

<b>Institution: Fort Hays State University</b>	Contact Person: Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: (785) 628-4241	Date: 07/15/2006
--	--	--	------------------

**Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes**

**Institutional Goal 1: Improve undergraduate student's writing abilities**

<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Performance Task score from Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1049	FY2007 - 1084 FY2008 - 1120 FY2009 - 1156	1171	Exceeded target by 87 points
Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 2.50	FY2007 - 2.55 FY2008 - 2.60 FY2009 - 2.65	2.39	Target not met
Critical Thinking score from CLA (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1152	FY2007 - 1181 FY2008 - 1211 FY2009 - 1240	1216	Exceeded target by 35 points
Analytic Writing score from CLA (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1163	FY2007 - 1192 FY2008 - 1221 FY2009 - 1250	1198	Exceeded target by 6 points
Writing clearly and effectively from NSSE (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 2.88	FY2007 - 2.93 FY2008 - 2.98 FY2009 - 3.03	3.02	Exceeded target by .09

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Improve undergraduate student's writing abilities**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Performance Task score from Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Performance Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of all seniors (1156) and subtracting one standard deviation (107).

**Targets:** Targets represent progression toward parity (mean score) with all CLA schools within a three-year window. Improvement of this level on a national norm referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Indirect measure).**

**Data Collection:** Mean score of seniors completing NSSE item 3d (Response to: During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done). Scores range from 1 (none) to 5 (more than 20 this year).

**Targets:** Target represents a 6% improvement over baseline, growing annually by 2%.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Critical thinking score from CLA (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Critique an Argument Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of all seniors (1240) and subtracting one standard deviation (88).

**Targets:** Targets represent progression toward parity (mean score) with all CLA schools within a three-year window. Improvement of this level on a national norm referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Analytic Writing score from CLA (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Analytic Writing Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of all seniors (1250) and subtracting one standard deviation (87).

**Targets:** Targets represent progression toward parity (mean score) with all CLA schools within a three-year window. Improvement of this level on a national norm referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Writing clearly and effectively from NSSE (Indirect measure).**

**Data Collection:** Mean of seniors score on NSSE item 11c (Response to: To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?). Scores range from 1 (very little) to 4 (very much).

**Targets:** Target represents a 5% growth over current levels, growing annually by 1.5%.

**Comments:** Fort Hays performed very well on this goal in 2007, exceeding or meeting four of the five KPI target levels. Overall, student performance on the CLA surpassed expectations. Baselines were estimated based on prior student performance since FHSU had not participated in this important national exam. FHSU uses the standard sampling required by the CLA experts for their cross-sectional study (a random sample of 100 FR and 100 SR students). The NSSE KPI dealing with "number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages" was lower than expected (NSSE = 2.55; FHSU = 2.39), but FHSU students indicated improvement from last year in "Writing clearly and effectively". Fort Hays State University has implemented a variety of strategies to improve the low KPI. FHSU has initiated a major "writing across the curriculum" initiative that has been charged with infusing writing intensive options into general education and major curriculum. In addition, last year every department was asked to conduct an academic audit of their curriculum with a focus on the level of writing (and assessment of those skills) found in their majors. The results of the academic audit will not be immediate and should be realized as new or revised curriculum begins to be applied. To support this enhanced level of activity, the University Writing Center has been expanded through additional staffing, and the Center closely tracks the level of usage so that additional staffing can be added as necessary.

<b>Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 2: Develop mobile learning environment</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Number of full-time faculty using mobile learning technology	FY2006 - 55	FY2007 - 115 FY2008 - 215 FY2009 - 300	120	Exceeded target by 5
Percent of instructional and student life buildings with WiFi zone	FY2006 – 40%	FY2007 - 80% FY2008 – 90%	100%	Final target met
Percent of students satisfied with WiFi infrastructure	FY2006 - Building baseline	FY2007 - 5% over baseline FY2008 - 8% over baseline FY2009 - 10% over baseline	89%	Baseline of 56% was exceeded by 33%
Using computers in academic work from NSSE	FY2006 - 3.57	FY2007 - 3.62 FY2008 - 3.66 FY2009 - 3.70	3.34	Target not met
Number of operational WiFi access points in academic buildings	FY2005 - 110	FY2007 - 225 (fully deployed) FY2008 - KPI retired	225	Final target met

