

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 **THREE YEAR PERFORMANCE HISTORY**, i.e., value of the key performance indicator (data) for December 31, 2006, 2005, and 2004, if available.
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. **EVALUATION** of performance, i.e., target met, target not met, directional improvement, etc.
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.
7. The narrative should not repeat information in the table. Instead, the narrative should provide explanation of anything in the table that may not be obvious to the reader. If applicable, the narrative should also describe any circumstances that prevented the institution from making directional improvement and future plans for improving performance.

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

Institution: Fort Hays State University	Contact Person: Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-628-4531	Date: 08/16/2007
--	--	--------------------------------------	------------------

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) 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)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 1049	2008 - 1103 2009 - 1130 2010 - 1156		
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		
Critical Thinking score from CLA (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 1152	2008 - 1196 2009 - 1218 2010 - 1240		
Analytic Writing score from CLA (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 1163	2008 - 1207 2009 - 1229 2010 - 1250		
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		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1(Title Only): Improve undergraduate student's writing abilities

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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: 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 four years. 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. FHSU has estimated a baseline at one standard deviation below the mean due to repeated NSSE findings that suggest that our freshmen and senior students are not well prepared in the area of written communications and critical thinking. 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 (Click on Arrow to view selections) C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 2: Develop mobile learning environment				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation

	History			
Percent of full-time faculty using mobile learning technology	2004 - 15% 2005 - 32% 2006 - 68%	2008 - 90% 2009 - 95% 2010 - 100%		
Percent of instructional and student life buildings with WiFi zone	2004 - 0% 2005 - 10% 2006 - 40%	2008 - 80% 2009 - 95% 2010 - 100%		
Percent of students satisfied with WiFi infrastructure	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 56%	2008 - 59% 2009 - 64% 2010 - 67%		
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		
Annual usage of mobile tablets	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 9308	2008 - 11500 2009 - 13000 2010 - 14000		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): Develop mobile learning environment

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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 20% improvement over the reporting period.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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: 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 four years. This goal is continued from last year's Performance Agreement when it was reclassified 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 where improvement of computing/technical skills were seen as highly beneficial to the long-term competitiveness of a Kansas workforce.

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 3: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
Number of FHSU and partner faculty visiting foreign campuses	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 23	2008 - 29 2009 - 32 2010 - 35		
Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming	2004 - 25 2005 - 31 2006 - 54	2008 - 57 2009 - 60 2010 - 62		
Number of international students attending FHSU campus	2004 - 160 2005 - 142 2006 - 134	2008 - 167 2009 - 200 2010 - 235		
Number of freshmen planning to study abroad from NSSE	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 38	2008 - 43 2009 - 46 2010 - 49		
NA	NA	NA		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): Internationalize the campus and curriculum

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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 a 75% improvement over current level of international students participating in campus-based education.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 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: 2010 target represents a 30% 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.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): NA

Data Collection:

Targets:

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 four years. While this goal might be classified as a "Improve Student Learning Outcomes" goal, the designation of "Institutional Goal" is retained given the broader objectives.

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 4: Strategically manage on-campus enrollment opportunities				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
Number of students enrolled on-campus	2004 - 5775 2005 - 5650 2006 - 5395	2008 - 5400 2009 - 5400 2010 - 5400		
Number of FTF enrolled from Turnpike corridor counties	2004 - 73 2005 - 85	2008 - 73 2009 - 80		

	2006 - 67	2010 - 87		
Number of students enrolled from out-of-state	2004 - 432 2005 - 413 2006 - 457	2008 - 472 2009 - 487 2010 - 503		
Number of Kansas resident Hispanic students enrolled	2004 - 148 2005 - 171 2006 - 187	2008 - 196 2009 - 205 2010 - 215		
Number of students enrolled through contiguous states tuition model	2004 - 313 2005 - 311 2006 - 351	2008 - 363 2009 - 375 2010 - 386		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4(Title Only): Strategically manage on-campus enrollment opportunities

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Number of students enrolled on-campus

Data Collection: Report of the number of students enrolled in on-campus classes annually.

Targets: Target represents a maintenance of enrollment trend that has been diminishing.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 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 over 30% growth in FTF enrolled from this area. The university has committed extensive financial resources to strategically position our programs in the area.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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 10% over current levels.

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 four years. This goal is continued from last year's Performance Agreement, but broadened to more accurately describe the expected impact on the university. the underserved population, in this goal, refers to three distinct market segments: traditional on-campus student base, hispanic students, and Turnpike corridor students. Each of the three market bases have been identified as critical areas of focus, each for a different reason. The health of our campus is assured by having a stable and growing on-campus traditional student base. However, as the number of high school graduates decline in our service area, our strategy of enrollment growth will necessarily give way to a strategy of maintenance and expansion into contiguous states. At the same time that our traditional student market is being threatened, FHSU is presented with a unique challenge in our service area - serving the underserved and growing hispanic population. Finally, FHSU identified an underserved target market in the Turnpike corridor region where FHSU can better serve students with interests consistent with some of our innovative degree programs.

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
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%		
Percent 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%		
Post-test score on computer concepts and word processing (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 76%	2008 - 78% 2009 - 81% 2010 - 84%		
Post-test score on spreadsheets and database (Direct measure)	2004 - NA 2005 - NA 2006 - 61%	2008 - 63% 2009 - 65% 2010 - 67%		
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		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5(Title Only): Improve student learner outcomes in computing

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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(Title Only): 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 four years. FHSU has committed to the use of the ETS iSkills exam (formerly known as the ICT Literacy Exam). FHSU has not used the iSkills exam and therefore does not include baseline data. Our peer group, for the purposes of the iSkills exam, is all 4 year colleges as ETS does not allow for greater granularity in establishing peer groups. Baseline data is not available for the local exam due to the substantially revised nature of the course - all exams would have been for the old curriculum.

Institutional Goal 6:				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6(Title Only):

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

Targets:

Comments:

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