

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, 2007, 2006, and 2005, if available. If the key performance indicator is an average, be sure to show the appropriate average for each of the past three years.
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 or no directional improvement.
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 for the performance report should also describe any circumstances that prevented the institution from making directional improvement and specific future plans for improving performance.

Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

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

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Data point 1): Identify the data to be collected using 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, so absolutely no doubt exists as to how the data are calculated. When appropriate, indicate the range of scores (as in a survey or standardized test).

b. 3-year Performance History: Indicate whether these values represent relatively low, average, or strong performance. Comparison to state or national data will be useful.

c. 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 comments that are **ESSENTIAL** to understanding the goal. A layperson should be able to understand the goal, its implications, and its significance.

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; ccrawfor@fhsu.edu and lgould@fhsu.edu	Date: July 15, 2008
--	--	---	---------------------

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access

Institutional Goal 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1.1 Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled	2005 - 171 2006 - 187 2007 - 239	2009 - 252 2010 - 266 2011 - 279		
1.2 Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 54.5% 2006 - 57.9% 2007 - 53.8%	2009 - 55.7% 2010 - 57.5% 2011 - 59.3%		
1.3 Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 28.6% 2006 - 36.3% 2007 - 20.0%	2009 - 29.0% 2010 - 30.0% 2011 - 31.0%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1(Title Only): Increase access and retention for Hispanic students

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 1.1 Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled

Data Collection: Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled annually

3-Year Performance History: It is difficult to determine prior performance relative to other institutions or demographic groups given the uniqueness of the target population. Clearly performance has increased over the past three years, but determining the market saturation point for this target demographic is impossible to gauge. To gain on this important goal, FHSU revised three primary institutional strategies. First, FHSU hired a full-time recruiter to focus on this population demographic. Second, FHSU built a scholarship model specific to Hispanic students graduating from Kansas high schools. Finally, FHSU opened an ancillary store-front in Garden City charged jointly with assisting new FR students as well as enrolling new Virtual College students.

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 20% over the three-year average baseline (199). FHSU is likely to have continued state-wide appeal to this target population due to our strategy of "Affordable Success" and workforce development programs. Building a successful strategy for the Hispanic population has taken years, but FHSU continues to make progress on serving this student demographic that is concentrated

in our geographic service area. An increase of 20% requires a significant institutional commitment of personnel, scholarships, and operating expenses.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 1.2 Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students

Data Collection: Percent of FT/FT FR Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students retained fall-to-fall

3-Year Performance History: Performance on this indicator has not been consistent for the three prior years which clearly attests to the difficulty of moving retention-focused measurements. In a quick review of IPEDS data of peer institutions, it is common to have lower retention of targeted demographic groups. Across the last three years, the spread of difference has been between 10 and 20%. The difference at FHSU has been consistently around 10% lower than retention of traditional demographic students (67% retention for all FT/FT FR students, 55.4% retention for FT/FT FR Hispanic students).

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the average of the last three years. Impacting retention rates is difficult, and a change of 10% may well take years to accomplish. Institutionally, FHSU retains about 70% of all FT/FT FR students. Bringing the retention rate up for the Hispanic segment is important to increasing the overall institutional retention benchmark. While enrollment is impacted most by input considerations (recruitment, enrollment, and financial aid processes), increased retention comes from personalized advising and success in the classroom. These factors are much more difficult to effectively coordinate.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 1.3 Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students

Data Collection: Percent of Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students graduating within five years

3-Year Performance History: The three year performance record shows wide variation with a low of 20% and peaking at 36%. Swings in performance history occur when relatively small numbers of students are partitioned off for analysis. As larger numbers of students are included in the cohort group, the graduation rate should stabilize. Across the three years, the average graduation rate for this demographic is 28%. Assumably, this average should be realized as more students are included in the cohort.

