MINUTES
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
April 13, 1999   3:30 p.m.   Big 12 Room, K-State Union

Present: D. Anderson, P. Anderson, Aramouni, Baker, Behnke, Clegg, Conrow, Delker, Devault, Dodd, Exdell, Fenton, Fenwick, Flores, Foster, Geiser, Gray, Hamilton, Holden, Hosni, Johnson, C. Jones, J. Jones, Keiser, Kirkham, Koelliker, Krstic, Legg, Liang, Lynch, Maatta, Mann, Martin, Mathews, McClaskey, McCulloh, Miller, D. Mosier, N. Mosier, Ossar, Ottenheimer, Oukrop, Pence, Rahman, Ransom, Raub, Schapaugh, Selfridge, Schmidt, Stewart, Swanson, Takemoto, Taylor-Archer, Verschelden, Weiss, Wetta, Williams, Wissman, Youngman, Zabel

Proxies: Kassebaum, Salsberry, White

Absent: Atkinson, Barkley, Briggs, Cushman, Deluccie, Devlin, Eckert, Finnegan, Fjell, Glasgow, Grunewald, Hagmann, Higgins, Hightower, Hoag, Jardine, Lehman, Michie, Rush, Schroeder, Shultis, Webb

Visitors: Beth Unger, David Royse, Amy Gross

I.   President Rahman called the meeting to order.

II.   Minutes of the March 9, 1999 meeting were approved.

III.   Special Reports

A.   Dr. Beth Unger, Vice Provost for Academic Services and Technology and Dean of Continuing Education described recent computer security problems at KSU. In recent months, the campus has seen attacks by nearly three dozen different viruses of which two are very dangerous. She reminded people that the CIH virus has been identified here and that it has several versions with one designed to become active and damage computers on April 26th. To prevent infections and cleanse machines already infected, KSU has a site license for F-Secure and has made it available free to everyone affiliated with KSU and for any computer they own. It is available through iTAC. Also, a virus alert will be posted on the KSU web home page which will serve as a link to upgrades to make available the most recent antidotes for any new viruses that are discovered on machines here. To further the maintenance of security at KSU, an interim policy has been put into place concerning University institutional data (ATTACHMENT 1). This involves all data that are centrally located and critical to the operation of the University. Another policy, one that would require all sites on campus to have virus protection installed, is being considered. At present, the practice has been to cut off access to other computers from a site that has been identified with a virus rather than attempt to access an individual's PC or a network and remove it.

B.   Don Foster, Chair of the Calendar Committee, reported that the Committee will have a proposal for a Fall Break ready for the next Faculty Senate meeting. It will recommend a one-day break on a Friday in October. Both KU and WSU are in the process of implementing a Fall Break and it is not improbable that one will be mandated by the Board of Regents in the near future. The College of Veterinary Medicine at KSU already has a Fall Break.

IV.   Old Business

It was moved and seconded to remove from the Table the motion to adopt the Report of the General Education Assessment Team. The motion to Remove from the Table passed. After discussion, the original motion to adopt the report was passed. (Located on Web under http://www.ksu.edu/facsen/execcom/EXA0299.HTM)

V. Standing Committee Reports

A. *Academic Affairs Committee* - Margaret Conrow

1. Course and Curriculum Changes

a. It was moved and seconded that the following Undergraduate Education changes be approved:
1. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences February 18, 1999.
2. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Architecture, Planning and Design February 18, 1999.
3. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of College of Agriculture February 18, 1999.
4. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Education February 23, 1999.
5. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Engineering February 26, 1999.
6. Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Human Ecology February 26, 1999.

The motion passed.

b. It was moved and seconded that the following courses approved for general education credit at the General Education Task Force at their February 18, 1999 meeting and approved by the College of Arts and Sciences October 8, 1998 be approved:

AERO 210   Aerospace Studies 2A
AERO 211   Aerospace Studies 2B
AERO 310   The Professional Officer 3A
AERO 311   The Professional Officer 3B

The motion passed.

c. It was moved and seconded that the following Graduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by Graduate Council March 2, 1999 be approved:

MINOR MODIFICATION
AGRON 655 Site Specific Agriculture
EDCEP 917 Experimental Design in Educational Research

The motion passed.

