

Instructions for Completing the Performance Agreement Application

Provide the following information in the **PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT**:

1. Identify the **PERFORMANCE INDICATOR** that will be used to determine progress toward goals. Be as specific and as succinct as possible. The performance indicator may be quantitative or qualitative.
2. Show the **THREE YEAR PERFORMANCE HISTORY**, i.e., value of the performance indicator for the most recent three-year period, if available.
3. Show **TARGETS** for the next 3 years. Targets must be expressed in terms of the performance indicator identified in the first column.
4. **PERFORMANCE OUTCOME and EVALUATION** should be left blank.
5. At least one institutional goal must support Foresight 2020 Goal 4. Institutional goals must support two additional Foresight 2020 Goals selected from Goals 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6.
6. The narrative should not repeat information in the table. Instead, the narrative should provide explanation of the table.

Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

1. **Institutional Goal 1:** List goal exactly as it appears in the summary table.

Performance Indicator 1: Use the same description that appears in the first column of the form.

a. Data Collection: Describe **EXACTLY** how the data for the performance indicator will be collected. For example, if the data is “retention,” describe exactly how retention will be calculated.

b. Targets: Describe the rationale for selecting the targets in order for the Board to determine the degree of difficulty in achieving the target. (Note: Targets must be expressed in terms of the performance indicator/data. For example, if the performance indicator is “retention,” the targets should be expressed in terms of the actual retention figures expected in the next 3 years.)

Continue in the same fashion for all indicators for this goal.

Comments: Include comments that are **ESSENTIAL** to understanding the goal. Comments are optional.

And so on up to five goals.

Performance Agreement

Institution: Fort Hays State University	Contact Person: Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-628-4241; ccrawfor@fhsu.edu, lgould@fhsu.edu	Date: 07/15/2011
--	--	--	------------------

Foresight 2020 Goal 1: Achieve alignment between preK-12 and higher education systems and continue to enhance alignment between higher education institutions.

Institutional Goal: Align Programs and Services with NCKTC (Noth Central Kansas Technical College)

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase percent completion of articulation/program pathways in Technology Studies and Nursing programs	2008 - 0% 2009 - 0% 2010 - 0%	2012 - 75% 2013 - 100% 2014 - 100%		
2. Increase number of transfer students from NCKTC to FHSU (direct measure)	2008 - 6 2009 - 12 2010 - 9 (Mean = 9)	2012 - 12 2013 - 16 2014 - 20		
3. Increase student enrollment in the Technology Studies and Nursing programs (direct measure)	2008 - 0 2009 - 0 2010 - 0	2012 - 0 2013 - 15 2014 - 30		
4. Increase number of course share arrangements between FHSU and NCKTC in the Technology Studies and Nursing programs	2008 - 0 2009 - 0 2010 - 0	2012 - 3 2013 - 5 2014 - 7		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1(Title Only): Align Programs and Services with NCKTC (North Central Kansas Technical College)

Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 1. Increase percent completion of articulation/program pathways in Technology Studies and Nursing programs

Data Collection: Project completion estimate based on annual evaluation of pathways implementation by the faculty, department chairs, and Dean of the College of Education and Technology.

Targets: The 2013 target for this indicator is for the two pathways to be implemented. Articulation/program pathways are detailed curriculum guides that facilitate student transfer and ease of enrollment between both institutions (transfer from NCKTC to FHSU, but will

also be useful for FHSU students wanting to take classes at NCKTC during a semester). Completion of these pathways is essential to successful performance of the 5.3 indicator. Once this indicator has been completed, FHSU will review the current indicators for this goal and likely submit a new indicator to track success of alignment of programs and services between FHSU and NCKTC. Currently (2011), about 20% of the work on the new pathways has been completed. Creation of articulation/program pathways reduces issues from transfer of coursework. Accomplishing this target will require significant meeting time between FHSU and NCKTC faculty and the administrative teams.