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Develop mobile learning environment**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of full-time faculty using mobile learning technology.**

**Data Collection:** Number of full-time faculty receiving tablet/laptop technology through annual action plan process.

**Targets:** FY2009 target represents 100% distribution of mobile computing technology for full-time faculty.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of instructional and student life buildings with WiFi zone.**

**Data Collection:** Percent of WiFi accessible instructional and student life buildings.

**Targets:** The FY2008 target is 90% saturation of student use and academic buildings.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of students satisfied with WiFi infrastructure.**

**Data Collection:** Percent of students not disagreeing with survey statements about the utility of WiFi to meet their needs.

**Targets:** Target represents a 10% improvement over the reporting period.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Using computers in academic work from NSSE.**

**Data Collection:** Mean score on NSSE item 11g for seniors (Response to: To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?). Scores range from 4 (very much) to 1 (very little).

**Targets:** Target represents a near 4% improvement on a national norm-referenced instrument. Improving national benchmarked indicators requires significant effort against other IHEs trying to improve.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of operational WiFi access points in academic buildings.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of operational access points to the wireless network installed in academic buildings.

**Targets:** Target represents a creation of a fully-deployed credible umbrella of service within a three year time-frame.

**Comments:** Last year FHSU met or exceeded targets for four of the five KPIs for this goal. FHSU continues to build a mobile teaching and learning environment through funding tablets for full-time faculty. In 2006 FHSU developed a satisfaction survey of users aimed at system improvement. In 2007 this was implemented (N = 457) again and the results (move from 56% to 89% agree or strongly agree with "I am satisfied with the wireless environment") confirm that the mobile learning environment is a stable and effective platform to support the expected expansion. FHSU did fail to meet one KPI for this goal, a NSSE item "using computers in academic work". FHSU students have always performed well above the peer and national NSSE average on this item, so movement of this indicator would be adding on to very high level. Next year FHSU plans to address this specific indicator by asking for faculty to increase the utilization of our portal and Blackboard technology so that students have a clearer understanding of the amount of computer related activity that can be reasonably integrated into a typical course. In addition, FHSU continues to reinforce the need for utilization of tablet technology and continues to provide over 200 checkout tablets for usage for entire sections of upper-division classes (since tablets have not been required of SO, JR, or SR). The original KPI target will be re-evaluated based on the already high level of performance achieved.

<b>Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 3: Internationalize the campus and curriculum</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Number of FHSU and partner faculty visiting foreign campuses	FY2006 -23	FY2007 - 26 FY2006 - 29 FY2009 - 32	40	Exceeded target by 14
Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming	FY2006 - 54	FY2007 - 56 FY2006 - 59 FY2009 - 62	76	Exceeded target by 20

Number of international students attending FHSU campus	FY2006 - 128	FY2007 - 132 FY2008 - 136 FY2009 - 141	231	Exceeded target by 99 students
--	--------------	--	-----	--------------------------------

Number of students enrolled in the International Studies minor	FY2006 – 0	FY2007 - 5 FY2008 - 12 FY2009 - 20	0	Target not met
Number of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE	FY2006 - 38	FY2007 - 40 FY2008 - 42 FY2009 - 44	30	Target not met

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Internationalize the campus and curriculum**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of FHSU and partner faculty visiting foreign campuses.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the total number of faculty members coming to FHSU or traveling to partner campuses.

**Targets:** Target of 15% increase represents a significant advance in faculty exchange and increase in requisite fiscal commitment.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the total number of students traveling to or from FHSU for international exchange or study abroad activities

**Targets:** Target of 15% growth represents a substantial increase in international exchange/study abroad activity.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of international students attending FHSU campus.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the total number of non-US residents enrolled on-campus.

**Targets:** The FY2009 target represents a 10% improvement over current level of international students participating in campus-based education.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of students enrolled in the International Studies minor.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of students declaring an International Studies minor.

