

## Fort Hays State University Performance Report (2<sup>nd</sup> Year) 1-01-2010 to 12-31-2010

Fort Hays State University	Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	(785) 628-4531; ccrawfor@fhsu.edu and lgould@fhsu.edu		
Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1.1 Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled	2005 - 171 2006 - 187 2007 - 239	2009 - 252 2010 - 266 2011 - 279	2009 - 252 2010 - 374	Target Exceeded
1.2 Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 54.5% 2006 - 57.9% 2007 - 53.8%	2009 - 55.7% 2010 - 57.5% 2011 - 59.3%	2009 - 70% (12/17) 2010 - 48% (12/25)	Target Not Met, No Directional Improvement
1.3 Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 28.6% 2006 - 36.3% 2007 - 20.0%	2009 - 29.0% 2010 - 30.0% 2011 - 31.0%	2009 - 18% (2/11) 2010 - 23% (6/26)	Target Not Met

### **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students**

#### **Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled**

**Data Collection:** Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled annually

**3-Year Performance History:** It is difficult to determine prior performance relative to other institutions or demographic groups given the uniqueness of the target population. Clearly performance has increased from 2005 to 2007, but determining the market saturation point for this target demographic is impossible to gauge. To gain on this important goal, FHSU revised three primary institutional strategies. First, FHSU hired a full-time recruiter to focus on this population demographic. Second, FHSU built a scholarship model specific to Hispanic students graduating from Kansas high schools. Finally, FHSU opened an ancillary store-front in Garden City charged jointly with assisting new freshman (FR) students as well as enrolling new Virtual College students.

**Targets:** The target presented represents an increase of 20% over the three-year average baseline (199). FHSU is likely to have continued state-wide appeal to this target population due to our strategy of "Affordable Success" and workforce development programs. Building a successful strategy for the Hispanic population has taken years, but FHSU continues to make progress on serving this student demographic that is concentrated in our geographic service area. An increase of 20% requires a significant institutional commitment of personnel, scholarships, and operating expenses.

#### **Key Performance Indicator 2: Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students**

**Data Collection:** Percent of FT/FT FR Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students retained fall-to-fall

**3-Year Performance History:** Performance on this indicator has not been consistent for the three-year period 2005-2007 which clearly attests to the difficulty of moving retention-focused measurements. In a quick review of IPEDS data of peer institutions, it is common to have lower retention of targeted demographic groups. Across the last three years, the spread of difference has been between 10 and 20%. The difference at FHSU has been consistently around 10% lower than retention of traditional demographic students (67% retention for all FT/FT FR students, 55.4% retention for

FT/FT FR Hispanic students).

**Targets:** The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the 2005-2007 average. Impacting retention rates is difficult, and a change of 10% may well take years to accomplish. Institutionally, FHSU retains about 70% of all FT/FT freshman students. Bringing the retention rate up for the Hispanic segment is important to increasing the overall institutional retention benchmark. While enrollment is impacted most by input considerations (recruitment, enrollment, and financial aid processes), increased retention comes from personalized advising and success in the classroom. These factors are much more difficult to effectively coordinate.

### **Key Performance Indicator 3: Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students**

**Data Collection:** Percent of Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students graduating within five years

**3-Year Performance History:** The three year performance record shows wide variation with a low of 20% and peaking at 36%. Swings in performance history occur when relatively small numbers of students are partitioned off for analysis. As larger numbers of students are included in the cohort group, the graduation rate should stabilize. Across the three years in the performance history, the average graduation rate for this demographic is 28%. Assumably, this average should be realized as more students are included in the cohort.

**Targets:** The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the 2005-2007 average. Impacting graduation rates is even more difficult than impacting retention rates. As an institution, FHSU graduates about 32% of the FT/FT freshman cohort within five years. However, graduation rates for our Hispanic student segment is lower. In order to have a long-term impact on that population demographic, FHSU must have a strategic effort to increase graduation rates.