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 2. Increase number of transfer students from NCKTC to FHSU (direct measure)

Data Collection: Annual count of students with transfer credit hours from NCKTC.

Targets: The 2014 target represents an increase of transfer students 100% over the three-year baseline (9). Increasing the number of transfer students from NCKTC represents just one of the strategic priorities associated with alignment of programs and services between the institutions. Students completing the pathways will not be considered as part of this indicator, thus making a 100% increase a significant target to affect. In order to attain this target, additional resources and time will need to be invested between enrollment management areas of both institutions.

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 3. Increase student enrollment in the Technology Studies and Nursing programs (direct measure)

Data Collection: Annual count of students jointly enrolled (FHSU and NCKTC) in the two Pathway programs.

Targets: The 2014 target for this indicator represents a modest increase based on the number of students enrolled in the NCKTC programs expressing interest in the Pathway model. It is difficult to estimate popularity of the Pathway program since implementation is on-going, thus the 2014 target of 30 students appears to be a high target to meet. Strategies employed to meet these targets will be identification and facilitation of faculty collaboration, enlarged institutional planning on both campuses, and targeted marketing efforts for students.

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 4. Increase number of course share arrangements between FHSU and NCKTC in the Technology Studies and Nursing programs

Data Collection: Annual count of introductory courses shared for joint credit between NCKTC and FHSU.

Targets: The 2014 target estimates that FHSU and NCKTC will align curriculum in up to seven courses. Course sharing is one of the identified strategic goals that FHSU and NCKTC are implementing to manage capacity among common introductory sections. Course sharing is an important step in balancing the course demands between institutions (if one institution has capacity, the partner can utilize that unused course space to better serve students). Developing course sharing agreements requires significant commitment of time from the faculty and administrative offices of FHSU and NCKTC. Course sharing is one identified method of building capacity and efficiently utilizing instructional resources, leading to a more standard learning experience between partner institutions. FHSU estimates that ultimately seven introductory courses can be shared to manage program capacity and improve learning opportunities for Pathway students.

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments (optional):

Foresight 2020 Goal 2: Achieve participation in the state's higher education system that better reflects the state's demography and more fully engages adult learners.

Institutional Goal Increase Enrollment

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase on-campus KS resident Hispanic enrollment (direct measure)	2008 - 104 2009 - 109 2010 - 118 (Mean = 110)	2012 - 121 2013 - 132 2014 - 143		
2. Increase on-campus KS resident transfer student enrollment (direct measure)	2008 - 273 2009 - 280 2010 - 244 (Mean = 266)	2012 - 275 2013 - 290 2014 - 305		
3. Increase on-campus non-KS resident FT/FR enrollment (direct measure)	2008 - 97 2009 - 145 2010 - 147 (Mean = 130)	2012 - 150 2013 - 160 2014 - 170		
4. Increase on-campus KS resident FT/FR enrollment (direct measure)	2008 - 638 2009 - 605 2010 - 630 (Mean = 624)	2012 - 637 2013 - 649 2014 - 661		
5. Increase Virtual KS resident enrollment (direct measure)	2008 - 3412 2009 - 3500 2010 - 3634 (Mean = 3515)	2012 - 3770 2013 - 3918 2014 - 4042		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): Increase Enrollment**Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 1. Increase on-campus KS resident Hispanic enrollment**

Data Collection: Fall semester headcount of Hispanic students, enrolling on-campus, with KS permanent residence code.

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 2. Increase on-campus KS resident transfer student enrollment

Data Collection: Fall semester headcount of degree-seeking transfer students, enrolling on-campus, with KS permanent residence code.

Targets: The 2014 target represents 15% growth over the three-year average baseline performance (266). Many factors impact transfer student enrollment, and perhaps most significantly, the pool of community college graduates provides both opportunity and limitation. Given the recent

unexpected drop in KS transfer students in 2010, 15% growth is prudent and will require stretch to accomplish. Strategies employed to increase this enrollment metric will include greater focus on retention activities, mandatory transfer student orientation, continued participation in the KBOR Core Outcomes and Transfer and Articulation Agreement projects, and expansion of 2+2 agreements with KS community colleges.

