

## Performance Report

<b>Institution: Fort Hays State University</b>	Contact Person: Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-628-4531	Date: 07/15/2007
------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------

### Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

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

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
Performance Task score from Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1171	2008 - 1190 2009 - 1210 2010 - 1230	1116	No directional improvement
Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Indirect measure)	2004 - 2.49 2005 - 2.31 2006 - 2.50	2008 - 2.58 2009 - 2.62 2010 - 2.65	2.37	No directional improvement
Critical Thinking score from CLA (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1216	2008 - 1236 2009 - 1256 2010 - 1276	1151	No directional improvement
Analytic Writing score from CLA (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1198	2008 - 1218 2009 - 1238 2010 - 1258	1126	No directional improvement
Writing clearly and effectively from NSSE (Indirect measure)	2004 - 2.88 2005 - 2.82 2006 - 2.92	2008 - 2.95 2009 - 2.98 2010 - 3.00	2.97	Directional improvement

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

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

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Performance Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of FHSU seniors (1171) for the 2006-2007 administration.

**Targets:** Targets represents 5% growth over the next three years. Improvement of this level on a national norm-referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

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

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

**Targets:** Target represents a 6% improvement over baseline.

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

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Critique an Argument Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of FHSU seniors (1216) for the 2006-2007 administration.

**Targets:** Targets represents 5% growth over the next three years. Improvement of this level on a national norm-referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

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

**Data Collection:** Mean score for seniors completing Collegiate Learning Assessment on the Make an Argument Task measure. FHSU has established a baseline by taking the mean score of FHSU seniors (1198) for the 2006-2007 administration.

**Targets:** Targets represents 5% growth over the next three years. Improvement of this level on a national norm-referenced exam is substantial, as is noted below.

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

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

**Targets:** Target represents a 3% growth over current levels.

**Comments:** This is truly an example of how goal creation and performance measurement can reveal the need for continuous improvement. Performance on this goal in 2008 did not meet expectations in 4 of the 5 key performance indicators. This goal was our designated "learner outcomes" goal. KPI 1, 3, and 4 were all derived from our implementation of the Collegiate Learning Assessment exam. Because FHSU has had limited experience with this assessment tool having only used it for one year prior to this 2008 performance agreement, it was necessary to infer performance levels and chart scores. In 2007 FHSU charted "above average" performance in the use of the CLA. However, 2008 performance was far below what was noted for 2007 as is displayed above. Our philosophy in testing of SR students has been to take a sample of graduates across all the colleges. In 2008 we included a disproportionate number of graduates from majors that did not have an opportunity to take writing intensive courses in their curriculum. In a special analysis, if these graduates were removed from the sample performance was actually much better and met the targeted performance outcome on 2 of the 3 KPIs for the CLA. Performance on KPI 2 and 5 was taken from NSSE and the results were mixed with KPI 2 not meeting the expected target and KPI 5 exceeding the target. Further analysis of this data suggests that in the area of writing overall students reported greater emphasis on writing, but not in particular in the area of mid-length papers as the KPI specifies. To improve performance in the area of writing, FHSU will more closely examine the solutions in our "Writing Across the Curriculum" initiative and more aggressively implement the solutions on a faster schedule. Specifically, our plans to apply a rubric-based evaluation of student writing within general education combined with benchmark writing analysis of FR, SO, JR, and SR students will be implemented this year. These additional solutions will prove to be more costly and difficult to implement given the current budget constraints, so solutions with a greater probability of success will be considered and implemented before other more costly changes.

**Regents System Goal Institutional Goal**

<b>Institutional Goal 2: Develop mobile learning environment</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Percent of full-time faculty using mobile learning technology	2004 - 15% 2005 - 32% 2006 - 68%	2008 - 90% 2009 - 95% 2010 - 100%	95%	Directional improvement
Percent of instructional and student life buildings with WiFi zone	2004 - 0% 2005 - 10% 2006 - 40%	2008 - 80% 2009 - 95% 2010 - 100%	100%	Directional improvement
Percent of students satisfied with WiFi infrastructure	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 56%	2008 - 67% 2009 - 75% 2010 - 90%	71%	Directional improvement
Using computers in academic work from NSSE	2004 - 3.29 2005 - 3.34 2006 - 3.57	2008 - 3.62 2009 - 3.67 2010 - 3.71	3.53	No directional improvement
Annual usage of mobile tablets	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 9308	2008 - 11500 2009 - 13000 2010 - 14000	13990	Directional improvement

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

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

**Data Collection:** Total percent of full-time faculty receiving tablet/laptop technology through annual action plan process (three-year replacement cycle).

