

## Fort Hays State University Performance Report 3<sup>rd</sup> Year 1-1-2011 -12-31-2011

Fort Hays State University	Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: (785) 628-4531; ccrawfor@fhsu.edu and lgould@fhsu.edu	November 12, 2010	
Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year 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 2011 - 414	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) 2011 - 73.2% (30/41)	Target Exceeded
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) 2011 - 27% (7/26)	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 over the past three years, 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 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.

**PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** FHSU continues to move strategically to accommodate the states growing demographic group. This growth shows 10% performance improvement over the 2010 level. Additional scholarship monies as well as our flexible Virtual College offerings have allowed Hispanic students to complete classes from anywhere in the state.

#### **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 prior years 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 average of the last three years. 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 FR 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** The University continues to build stronger ties with incoming Hispanic FR students through campus activities and personalized advising. While the number is prone to fluctuate due to economic variables, the University continues to award qualified Hispanic students with competitive scholarships for continued success.

### **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, 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 average of the last three years. Impacting graduation rates is even more difficult than impacting retention rates. As an institution, FHSU graduates about 32% of the FT/FT FR 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 RESULTS:** The 2011 graduation rate is improved from the 2010 level, and is approaching the 5 year graduation rate of all FHSU students. Certainly, this metric is showing improvement due to the increased focus we have on retention activities and our scholarship package. However, the major reason why this metric is improving relates to our focus on building support and social networks for Hispanic students.

<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>3-Year 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 2011 - 1116	Target Not Met, No Directional Improvement
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 2011 - 1091	Target Not Met, No Directional Improvement
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% 2011 - 59%	Target Not 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%	2009 - 87% 2010 - 91%	Target Exceeded

		2011 - 91.5%	2011 - 99%	
--	--	--------------	------------	--

## **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 FR and SR 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** These performance results are disappointing. With the financial commitment the University has extended through our assessment, Writing Center, dedicated FTE for a Director of Writing, and creation of the WI designation, our expectation was that this metric would show steady improvement. The next step will be to redeploy a new strategy for improving writing in our SR students - back to the drawing board for a new approach.

### **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

**3-Year Performance History:** See comments on prior KPI performance history. Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1097 (25<sup>th</sup> percentile) to a high scale estimate of 1327 (75<sup>th</sup> percentile).

**Targets:** See comments on prior KPI target.

### **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 over the past 2 years 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 for students 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** The University saw directional improvement on this goal, but missed the target by 1%. The University has always been successful on technology related metrics, and "squeezing out the last drop" of performance is difficult when our students are near the top of the curve already. Additional focus on curriculum revision and re-deployment of a revised teaching model may be necessary to see further performance gains.

**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 a 88 has averaged 82.6% over the last two year reporting period. Recent performance indicates that 87% of students pass the FPA at a cut-rate of 88 points or higher. Prior data is not available on this indicator since assessment data prior to 2005 was based on a 100 point FPA scaling rather than the current 113 point assessment instrument.

**Targets:** The cut-point of 88 for the FPA was chosen for consistency with the 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** Student performance on the FPA in 2011 was astounding. We can certainly claim that our Education unit continues to improve results. Even as FHSU sees a decline in the number of "alternative certification" students, the 99% performance result is still remarkable. It would be impossible to attribute this performance result to a particular variable, and actually, these near perfect results are more an indication of systemic success with teaching, advising, testing, and aligned student expectations.

<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>3-Year 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 – 74,025 2010 – 74,833 2011 - 84,342	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) 2011 - 96% (221/230)	Target Exceeded, No Directional Improvement
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) 2011 - 51% (n = 382)	Target Not Met, No Directional Improvement
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% 2011 - 24%	Target Not 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% 2011 - 26%	Target Exceeded

#### **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 over the last three years. In 2007 the Wellness Center was completely renovated in an effort to update equipment and expand the square footage of the facility.

**Targets:** Last year FHSU conducted a complete renovation of the Wellness Center to update equipment and expand the facility. 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). **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** Performance results of 2011 indicate that the Wellness initiative, while at the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of this performance agreement, has not lost momentum in any way. As a single indicator, the number of users tends to be a gross measure of effectiveness, but in this case the rest of the facts support the idea that campus wellness is increasing. As a strategic measure, the number of users is a great indicator of the need to upgrade machinery and expand access to facilities given this strongly increased interest.

