

## Instructions for Completing the Performance Agreement Application and Reporting Form

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

1. Identify the **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR** (i.e. data) that will be used to determine progress toward goals. Be as specific and as succinct as possible. The key performance indicator (data) may be quantitative or qualitative.
2. Show the **BASELINE** value of the key performance indicator (data). The baseline means “where are you now?”
3. Show **TARGETS** for the next 3 years. Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) identified in the first column.
4. **PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES** must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) listed in the first column.
5. **AMOUNT OF DIRECTIONAL IMPROVEMENT** equals the difference between baseline and performance.
6. At least one institutional goal must support Regents’ System Goal B. Institutional goals must support two additional Regents’ System Goals selected from Regents’ System Goals A, C, and D.

### Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

1. **Institutional Goal 1:** List goal as succinctly as possible.

**Key Performance Indicator 1** (Data point 1): Identify the data to be collected as succinctly as possible. Use the same description that appears in the first column of the form.

**a. Data Collection:** Describe EXACTLY how the data for the key 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. This information is required. (Note: Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator/data. For example, if the key 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 only comments that are ESSENTIAL to understanding the goal. Comments are optional.

And so on up to six goals.

## Performance Agreement/Report

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

### Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

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

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Performance Task score from Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1049	FY2007 - 1084 FY2008 - 1120 FY2009 - 1156		
Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 2.50	FY2007 - 2.55 FY2008 - 2.60 FY2009 - 2.65		
Critical Thinking score from CLA (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1152	FY2007 - 1181 FY2008 - 1211 FY2009 - 1240		
Analytic Writing score from CLA (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 1163	FY2007 - 1192 FY2008 - 1221 FY2009 - 1250		
Writing clearly and effectively from NSSE (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 2.88	FY2007 - 2.93 FY2008 - 2.98 FY2009 - 3.03		

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

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

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

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

**Key Performance Indicator 2:** Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages from the National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) (Indirect measure)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In February 2006, FHSU attended our scheduled AQIP Strategy Forum. A result of that meeting was the declaration of five strategic goals for the university. Improving student's writing abilities was declared one of the five strategic priorities for the next three to four years. This is a new Performance Agreement goal. Please note that FHSU has submitted five KPIs from objective national norm-referenced assessments. Improvement against these benchmarks represents a significant challenge because many participating institutions use the measure for the same purpose - to advance against an improving national average. Both assessments represent "best of class" measurements, are well cited in the higher education literature, and commonly used by peer quality improvement institutions.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 2: Develop mobile learning environment				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement

Number of full-time faculty using mobile learning technology	FY2006 - 55	FY2007 - 115 FY2008 - 215 FY2009 - 300		
Percent of instructional and student life buildings with WiFi zone	FY2006 - 40%	FY2007 - 80% FY2008 - 90%		
Percent of students satisfied with WiFi infrastructure	FY2006 - Building baseline	FY2007 - 5% over baseline FY2008 - 8% over baseline FY2009 - 10% over baseline		
Using computers in academic work from NSSE	FY2006 - 3.57	FY2007 - 3.62 FY2008 - 3.66 FY2009 - 3.70		
Number of operational WiFi access points in academic buildings	FY2005 - 110	FY2007 - 225 (fully deployed) FY2008 - KPI retired		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In February 2006, FHSU attended our scheduled AQIP Strategy Forum. A result of that meeting was the declaration of five strategic goals for the university. Developing the mobile learning environment was declared one of the five strategic priorities for the next three to four years. This goal is continued from last year's Performance Agreement but re-classified as a workforce development goal to more accurately describe the impact on the university and our students. This reclassification is consistent with results from strategic planning.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of FHSU and partner faculty visiting foreign campuses	FY2006 - 23	FY2007 - 26 FY2008 - 29 FY2009 - 32		
Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming	FY2006 - 54	FY2007 - 56 FY2008 - 59 FY2009 - 62		
Number of international students attending FHSU campus	FY2006 - 128	FY2007 - 132 FY2008 - 136 FY2009 - 141		
Number of students enrolled in the International Studies minor	FY2006 - 0	FY2007 - 5 FY2008 - 12 FY2009 - 20		
Number of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE	FY2006 - 38	FY2007 - 40 FY2008 - 42 FY2009 - 44		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In February 2006, FHSU attended our scheduled AQIP Strategy Forum. A result of that meeting was the declaration of five strategic goals for the university. Internationalize the campus and curriculum was declared one of the five strategic priorities for the next three to four years. This is a new Performance Agreement goal.

<b>Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 4: Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities around the Kansas Turnpike and our service area</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Number of first-time freshmen (FTF) admitted from Turnpike corridor counties	FY2006 - 32	FY2007 - 40 FY2008 - 50 FY2009 - 64		
Number of FTF enrolled from Turnpike	FY2006 - 17	FY2007 - 21		

corridor counties		FY2008 - 28 FY2009 - 35		
Number of Hispanic students served from the FHSU service area	FY2006 - 156	FY2007 - 162 FY2008 - 170 FY2009 - 179		
Number of Kansas resident Hispanic students served	FY2006 - 187	FY2007 - 196 FY2008 - 206 FY2009 - 216		
Number of Hispanic students enrolled	FY2006 - 285	FY2007 - 299 FY2008 - 314 FY2009 - 328		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In February 2006, FHSU attended our scheduled AQIP Strategy Forum. A result of that meeting was the declaration of five strategic goals for the university. Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities was declared one of the five strategic priorities for the next three to four years. This goal is continued from last year's Performance Agreement, but broadened to more accurately describe the expected impact on the university.

<b>Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes</b>				
<b>Institutional Goal 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing</b>				
<b>Key Performance Indicator (Data)</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Performance Outcome</b>	<b>Amount of Directional Improvement</b>
Post-test score on computer concepts (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 67%	FY2007 - 69% FY2008 - 71% FY2009 - 73%		
Post-test score on word processing (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 85%	FY2007 - 88% FY2008 - 90% FY2009 - 93%		
Post-test score on spreadsheets (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 65%	FY2007 - 67% FY2008 - 69% FY2009 - 71%		
Post-test score on database (Direct measure)	FY2006 - 57%	FY2007 - 59% FY2008 - 61% FY2009 - 63%		
Using computers in academic work from NSSE (Indirect measure)	FY2006 - 3.34	FY2007 - 3.34 FY2008 - 3.38 FY2009 - 3.42		

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Comments:** In February 2006, FHSU attended our scheduled AQIP Strategy Forum. A result of that meeting was the declaration of five strategic goals for the university. Improving student learner outcomes in computing was declared one of the five strategic priorities for the next three to four years. This is a new Performance Agreement goal.

**NOTE:** Historically, FHSU has used a local examination to measure student learning improvement. This fall we are slated to participate in the ICT (Information and Computer Technology) Literacy Exam which offers more robust norm-referenced data. Future iterations of this goal will likely contain ICT Literacy subscales as KPIs in conjunction with a revised local examination.

Regents System Goal Select One				
Institutional Goal 6: NA				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement


**NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6:**

**Key Performance Indicator 1:**

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Key Performance Indicator 2:**

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Key Performance Indicator 3:**

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Key Performance Indicator 4:**

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Key Performance Indicator 5:**

**Data Collection:**

**Targets:**

**Comments:**

<b>KBOR use only: Institution Name:</b>
<b>Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement</b>
<b>Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement</b>

<b>Recommendation and Comments</b>