2. It was moved and seconded to approve the addition to the May 1995 graduation list and the additions to the December 1998 graduation list. Registrar Foster explained that sometimes omissions in the record occurs which is later discovered by the student, the Registrar's Office or Faculty Senate Office. These are then corrected by Faculty Senate action.

The motion passed.

B. *Faculty Affairs Committee* - Alexander Mathews

1. It was moved and seconded to amend Sections C110 - 116.2 (Procedures for Tenure Evaluation) of the Faculty Handbook as presented as Attachment 1 of the Agenda.

A friendly amendment was proposed by Senator McCulloh to insert "along with a log documenting the occasions when each of these criteria was met" into the first sentence of C113.2. The sentence would then read, "A copy of the candidate's file and the departmental tenure criteria documents along with a log documenting the occasions when each of these criteria was met will be forwarded to the college advisory committee."

The friendly amendment was accepted.

A friendly amendment was proposed by Senator Baker to change the last line of C112.3 as follows: "All recommendations and written comments of eligible departmental faculty are forwarded to the department chair/head."

The friendly amendment was accepted.

A friendly amendment was proposed by Senator Baker to change the second sentence of C112.5 as follows: "All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean.

The friendly amendment was accepted.

A friendly amendment was proposed by Senator Fenwick to insert the word, "written" in the first line of C113.3 and substitute "no sooner than seven calendar days following" for "within seven calendar days of" also in the first line. The first

line would then read, "The dean, after consulting with the department chair/head and the college advisory committee and after discussing his or her recommendations with the chair/head and the committee, will submit his or her written recommendation to the Dean's council accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department chair/head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee and the departmental tenure criteria documents, no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate (See C113.4).

The friendly amendment was accepted.

A friendly amendment was proposed to insert the word, "tenured," in C112.4. It would then read, "...request that the candidate meet with the eligible tenured faculty to discuss, ..."

The friendly amendment was accepted.

The main motion as amended passed. (ATTACHMENT 2)

C. *Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning* - Vladimir Krstic

Senator Krstic noted that FSCOUP has sent to the Strategic Planning Committee its strategic themes summary report. (ATTACHMENT 3)

VI.   New Business

It was moved and seconded to approve the Kansas State University Undergraduate Honor System Constitution.

The motion passed.

VII.   Announcements

A.   Steve Galitzer, Chair of the Campus Recycling Advisory Committee, described the new efforts being made on and off Campus to promote recycling. Fifty-nine recycling containers will be put in place and students hired to pick up materials from the containers. Eight buildings on Campus will serve as recycling centers with the possibility that the number will increase. Also, KSU will attempt to make recycling pay for itself with the funds saved from reduced tonnage going to trash sites being used to cover the costs of recycling. Other efforts include the promoting of the purchase of recycled products, the introduction of a "Green Award" to be given to the individual or department that has done the most for recycling, and the identification of a specific individual in each department to champion recycling.

B.   President Rahman noted that details of the Kansas Board of Regents meeting and the meeting of Faculty Senate-Leadership with Regent Blair can be-found in the attachments to the Agenda.

VIII. For the Good of the University

A. A congratulatory letter from Faculty Senate will be sent to the KSU Debate Team.

B. Retention rates of students are of concern to Faculty Senate and are being worked on. The presentation by Dr. Lynch, prior to today's Faculty Senate meeting was held in this connection. Attached are some of the data on retention and graduation rates that Dr. Lynch presented (ATTACHMENT 4).

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Information Resource Management Policy

PURPOSE

To establish policy for the management of University institutional data and the responsibilities for the protection of those data.

An element of data is considered institutional data if it satisfies one or more of the following criteria:
- *It is relevant to planning, managing, operating, controlling, or auditing administrative functions of an administrative or academic unit of the University.*
- *It is generally referenced or required for use by more than one organizational unit.*
- *It is included in an official University administrative report.*
- *It is used to derive an element that meets the criteria above.*

Data elements used internally by a single department, research project or office are not typically considered part of the University's Institutional Database.

POLICY

Kansas State University's institutional data, by definition, practice, and intent, is a university asset.

The institutional data will be safeguarded/protected. As an institutional asset, data will be protected from deliberate, unintentional or unauthorized alteration, destruction and/or inappropriate disclosure or use in accordance with established institutional policies and practices and federal and state laws.

Data will be shared based on institutional policies. Institutional data are not owned by a particular individual, unit, department or system. Institutional data will be made accessible to all authorized users and systems. Research and instructional data may be protected as is appropriate, and clinical data will be protected according to confidentiality standards.