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 3. Increase on-campus non-KS resident FT/FR enrollment

Data Collection: Fall semester headcount of degree-seeking, first-time, freshmen (FT/FR) without KS permanent residence code.

Targets: Our 2014 target is predicated on an estimated 30% growth of this enrollment market over the three-year average (130). FHSU continues to invest considerable personnel time in recruitment of non-KS resident students, and the strategy has been productive as evidenced in the jump from 2008 to 2009. It is unclear if this sustained performance can be realized, but our goal is to add more than 20 additional FR students from out-of-state markets by 2014. Strategies employed to achieve this target will include expansion of out-of-state recruitment partnerships, possible expansion of scholarship programs, and continued low to moderate tuition increase strategies.

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 4. Increase on-campus KS resident FT/FR enrollment (direct measure)

Data Collection: Fall semester headcount of degree-seeking, KS-resident first-time, freshmen (FT/FR)

Targets: The 2014 goal reflects a 6% increase over the three-year average (624) performance level. Enrollment performance has long relied on the first-time freshman enrollment metric and FHSU continues to strive for additional market share of freshmen as a primary market. A target growth of 6% represents a stretch given declining enrollment in our traditional student base, but is attainable given new strategies employed to appeal to KS residents and out-of-state high school students. Strategies employed to achieve this target will include continued moderate tuition structure for in-state residents, focused marketing and recruiting effort in Sedgwick and surrounding counties, mining potential recruitment data sources, and enlargement of chartered bus tours to campus.

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 5. Increase Virtual KS resident enrollment

Data Collection: Fall semester headcount of Virtual students with KS permanent residence code (Only students taking classes virtually are counted in this KPI).

Targets: The 2014 goal reflects a 30% enrollment gain over the three-year average (3515). Due to our lower tuition structure, FHSU has been an appealing institution for Virtual students from across the US. This target becomes important for the institution as we attempt to raise awareness of our Virtual offerings with the strategic priority of serving more KS resident adult learners. A target of 30% (10% annual growth) is a stretch given our continuing priority of reaching non-KS residents. Strategies employed to achieve this target include continued moderate tuition structure, targeted social media and traditional marketing campaigns, additional evening office hours for our Higher Education Opportunity Center in Garden City, and expansion of 2+2 partnerships with community colleges in KS.

Comments (optional):

Foresight 2020 Goal 3: Achieve measureable improvement in persistence (retention) and completion (graduation) rates for higher education across the state.

Institutional Goal Improve Persistence and Retention

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
-----------------------	----------------	---------	---------------------	------------

1. Increase Hispanic student retention through targeted persistence activities (direct measure)	2008 - 74.6% (94/126) 2009 - 76.4% (103/136) 2010 - 76.1% (118/155) (Mean = 75.7%)	2012 - 77.2% 2013 - 78.7% 2014 - 80.2%		
2. Increase transfer student persistence through targeted activities (direct measure)	2008 - 73.6% (240/326) 2009 - 74.6% (217/291) 2010 - 75.3% (192/255) (Mean = 74.5%)	2012 - 76.0% 2013 - 77.5% 2014 - 79.0%		
3. Increase persistence of at-risk students referred through the Early Alert program (direct measure)	No baseline - new initiative	2012 - 50% 2013 - 60% 2014 - 70%		
4. Increase fall-to-fall persistence of Virtual students (direct measure)	2008 - 53.8% (1279/2379) 2009 - 56.6% (1525/2694) 2010 - 55.8% (1849/3314) (Mean = 55.4%)	2012 - 56.5% 2013 - 57.6% 2014 - 58.7%		
5. Increase the percent of students successfully completing courses (direct measure)	2008 - 86.3% (50625/58664) 2009 - 87.4% (52711/60327) 2010 - 88.3% (57360/64950) (Mean = 87.3%)	2012 - 89.2% 2013 - 90.0% 2014 - 90.9%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): Improve Persistence

Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 1. Increase Hispanic student retention through targeted persistence activities

Data Collection: Fall-to-fall persistence percentage of Hispanic undergraduate students

Targets: The 2014 target represents a 6% increase over the three-year average (75.7%) in persistence of Hispanic students. FHSU has a long-standing commitment to serving the Hispanic population, and improving persistence will increase the success of students and shorten time to degree.

