

Approve Performance Agreements

Summary and Recommendation

In accordance with SB647 and the Board-approved Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, the following performance agreements are presented to the Board for action. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee recommends approval of all performance agreements. (10/24/06)

Background

The fourth performance agreements cover performance during the calendar year of 2007. New funding awarded in July 2008 will be dependent upon the institution's compliance with its performance agreement.

Proposed performance agreements were due to Board staff July 15, 2006. Staff conducted a preliminary review and shared any comments/concerns with the institution. Institutions then either revised the performance agreement or elected to forward it to the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) as originally submitted.

Several different actions were considered by BAASC.

1. Forward the performance agreement to the full Board with a recommendation for approval.
2. Forward the performance agreement to the full Board with a recommendation for approval of only certain parts of the performance agreement.
3. Forward the performance agreement to the full Board with a recommendation that the agreement not be approved.
4. Forward the performance agreement to the full Board with a recommendation for approval (in full or in part) subject to comments. These comments must be addressed in future performance agreements.
5. Return the performance agreement to the institution for rapid revision.
6. Request additional information prior to making a recommendation.

Several performance agreements were returned for revision. All performance agreements are now recommended for approval.

This year, some institutions have been selected to begin a three-year cycle of performance agreements. The recommended duration of each performance agreement is noted.

In the following performance agreements, the target statements should be interpreted as follows:

Target year 1	Performance at December 31, 2007
Target year 2	Performance at December 31, 2008
Target year 3	Performance at December 31, 2009

Table of Contents

Institution	Duration	Page
Emporia State University	1 year	3
Fort Hays University	1 year	11
Kansas State University	3 years	20
Pittsburg State University	1 year	30
University of Kansas	3 years	40
University of Kansas Medical Center	3 years	47
Wichita State University	3 years	59
Washburn University	1 year	69
Allen County Community College	3 years	78
Barton County Community College	1 year	85
Butler County Community College	3 years	93
Cloud County Community College	3 years	104
Coffeyville Community College	1 year	113
Colby Community College	1 year	124
Cowley County Community College	1 year	134
Dodge City Community College	1 year	142
Fort Scott Community College	1 year	149
Garden City Community College	3 years	157
Highland Community College	1 year	167
Hutchinson Community College	1 year	175
Independence Community College	3 years	185
Johnson County Community College	1 year	193
Kansas City Kansas Community College	1 year	198
Labette Community College	1 year	206
Neosho County Community College	1 year	220
Pratt Community College	1 year	234
Seward County Community College	3 years	244
Flint Hills Technical College	1 year	256
Kansas City Kansas Area Technical School	1 year	265
KAW Area Technical School	1 year	270
Manhattan Area Technical College	3 years	275
North Central Kansas Technical School	1 year	285
Northeast Kansas Technical College	1 year	292
Northwest Kansas Technical School	3 years	298
Salina Area Technical School	1 year	308
Southwest Kansas Technical School	3 years	315
Wichita Area Technical College	1 year	322

Institution: Emporia State University	Contact Person: Tes Mehring	Contact phone & e-mail: 620-341-5171 tmehring@emporia.edu	Date: July 15, 2006
--	-----------------------------	---	---------------------

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Expand elementary teacher ed completion program with Kansas City Kansas Community College to help meet needs of school districts in KC, KS Metro Area

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of students admitted to Block 1 and Block 2	Block 1: 5 Block 2: 5	Yr 1: Block 1-11 Block 2-11 Yr 2: Block 1-15 Block 2-15 Yr 3: Block 1-28 Block 2-22		
2. Number of students retained	24	Yr 1: 36 Yr 2: 40 Yr 3: 85		
3. Number of students completing the program	0	Yr 1: 14 Yr 2: 16 Yr 3: 21		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Expand elementary teacher ed completion program with Kansas City Kansas Community College to help meet needs of school districts in KC, KS Metro Area.

Key Performance Indicator 1: The number of students admitted to Block 1 and Block 2

Data Collection: The number of students admitted to Block 1 and Block 2

Targets: The Kansas City Kansas Community College program was developed as a pilot program and students are now at the points of admittance into Block 1 and Block 2; thus targets have numbers that reflect actual admittance of students to the Kansas City Kansas Community College program. The program is being revamped to utilize cohorts going through the program together.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Develop an academic and student support structure for students enrolled in the program.

Data Collection: The number of students retained.

Targets: This was a pilot program and the first students are just now progressing through and completing the program. Retention is increasing as the program strengthens and support structures are developed.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of teachers available to the Kansas City, Kansas Metro area.

Data Collection: The number of students completing the program.