**PERFORMANCE RATIONALE.** FHSU is generally pleased with the continued success of our Hispanic initiative relative to the record number of new FR students enrolled and the improving graduation rate. In 2010, FHSU retained just 48% of Hispanic coded students (retained 12 out of the 25 KS first-time degree-seeking FR) and did not have directional improvement in this area. FHSU continues to track the success of Hispanic students and this decline in retention cannot be attributed to one single factor, but we are certain that economic pressures have contributed. The graduation rate of Hispanic students did increase from 18% to 23%, but more study and focused effort needs to occur for FHSU to meet the final target.

**PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.** To address this decline, FHSU has re-staffed the Hispanic coordinator position in the Student Affairs division. In addition, FHSU continues to aggressively track all Hispanic students in an effort to maintain higher retention and graduation goals. Even during these tough economic times, FHSU's financial commitment to Hispanic students has not been cut due to our long-term commitment to this important demographic sector. Recently, FHSU has made the commitment to expand the number of recruitment buses bringing students from all across the state. In addition, FHSU has recently funded new software (Tiger Connect) to identify early signs of retention issues and to provide an additional layer of feedback for all students so intervention can be more timely and effective. Retention and graduation rate performance is expected to climb as a result of new personnel and early alert notifications. Finally, the Student Affairs division has recently become more focused on tracking success of minority students to better understand factors that lead to success, retention, and ultimately, graduation. Through the use of focus groups (titled "pulse groups") and the Students of Color Task Force (charged with looking at an array of factors which impact the retention of minority students) the Student Affairs division has become much more aggressive in the success of this goal.

<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 2: Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
2.1 Performance Task index score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1171	2009 - 1183 2010 - 1195 2011 - 1206	2009 - 1125 2010 - 1160	Target Not Met
2.2 Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1211	2009 - 1223 2010 - 1235 2011 - 1247	2009 - 1160 2010 - 1190	Target Not Met
2.3 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - 55% 2007 - 52%	2009 - 55% 2010 - 58% 2011 - 60%	2009 - 56% 2010 - 58%	Target Met
2.4 Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA)	2006 - 77.8% 2007 - 87.4%	2009 - 88.6% 2010 - 90.1% 2011 - 91.5%	2009 - 87% 2010 - 91%	Target Exceeded

#### **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills**

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

**Data Collection:** Critical Thinking index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

**3-Year Performance History:** FHSU first participated in the Collegiate Learning Assessment in the 2006-2007 cycle. Results of this administration supported the conclusion that our graduates are average writers. The CLA is a national assessment of freshman and senior students writing, critical thinking, and analysis skills. Our performance is norm-referenced against other institutions and factors out performance relative measures like retention and abilities at college entrance to validate the actual value added of an institution's instruction. Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1016 (25<sup>th</sup> percentile) to a high scale estimate of 1320 (75<sup>th</sup> percentile).

**Targets:** The three year target represents a 3% improvement over 2007 performance. Improvement against national norm-referenced indicators requires significant institutional effort. FHSU continues to commit substantial resources to the "Writing Across the Curriculum" initiative and Writing Center. In addition, FHSU faculty continue to integrate writing intensive assignments into general education and program-level curriculum in order to improve the writing effectiveness of our graduates.

##### **Key Performance Indicator 2: Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)**

**Data Collection:** Analytic Writing index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

**Performance History:** Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1097 (25<sup>th</sup> percentile) to a high estimate of 1327 (75<sup>th</sup> percentile).

##### **Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)**

**Data Collection:** Percent of students passing post-tests on computer concepts and word processing in the Introduction to Computing class at the 70% cut score or higher

**3-Year Performance History:** In 2005 faculty teaching the Introduction to Computing class completely refocused the course on learning outcomes that were determined to be critical to the success of our graduates. At this time the assessment models were also completely reviewed and adapted to the new learning outcomes. Since that time student performance has been tracked on the basis of pre-test and post-test scoring to determine course efficacy. Performance history for 2006 and 2007 has shown that about 54% of students pass the post-test on concepts and word processing at a score of 70% or greater.