This target will require additional attention for Hispanic student success programming and increasingly personalized advising and student service strategies to successfully achieve. Strategies employed to meet this target include expansion of the Higher Education Opportunity Center in Garden City, enhanced tracking systems facilitating Hispanic student success, better integrated activities with the HALO group, as well as other retention/persistence activities not solely focused on the Hispanic demographic.

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 2. Increase transfer student persistence through targeted activities

Data Collection: Fall-to-fall persistence percentage of on-campus degree-seeking transfer students

Targets: The 2014 target represents a 6% increase over the three-year average (74.5%) in persistence of students transferring to FHSU from a community college. Despite the substantial performance improvement from 2008 to 2010, FHSU is committed to continued performance improvement growth in this area due to the importance of transfer student success. These targets are supported through the significant investment of time in developing 2+2 agreements and through working closely with community colleges to realize benefits from the Transfer and Articulation Agreement. In addition, the new transfer student orientation is expected to yield positive results relative to persistence by better aligning transfer student expectations.

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 3. Increase persistence of at-risk students referred through the Early Alert program

Data Collection: Subsequent semester re-enrollment of at-risk students referred through the new Early Alert program (Early IQ)

Targets: The 2014 target represents retention at the University retention benchmark level (69-70%). Currently, it is nearly impossible to estimate the persistence of students classified as at-risk given our current lack of systematic tracking. Our professionals estimate that about 40% of these students re-enroll. Adoption of the new Early IQ software package which tracks and classifies students deemed at-risk (based on academic, behavioral, or other issues) should allow for closer attention and precise academic/student service involvement to improve student success and re-enrollment. At-risk students will be identified through specific general education "gateway" courses, so that meaningful changes in student behavior can be facilitated long before final grades of the semester are assigned.

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 4. Increase fall-to-fall persistence of Virtual students

Data Collection: Fall-to-fall persistence percentage of degree-seeking Virtual students

Targets: The 2014 target represents a 6% increase over the 2010 baseline (55.4%) for student re-enrollment fall-to-fall. FHSU persistence is near national average for students in distance learning programs, and the 2014 target will exceed national re-enrollment benchmark for fall-to-fall persistence if we achieve the target of 58.7% in 2014. The primary strategy employed to meet this performance improvement target will be the creation of a Student Engagement and Advising Center (SEAC) specifically designed for Virtual student success (recruitment, persistence, problem solving).

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 5. Increase the percent of students successfully completing courses

Data Collection: Measure of student successful/passing completion grades (A, B, C, D, P) divided by all grades assigned (includes passing grades and all U, I, W, and F grades) by FY.

Targets: The target for 2014 reflects a 3% increase over the three-year performance history average (87.3%). This measure is considered an innovative, institution-wide metric, attempting to capture student success as a more minute level than traditional retention, persistence, and

graduation metrics. Moving the percentage of passing grades to above 90% is a method consistent with much of the current research in retention done with institutions working with the Gardner retention model. Achieving this target will take a serious commitment to working closely with marginal students to help them succeed. Reducing the number of withdrawals and incompletes serves to increase efficiency of operations and reduce duplication of efforts. Specific strategies to improve course success are under development currently, but all will focus on better student-faculty relations within the classroom setting. Our current and unfolding focus on "Red Balloon" projects, supported by AASCU, will serve as the organizing strategy for achieving targets on this goal.