Data will be managed as an institutional resource. Data organization and structure will be planned on functional and institutional levels. Data usage and data sources will be managed through the data stewardship principles of administering and controlling data quality and standards in support of institutional goals and objectives.

Institutional data will be identified and defined. Standards will be developed for the identification and representation of data in the database. Controls will be established to assure the completeness and validity of the data, and to manage redundancy. Guidelines for data integrity, validity, availability, accessibility, interpretation, and ease of use will be established and promoted.

Databases will be developed based on needs of University processes. Data architectures will be developed to support our institutional processes. These data architectures will drive physical implementation of databases.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Every University Dean and Director is responsible for implementing and ensuring compliance with the Kansas State University Information Resource Management Policy. Responsibilities include initiation of specific goals, objectives and action plans to implement the information policy, and active support of strong data management through data stewardship.

Tenure Evaluation Procedure

Revised Policy

Procedures for Tenure Evaluation

C110   Timing. Recommendations for tenure are considered annually. Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless they resign. A faculty member may request an early tenure review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the department chair/head and the tenured faculty members in the department.

C111   Candidate's responsibilities. The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents her or his professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department.

C112.1   Departmental procedures. The department chair/head is advised by the eligible tenured faculty members of the department regarding the qualifications of the candidate for tenure. The department chair/head is responsible for making the candidate's file and departmental tenure criteria documents available to eligible tenured faculty members in the department at least fourteen calendar days prior to the scheduled meeting date to discuss the candidate's petition. A cumulative record of recommendations from the reappointment and mid-probationary review meetings, and any outside reviews that have been solicited by the department chair/head will also be made available to the eligible tenured faculty. (See also Secs. C35, C36.1, C36.2, C37 and C38).

C112.2 When appropriate, comments are solicited from students and from other faculty members and department chairs/heads in the college or university. Outside reviewers (see C36.1) recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline or profession may be asked to advise. When outside reviewers are used, an equal number are usually selected by the candidate and the department chair/head.

C112.3   Eligible tenured faculty members will individually review the candidate's file, considering the department's criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure, and will then meet to discuss the candidate's petition. All recommendations and written comments of eligible departmental faculty are forwarded to the department chair/head.

C112.4   Any member of the eligible faculty may, prior to the submission of any recommendations to the department chair/head, request that the candidate meet with the eligible tenured faculty to discuss, for purposes of clarification, the record of accomplishment submitted by the candidate.

C112.5   The department chair/head will forward a written recommendation to the dean, accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgement. All recommendations and unedited written comments of the department's eligible tenured faculty members and the candidate's complete file are also forwarded to the dean. A copy of the department chair's/head's written recommendation alone is forwarded to the candidate.

C113.1   College Procedures. Each college will have an advisory committee to advise the dean on candidates proposed for tenure and/or promotion. The faculty, dean, and provost must approve the composition, procedures for selection of college advisory committee members, and the procedures for the operation of the college advisory committee (See C113.2). The composition, procedures for selection of the college advisory committee, and the procedures for operation of the college advisory committee may be reviewed any year at the request of the faculty, dean or the provost, and must be reviewed at least once every five years.

C113.2   A copy of the candidate's file and the departmental tenure criteria documents will be forwarded to the college advisory committee. The committee's specific charge is to assure that all applicable procedures have been followed and that the department/unit in arriving at a recommendation did so by fairly applying established criteria, standards, and guidelines for tenure (See C30.1-C31.4, C32.1-C38). The committee, in advising the dean, will base its recommendation exclusively on a comparison of the candidate's credentials with the criteria, standards, and guidelines of the candidate's department. The committee will report its findings in writing to the Dean. The committee's report must specifically contain a statement as to whether or not all applicable procedures were followed. The report must also explain the rationale behind the committee's

recommendation by providing a detailed evaluation of the candidate's credentials with regard to how they meet or fail to meet the specific criteria, standards, and/or guidelines of the candidate's department/unit. A minority committee report is required when the committee's recommendation is not unanimous.