Targets: The first students are completing the program so targets reflect the growing strength of the program and actual numbers progressing through the Kansas City Kansas Community College program.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Increase the percentage of students graduating with a Bachelor's degree who have participated in one or more out-of-classroom supervised successful educational experiences.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a research, scholarly, or creative (e.g., music, art, theatre) activity.	15% of graduating seniors	Yr 1: 70% of those participating in this activity will receive a rubric score of 2 or 3. Goal will be retired after this year.		
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a civic engagement activity	20% of graduating seniors	Yr 1: 70% of those participating in this activity will receive a rubric score of 2 or 3. Goal will be retired after this year.		
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in an internship or practicum experiences	30% of graduating seniors	Yr 1: 70% of those participating in this activity will receive a rubric score of 2 or 3. Goal will be retired after this year.		
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have served in a leadership position	15% of graduating seniors	Yr 1: 70% of those participating in this activity will receive a rubric score of 2 or 3. Goal will be retired after this year.		
Increase percentage of graduating	1% of graduating	Yr 1: 70% of those		

baccalaureate students who have participated in an international educational experience	seniors	participating in this activity will receive a rubric score of 2 or 3. Goal will be retired after this year.		
---	---------	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Increase number of students graduating with a Bachelor's degree who have participated in one or more out of classroom supervised educational experiences

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase the percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a research, scholarly, or creative (e.g., music, theatre, or art) activity.

Data Collection: Each student will complete a co-curricular E-portfolio prior to enrolling in the last semester of the senior year. The E-portfolio will serve as a resume of activities they have been involved in at the time of graduation and can supplement other information submitted as part of job or graduate school applications. Academic faculty advisors will rate the quality of student engagement activities using a 3 point scale rubric.

Targets: 20% of graduating seniors will participate in a research/scholarly/creative activity. 70% of these students will receive a rubric rating of 2 or 3. A 5% increase in the percentage of our students participating in this activity is appropriate as it necessitates a change in faculty/staff behavior.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in civic engagement activity.

Data Collection: Each student will complete a co-curricular E-portfolio prior to enrolling in the last semester of the senior year. The E-portfolio will serve as a resume of activities they have been involved in at the time of graduation and can supplement other information submitted as part of job or graduate school applications. Academic faculty advisors will rate the quality of student engagement activities using a 3 point scale rubric.

Targets: 25% of graduating seniors will participate in a civic engagement activity. 70% of these students will receive a rubric rating of 2 or 3. A 5% increase in the percentage of our students participating in this activity is appropriate as it necessitates a change in faculty/staff behavior.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a practicum/internship experience.

Data Collection: Each student will complete a co-curricular E-portfolio prior to enrolling in the last semester of the senior year. The E-portfolio will serve as a resume of activities they have been involved in at the time of graduation and can supplement other information submitted as part of job or graduate school applications. Academic faculty advisors will rate the quality of student engagement activities using a 3 point scale rubric.

Targets: 35% of graduating seniors will participate in a practicum/internship experience. 70% of these students will receive a rubric rating of 2 or 3. A 5% increase in the percentage of students participating in an internship or practicum is a stretch as the number of placements will need to be increased, the number of faculty to supervise will need to be increased, and the number of students needing to change their program of study will need to be increased.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase the percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in a leadership experience.

Data Collection: Each student will complete a co-curricular E-portfolio prior to enrolling in the last semester of the senior year. The E-portfolio will serve as a resume of activities they have been involved in at the time of graduation and can supplement other information submitted as part of job or graduate school applications. Academic faculty advisors will rate the quality of student engagement activities using a 3 point scale rubric.

Targets: 18% of graduating seniors will serve in a leadership position. 70% of these students will receive a rubric rating of 2 or 3. A 3% increase was chosen as there are a limited number of organizations and committees. Additional leadership opportunities must be discovered.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Increase the percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have participated in an international experience.

Data Collection: Each student will complete a co-curricular E-portfolio prior to enrolling in the last semester of the senior year. The E-portfolio will serve as a resume of activities they have been involved in at the time of graduation and can supplement other information submitted as part of job or graduate school applications. Academic faculty advisors will rate the quality of student engagement activities using a 3 point scale rubric.

Targets: 2% of graduating students will participate in an international experience. 70% of these students will receive a rubric rating of 2 or 3. Doubling the percentage of students participating in an international experience is a stretch but chosen because of the importance of international experience.