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the average of the last three years. Impacting graduation rates is even more difficult than impacting retention rates. As an institution, FHSU graduates about 32% of the FT/FT FR cohort within five years. However, graduation rates for our Hispanic student segment is lower. In order to have a long-term impact on that population demographic, FHSU must have a strategic effort to increase graduation rates.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 2: Increase the quantity and quality of K-12 teachers educated				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
2.1 Number of candidates enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program	2005 - 0 2006 - 57 2007 - 108	2009 - 140 2010 - 170 2011 - 200		
2.2 Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA)	2006 - 77.8% 2007 - 87.4%	2009 - 88.2% 2010 - 89.1% 2011 - 89.9%		
2.3 Number of districts benefitting from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program	2005 - 0 2006 - 14 2007 - 49	2009 - 60 2010 - 70 2011 - 80		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2(Title Only): Increase the quantity and quality of K-12 teachers educated

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 2.1 Number of candidates enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

Data Collection: Annual count of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

3-Year Performance History: The Transition to Teaching program is relatively new. Having just been implemented in 2004-2005, the program has grown to over 100 students in two years. No data is available prior to 2004 due to the non-existence of the program and students meeting the criteria of the current program would have been redirected back into the traditional BS in Education program.

Target: The target represents near estimated full program capacity given demand for this sector. The current enrollment of 108 stretches the limits of existing personnel. In order to achieve the target of 200, additional staff and infrastructure will be required. Given the popularity of the program, the balance between serving the needs of adult learners and program optimization will be challenging to effectively moderate.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 2.2 Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA)

Data Collection: Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA). The FPA is an assessment given to all

seniors graduating with teaching credentials. The FPA is a 113-point rubric-based assessment evaluated by education unit members. The assessment is given at the end of every semester and has been given in its current form since 2005-2006.

3-Year Performance History: Percentage of students passing the FPA at a 88 has averaged 82% over the last two year reporting period. Recent performance indicates that 87% of students pass the FPA at a cut-rate of 88 points or higher. Prior data is not available on this indicator since assessment data prior to 2005 was based on a 100 point FPA scaling rather than the current 113 point assessment instrument.

Targets: The cut-point of 88 for the FPA was chosen for consistency with the KSDE requirement. The final target of 89.9% was based on a 3% improvement strategy for student performance. An increase of this level is consistent with NCATE and KSDE expectations for continued accreditation.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 2.3 Number of districts benefitting from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

Data Collection: Annual count of the number of school districts placing graduates from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

3-Year Performance History: Performance history on this indicator is based on the two most recent years data. In just two years, FHSU was able to place graduates of the Transition to Teaching program in 49 school districts. These numbers do not tell the whole story, however. A number of these school districts place graduates that have an interest in staying in western Kansas in high priority areas (STEM, for example).

Targets: In three years, FHSU seeks to place Transition to Teaching graduates in 80 districts across the state. Again, many of the districts served by this program are located in areas not likely to attract traditional new teachers given geographic remoteness. Serving these high need areas will continue to challenge the Transition to Teaching program, but overall impact of the program is largely measured by FHSU's ability to address needs in underserved areas.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) B: Improve Learner Outcomes
Institutional Goal 3: Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
3.1 Performance Task index score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1171	2009 - 1183 2010 - 1195 2011 - 1206		
3.2 Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1211	2009 - 1223 2010 - 1235 2011 - 1247		
3.3 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - 55% 2007 - 52%	2009 - 55% 2010 - 58% 2011 - 60%		
3.4 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on spreadsheets and databases at 70% or greater (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - 64% 2007 - 63%	2009 - 67% 2010 - 70% 2011 - 73%		
3.5 Improvement from pre-test to post-test in College Algebra (Direct measure)	2005 - 14.41 2006 - 14.72 2007 - 13.77	2009 - 14.01 2010 - 14.25 2011 - 14.49		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 3.1 Performance Task index score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Critical Thinking index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

3-Year Performance History: FHSU first participated in the Collegiate Learning Assessment in the 2006-2007 cycle. Results of this administration supported the conclusion that our graduates are average writers. The CLA is a national assessment of FR and SR students writing, critical thinking, and analysis skills. Our performance is norm-referenced against other institutions and factors out performance relative measures like retention and abilities at college entrance to validate the actual value added of an institution's instruction. Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1016 (25th percentile) to a high scale estimate of 1320 (75th percentile).

Targets: The three year target represents a 3% improvement over 2007 performance. Improvement against national norm-referenced indicators requires significant institutional effort. FHSU continues to commit substantial resources to the "Writing Across the Curriculum" initiative and Writing Center. In addition, FHSU faculty continue to integrate writing intensive assignments into general education and program-level curriculum in order to improve the writing effectiveness of our graduates.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 3.2 Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)

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

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

Targets: See comments on prior KPI target.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 3.3 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Percent of students passing post-tests on computer concepts and word processing in the Introduction to Computing class at the 70% cut score or higher

3-Year Performance History: In 2005 faculty teaching the Introduction to Computing class completely refocused the course on learning outcomes that were determined to be critical to the success of our graduates. At this time the assessment models were also completely reviewed and adapted to the new learning outcomes. Since that time student performance has been tracked on the basis of pre-test and post-test scoring to determine course efficacy. Performance history over the past 2 years has shown that about 54% of students pass the post-test on concepts and word processing at a score of 70% or greater.