C113.3   The dean, after consulting with the department chair/head and the college advisory committee and after discussing his or her recommendations with the chair/head and the committee, will submit his or her written recommendation to the Dean's Council accompanied by the recommendations and unedited written comments of the department chair/head, the departmental faculty, and the college advisory committee, and the departmental tenure criteria documents, no sooner than seven calendar days following notification to the candidate (See C113.4). The dean's recommendation and the recommendation of the college advisory committee will be copied to the department chair/head and the candidate.

C113.4   Notification to candidates. Candidates are informed of the college's recommendations (See C113.3) prior to the time that the file and recommendations are forwarded to the Dean's Council. Candidates may withdraw from further consideration for tenure by submitting to the dean a written request for withdrawal. This must be done within seven calendar days following notification of the college's recommendation. Withdrawal by a candidate who is in the final year of probationary period may be done only by formal resignation.

C114.1   University tenure evaluation procedures. The Dean's Council meeting will be chaired by the senior dean (longest serving), and the provost will not be a party to the discussions. The dean of the candidate's college will abstain from voting when the Council votes on the candidate, and will notify the candidate and the candidate's department chair/head of the Council's vote. If the finding of the Dean's Council differs from those of the department and/or the college dean, written justification must be provided as to how the candidate's credentials meet or fail to meet the departmental criteria, standards, and/or guidelines, to the candidate, dean of the candidate's college, and the department chair/head.

C114.2   If the finding of the Dean's Council is to not grant tenure, the candidate may appeal this decision to the provost within a period of fourteen calendar days of receiving notification. If the provost concurs with the finding of the Dean's Council to not grant tenure, the candidate then has the option to file a grievance with the General Faculty Grievance Board.

C114.3   If the finding of the Dean's Council is to grant tenure, the case is then reviewed by the provost. If the provost does not concur with the finding of the Dean's Council, then the provost will offer to arrange a meeting with the candidate, the senior dean, and a tenured faculty moderator mutually acceptable to the provost and the candidate, within a period of fourteen calendar days of notification of provost's decision. If no agreement is reached, then the provost will provide the candidate, the department chair/head, the dean of the candidate's college, and the Dean's Council, written reasons for the decision. At that point, the candidate has the option to file a grievance with the General Faculty Grievance Board.

C114.4   The provost will send his or her recommendation of the cases that are to be granted tenure to the president. Decisions to deny tenure are not forwarded to the president. When the provost's recommendation disagrees with that of the Dean's Council, the provost will provide a written explanation of her or his judgement to the Dean's Council, the dean, the department chair/head, and the candidate.

C115 The president has final authority for granting tenure. Candidates are notified of the University's action when the provost's recommendation to grant tenure are forwarded to the president.

C116.1   Interdisciplinary program faculty. A faculty member- with appointment in an to-interdisciplinary programs will be evaluated for tenure in their disciplinary departments-in which the candidate holds majority appointment. The department chair/head also must solicit input from the interdisciplinary program director as well as the eligible tenured faculty members in the interdisciplinary program. Departmental, college and university procedures as outlined in C110 to C115 shall be followed. A copy of the department chair's/head's recommendation shall be provided to the interdisciplinary program director.

C116.2 In the rare case when it is not possible to designate an appropriate disciplinary department at the time of appointment, recommendations for tenure may come from the formally designated eligible tenured faculty members within the interdisciplinary-program; provided that prior to the appointment the eligible tenured faculty of the interdisciplinary program agree to provide this recommendation, and that the appointment was approved by the dean(s) of the appropriate college(s) and provost. The terms of the faculty appointment must be presented in writing and agreed to by the appointee. Copies of the conditions for the appointment will be filed with the interdisciplinary program director, respective dean(s) and provost.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 19, 1999

FROM: Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning

TO: Strategic Planning Committee

SUBJECT: Strategic Themes Summary Report

As outlined in the strategic themes generation process, and as agreed upon and determined by the Faculty Senate Leadership Group and the Central Administration, we are presenting the strategic themes summary report. These themes have been generated, upon the request of the Strategic Planning Committee, by the individual College Committees on Planning. Their reports included the evaluation of the existing five strategic themes and suggestions for new themes to be incorporated in the strategic plan.

The FSCOUP Strategic Themes Summary Report has been based on the reports by the individual CCOP reports and the president's office report on the same subject. FSCOUP has not received the strategic themes report by the Dean's Council as called for in the original process outline schedule. Our Strategic Themes Summary Report lacks that particular component and was not able to take into account such an additional perspective.