Comments (optional):

Foresight 2020 Goal 4: Ensure that students earning credentials and degrees across the higher education system possess the foundational skills essential for success in work and in life.				
Institutional Goal Improve Student Learning				
Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Improve student achievement on the Performance Task score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (direct measure)	2008 - 1171 2009 - 1125 2010 - 1160	2012 - 1171 2013 - 1191 2014 - 1211		
2. Improve student achievement on the Analytic Writing score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (direct measure)	2008 - 1211 2009 - 1160 2010 - 1190	2012 - 1206 2013 - 1226 2014 - 1246		
3. Increase the number of students successfully completing a undergraduate research project (direct measure)	2008 - 200 2009 - 250 2010 - 350	2012 - 400 2013 - 450 2014 - 500		
4. Increase participation in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course (indirect measure)	2008 - 50% 2009 - 50% 2010 - 49%	2012 - 51% 2013 - 52% 2014 - 53%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4(Title Only): Improve Student Learning

Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 1. Improve student achievement on the Performance Task score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (direct measure)

Data Collection: Performance Task index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

Targets: The 2014 target is based on 5% improvement over the three-year average baseline (1152) on the CLA Performance Task. The

CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment) is a nationally normed written examination focused on critical thinking, analysis, and writing ability administered to freshmen and seniors. FHSU has been involved in administration of the CLA, has significant resources invested in the Writing Center, and has recently created a Writing Intensive curriculum designation. Nonetheless, realizing a 5% improvement in student performance on this writing-based assessment will require continued adjustment of curriculum and dedication to the success of the Writing Center. NOTE: This goal aligns to the written communication and critical thinking foundational skills articulated in objective 4.1 of Foresight 2020.

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 2. Improve student achievement on the Analytic Writing score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (direct measure)

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

Targets: The 2014 target is based on 5% improvement over the three-year average baseline (1187). FHSU has been involved in administration of the CLA, has significant resources invested in the Writing Center, and has recently created a Writing Intensive curriculum designation. Nonetheless, realizing a 5% improvement in student performance on this writing-based assessment will require continued adjustment of curriculum and dedication to the success of the Writing Center. NOTE: This goal aligns to the written communication and critical thinking foundational skills articulated in objective 4.1 of Foresight 2020.

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 3. Increase the number of students successfully completing a undergraduate research project (direct measure)

Data Collection: Annual count of UG students completing research projects submitted through the Department Annual Report process

Targets: The 2014 target represents an increase of 100% over the three-year baseline (250). In 2008-2009, FHSU made a significant investment to incentivize undergraduate research activities through scholarships and faculty policies. Many departments have broadened focus from research at the graduate level towards requiring a research project for undergraduate majors. FHSU considers undergraduate research as one of the pillars of student success and engagement, thus a 100% increase will continue to stretch the campus in this important direction. NOTE: This goal aligns to the oral and written communication, technical and numerical literacy, and critical thinking and problem-solving foundational skills articulated in objective 4.1 of Foresight 2020.

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 4. Increase participation in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course (indirect measure)

Data Collection: Data will be provided from the annual administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), item 1k, of SR students answering sometimes, often, or very often to participation

Targets: The 2014 target is an increase of 6% performance improvement over the baseline (49.3%). FHSU has a long tradition of student involvement in community-based project participation. The NSSE measure is perhaps the most systematic means we have to track student involvement in community project-based learning experiences. The target of 53% is notably higher performance and will necessitate additional academic-focused strategies to achieve over the three year period. NOTE: This goal aligns to the critical thinking and problem-solving foundational skills articulated in objective 4.1 of Foresight 2020.

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments (optional):

Foresight 2020 Goal 5: Enhance alignment between the work of the state's higher education system and the needs of the Kansas economy.

Institutional Goal

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5(Title Only):

Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments (optional):

Foresight 2020 Goal 6: Enhance the regional and national reputation of Kansas universities through aspirational initiatives.				
Institutional Goal				
Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5(Title Only):

Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments (optional):

KBOR use only: Institution Name:
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement
Recommendation and Comments
561.09