**Targets:** The final year target represents a significant commitment to recruiting and building the minor program capacity. Minor program capacity of 20 is near the critical mass required for program success.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE.**

**Data Collection:** Freshmen planning to study abroad NSSE item 7f (Response to: Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution?). Response options include "plan to do".

**Targets:** FY2009 target represents a 15% increase in the number of students planning to study abroad. Motivating student interest in an activity as time and resource intensive as study abroad is challenging.

**Comments:** FHSU met three of the five targets for this goal. Specifically, FHSU continues to make progress in sharing international scholars between campuses. Last year there were 40 scholar visits exchanged, almost double over the year before. Over 20 more students participated in international study in 2007 and FHSU continues to attract a substantial number of international students with an increase of more than 100 students over 2006. However significant these strides may be, we still have not been successful in attracting students to study in the International Studies minor. While we estimated 20 minors by the end of 2009, we have made no measureable progress in this area. In addition, FHSU estimated that

more FR students would be interested in study abroad activities (reported in NSSE). Our estimate of 44 students in 2009 is still easily achievable, but there was a slip in the actual number of FR indicating interest in 2007. In order to improve in these areas, FHSU has taken several steps. First, additional marketing efforts have been undertaken to increase the attractiveness of the minor programming. Early results indicate that this effort may provide some results in 2008. The minor has been reviewed by the International Studies committee with the intention of finding issues that may decrease student interest. Improvement in the number of FR students indicating interest in study abroad is estimated to increase because of a larger commitment during FR orientation.

<b>Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 4: Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities around the Kansas Turnpike and our service area</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Number of first-time freshmen (FTF) admitted from Turnpike corridor counties	FY2006 - 32	FY2007 - 40 FY2008 - 50 FY2009 - 64	174	Target not met, see comments
Number of FTF enrolled from Turnpike corridor counties	FY2006 - 17	FY2007 - 21 FY2008 - 28 FY2009 - 35	67	Target not met, see comments
Number of Hispanic students served from the FHSU service area	FY2006 - 156	FY2007 - 162 FY2008 - 170 FY2009 - 179	170	Exceeded target by 8 students
Number of Kansas resident Hispanic students served	FY2006 - 187	FY2007 - 196 FY2008 - 206 FY2009 - 216	211	Exceeded target by 15 students
Number of Hispanic students enrolled	FY2006 - 285	FY2007 - 299 FY2008 - 314 FY2009 - 328	305	Exceeded target by 6 students

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities around the Kansas Turnpike and our service area**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of first-time freshmen (FTF) admitted from Turnpike corridor counties.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of FTF admitted from the following counties: Butler, Chase, Douglas, Jefferson, Johnson, Leavenworth, Lyon, Osage, Sedgwick, Shawnee, Wabaunsee, and Wyandotte.

**Targets:** Target represents a doubling of the number of FTF admitted.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of FTF enrolled from Turnpike corridor counties.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of FTF enrolled from the following counties: Butler, Chase, Douglas, Jefferson, Johnson, Leavenworth, Lyon, Osage, Sedgwick, Shawnee, Wabaunsee, and Wyandotte.

**Targets:** FY2009 target represents a doubling of the number of FTF enrolled. The university has committed extensive financial resources to strategically position our programs.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of Hispanic students enrolled from the FHSU service area.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of students enrolled indicating hispanic ethnicity from 66 county service area

**Targets:** Final year target represents an increase of 15% over current levels. Realizing this increase has required substantial upgrades in scholarships and personnel.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of Kansas resident Hispanic students enrolled.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the total number of Kansas residents of hispanic ethnicity enrolled.

**Targets:** Target represents an increase of 15% over current levels. FHSU is likely to have state-wide appeal to underprivileged populations due to our strategy of "Affordable Success".

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of Hispanic students enrolled.**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of students of Hispanic ethnicity enrolling.

**Targets:** Target represents an increase of 15% over current levels, further utilizing the efficiency of the Virtual College to supplement campus-based programming..