Targets: As the new curriculum is implemented and adjustments are made to the pedagogy, performance improvement should occur. FHSU made a major commitment of resources to the project during the refocusing effort. The three year target established is for students to have a 15% increase in the number of students passing the post-test at a 70% cut score or greater. Performance gains at 5% annual improvement are attainable in the short-term. However, gains at this rate for the long-term are not possible or desirable given ever-present concerns of grade inflation and course rigor. Additionally, FHSU students already perform above peer as is noted through our participation in the ETS iSkills assessment where students perform at 103% of national peers.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 3.4 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on spreadsheets and databases at 70% or greater (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Percent of students passing post-tests on computer concepts and word processing in the Introduction to Computing class at the 70% cut score or higher

3-Year Performance History: See comments on prior KPI performance history.

Targets: See comments on prior KPI target.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 3.5 Improvement from pre-test to post-test in College Algebra (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Improvement from pre-test to post-test in College Algebra

3-Year Performance History: Faculty teaching College Algebra have been conducting pre- and post-test analyses for over 10 years in an effort to document student learning. Over the three year performance history, the pre-test average was 15.02 and the post-test average was 29.35, for an average improvement score of 14.33 on their instrument. Pre- and post-test scores are aggregated at the course level.

Targets: The three year target established attempts to improve performance by 5%. Movement of this indicator can occur only through improved

pedagogy. Like Calculus, College Algebra is a foundational course for general education at FHSU. Performance improvement on this indicator suggests that our students will be much better prepared to enter the workforce upon graduation.

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
4.1 Number of users of the Wellness Center	2005 - 21434 2006 - 23305 2007 - 26382	2009 - 40000 2010 - 50000 2011 - 60000		
4.2 Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 80% 2010 - 85% 2011 - 90%		
4.3 Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b)	2005 - 52% 2006 - 52% 2007 - 51%	2009 - 53% 2010 - 55% 2011 - 57%		
4.4 Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%		
4.5 Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4(Title Only): Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 4.1 Number of users of the Wellness Center

Data Collection: Annual count of FHSU faculty, staff, students, and cardholders using the Wellness Center.

3-Year Performance History: Utilization of the Wellness Center has been tracked since it opened in the 1990s. Annual usage has averaged 23707 users over the last three years. In 2007 the Wellness Center was completely renovated in an effort to update equipment and expand the square footage of the facility.

Targets: Last year FHSU conducted a complete renovation of the Wellness Center to update equipment and expand the facility. It is expected that utilization of the facility will double over the short-term, then stabilize based on hours available and amount of machines accessible. The university invested nearly \$500,000 in equipment and expansion, and further improvements are expected (enhanced "card" tracking system, additional

machines, staffing).

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 4.2 Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming

Data Collection: Annual survey of campus stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, cardholders) with percentage responding satisfaction or strong satisfaction with health screening and educational programming.

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

Targets: FHSU has estimated that 90% of stakeholders will be satisfied with health screening and educational programming related to physical wellness on campus within the three year time parameter.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 4.3 Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b)

Data Collection: Percent of SR students completing NSSE Item 6b (Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities) with a response of "often" or "very often".

3-Year Performance History: FHSU has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement since 2001. Performance history on this indicator suggests that about 52% (based on a three year average) of SR students engage in physical fitness activities at least "often". This level of performance is comparable to the larger NSSE population (53% in 2007).

Targets: Expansion of the Wellness Center and an institutional focus on physical wellness is expected to have residual impact on student participation in wellness activities. Moving performance on this indicator will require information sharing and marketing and will likely have a more immediate effect on FR students rather than SR students.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 4.4 Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures

Data Collection: Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a faculty/staff group.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: The three year goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies document the impact of fitness improvement for overall productivity of an organization.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 4.5 Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures

Data Collection: Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a student group.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: The three year goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies

document the impact of fitness improvement in students. Students improve their ability to learn and be successful in the collegiate environment if a fitness component is implemented.