Comments: RUBRIC: 3=course enrollment in a practicum/internship and grade of B or higher; publication or presentation of a scholarly/research/creative* activity at a state, regional, or national professional conference; service as an officer (president, vice-president, secretary, or treasurer) in a state/national professional organization or university approved student organization; international study experience for one semester or longer; civic engagement of 100 or more clock hours. 2=course enrollment in a practicum/internship and a grade of C; presentation of a scholarly/research/creative* activity at a university sponsored forum; service as an officer (president, vice-president, secretary, or treasurer) within a local community organization; international study experience lasting between 2 and 15 weeks; civic engagement ranging between 50 and 99 clock hours. 1=practicum or internship experience that is not enrolled in as a class but for which a student receives some kind of written observation from a faculty member or field experience supervisor; leadership experience that does not involve serving as a major officer in a university or community organization (e.g., directing/coordinating a major project within an organization); international study experience lasting less than two weeks; civic engagement ranging between 25 and 49 clock hours. *creative applies to art, music, theatre activities

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 3: Provide access to or awareness of higher education for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of programs for K-12 students from diverse ethnic backgrounds (We will drop programs not working but add new ones for a total of 6.)	3	Yr 1: 6 Yr 2: 6 Yr 3: 6		
2. Number of programs for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds (We will drop programs not working but add new ones for a total of 7.)	4	Yr 1: 7 Yr 2: 7 Yr 3: 7		
3. Number of enrolled students from diverse backgrounds	441	Yr 1: 470 Yr 2: 480 Yr 3: 530		
4. Percentage of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds retained	61.0%	Yr 1: 61.2% Yr 2: 61.3% Yr 3: 70.5%		
5. Degree completion count of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds	47	Yr 1: 55 Yr 2: 57 Yr 3: 73		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Provide access to or awareness of higher education for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Develop, implement, and maintain programs for K - 12 students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The number of programs developed, implemented, and maintained.

Targets: Targets are set based upon the resources available to implement the programs. Quality is important and some programs will cease while others will be added. Therefore, the number of programs will not continue to increase indefinitely.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Develop and implement student support programs for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The number of programs developed and implemented.

Targets: Targets are set based upon the resources available to implement the programs. Quality is important and some programs will cease while others will be added. Therefore, the number of programs will not continue to increase indefinitely.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of enrolled students from diverse backgrounds.

Data Collection: The number of enrolled students from diverse backgrounds.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the historical averages of students from diverse backgrounds. After a closer review of our historical data, our target population through geographic jurisdiction, and review of K-12 programs, these targets more accurately reflect the demographic profile and constituencies.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase the number of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds retained.

Data Collection: The number of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds retained comparing the fall semester to the next fall semester.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the historical averages of students from diverse backgrounds retained. However, the original method of collecting data and utilizing statistics was flawed and gave an erroneous impression of the numbers of students from diverse backgrounds retained. All percentages in the targets were revised to better reflect our collection method and statistical analysis.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Improve degree completion count of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds.

Data Collection: The completion count of students from ethnically diverse backgrounds.

Targets: Targets are set based upon increasing the number of students from diverse backgrounds completing degrees.

Comments: Ethnically diverse backgrounds are defined as: Black; Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islanders; and American Indian or Alaskan Native.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Implement new University administrative and business systems and a portal with expanded support capabilities				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of users of web-based reports	25	Yr 1: 150 Yr 2: 300 Yr 3: 500		
2. Number of reports available via the web	35	Yr 1: 100 Yr 2: 125 Yr 3: 200		

3. Average number of daily log-ins to the University's intranet (portal)	0	Yr 1: 3500 Yr 2: 5000 Yr 3: 5000		
--	---	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Implement new University administrative and business systems and a portal with expanded decision support capabilities.

Key Performance Indicator 1: The number of users of web-based reports.

Data Collection: Our baseline demonstrates that there are few users of web-based reports on campus. This indicator will allow us to increase the number of users.

Targets: Targets are set to match the goals and objectives of the Title III initiative.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The number of reports available via the web.

Data Collection: There are few reports posted on the web and the number of postings will be increased and counted.

Targets: Targets are set to match the goals and objectives of the Title III initiative.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Average number of daily log-ins to the University's intranet (portal)

Data Collection: Number of log-ins to the new portal (Luminis).

Targets: Targets are set to match the targets of installation and implementation over a three year period.

Comments: The replacement of the Enterprise Resource Planning system began with FY2006. Because ESU is now in the implementation stage, all performance indicators were changed. Previous indicators are no longer useful since we are implementing a new system.

KBOR use only: Emporia State University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Goal 2 has been modified; the remainder of the performance agreement is very similar to last years.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

Last year's performance agreement was approved with the comment, "*Future performance agreements should include assessment of the educational experiences in goal 2. In addition, data collection techniques other than self-report should be considered for this goal.*" Goal 2 has been modified to address these comments.

Recommendation and Comments

In the summary table, in goal 2, the indicator statement refers to the percent of graduating baccalaureate students who participate in a particular activity. Although, the target statements do not indicate what percentage of graduating students is expected to participate in the noted activity, this information is presented in the narrative.

Baselines for goals 1, 3 and 4 have not been updated from the previous performance agreement. Therefore, in order to make directional improvement, performance must exceed not the baselines presented here; but performance must exceed the values reported at the close of 2006.

