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Setting Targets for the Strategic Framework’s Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
Introduction

Targets are proposed for the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) previously identified for each of the Strategic Framework’s strategic drivers. The KPIs for each driver are:

1 Student Learning Experience
- Undergraduate Student Engagement
- Graduate Student Engagement
- Undergraduate and Graduate Experiential Education Opportunities
- New Credentials: Professional and Other Innovative Programming

2 Research Prominence
- Research Intensity and National Position
- Tri-Council Funding
- Alignment with the Strategic Research Plan

3 Financial Sustainability
- Revenue Generation
- Revenue Diversification
- Cost Containment

4 Internationalization
- International Research Engagement
- International Undergraduate Student Recruitment
- International Undergraduate Student Engagement

The main body of the document briefly discusses the targets, and for each one proposes a final target, to be achieved by 2019, and an interim target, to be achieved by 2017. Annual reports issued each fall will report the University’s progress against these targets, and also our success in implementing various initiatives designed to ensure that we meet our targets. These initiatives will sometimes represent collective action across the institution, and sometimes actions taken by one or several of our Faculties, Schools or other service units.

In preparing this document, we have worked closely with these units, each of which examined data related to its own performance, assessed its own strengths, weaknesses and operational capabilities, and then set unit-specific targets, and identified the activities to be undertaken to ensure the targets are met. This exercise will be repeated year by year as we all measure how far we have come and how much further we have yet to go.
Student Learning Experience

Undergraduate Student Engagement

We use the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to measure student engagement. Queen’s has performed well in most dimensions, scoring 10 to 15 percent above provincial (and national) averages; our interim and final targets are simply to maintain this. There are, however, two areas, Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) and Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI), where we lie below provincial averages.

The new (2014) NSSE contains ten engagement indicators and each indicator is measured separately for first-year and final-year students, for a total of 20 indicators. (Previously there were five benchmarks, each measured twice.) The new (2014) NSSE survey splits each of our two areas of concern into two engagement indicators (see Figure 1 on next page).
Active and Collaborative Learning
(previous benchmark title)

Learning with Peers
(new engagement theme)

Collaborative Learning
(new engagement indicator)

Discussions with Diverse Others
(new engagement indicator)

Sought support: course material from other students
Provided support re: course material to other students
Prepared for exams by discussing/working with other students
Working with other students on course projects or assignments

Sought support: course material from other students
Provided support re: course material to other students
Prepared for exams by discussing/working with other students
Working with other students on course projects or assignments

Had discussions with those of another race or ethnicity
Had discussions with those from another economic background
Had discussions with those having different religious beliefs
Had discussions with those having different political views

Student-Faculty Interaction
(previous benchmark title)

Experiences with Faculty
(new engagement theme)

Student-Faculty Interaction
(new engagement indicator)

Effective Teaching Practices
(new engagement indicator)

Talked about career plans with a faculty member
Worked with faculty on activities other than coursework
Discussed courses, ideas, etc. with faculty member outside of class
Discussed academic performance with a faculty member

Faculty clearly explained course goals and requirements
Faculty taught courses in an organized way
Faculty used examples to explain difficult points
Faculty provided feedback on a draft or work in progress
Faculty gave prompt and detailed feedback on tests, assignments
Our scores on these four indicators for first-year students and the same indicators for upper-year students sharpen our sense of where our attention must be focused. The graphs in figure 2 use vertical arrows to show the areas in need of improvement. They are:

- Discussions with diverse others (first-year students)
- Discussions with diverse others (final-year students)
- Faculty interaction (first-year students)
- Effective teaching practices (first-year students)
- Effective teaching practices (final-year students)

The graphs in Figure 2 also show where we aim to be by 2017 and 2019. Specifically, our target is to be above the provincial average, although not yet by 10 percent as with other scores. There are two reasons for our conservatism. First, there is a lot of evidence to indicate that large swings in NSSE benchmarks (now engagement indicators) take time. Second, initiatives we implement will only with some delay be reflected in NSSE scores.
Figure 2

Undergraduate Student Engagement

First Year Active and Collaborative Learning Targets

Fourth Year Active and Collaborative Learning Targets

First Year Student-Faculty Interaction Targets

Fourth Year Student-Faculty Interaction Targets
Graduate Student Engagement

We use the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (cgpss) to measure graduate student experience. Currently, graduate students rate their experience at a level comparable to the national averages. To put this in perspective, this means that about 65 percent of all Queen’s graduates rate their overall academic experience as “very good” or “excellent”. Our target is to improve this to 70% by 2017, and to 75% by 2019.

Graduate Student Engagement: Overall Academic Experience Rating Targets
Sum of “Excellent” and “Very Good” Ratings
Undergraduate and Graduate Experiential Education Opportunities

NSSE asks undergraduate students whether they have participated or intend to participate in “an internship, co-op, field placement, student teaching or clinical placement”; we use the proportion of final-year students who have already participated or who are currently participating in one or more of these activities to measure undergraduate experiential education. CGPSS asks students in professional master’s programs to rate “opportunities for internships, practical and experiential learning as part of the program”; we use the proportion of “very good” and “excellent” ratings.