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 5: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
5.1 Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships	2006 - 23 2007 - 40	2009 - 44 2010 - 48 2011 - 53		
5.2 Number of international faculty development grants awarded	2005 - 0 2006 - 0 2007 - 0	2009 - 3 2010 - 7 2011 - 10		
5.3 Number of international students enrolled on-campus	2006 - 128 2007 - 231	2009 - 300 2010 - 360 2011 - 411		
5.4 Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience	2006 - 54 2007 - 76	2009 - 87 2010 - 98 2011 - 109		
5.5 Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College	2006 - 2349 2007 - 2290	2009 - 2358 2010 - 2397 2011 - 2436		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5(Title Only): Internationalize the campus and curriculum

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): 5.1 Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships

Data Collection: Total number of faculty members coming to FHSU or traveling to partner campuses with expressed purpose of providing education.

3-Year Performance History: Since FHSU began tracking this KPI in 2006, the average baseline performance is 31.5 faculty engaged in international collaboration.

Targets: Target of 40% increase over the average baseline represents a significant advance in faculty exchange and increase in requisite fiscal commitment. Considering that each faculty member traveling abroad for FHSU represents at least a \$2500 investment (not accounting for time), the resources required to mount a large improvement in this area increases quickly. It is has long been our experience that faculty must be comfortable with other cultures to successfully teach international students, and the final target represents nearly 20% annual participation of FHSU faculty. Furthermore, given the current state budget constraints maintaining programs like faculty development become more difficult to commit to given the strain on OOE.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): 5.2 Number of international faculty development grants awarded

Data Collection: Total number of faculty successfully applying for and receiving the international faculty development grant.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: In 2007-2008 FHSU made a strategic commitment to better fund faculty international travel. Our strategic planning process generated the possibility of a faculty grant process that provides an opportunity for faculty to submit application for significant funding based on project merit. Preliminary feedback suggests that there is widespread interest in this type of approach rather than allocating monies by department or college, or by just considering faculty travel on an ad hoc basis.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): 5.3 Number of international students enrolled on-campus

Data Collection: Total number of non-US residents enrolled on-campus annually.

3-Year Performance History: FHSU has seen a strategic increase in this KPI. Recent performance history shows that over 200 international students are attending campus. Across the performance tracking segment, FHSU has averaged 179.5 international students attending campus, which we've established as our baseline for this performance agreement.

Targets: The 2011 target represents more than 100% improvement over the average baseline of international students participating in campus-based education. Goal 1 of our performance agreement illustrates our commitment to enrollment growth over the next 3-5 years, and the international student sector has been identified as a target for potential growth. Currently, additional resources will need to be committed and deployed quickly and continuously to make this goal a reality.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): 5.4 Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience

Data Collection: Number of students successfully completing requirements for international exchange or study abroad activities.

3-Year Performance History: Since FHSU began tracking this KPI we have seen an average of 65 students participating in study abroad activities. Data prior to 2006 is not available, but anecdotal information suggests that more students than ever are participating in international study opportunities.

Targets: The three year target of 50% growth (actual increase of 33 students over 2007 baseline of 76) over the average baseline represents a substantial increase in international/study abroad activity. Improving performance on this KPI requires additional scholarships and planning to get more student commitment earlier in their academic program of study. In addition, additional incentives and opportunity for faculty mentoring must be established to be successful.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): 5.5 Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College

Data Collection: Total number of non-US resident students enrolling and successfully completing Virtual College classes.

3-Year Performance History: FHSU saw a spike in the number of international students enrolling through the Virtual College in 2006. Average performance on this KPI suggests that 2320 non-US resident students enroll and complete classes through the Virtual College.

Targets: The 2011 target represents 5% growth over the current baseline of 2320 students. Success on this target is entirely subject to political processes, but FHSU has demonstrated consistency in our performance in terms of international distance education. Maintaining this level of performance is only possible through our extensive partnership building infrastructure realized through our Office of Strategic Partnerships. While FHSU has relied on 3 Chinese institutions to provide the international enrollments in the past, we have been very aggressive to expand collaborative partnerships by as many as 4-5 new institutions annually. While most of the agreements will not produce large numbers of international enrollments, a larger number of partners represents stability of the international

operation and subjects FHSU to less risk over the long-term.

Comments:

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
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:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

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
<small>561.09</small>