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

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

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

**Targets:** Target is 100% saturation of student use and academic buildings.

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

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

**Targets:** Target documents 90% satisfaction with the WiFi network. This mirrors industry best practice.

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

**Data Collection:** Mean score on NSSE item 11g for seniors (Response to: To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your

knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?"). Scores range from 4 (very much) to 1 (very little).

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

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Annual usage of mobile tablets**

**Data Collection:** Annual number of logons for all tablets available on mobile carts.

**Targets:** Target represents 50% growth over 2006 usage.

**Comments:** Performance on this goal in 2008 exceeded expectations on KPI 1, 2, 3, and 5 and did not meet the target on KPI 4. Overall, performance on this goal was notably positive. In further analysis, the one KPI that did not meet the target did appear to be close to prior performance (actually above 2 of the 3 years of performance history). Given the success in this goal, FHSU has determined that the objectives of the campus-wide tablet implementation have been met and the goal has been retired in the next performance agreement.

<b>Regents System Goal Institutional Goal</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 3: Internationalize the campus and curriculum</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Number of FHSU and partner faculty visiting foreign campuses	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 23	2008 - 29 2009 - 32 2010 - 35	33	Directional improvement
Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming	2004 - 25 2005 - 31 2006 - 54	2008 - 57 2009 - 60 2010 - 62	59	Directional improvement
Number of international students attending FHSU campus	2004 - 160 2005 - 142 2006 - 134	2008 - 200 2009 - 250 2010 - 300	271	Directional improvement
Percent of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE	2004 - 21% 2005 - 21% 2006 - 14%	2008 - 22% 2009 - 25% 2010 - 28%	19%	No directional improvement

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

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

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

**Targets:** Target of 50% increase represents a significant advance in faculty exchange and increase in requisite fiscal commitment.

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

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

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

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

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

**Targets:** The 2010 target represents more than 100% improvement over current level of international students participating in campus-based education.

**Key Performance Indicator 4: Percent of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE.**

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

**Targets:** 2010 target represents a double in the percent of students planning to study abroad from 2006. Motivating student interest in an activity as time and resource intensive as study abroad is challenging.

**Comments:** Performance in the area of internationalization of the FHSU campus had notable successes in 2008. FHSU exceeded three of the four key performance indicators in this area. Specifically, FHSU improved performance in the number of faculty involved in exchange with an international partner institution, the number of students participating in study abroad activities, and an increase in the number of international students enrolled. In fact, the only performance metric that did not meet target was from NSSE where FR students indicate if they have a desire to engage in study abroad activity. On this indicator, performance was slightly below the historic baseline, largely assumed because of lack of FR information on study abroad. While the direct performance indicators are tracking positive, we are still interested in raising the awareness of FR students in this area. Additional marketing of study abroad events will be created aimed at attracting more FR interest. In addition, the current scholarship structure will be reviewed to assure that it is meeting the objectives of the performance agreement.

<b>Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 4: Strategically manage on-campus enrollment opportunities</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Number of students enrolled on-campus	2004 - 4723 2005 - 4534 2006 - 4502 2007 - 4433	2008 - 4522 2009 - 4610 2010 - 4699	4303	No directional improvement
Number of FTF enrolled from Turnpike corridor counties	2004 - 73 2005 - 85 2006 - 67	2008 - 75 2009 - 87 2010 - 100	97	Directional improvement
Number of students enrolled from out-of-state	2004 - 432 2005 - 413 2006 - 457	2008 - 472 2009 - 487 2010 - 503	510	Directional improvement

Number of Kansas resident Hispanic students enrolled	2004 - 148 2005 - 171 2006 - 187	2008 - 196 2009 - 205 2010 - 215	203	Directional improvement
Number of students enrolled through contiguous states tuition model	2004 - 313 2005 - 311 2006 - 351	2008 - 375 2009 - 398 2010 - 421	406	Directional improvement

**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Strategically manage on-campus enrollment opportunities**

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of students enrolled on-campus**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of students enrolled in on-campus classes (Fall, 20<sup>th</sup> day).

**Targets:** Target represents 2% growth annually for an enrollment trend that has been diminishing. Baseline was established by adding 2% to the Fall 2007 20<sup>th</sup> day enrollment number of 4433.

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

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

**Targets:** 2010 target represents 50% growth in FTF enrolled from this area over the three year period. The university has committed extensive financial resources to strategically position our programs in the area.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of students enrolled from out-of-state**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of students enrolled paying out-of-state tuition and taking classes on-campus.

**Targets:** Final year target represents an increase of 10% over current levels, realizing this increase has required substantial upgrades in scholarships and personnel.

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

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

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

**Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of students enrolled through contiguous states tuition model**

**Data Collection:** Report of the number of on-campus students enrolling from Colorado, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Missouri.