**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.

**3-Year Performance History:** Establishment of the survey supports this new goal and has not yet been implemented. No history is available.

**Targets:** 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** The 2010 performance history of 97% satisfaction is clearly a difficult target to repeat, but the Wellness Center has come very close to this extremely high level of satisfaction with the 2011 performance result of 96%. The Wellness Center plans to continue the same outstanding efforts (including expanded access, more fit programming during high traffic hours, and onsite assistants to constantly monitor and manage the center).

**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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** The 2011 NSSE results relative to SR students who exercised often or very often did decline unexpectedly below the NSSE average of 55%. While this percentage dropped, the percent of SR students who sometimes exercised or participated in physical fitness activities did sharply increase from prior years. To address this decline, the Wellness Center has established a larger marketing presence in an effort to build greater interest.

**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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** Faculty and staff members still encountered a significant gain in fitness over 2010 levels. The Wellness Center staff will continue offering the same activities and assessments to faculty and staff as these results support the overall efficiacy of the program.

**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 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 in students. Students improve their ability to learn and be successful in the collegiate environment if a fitness component is implemented. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** These performance results, on the student demographic, definitely support the positive changes that the Wellness Center has facilitated. Student wellness has been a cornerstone of our General Education since 1992, and these results indicate that students not only learn about health and wellness issues, they actually apply those practices and expereince notable changes. Again, the Wellness Center staff will continue to specially serve the student demographic through innovative programming and peak hours and encourage assessment of student health as a centerpiece.



Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year 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 2011 - 74	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 2011 - 13	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 2011 - 329	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 2011 - 55	Target Not Met, No Directional Improvement
4.5 Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College	2006 - 2349 2007 - 2290	2009 - 2358 2010 - 2397 2011 - 2436	2009 - 2,969 2010 - 3,568 2011 - 3,992	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 to commit to given the strain on OOE. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** FHSU has long been known for our presence in several China provinces. This metric continues to reflect the growth of those partnerships, but also reflect the emerging trend of some of our faculty to engage in Fulbright work in other nations. Last year, FHSU hosted 2 Fulbright scholars and had at least two Fulbrights away on international experiences. Other faculty have taken advantage of comparable programs. FHSU expects both instruction and research related international travel to increase beyond the termination of this KBOR goal.

##### **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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** One of the primary policy choices that FHSU made to support faculty research at international locations was the creation of an international research grant, which began in 2009. This initiative has facilitated travel opportunities for 13 faculty members, allowing them to conduct in-depth research at locations close to the source of their academic research, including Germany, France, Paraguay, China, Mexico, Spain, and other countries. The university continues to expand this program to allow even more access for faculty interested in international research and exchange.

##### **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. Recent performance history 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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** While FHSU did not meet the goals we established in 2009, we continue to have marked increases in the number of

international students coming to campus. While the international economy is rebounding, supporting this growth, FHSU continues to support this important demographic through the expansion of our ESL programming and is proposing a new degree program (Global Business English) with specific appeal to international students. The university continues to experience not only growth in the number of students coming to campus, but the number of different nations students come from is also increasing. We are confident that the policies we've enacted to encourage these academic opportunities will continue to yield even larger numbers over the short and long-term.

**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. **PERFORMANCE RESULTS:** Despite additional efforts (scholarships for international travel, affordable tuition, expanded partnerships, faculty coordination of study abroad), the number of students completing study abroad has not rebounded. Feedback from students and faculty indicate that the primary impediment to growth in this metric relate solely to student finance issues and desire to manage the time to degree. While scholarships offset some of the expenses, there is still a sizable sum that students have not been willing or able to invest in study abroad. Our Assistant Provost for Internationalization and International Student Office continue to encourage study abroad activities and will expand marketing in the near future.

**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 RESULTS:** Maintining high academic standards in international partnership courses is an important step in assuring legitimacy of our programs. Theses results clearly show that the university views satisfactory international student academic performance as critical to the long-term viability of our offerings. Recently, the university has taken several steps to improve the quality of our international experience, including enhanced staffing of our Office of Strategic Partnerships, expansion of our ESL offerings on-site in foreign countries, and other support related activities through our International Student Office. These performance results are strong indication of not just the efforts, but the positive application of policy and improved academic performance of our international pertner students.

<b>KBOR use only: Fort Hays State University</b>
<b>Recommendation and Comments</b>
561.09