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement, with the understanding that the learner outcomes goal will be substantially strengthened in future performance agreements.

Institution: Fort Hays State University	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 FY2006 - 29 FY2009 - 32		
Number of students participating in international exchange or study abroad programming	FY2006 - 54	FY2007 - 56 FY2006 - 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.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 4: Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities around the Kansas Turnpike and our service area				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
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 corridor counties	FY2006 - 17	FY2007 - 21 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.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 5: Improve student learner outcomes in computing				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
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.

KBOR use only: Fort Hays State University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Major changes have been made throughout the performance agreement. The following goals have been deleted:

Meeting Kansas virtual students' needs
Participate meaningfully in the American Democracy Project

Goal 4 has been changed from "Increase Hispanic Participation in FHSU degree programs" to "Strategically manage new enrollment opportunities around the Kansas Turnpike and our service area."

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The last performance agreement was approved with the following comment, "*Performance is reported on a calendar year basis, not a fiscal year basis; targets should refer to the expected performance on December 31....*" This comment has been addressed.

Recommendation and Comments

The baseline for goal 2 indicator 4 is the same as last year.

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement.

Note that the baselines presented for the CLA reflect national data rather than data from FHSU.

Institution: Kansas State University	Contact Person: Ruth Dyer	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-532-4797; rdyer@ksu.edu	Date: September 22, 2006	
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.	FY 2004-2006 = 32,150	Target yr 1: FY 2005-2007 = 32,750 Target yr 2: FY 2006-2008 = 33,500 Target yr 3: FY 2007-2009 = 34,250		
2. Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.	Fall 2005 = 1,675	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 1,925 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 2,075 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 2,225		
3. Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).	Fall 2005 = 3	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 7 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 9 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 11		
4. Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.	CY 2005 = 3,621	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 3,750 Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 3,800 Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 3,890		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase Collaboration with Other Institutions and Enhance Student Efficiency at K-State.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Three-year average of credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education.

Data Collection: Compile the number of SCH generated by for-credit courses through the Division of Continuing Education at Kansas State University by fiscal year (summer, fall, spring) and average them over three years. The baseline value is 32,150 SCH, which is the 3-year average for FY 2004-06.

Targets: Continuing Education provides students with different avenues to complete the necessary coursework for graduation or to gain a certification in a specialized area. Students are very adept at using the Internet and appreciate the flexibility provided through enrollment in courses that may fit better with their work schedules and family commitments. Courses are offered in several modes of delivery, including face-to-face, mediated, asynchronous and synchronous formats. These offerings help students with the efficient and effective scheduling of their time, allowing K-State to serve more students who have various scheduling needs. The university has experienced a steady growth in courses offered through continuing education, in part due to the additional number of collaborative programs and courses offered and new certificate programs that have been approved. We anticipate a growth of 600-800 credit hours generated per year.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students in degree programs who are enrolled in distance education courses.

Data Collection: Determine the headcount & curriculum of all students enrolled in a fall semester Division of Continuing Education (DCE) course in which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. Students in non-degree-seeking curricula will be removed from the total headcount. The baseline value is 1,675 students for Fall 2005.

Targets: Several factors should contribute to a steady annual increase in the headcount for students in degree-seeking programs who are enrolled in distance education courses for which 66% or more of the delivery is mediated. These factors include increased targeted marketing of DCE distance degree programs to placebound degree-seeking students; the University continuing to add new distance degree programs each year; and the various 2 + 2 agreements established with community colleges in Kansas and in other parts of the U.S. These courses provide students with the flexibility in scheduling that they need and provide place-bound students with enhanced access. These benefits lead to more students being served and those students being more efficient in completing their degrees. Our optimistic targets reflect an increase of 150 students per year.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of degree programs in which K-State participates through the Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) and the KSU Institute for Academic Alliances (IAA).

Data Collection: Compile the number of degree programs each fall in which K-State participates through the Great Plains IDEA and the KSU IAA, either by offering complete degree programs or courses that are part of a degree program. The baseline value is 3 programs for Fall 2005.

Targets: By collaborating with other universities, K-State enhances its efficiency by participating in or offering degree programs that it could not offer on its own. These programs allow students to remain at K-State instead of transferring to other institutions. Faculty members in a number of our degree programs have begun discussions that we expect will lead to new collaborative offerings. Our target values incorporate these expected collaborations and represent stretch values, since some programs currently under consideration for such collaboration may not be approved or implemented.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of courses that use K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is mediated.

Data Collection: Determine the number of courses during a calendar year for which the instructor uses K-State Online or for which a portion of the course is delivered in a mediated format. The baseline value is 3,621 in CY 2005.