**Targets:** 2010 target represents an increase of 20% over current levels.

**Comments:** In 2008 FHSU reports improvement in four of the five key performance indicators related to the strategic management of on-campus enrollment. The one KPI that was not met in 2008 was a decline in the number of on-campus students, missing the target by over 200 students.

FHSU did enjoy improvement in the number of first-time FR students enrolled from the Turnpike Corridor, the number of on-campus students enrolled from out-of-state, the number of Kansas resident Hispanic students, and the number of students enrolled through our contiguous states model. Given the scope of variables that comprise student choice in attending campus it is difficult to determine specific causal factors that are influencing student choice in attending campus. Three reasons appear to have some level of probability: continued population decline in western Kansas, larger number of competitors (including online educators) that are cutting into our tradition base of students, and lower than expected retention of students from fall to fall enrollment periods. In 2008, further actions were taken to avert the continued slip of on-campus students. Specifically, the scholarship program was renovated providing better awards to meritorious students while still providing some limited award to students based on interest and program. In addition, FHSU continues to vigorously explore the potential of attracting students from the southwest (TX, MN, AZ) to attending campus through aggressive scholarshiping. Finally, FHSU has completed work on a retention study that serves as the basis for strategy in addressing retention issues.

<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>3-Year Performance History</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>
Percent of peer on information access and evaluation score on iSkills Exam (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - NA	2008 - 100% 2009 - 103% 2010 - 105%	93%	No directional improvement
Percvent of peer on information utilization and communication score on iSkills Exam (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - NA	2008 - 100% 2009 - 103% 2010 - 105%	96%	No directional improvement
Post-test score on computer concepts and word processing (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 76%	2008 - 78% 2009 - 81% 2010 - 84%	69%	No directional improvement
Post-test score on spreadsheets and database (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 61%	2008 - 63% 2009 - 65% 2010 - 67%	68%	Directional improvement
Using computers in academic work from NSSE (Indirect measure)	2004 - 3.57 2005 - 3.48 2006 - 3.55	2008 - 3.58 2009 - 3.62 2010 - 3.66	3.53	No directional improvement

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

**Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of peer on information access and evaluation score on iSkills Exam (Direct measure)**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from average of students completing iSkills examination on combined define, access, and evaluate subscales compared to peer reference group.

**Targets:** Target represents a significant improvement over an improving reference group. Target is 105% of peer group average on the same

subscales

**Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of peer on information utilization and communication score on iSkills Exam (Direct measure)**

**Data Collection:** Data collected from average of students completing iSkills examination on combined manage, integrate, create, and communicate subscales compared to peer reference group.

**Targets:** Target represents a significant improvement over an improving reference group. Target is 105% of peer group average on the same subscales.

**Key Performance Indicator 3: Post-test score on computer concepts and word processing (Direct measure)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In the area of improving student learning in computing, FHSU did not meet targeted performance in four of the five key performance indicators. Specifically, FHSU students did not perform as well as expected on the national norm-referenced iSkills assessment, which were used as two of the five performance indicators on this goal. In addition, on our internal pre-test post-test assessment, students did not perform as expected on computer concepts and word processing. Finally, FHSU has long used the NSSE as a means of gauging student use of computers in academic work. Our performance on this metric was consistent with past performance, but did not meet the target threshold. It is difficult to attribute cause to the poor performance on the iSkills assessment, but anecdotal evidence suggests that the lack of incentive is a major contributor. In the area of computer concepts and word processing, it is unclear why there was a drop in performance, but additional research is being conducted and the course is still considered an "ongoing" project. Future plans to attain the performance indicators on this goal include consideration of nominal incentives for students participating in systematic institutional assessment activities. In addition, further alignment between the curriculum of the CIS 101 class and the iSkills assessment is occurring. To address the flat performance related to NSSE, additional marketing efforts to increase the number of students participating in NSSE may help, but more focused education about NSSE in computing intensive classes will be solicited among those faculty.

**Board comments on the approved performance agreement**

Staff is concerned about the weakness of the links between an enrollment goal (goal 4) and underserved populations. It is a contradiction in terms to assert that all on-campus students represent an underserved population. No data are provided to support the claim that turnpike corridor residents or out-of-state residents are underserved.

Staff is also concerned about the weakness of the link between mobile learning environment (goal 2) and workforce development. Regents System Goal C reads, "Institutions will improve career preparation, job placement, and life-long learning activities to better reflect the current and emerging needs of the state." Staff does not see a direct and convincing link to the goal of developing a mobile learning environment.

In light of the absence of baseline data, goal 5 is premature.

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement, with the understanding that the next agreement will address the above comments.

**Recommendation and Comments**