Our targets, shown in Figure 4, are to increase:

- undergraduate participation in experiential learning from 45 percent to 50 percent by 2019;
- the proportion of “very good” and “excellent” ratings of experiential learning opportunities by professional master’s programs from 53 percent to at least 60 percent by 2017 and to 70 percent by 2019.

**Experiential Learning: Undergraduate and Graduate Experiential Education Opportunities Targets**

**Proportion of Fourth-Year Undergraduates Participating in Experiential Learning**

- 2006
- 2008
- 2011
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017 Interim
- 2019 Target

**Proportion of Professional Masters Students Rating Experiential Learning Opportunities as “Very Good” or “Excellent”**

- 2010
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017 Interim
- 2019 Target
New Credentials: Professional and Other Innovative Programming

At the graduate level, the University has committed in its Strategic Mandate Agreement with the provincial government to an expansion of the number of students in professional master’s programs. This will occur through both expansion of existing programs and the introduction of new ones. Innovation at the graduate level is not confined only to master’s and doctoral programs, nor is it confined only to professional programs. Other types of innovative programs, including graduate certificates, are being developed.

Overall, our target for 2019 is to double the number of professional and innovative graduate programs. At the same time, we envisage increasing by approximately 50 percent the number of graduate students enrolled in these programs (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5** New Credentials: Innovative Graduate Program Targets
Research Prominence

Research Intensity and National Position

Research intensity is typically measured in terms of research income per faculty member. By this measure, and according to Research Infosource, Queen’s ranked fifth in Canada in FY2013 (the latest year for which data are currently available) with research income per faculty member of $240,000 (see Figure 6). Both the level and hence the rank vary somewhat from year to year, and our target is to stay in the range of figures over the past several years, which means $200,000 to $240,000 per faculty member, and ranked between fifth and eighth.

Figure 6 Research Prominence: Research Intensity and National Position Targets
Tri-Council Funding

Because of the risk of declining federal support for the three granting councils, we use as our kpi Queen’s share of funding from each council. More specifically, the share is based on a three-year rolling average calculated every two years; this figure determines our Canada Research Chairs allocation and our funding from the federal indirect costs program. Our goal is to maintain our current share in each program (see Figure 7).

Some might argue that there is room for improvement in respect of Canadian Institutes of Health Research CIHR funding, in light of recent declines, but the frequent program changes made by this council make it difficult to be too confident about success in moving much above our current level of just over 2 percent.

Figure 7

Research Prominence: Tri-Council Funding Targets

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council

Canadian Institutes for Health Research

Queen’s Funding as Percentage of National Total for the Three-Year Period Ending in the Year Shown
Alignment with Strategic Research Plan

Our target is straightforward: ensure the continued alignment of Canada Research Excellence Chair, Canada Research Chair and Queen's National Scholar appointments with the four themes of the Strategic Research Plan (SRP) and to ensure that faculty renewal, to the maximum extent possible, is also thus aligned, especially at the senior hiring level (e.g., research chairs).
Financial Sustainability

Revenue Generation, Revenue Diversification and Cost Containment

Our targets are to:

- generate revenue growth that keeps up with cost growth and sustains any enrolment growth;
- diversify revenue, specifically with the goal of increasing the proportion of revenue from non-government and non-regulated sources.

The inherent incentives of the budget model help enormously, but do not have as strong an effect on costs. We therefore need to maintain our emphasis on cost containment, while recognizing that it should not be expected to continuously lower costs.

Finally, we recognize that financial sustainability is about more than just these targets. Our efforts in this direction go well beyond the KPIs we are reporting within the Strategic Framework in respect of financial sustainability. To ensure appropriate Board oversight of this strategic driver, we propose to engage the Board’s Capital Assets and Finance Committee in a continuing discussion of our pursuit of financial sustainability.
Internationalization

International Research Engagement

We measure international research collaboration as the proportion of all refereed journal articles with a Queen's author that also have an international co-author. International research collaboration has almost doubled within the U15 since the turn of the century. Queen's growth has matched that of the U15 overall, but collaboration levels remain slightly below the U15 average. Our goal is for the collaboration rate to continue to increase at the rate it has been increasing, with Queen's approaching the U15 average by 2019 (see Figure 8).

Figure 8

Internationalization: International Research Engagement Targets

![Bar graph showing the percentage of journal articles with one or more international co-authors for Queen's, Rest of U15, and the Queen's:U15 ratio from 1999-2001 to 2017-2019. The graph indicates an increase in the percentage of international co-authors with Queen's ratio approaching the U15 average by 2019.]
International Undergraduate Student Recruitment

Our target is that, by 2019, 10 percent of our incoming undergraduates will be international fee-paying students. We have already begun working towards this target, which represents something in excess of a doubling of the number of international fee-paying undergraduates admitted in the fall of 2014.

Realization of this target will mean that, within 10 years from now we shall reach a steady state in which 10 percent of all undergraduate degree program students will be paying international fees.

It is important to stress that the target’s realization will depend not only on a successful implementation of our international undergraduate recruitment strategy but also on several other factors including, critically, residence capacity and student support services.

Internationalization: International Undergraduate Degree Program Student Intake

International Undergraduate Student Engagement

Discussions regarding our international strategy have highlighted our lack of a reliably comprehensive measure of undergraduate international engagement. The establishment of interim and final targets will occur as soon as this shortcoming is overcome.