Targets: K-State Online increases the efficiency of both students and faculty. Students have 24/7 access to course materials and information about their grades, and they can submit questions to their instructors at any time. Not all courses will desire to utilize mediated instruction, but a realistic goal might be 75%. Our target values are selected to attain this goal by CY 2009.

Comments: We replaced one indicator and changed the scope of another indicator from our 2006 Performance Agreement. We also have added one indicator, which is the second one listed. We changed the indicator on number of place-bound students in Western Kansas enrolled in distance education courses to be the number of student credit hours generated by for-credit courses offered through continuing education. We felt this expanded indicator captured a broader picture of the outreach to more students that these courses provide. We replaced the indicator on credit hours taken by transfer students, because this indicator did not follow the same pattern as the increased enrollment of transfer students, and we wanted to include an indicator that was more reflective of the efficiency we were wanting to provide to our students.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Percent of English 100 students enrolled in “Diversity Writing” sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.	CY 2005 = 17%	Target yr 1: CY 2007 = 63% Target yr 2: CY 2008 = 73% Target yr 3: CY 2009 = 85%		
2. Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.	FY 2006 = 603	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 630 Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 660 Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 690		

3. Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience with a grade of "C" or better.	FY 2005 = 75.3%	Target yr 1: FY2007 = 83% Target yr 2: FY2008 = 85% Target yr 3: FY2009 = 87%		
4. Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.	AY 2006 = 27.5%	Target yr 1: AY 2007 = 30% Target yr 2: AY 2008 = 35% Target yr 3: AY 2009 = 40%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve student learning outcomes in general education and the majors by first positioning students to learn and then giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their learning.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of English 100 students enrolled in “Diversity Writing” sections; an overall pass rate of 90% will be maintained.

Data Collection: Enrollment figures (last day of class) will be calculated by dividing the total number of students enrolled in the "Diversity Writing" sections of ENGL 100 ("Expository Writing I") by the total number of students enrolled in all sections of ENGL 100. Pass/fail rates will be calculated by dividing the total number of students who passed by the total number of students in the course at the end of the semester.

Targets: This curriculum transformation project addresses three of our undergraduate learning outcomes: communication, diversity, and critical thinking. The goal of the English department is to, eventually, teach all of the English 100 sections with this methodology. Student work is evaluated via a portfolio method using a common scoring rubric. Assignments in the "Diversity Writing" sections require students to identify, describe, research, and analyze issues of diversity. This approach engages students with diversity issues in society and prepares them to think and write about real world situations. The English department is training new sets of instructors and graduate teaching assistants each fall semester and adding sections as they have instructors trained in this method. In the Fall 2006 semester, 25 GTAs and five instructors will be trained, so that approximately 42% of ENGL 100 sections can be taught using the "Diversity Writing" approach. In the following two fall semesters, additional GTAs and instructors will be trained. By the Fall 2008 semester, the "Diversity Writing" content will be the mainstream curriculum for ENGL 100.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students participating in the KSU Study Abroad Program.

Data Collection: Students who register with our Study Abroad office and successfully complete a study abroad experience will be counted.

Targets: K-State has a goal of increasing the number of students who participate in a study abroad experience, because we believe (and have instituted an assessment plan to measure) that students who have such experiences gain "awareness and understanding of the skills necessary to live and work in a diverse world" - one of our university's undergraduate student learning outcomes. We have been recruiting more students to participate, increasing the number of scholarships available for study abroad, and providing financial support to faculty who want to take groups of students to another country. The national average annual growth in study abroad is 4%; our stretch target values reflect a 5% increase.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of K-State associate and bachelor degree graduates who successfully completed a capstone course or experience.

Data Collection: All students in a given academic year who passed, with a grade of "C" or better, one of the courses designated by a department as a capstone course or experience will be counted. This number will be expressed as a percent of the number of students who are awarded associate or bachelors degrees during the academic year.

Targets: As a part of K-State's efforts to establish assessment of student learning as a priority at the department level, we have encouraged faculty to utilize capstone courses or experiences as vehicles for doing comprehensive assessment of integrated learning within the major. In capstone experiences, students are asked to demonstrate the learning of degree program outcomes and university learning outcomes (e.g., communication, critical thinking, ethics) in a final project or within an internship or through a case-based real-world challenge to which they are asked to respond. In some cases, performance is evaluated by both faculty and professionals outside of the university. These courses already existed in many disciplines, and it is our goal to continue to create such experiences. Given that new course development is a complex and sometimes time-consuming process, our target values represent a challenge for us, but are ones we are committed to reaching.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase in the percent difference between pre-test (1st year students) and post-test (seniors) scores on a management concepts assessment for students majoring in business curricula.

Data Collection: Students in a 1st-year required business course are given a 40-item exam on management concepts. The same exam is given to seniors in a required business course. The average score for all 1st-year students and the average score for all seniors will be computed and compared.