**Targets:** As the new curriculum is implemented and adjustments are made to the pedagogy, performance improvement should occur. FHSU made a major commitment of resources to the project during the refocusing effort. The three year target established is to have a 15% increase in the number of students passing the post-test at a 70% cut score or greater. Performance gains at 5% annual improvement are attainable in the short-term. However, gains at this rate for the long-term are not possible or desirable given ever-present concerns of grade inflation and course rigor. Additionally, FHSU students already perform above peer as is noted through our participation in the ETS iSkills assessment where students perform at 103% of national peers.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA)**

**Data Collection:** Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA). The FPA is an assessment given to all seniors graduating with teaching credentials. The FPA is a 113-point rubric-based assessment evaluated by education unit members. The assessment is given at the end of every semester and has been given in its current form since 2005-2006.

**3-Year Performance History:** Percentage of students passing the FPA at 88 has averaged 82.6% for the two year period of 2006 and 2007. Recent performance indicates that 87% of students pass the FPA at a cut-rate of 88 points or higher.

**Targets:** The cut-point of 88 for the FPA was chosen for consistency with the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) requirement. The final target of 91.5% was based on a 5% improvement strategy for student performance. An increase of this level is consistent with NCATE and KSDE expectations for continued accreditation. NCATE accredits teacher education programs.

**PERFORMANCE RATIONALE.** FHSU experienced directional improvement on all four KPIs related to improving student learning. FHSU continues to gain experience with the CLA, and the performance improvement for the CLA indicators demonstrate this growth. In the 2010 implementation, FHSU had a record number of SR students completing the CLA. FHSU has spent considerable effort in the redesign of the Introduction to Computing course over the last 5 years to improve learner outcomes, and we continue to meet performance improvement targets on these essential computing concepts. The university is also very pleased with the direction of the FPA assessment which all of our teacher education graduates must pass at 88 or above for licensure. We note a 4% increase in this KPI, which exceeds our 2<sup>nd</sup> year target.

**PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.** During 2009-2010, the university placed greater importance on improving implementation of the CLA. These steps increased the overall participation and representativeness of the examination. We will continue these process changes for 2010-2011. FHSU has also recently implemented a “Writing Intensive” designation for individual courses so students can better select courses which address perceived deficits. Enrollment in “Writing Intensive” courses has been strong and the number of courses also continues to grow (over 50 courses are now available as WI). In addition, FHSU is piloting a Performance Task Assessment Program. Using techniques and practices advanced by CLA in the Classroom Academies, this program implements performance tasks, like those used in the CLA, into the curriculum to engage students in the following academic activities: analytical reasoning, critical thinking, problem-solving and effective written communication. A sample of students at the following levels will complete the performance tasks: Freshmen, Upper-Level General Education, and Senior Capstone. Students’ results are scored according to performance-based rubrics and assessed for a value-added score. Finally, we continue to become more comfortable with the FPA and our students continue to grow in their understanding of this important end of program assessment for teacher licensure.

<b>Regents System Goal Institutional Goal</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 3: Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
3.1 Number of users of the Wellness Center	2005 - 21434 2006 - 23305 2007 - 26382	2009 - 40000 2010 - 50000 2011 - 60000	2009 - 74025 2010 - 74833	Target Exceeded
3.2 Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 80% 2010 - 85% 2011 - 90%	2009 - 90% (91/101) 2010 - 97% (152/156)	Target Exceeded
3.3 Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b )	2005 - 52% 2006 - 52% 2007 - 51%	2009 - 53% 2010 - 55% 2011 - 57%	2009 - 53% (n = 670) 2010 - 55% (n = 615)	Target Met
3.4 Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%	2009 - 12% 2010 - 20%	Target Met
3.5 Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%	2009 - 10% 2010 - 19%	Target Not Met

#### **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff**

##### **Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of users of the Wellness Center**

**Data Collection:** Annual count of FHSU faculty, staff, students, and cardholders using the Wellness Center.

**3-Year Performance History:** Utilization of the Wellness Center has been tracked since it opened in the 1990s. Annual usage has averaged 23707 users from 2005-2007. In 2007 the Wellness Center was completely renovated in an effort to update equipment and expand the square footage of the facility.

