus Life

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

Since Fall 2004, Pittsburg State University’s pro-growth strategy has produced an enrollment increase of 13%. As most of our expenditures are related to personnel, it is a challenge to reduce costs given this ten-year enrollment growth pattern. The responses to the efficiency report provide examples of changes made to achieve financial savings and efficiencies.

Source: Institutional Division of Administration & Campus Life

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?

Pittsburg State University recognizes that not all students are well prepared to enter college and have numerous programs and services in place to facilitate success. Students who do not meet qualified admission at the time of application may be admitted through one of several exception windows. Students admitted through one of the exception windows must adopt an individual success plan prior to enrollment. As part of each freshman success plan, a student is advised through our Exploratory Studies program before going directly to an academic department. This allows for enhanced tracking and monitoring. In addition, a student is assigned a designated section of our Freshman Experience course, which has added contact hours focusing on academic skills. These designated sections are taught by professional staff with experience in advising, teaching, and/or student development. These instructors also serve as the advisors for these students. Transfer students admitted through one of the exception windows also adopt an

individual success plan which includes assignment in a Transitions course and tracking through the Student Success Center.

The Pittsburg State Student Success Center is designed to promote the success of all students. Academic skills workshops, tutoring, and one-on-one academic success coaching is available. In addition, the Student Success Center leads efforts in the university's early alert program working with advisors and student peers to reach out to students identified by faculty as at-risk.

Pittsburg State University provides educational support services to currently enrolled PSU students with a diagnosed Learning Disability, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, or a Physical/Mental Illness which substantially impairs one or more major life activities. Students with disabilities may qualify for services that accommodate for their impairments and provide equal access to educational opportunity. All accommodations provided by Pittsburg State University are channeled through two offices; the Center for Student Accommodations and the Equal Opportunity Office.

The Bryant Student Health Center supports students' physical and mental health needs. In addition to counseling services, the Bryant Health Center provides traditional medical care, lab services, immunizations, specialty clinics, and dental services. Student prevention and wellness is also an important focus at Pittsburg State. GORILLAS IN YOUR MIDST is a nationally affiliated peer health education group, with student members completing a comprehensive two-credit hour course designed to help them educate peers to make healthy choices. The group offers educational, peer theatre, and interactive programs on such topics as substance use, date rape, sexual assault, STD's, HIV/AIDS, contraception, suicide, smoking cessation, eating disorders, diversity, stress management and depression.

Source: Institutional Office of Enrollment Management & Student Success, and Institutional Office of Campus Life & Auxiliary Services