In creating the summary FSCOUP has tried to find logical common or related threads within CCOP report that could be grouped together into new strategic themes. We have tried to take into account and include all of the various ideas and proposed areas of focus discussed in the CCOP reports. Further, FSCOUP has tried to bring cohesion and focus to the grouped themes by advocating articulation of a specific emphasis within each given theme. In addition to the CCOPs generated themes FSCOUP, as a consequence of its involvement with the university planning issues, has reached a decision that the attainment of the ARL status for KSU Libraries constitutes a critical academic concern and proposes it as an objective that needs to be incorporated into the new strategic plan. Following the discussion of the strategic themes report on the senate floor and the ensuing broad faculty input FSCOUP has reached the decision that rather then attempting to define new strategic themes our report would best serve its purpose as an outline of critical issues that need to be incorporated under new strategic plan.

Proposed Critical Issues:
> University Libraries
> Recruitment, Support and Retention of High Quality Faculty
> Instructional Technologies
> University Learning Environment
> Contribution to Environmental Health

Regarding the existing strategic themes, the CCOP reports were almost unanimous in advocating their continuing validity with only one report suggesting the need to discontinue theme #2. Based on the CCOP reports FSCOUP has generated in its summary report proposition for further articulation and enhancement of the existing themes.

Existing Strategic Themes:
> Strengthen and enhance the quality of graduate and research
>> programs
> Ensure that all curricula rest upon a common intellectual foundation
> Contribute to the state's economic enrichment and environmental health
> Respond to the educational needs and special circumstances of diverse
>> groups
> Enhance international emphasis

The question that remains open is how many themes can a viable strategic plan embody. Judged by the CCOP reports and FSCOUP's assessment, the existing themes seem to be still quite relevant and perhaps will eventually need only partial revision and updating. Is there room and a need for more strategic themes under such circumstances and what would be the purpose of such an expansive strategic plan? And, finally, what should happen with the existing themes if they are removed from the new strategic plan? Do they get abandoned or remain a part of the established university operating policy ? In FSCOUP's opinion answer to these questions is the prerequisite for any future action on forging a new strategic plan.

cc: Faculty Senate Leadership Group
        Faculty Senate Executive Committee

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY
Institution: Kansas State University

First-Time Freshmen: **Total** - *Includes part-time* _____ *Yes* __X__ *No.   If Yes,* _____ *% part-time.*   Page 1 of 7

GROUP: UNIVERSITY

| Fall | First-Time Freshmen | No. Tested | ACT Comp. | ----Retention Rate---- | | --------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- | | | | | |
				Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	Beginning of Fifth Year Graduated	Fifth Year Continued	Beginning of Sixth Year Graduated	Sixth Year Continued	Beginning of Seventh Year Graduated	Seventh Year Continued
1988	2977	2426	21.5	75.85 %	67.01[1] %	18.51 %	39.64 %	42.16 %	13.07 %	48.07 %	6.04 %
1989	3221	2651	21.3	75.57 %	63.52[2] %	16.42 %	37.57 %	43.05 %	6.79 %	45.39 %	4.34 %
1990	2771	2445	22.7	73.69 %	64.16 %	18.26 %	37.96 %	41.54 %	11.73 %	47.75 %	5.16 %
1991	2669	2377	23.0	75.72 %	63.77 %	17.72 %	37.28 %	39.93 %	11.72 %	45.32 %	4.68 %
1992	2777	2433	22.5	74.36 %	64.43[3] %	17.42 %	38.34 %	39.42 %	12.67 %	45.43 %	5.08 %
1993	2738	2462	23.0	74.32 %	65.31[1] %	16.72 %	39.76 %	39.36 %	12.49 %		
1994	2798	2571	23.1	74.66 %	66.47[5] %	16.40 %	40.99 %				
1995	2877	2652	23.2	75.95 %	65.93[6] %						
1996	2670	2500	23.4	77.19 %	68.39[2] %						
1997	2906	2736	23.7	78.46 %							
1998	3092	2914	23.8								

[1] contains 1 graduation, .03%
[2] contains 3 graduations, .09%
[3] contains 26 graduations, .94%
[4] contains 10 graduations, .37%
[5] contains 9 graduations, .32%
[6] contains 11 graduations, .38%
[7] contains 12 graduations, .45%