Targets: With this assessment, management faculty are asking two questions: 1. Do seniors in management know more about management concepts than 1st-year management students; and 2. Do management students know more about management concepts than other business majors (finance, accounting, marketing)? The results of this direct measure will help faculty to modify their teaching methods and/or course content to help students to learn better. The baseline is, at this point, based on only one semester, so targets are modest, but hopeful, as the faculty already have ideas on areas of improvement in their teaching strategies.

Comments: We have removed three indicators from the 2006 Performance Agreement and added three new indicators. We removed the indicator related to the percentage of degree programs having approved assessment plans with the required proportion of direct measures of student learning, because we had achieved our target values. We removed the indicator on number of students earning a minor in Leadership Studies and the indicator on mean score from learning outcomes in the general education program, because we had achieved significant change in these indicators over the last three years. We also wanted to add new indicators that included direct measures of student learning and that involved a larger number of students on our campus.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access

Institutional Goal 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.	Fall 2005 = 595 Hispanic students enrolled.	Target yr 1: Fall 2007 = 625 Target yr 2: Fall 2008 = 650 Target yr 3: Fall 2009 = 665		
2. Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.	AY 2005-2006 = 4,078	Target yr 1: AY 2006-2007 = 4,100 Target yr 2: AY 2007-2008 = 4,150 Target yr 3: AY 2008-2009 = 4,200		
3. The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).	FY 2005 = 1,290 families and 5,214 youth.	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = 1,369 families and 5,532 youth Target yr 2: FY 2008 = 1,410 families and 5,697 youth Target yr 3: FY 2009 = 1,452 families and 5,868 youth		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Continue the development of programs and approaches that will serve current at-risk and under-served populations (underrepresented groups and families with limited resources).

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Hispanic students enrolled at KSU.

Data Collection: The fall semester 20th day headcount will be used. The headcount includes undergraduate and graduate students. The baseline is 595 Hispanic students for Fall 2005.

Targets: Our baseline enrollment is almost completely composed of long-time Kansas residents. Any significant growth will come from recent immigrants who are first- or second-generation citizens (or undocumented immigrants with resident tuition status). This group is much harder to recruit because of multiple cultural and financial issues. The community colleges in southwest Kansas have significant enrollments of Hispanic students, but these students frequently take small numbers of credit hours and move slowly, if at all, through the associate degree programs. We have recognized the increase in the overall Hispanic population in western Kansas, and we have dedicated resources to recruit prospective Hispanic first- and second-generation students. In addition, on-line distance education provides opportunities for Hispanic students to enroll in K-State courses without leaving home. In reference to the baseline, our target values represent an increase of 12% by 2009. Because of the various factors noted above, we consider our target values to be particularly expansive.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students receiving Need Based Tuition Waivers.

Data Collection: Twenty percent of the money from tuition increases at K-State is set aside for Need Based Tuition Waivers. Eligibility for the waivers is based on the ability of the student and the student's family to pay for college, rather than on the actual cost of attending college. Since a family's ability to pay generally remains constant, improvement will be measured by an increase in the number of awards.

Targets: Since a family's inability to pay for college is one of the major reasons why potential students do not attend K-State, or withdraw after starting, an increase in the number of awards will result in greater access to students from lower-income families to begin and continue to attend K-State. Given the projected plateauing of tuition increases, the increase in the number of students receiving waivers is expected to taper off also, as is reflected in our targets.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The number of low income individuals/families who are provided nutrition education through the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP).

Data Collection: Families and youth enroll in our programs, and we track their progress through a series of 10 or more lessons on nutrition. The number of enrolled families and youth will be compiled.

Targets: K-State's land-grant mission includes enriching the lives of the citizens of Kansas by extending to them opportunities to benefit from the results of research. This indicator is one example of the alignment of our land-grant mission with the Regents goal of increased targeted participation and access to university services. The mission of EFNEP is to assist families and youth with limited resources in making simple changes in eating behaviors so that over time, healthy choices become healthy habits. EFNEP lessons (available in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese/Laotian) help at-risk Kansans develop the skills and behaviors they need to improve their diets and effectively manage resources. Currently, the EFNEP programs assist Kansans in Sedgwick, Shawnee, Crawford and Bourbon counties through the efforts of nutrition assistants. Kansas EFNEP nutrition assistants teach in homes, schools, assisted living sites, prisons, clinics, and libraries. Our targets reflect an increase of 3% in the number of contacts in each of the next three years, as this program is expanded.

Comments: We removed two indicators from the 2006 Performance Agreement and added two new indicators. The indicators we deleted included only a relatively small number of students, and we replaced them with ones that include larger numbers of students and constituents.

Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.	FY 2005 = \$110.9M	Target yr 1: FY 2007 = \$115M Target yr 2: FY 2008 = \$118M Target yr 3: FY 2009 = \$120M		
2. The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.	Average for FY 2003-2005 = \$74.0M	Target yr 1: FY 2005 – 2007 = \$79M Target yr 2: FY 2006 – 2008 = \$81M Target yr 4: FY 2007 – 2009 = \$83M		
3. The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.	Previous 5-year average (2001-2005): Licensing Income = \$232.1K	Target yr 1: For 2002-2006 = \$271K Target yr 2: For 2003-2007 = \$307K Target yr 3: For 2004-2008 = \$340K		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase financial support from extramural sources

Key Performance Indicator 1: The amount of extramural support for research/scholarly activity in a fiscal year.

Data Collection: Self-explanatory. The baseline value is \$110.9M in FY05.

Targets: Emphasis on enhanced research/scholarly activity has resulted in additional external funding, especially with the start of the Biosecurity Research Institute (BRI). The FY 2005 baseline figure is a \$10M increase from FY 2004, which is due in part to the BRI receiving \$4.5M for equipment and \$2M to enhance BRI research activity once the BRI is operational in 2006. Our projected targets are conservatively lower (\$5M, \$3M, and \$2M consecutive increases), since we have taken into consideration concerns about the levels of future federal funding and that the significant BRI funding was a one-time expense for equipment.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The average amount of private support (cash and deferred) over a three-year period.

Data Collection: Dollars generated each fiscal year from new funds, which include both cash and deferred gifts. The amounts are averaged over a three year period. The baseline value for FY 2003-05 is \$74.0M.

Targets: The current capital campaign and other development activities will result in an estimated 2%-3% increase in private support in each of the three target years. A three-year average is used to take into account the volatility of this indicator.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The amount of licensing income from use of university-based technologies by other groups.

Data Collection: Determine the average over five years of the amount of licensing revenues and equity received from companies to develop K-State technologies. Our baseline value is a 5-year (2001-2005) average of \$232.1K in licensing income and equity.

Targets: In CY 2004, our total licensing income was \$554.8K, however, based on income in 2001-2003, this appears to be an anomaly. Licensing income was \$110.9K in CY 2003 and \$383.4K in CY 2005. We have incorporated an annual increase of about \$30K into our target values to account for the extreme volatility that can occur in this measure.

KBOR use only: Kansas State University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Goal 2 has been modified. The focus of goal 3 has changed from Hispanics and Women to Hispanics and low-income families. Otherwise, the performance agreement is very similar to last years.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The last performance agreement was approved with the comment, *“Recommend approval with the understanding that the institution will continue to strengthen future performance agreements by including additional direct measurements of learner outcomes.”* The learner outcomes goal has been modified to address this comment.

Recommendation and Comments

Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.

Institution: Pittsburg State University	Contact Person: Steven A. Scott, VP Academic Affairs	Contact phone & e-mail: 620-235-4500 sascott@pittstate.edu	Date: July 15, 2006 (TY1 = CY2007)
--	--	--	------------------------------------

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Design flexible academic programs for the changing workforce, transfer students, and students with highly specialized needs.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of students enrolled in Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Technology	0, this is a new program	TY 1: 15 students TY 2: Select new Institutional Goal TY 3: N/A		
New academic programs	0, these are new programs	TY 1: 1 new program (BIS) TY 2: Select new Institutional Goal TY 3: N/A		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Design flexible academic programs for the changing workforce, transfer students, and students with highly specialized needs.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of students enrolled in Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Technology

Data Collection: Count number of majors

Targets: The university will measure the success of the program by the number of majors in this program.

Key Performance Indicator 2: New academic programs

Data Collection: This performance agreement will be judged by the number of programs being approved and implemented.

Targets: Each program targets students with highly specialized needs.

Comments: As noted in the table above, 2007 is scheduled to be the final year that the university will focus on this particular institutional goal. In fact, throughout this agreement a number of goals/indicators are identified as being replaced over the next 1-2 years. In July 2007, Pittsburg State University will submit an application that will be in place for the three ensuing years. Given that timeline, TY1 is the most significant element of this particular agreement. Beginning this fall, the university will be engaged in a strategic planning process that will have as one of its outcomes the identification of 2-3 new performance agreement goals and the appropriate indicators, replacing those that are scheduled to be retired. This planning effort will be based on the extensive campus-wide visioning initiative that was completed in the fall of 2005. This vision, documented in the report of the Second Century Task Force, provides a framework for how the university should approach the next 5-10 years. The strategic plan will detail how this vision will be achieved. Elements of that strategic plan will be selected for inclusion in the July 2007 Performance Agreement application. This will create a strong linkage between the university's vision, strategic plan, and performance agreement initiatives.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Enhance assessment of student learning				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
AIC/CPC Exam	Established baseline in 2005 - 95.69 % of national mean	TY 1: 98% of national mean TY 2: 99% of national mean TY 3: Select new indicator		
BBA Major Field Test	Established baseline in 2005 - Mean 2004 PSU raw score = 152	TY 1: 154 TY 2: Select new indicator TY 3: N/A		
Knowledge of Psychology Assessment	Established baseline in 2005 – Mean percent correct = 41.2	TY 1: 82nd percentile TY 2: 84th percentile TY 3: 86th percentile		
Biology Field Test	Established baseline in 2005 - average 2004 PSU raw score = 150	TY 1: 152 TY 2: Select new indicator TY 3: N/A		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Enhance assessment of student learning