**Targets:** It is expected that utilization of the facility will double over the short-term, then stabilize based on hours available and amount of machines accessible. The university invested nearly \$500,000 in equipment and expansion, and further improvements are expected (enhanced "card" tracking system, additional machines, staffing).

##### **Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming**

**Data Collection:** Annual survey of campus stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, cardholders) with percentage responding satisfaction or strong satisfaction with health screening and educational programming.

**Targets:** By the end of the performance agreement, FHSU has estimated that 90% of stakeholders will be satisfied with health screening and educational programming related to physical wellness on campus within the three year time parameter.

##### **Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b)**

**Data Collection:** Percent of SR students completing NSSE Item 6b (Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities) with a response of "often"

or "very often".

**3-Year Performance History:** FHSU has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement since 2001. Performance history on this indicator suggests that about 52% (based on a three year average) of SR students engage in physical fitness activities at least "often". This level of performance is comparable to the larger NSSE population (53% in 2007).

**Targets:** Expansion of the Wellness Center and an institutional focus on physical wellness is expected to have residual impact on student participation in wellness activities. Moving performance on this indicator will require information sharing and marketing and will likely have a more immediate effect on FR students rather than SR students.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures**

**Data Collection:** Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a faculty/staff group.

**3-Year Performance History:** No performance history exists for this KPI.

**Targets:** The three year goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies document the impact of fitness improvement for overall productivity of an organization.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures**

**Data Collection:** Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a student group.

**3-Year Performance History:** No performance history exists for this KPI.

**Targets:** The goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs by the end of the performance agreement. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies document the impact of fitness improvement in students. Students improve their ability to learn and be successful in the collegiate environment if a fitness component is implemented.

**PERFORMANCE RATIONALE.** FHSU reports directional performance improvement for all indicators in this goal. In 2009, FHSU began a wellness initiative to increase the health of its faculty, staff and students. Through limited enhancements of existing resources, the Tiger Wellness Center; the Departments of Health and Human Performance, Nursing, and Communication Disorders; Student Health Services; and the Kelly Center (Academic Success Programming, Drug & Alcohol Programming, Personal Counseling) worked together to implement specific programs to the campus community and their immediate family members. Over 250 individuals participated in wellness initiative events including not only organized physical activity (Fitness Bootcamp, Kickboxing, Pilates, Zumba, etc) but also educational presentations for overall wellness (Heart Healthy Diets, Eating Well While Traveling, Alcohol Awareness, etc). The institution has continued to see huge success and a modest increase in the number of patrons utilizing the Wellness Center. The facility was expanded in 2006-2007 contributing in large part to the increased interest. Since that renovation, the Wellness Center has also increased (and replaced) the available exercise machines for patrons, increased hours of the facility, and increased staffing. Importantly, the wellness initiative has become a "best practice" model due to the success we have documented in patron use, satisfaction, and health related outcomes.

**PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT:** Approximately 156 participants returned satisfaction surveys with 97% satisfaction reported with programming available (Indicator 2). The NSSE data of senior students confirms this finding as well, showing that 55% of seniors now exercise often or very often (Indicator 3). Perhaps most important, the final key performance indicators for this goal support the success of the project. Across both the faculty/staff and student segments, participants (n = 400) realized about 10% additional improvement in five fitness-related health measures (cardiovascular strength, muscular strength, muscular endurance, body composition, and flexibility). Several faculty/staff members that were

contemplating retirement because of their decline in health have reversed their health and remain productive members of the campus. Faculty members have also integrated their children into this program to assist in dealing with diabetes, obesity and to raise the self-esteem of their children. Another faculty member has implemented a nutrition program recommended by the wellness staff in their own home for the health and the future of their grandchildren. Another faculty member participates in this wellness program as a daily stress reliever as the faculty member is caring for a seriously ill child. Students also improved their overall health and saw such benefits as improved grades, higher self-esteem and successfully dealing with eating disorders. As students nationally are dealing with depression, wellness center personnel report on three separate occasions in which depressed students became involved in this program and experienced positive mental outcomes. This level of success was possible due to the popular fitness programming and enhanced access to the facility. An increase in collegiality and research across disciplines was an unexpected benefit among faculty and staff who participated in this process. Finally, the wellness staff report that these personal health and fitness changes are generally characterized as sustainable, meaning that the fitness models being presented have long-term value to faculty, staff and students suggesting lifelong change is probable.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
4.1 Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships	2006 - 23 2007 - 40	2009 - 44 2010 - 48 2011 - 53	2009 - 50 2010 - 70	Target Exceeded
4.2 Number of international faculty development grants awarded	2005 - 0 2006 - 0 2007 - 0	2009 - 3 2010 - 7 2011 - 10	2009 - 5 2010 - 12	Target Exceeded
4.3 Number of international students enrolled on-campus	2006 - 128 2007 - 231	2009 - 300 2010 - 360 2011 - 411	2009 - 283 2010 - 291	Target Not Met
4.4 Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience	2006 - 54 2007 - 76	2009 - 87 2010 - 98 2011 - 109	2009 - 53 2010 - 59	Target Not Met
4.5 Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College	2006 - 2349 2007 - 2290	2009 - 2358 2010 - 2397 2011 - 2436	2009 - 2969 2010 - 3568	Target Exceeded

#### **NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Internationalize the campus and curriculum**

##### **Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships**

**Data Collection:** Total number of faculty members coming to FHSU or traveling to partner campuses with expressed purpose of providing education.

**3-Year Performance History:** Since FHSU began tracking this KPI in 2006, the average baseline performance is 31.5 faculty engaged in international collaboration.

**Targets:** Target of 40% increase over the average baseline represents a significant advance in faculty exchange and increase in requisite fiscal commitment. Considering that each faculty member traveling abroad for FHSU represents at least a \$2500 investment (not accounting for time), the resources required to mount a large improvement in this area increases quickly. It has long been our experience that faculty must be comfortable with other cultures to successfully teach international students, and the final target represents nearly 20% annual participation of FHSU faculty. Furthermore, given the current state budget constraints maintaining programs like faculty development become more difficult.

##### **Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of international faculty development grants awarded**

**Data Collection:** Total number of faculty successfully applying for and receiving the international faculty development grant.

**3-Year Performance History:** No performance history exists for this KPI.

**Targets:** In 2007-2008 FHSU made a strategic commitment to better fund faculty international travel. Our strategic planning process generated the possibility of a faculty grant process that provides an opportunity for faculty to submit application for significant funding based on project merit. Preliminary feedback suggests that there is widespread interest in this type of approach rather than allocating monies by department or college, or by just considering faculty travel on an ad hoc basis.



**Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of international students enrolled on-campus**

**Data Collection:** Total number of non-US residents enrolled on-campus annually.

**3-Year Performance History:** FHSU has seen a strategic increase in this KPI. Performance history for 2007 shows that over 200 international students are attending campus. Across the performance tracking segment, FHSU has averaged 179.5 international students attending campus, which we've established as our baseline for this performance agreement.