ATTACHMENT 4

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY

Institution: Kansas State University

GROUP: CAUCASIAN

Fall	First-Time Freshmen	No. Tested	ACT Comp.	----Retention Rate---- Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	--------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- Beginning of Graduated	Fifth Year Continued	Beginning of Sixth Year Graduated	Continued	Beginning of Graduated	Seventh Year Continued
1988	2777	2292	21.7	76.92 %	68.32❶ %	19.30 %	40.33 %	43.57 %	13.00 %	49.62 %	6.01 %
1989	2955	2510	21.4	76.68 %	64.80❷ %	17.26 %	38.24 %	41.46 %	11.00 %	46.90 %	4.47 %
1990	2553	2311	22.9	75.17 %	65.53 %	19.08 %	38.70 %	43.16 %	11.59 %	49.43 %	5.01 %
1991	2466	2239	23.1	76.44 %	65.25 %	18.49 %	38.12 %	41.75 %	11.80 %	47.34 %	4.62 %
1992	2524	2268	22.7	74.96 %	65.65❸ %	18.46 %	38.85 %	41.03 %	17.54 %	47.17 %	5.11 %
1993	2502	2282	23.2	75.62 %	66.79❹ %	17.78 %	40.15 %	41.27 %	12.58 %		
1994	2540	2370	23.3	75.59 %	67.40 %	17.44 %	41.54 %				
1995	2626	2467	23.4	77.11 %	67.71❺ %						
1996	2463	2326	23.6	77.71 %	69.07❻ %						
1997	2650	2524	23.8	79.32 %							
1998	2790	2656	24.0								

❶ contains 1 graduation, .04%
❷ contains 1 graduation, .03%
❸ contains 24 graduations, .95%
❹ contains 10 graduations, .40%
❺ contains 11 graduations, .42%
❻ contains 11 graduations, .45%

Revised October, 1998

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY

Institution: __Kansas State University__

First-Time Freshmen: **Total** - *Includes part-time* _____ *Yes* __X__ *No.*   *If Yes,* _____ *% part-time.*

GROUP: BLACK, NON-HISPANIC

Fall	First-Time Freshmen	No. Tested	ACT Comp.	----Retention Rate---- Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	--------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- Beginning of Graduated	Fifth Year Continued	Beginning of Sixth Year Graduated	Continued	Beginning of Seventh Year Graduated	Continued
1988	110	61	16.5	56.36 %	43.64 %	6.36 %	28.18 %	19.09 %	17.27 %	24.55 %	10.00 %
1989	138	68	14.7	65.22 %	43.48 %	3.62 %	26.09 %	14.49 %	10.87 %	17.39 %	2.90 %
1990	88	55	18.4	45.45 %	40.91 %	4.55 %	26.14 %	14.77 %	14.77 %	19.32 %	9.09 %
1991	94	64	18.9	57.45 %	35.11 %	4.26 %	27.66 %	9.57 %	12.77 %	12.77 %	7.45 %
1992	120	74	18.4	66.67 %	47.50⁰ %	5.00 %	30.00 %	17.50 %	13.33 %	21.67 %	5.00 %
1993	105	73	18.8	54.29 %	41.90 %	2.86 %	28.57 %	11.43 %	10.48 %		
1994	104	75	18.7	67.31 %	52.88 %	1.92 %	36.54 %				
1995	96	62	19.3	58.33 %	40.63 %						
1996	102	82	19.0	67.65 %	52.94 %						
1997	78	59	19.9	67.95 %							
1998	85	71	19.3								

⁰ contains 1 graduation, .83%

Revised October, 1998

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY

Institution: Kansas State University

First-Time Freshmen: <u>**Total**</u> - *Includes part-time* _____ *Yes* __X__ *No.*   *If Yes,* _____ *% part-time.*
  GROUP: HISPANIC