**Comments:** FHSU achieved targets in three of the five areas for this goal. Fort Hays continues to build a large cohort of hispanic students as is evidenced by our continued success in attracting Hispanic students from the service area, from Kansas, and from across the nation. In each of these KPIs FHSU exceeded the targets. FHSU did not meet estimated targets in our Turnpike Corridor initiative. NOTE: Baseline and target data for the two Turnpike corridor KPIs were incorrect and only included Johnson and Wyandotte counties. The baseline on the first indicator should be 179 (2007 goal should be 238) and 85 for the second indicator (2007 goal should be 113). Even when all Turnpike corridor students were reviewed, FHSU's performance actually declined in 2007. To improve our performance, FHSU has invested heavily in marketing in the area with a marketing consulting firm in KC. Our admissions staff has substantially increased efforts in the area through visits and sponsorships. Early results (application tracking) indicates that FHSU has rebounded in this area of the state as we move into the Fall 2008 count. Our commitment to building an institution attractive to Hispanic students appears to have been successful, and FHSU continues to expand scholarships and personalized service. In 2007 FHSU opened a regional office in Garden City to provide greater response to this important student demographic sector. Feedback and results from the office have been very positive.

<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Post-test score on computer concepts (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 67%	FY2007 - 69% FY2008 - 71% FY2009 - 73%	70.6%	Exceeded target by 1.6%
Post-test score on word processing	FY2006 - 85%	FY2007 - 88%	60.2%	Target not met

(Direct measure)		FY2008 - 90% FY2009 - 93%		
Post-test score on spreadsheets (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 65%	FY2007 - 67% FY2008 - 69% FY2009 - 71%	65.4%	Target not met

Post-test score on database (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 57%	FY2007 - 59% FY2008 - 61% FY2009 - 63%	87.7%	Exceeded target by 28%
Using computers in academic work from NSSE (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 3.34	FY2007 - 3.34 FY2008 - 3.38 FY2009 - 3.42	3.34	Target met

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Post-test score on computer concepts (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from class average of students enrolling in CIS 101 completing post-test examination on computer concepts.

**Targets:** As 10% is an average baseline improvement for the last two implementations, the three-year goal is to double that level of effect.

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Post-test score on word processing (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from class average of students enrolling in CIS 101 completing post-test examination on word processing.

**Targets:** As 10% is an average baseline improvement for the last two implementations, the three-year goal is to double that level of effect.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Post-test score on spreadsheets (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from class average of students enrolling in CIS 101 completing post-test examination on spreadsheets.

**Targets:** As 10% is an average baseline improvement for the last two implementations, the three-year goal is to double that level of effect.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Post-test score on database (Direct measure).**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from class average of students enrolling in CIS 101 completing post-test examination on database.

**Targets:** As 10% is an average baseline improvement for the last two implementations, the three-year goal is to double that level of effect.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Using computers in academic work from NSSE (Indirect measure).**

**Data Collection:** NSSE mean score of seniors on using computers in academic work (item 10g). (Response to: To what extent does your institution emphasize the following?). Scores range from 4 (very much) to 1 (very little).

**Targets:** Target represents a 3% increase in students' use of computers in academic work on a national norm-referenced instrument. Fort Hays is already well above the national average in this area and further improvement requires substantial effort and resource commitment.

**Comments:** Fort Hays State University met or exceeded performance targets on three of the five KPIs for this goal. Scores on computer concepts and databases exceeded expected targets and the NSSE question regarding the use of computers in academic work met the target value. The post-test scores for word processing and spreadsheets failed to meet the established standards for performance. In 2006 FHSU totally redesigned the learning model used in CIS 101 Intro to Computing Systems to better meet the needs of a more proficient student body. During the redesign process, new assessment models were established and the dated pre-test/post-test exams were discarded. Performance was estimated based on prior learning models and exams - and were obviously too optimistic. Over 500 students participated in the new departmental assessment, and nearly that many participated in NSSE. As the learning model matures, more precise assessment will be possible in the departmental assessment. In addition, improvement will occur when both students and professors have clearer expectations about the outcomes of the course.

<b>KBOR use only: Fort Hays State University</b>
<b>Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement</b>
<b>Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement</b>
<b>Recommendation and Comments</b>