**Targets:** The 2011 target represents more than 100% improvement over the average baseline of international students participating in campus-based education. Goal 1 of our performance agreement illustrates our commitment to enrollment growth over the next 3-5 years, and the international student sector has been identified as a target for potential growth. Currently, additional resources will need to be committed and deployed quickly and continuously to make this goal a reality.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience**

**Data Collection:** Number of students successfully completing requirements for international exchange or study abroad activities.

**3-Year Performance History:** Since FHSU began tracking this KPI we have seen an average of 65 students participating in study abroad activities. Data prior to 2006 is not available, but anecdotal information suggests that more students than ever are participating in international study opportunities.

**Targets:** The three year target of 50% growth (actual increase of 33 students over 2007 baseline of 76) over the average baseline represents a substantial increase in international/study abroad activity. Improving performance on this KPI requires additional scholarships and planning to get more student commitment earlier in their academic program of study. In addition, additional incentives and opportunity for faculty mentoring must be established to be successful.

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College**

**Data Collection:** Total number of non-US resident students enrolling and successfully completing Virtual College classes.

**3-Year Performance History:** FHSU saw a spike in the number of international students enrolling through the Virtual College in 2006. Average performance on this KPI suggests that 2320 non-US resident students enroll and complete classes through the Virtual College.

**Targets:** The 2011 target represents 5% growth over the current baseline of 2320 students. Success on this target is entirely subject to political processes, but FHSU has demonstrated consistency in our performance in terms of international distance education. Maintaining this level of performance is only possible through our extensive partnership building infrastructure realized through our Office of Strategic Partnerships. While FHSU has relied on 3 Chinese institutions to provide the international enrollments in the past, we have been very aggressive to expand collaborative partnerships by as many as 4-5 new institutions annually. While most of the agreements will not produce large numbers of international enrollments, a larger number of partners represents stability of the international operation and subjects FHSU to less risk over the long-term.

**PERFORMANCE RATIONALE:** 2010 was another year of success relative to international programming. FHSU experienced performance improvement across all indicators for internationalization. Specifically, the university saw another increase in the number of faculty traveling between partner institutions (Sias International, Shenyang Normal University, Tak Ming College - Maxwell). FHSU also created a new program of grant opportunities for faculty members interested in giving on-campus students an international experience. The university was also successful in increasing the success rate of international partner students while maintaining rigor in these programs. FHSU did not meet performance targets on two KPIs, "Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience" and "Number of international students enrolled on-campus". While in most cases it is difficult to make direct causal linkages, all stakeholders have indicated that the major, if not sole, impediment to students completing a study abroad experience is the difficult economic climate. As one might expect, students are engaging in less study abroad activity because there is

simply less financial commitment provided from households during these lean periods. Relative to the target established for international students taking classes on-campus, FHSU realized that growth at this level would be a stretch, but we are determined to continue the push for recruiting more international students. Nonetheless, FHSU did realize significant gain on this KPI but fell short of the target for 2010.

**PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT.** FHSU has actually increased the amount of financial incentive to study abroad, but this increase was not substantial enough to offset the drop in parental and student contribution during the 2009 cycle. FHSU continues to closely monitor the KPI and continues to adopt other academic incentives (college credit opportunities for study abroad) in an effort to boost the number of students considering study abroad experiences. FHSU expects the number of students traveling internationally will rebound in accordance with the larger economic recovery, but we hold little hope that performance on this KPI will fully recover during the 2011 performance agreement cycle. In order to increase the number of international students enrolled on-campus, FHSU has started working much more closely with recruitment and placement agencies and now has agreements signed to facilitate international student enrollment. Finally, in 2008, FHSU implemented two significant and resource intensive strategies related to improving international students' English skills. The Intensive Summer English Experience and our ESL Center continue to grow to meet the demands for improving English competency so that students can be much more successful when they enroll in formal program coursework.

<b>KBOR Recommendation and Comments: Fort Hays State University</b>
Fort Hays State University is reporting on the second year of a three-year performance agreement.
561.09