Fall	First-Time Freshmen	No. Tested	ACT Comp.	----Retention Rate---- Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	--------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- Beginning of Graduated	Fifth Year Continued	Beginning of Sixth Year Graduated	Continued	Beginning of Seventh Year Graduated	Continued
1988	52	35	18.1	73.08 %	55.77 %	5.77 %	32.69 %	25.00 %	9.62 %	26.92 %	3.85 %
1989	62	33	19.1	56.45 %	54.84❶ %	14.52 %	29.03 %	32.26 %	12.90 %	38.71 %	6.45 %
1990	55	31	20.2	69.09 %	56.36 %	12.73 %	30.91 %	34.55 %	12.73 %	36.36 %	9.09 %
1991	49	32	21.1	73.47 %	53.06 %	12.24 %	22.45 %	22.45 %	8.16 %	24.49 %	2.04 %
1992	55	35	20.5	72.73 %	52.73 %	3.64 %	40.00 %	20.00 %	18.18 %	27.27 %	3.64 %
1993	56	50	20.1	58.93 %	44.64 %	7.14 %	35.71 %	19.64 %	12.50 %		
1994	76	58	21.9	64.47 %	57.89 %	9.21 %	31.58 %				
1995	77	59	21.0	63.64 %	48.05 %						
1996	50	44	21.5	78.00 %	70.00❷ %						
1997	67	56	21.7	73.13 %							
1998	72	57	22.3								

❶ contains 2 graduations, 3.23%
❷ contains 1 graduation, 2.00%

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY

Institution: Kansas State University

First-Time Freshmen: **Total** - *Includes part-time* _____ *Yes* __X__ *No.*   *If Yes,* _____ *% part-time.*   Page 1 of 7

GROUP: ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER

Fall	First-Time Freshmen	No. Tested	ACT Comp.	----Retention Rate---- Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	--------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- Beginning of Fifth Year Graduated	Continued	Beginning of Sixth Year Graduated	Continued	Beginning of Seventh Year Graduated	Continued
1988	31	21	20.1	58.06 %	51.61 %	6.45 %	35.48 %	25.81 %	9.68 %	32.26 %	3.23 %
1989	58	33	21.9	65.52 %	58.62 %	8.62 %	39.66 %	36.21 %	10.34 %	46.55 %	0 %
1990	67	43	21.2	62.69 %	53.73 %	11.94 %	32.84 %	22.39 %	13.43 %	32.84 %	2.99 %
1991	50	32	21.9	82.00 %	64.00 %	14.00 %	32.00 %	32.00 %	8.00 %	36.00 %	4.00 %
1992	64	44	21.0	70.31 %	62.50⁰ %	10.94 %	37.50 %	34.38 %	10.94 %	39.06 %	6.25 %
1993	58	42	22.2	74.14 %	68.97 %	6.90 %	50.00 %	29.31 %	13.79 %		
1994	51	44	22.5	62.75 %	49.02 %	9.80 %	41.18 %				
1995	56	43	21.9	75.00 %	57.14 %						
1996	36	32	21.5	72.22 %	61.11 %						
1997	45	40	23.1	86.67 %							
1998	32	30	22.7								

⁰ contains 1 graduation, 1.56%

Revised October, 1998

BIG TWELVE LONGITUDINAL RETENTION SURVEY

Institution: Kansas State University

First-Time Freshmen: **Total** - *Includes part-time* _____ *Yes* __X__ *No.*   *If Yes,* _____ *% part-time.*   Page 1 of 7

GROUP: AM. INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE

Fall	First-Time Freshmen	No. Tested	ACT Comp.	----Retention Rate---- Beginning of Second Year	Beginning of Third Year	--------Cumulative Graduation Rate and Continuation Rate-------- Beginning of Graduated	Fifth Year Continued	Beginning of Graduated	Sixth Year Continued	Beginning of Graduated	Seventh Year Continued
1988	7	4	21.0	57.14 %	71.43 %	42.86 %	14.86 %	42.86 %	14.29 %	57.14 %	0 %
1989	8	6	18.5	62.50 %	37.50 %	0 %	37.50 %	12.50 %	12.50 %	12.50 %	0 %
1990	8	5	19.4	37.50 %	25.00 %	0 %	25.00 %	25.00 %	0 %	25.00 %	0 %
1991	10	10	20.9	50.00 %	20.00 %	0 %	20.00 %	0 %	20.00 %	0 %	10.00 %
1992	14	12	22.7	57.14 %	42.86 %	21.43 %	14.29 %	35.71 %	0 %	35.71 %	0 %
1993	17	15	23.6	58.82 %	47.06 %	11.76 %	29.41 %	29.41 %	5.88 %		
1994	27	24	21.4	66.67 %	55.56 %	7.41 %	33.33 %				
1995	22	21	20.4	59.09 %	50.00 %						
1996	19	16	22.8	68.42 %	73.68 %						
1997	23	20	22.8	65.22 %							
1998	20	18	22.1								

Revised October, 1998