Key Performance Indicator 1: AIC/CPC Exam

Data Collection: Construction Engineering Technology and Construction Management students will sit for the American Institute of Constructors (AIC) Certified Professional Constructors (CPC) exam. The composite score compares PSU students' performance against peer institutions to document improved student learning in areas designated as weaknesses.

Targets: By challenging the department to elevate the institution's mean score to the national average, this indicator represents a clear stretch for both the department and the institution. It is recognized that curricular improvements are incremental and it will take time to document the impact of changes. However, it is the department's long-term goal to surpass the national mean.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Bachelors in Business Administration (BBA) Major Field Test

Data Collection: The BBA degree program will utilize the ETS Major Field Test. This test reflects basic knowledge and understanding gained in the core undergraduate curriculum. The requirement of this examination is a critical part of the College of Business assessment system.

Targets: Curricular improvements are usually incremental and it takes time to document the impact of changes. However, it is the department's long-term goal for the average PSU raw score to continue to increase over the next five years.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Knowledge of Psychology Assessment

Data Collection: The Knowledge of Psychology Assessment will be administered to senior psychology majors during their last semester of their capstone course. This assessment will be an important source of information to determine the ability of psychology majors to retain important concepts.

Targets: Curricular improvements are usually incremental and it takes time to document the impact of changes. However, it is the department's long-term goal for all undergraduate psychology majors to score at or above the 82nd percentile. This is an internally developed exam based on the curricular goals and objectives of the degree program and as such baseline data was established during Spring 2005.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Biology Field Test

Data Collection: The content of the Major Field Test in Biology reflects the base knowledge and understanding gained in the core undergraduate biology curriculum.

Targets: Curricular improvements are usually incremental and it takes time to document the impact of changes. However, it is the department's long-term goal for the average PSU raw score to continue to increase over the next five years. Baseline data was established during Spring 2005.

Comments: Pittsburg State University continues to focus on developing a ‘culture of assessment’ throughout the university’s academic program. Significant progress has been made in this regard, particularly in those programs that operate under the review of formal accrediting bodies. This particular goal has been used to focus greater attention on improving learner outcomes by implementing improved assessment processes and systems. The four programs included above have served as pilot efforts in that regard. In each case, targets have been selected that stretch the academic programs and are causing changes in instruction, realignment of curriculum, and more focused attention to student learning. As can be seen in the TY2 and TY3, some of these programs will be replaced by new initiatives that will also target improvements in the assessment of student learning. The goal of improving learning outcomes will continue to be a central and critical part of the university’s academic activities and culture.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 3: Enhance diversity of the University.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Admission activities	Established baseline of 717 contacts of minority students	TY 1: 25% increase over baseline TY 2: 30% increase over baseline TY 3: Reassess indicator		
Number of freshmen minority students	Established baseline of 48 enrollments	TY 1: 10% increase over baseline TY 2: 12% increase over baseline TY 3: Reassess indicator		
Number of transfer minority students	Established baseline of 37 enrollments	TY 1: 10% increase over baseline TY 2: 12% increase over baseline TY 3: Reassess indicator		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Enhance diversity of the University.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Admission activities

Data Collection: Count and report the number of contacts with minority students.

Targets: Contacts will be measured against the baseline established during 2004. While the target was initially set too low, the institution has consistently (and dramatically) increased the number of contacts. A commitment remains to see continued growth in this indicator.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of freshmen minority students enrolling at Pittsburg State University.

Data Collection: Count the number of new minority freshmen, as reported by the Office of Admissions and the Registrar.

Targets: Percentage will be measured against the baseline established in 2004. Given the demographics of the region, the targets represent real and meaningful challenges.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of transfer minority students enrolling at Pittsburg State University.

Data Collection: Count the number of new minority transfer students, as reported by the Office of Admissions and the Registrar.

Targets: Percentage will be measured against the baseline established during 2004. Given the demographics of the region, the targets represent real and meaningful challenges.

Comments: From the report filed in March of 2006, it is apparent Pittsburg State University is committed to diversifying its student body and the interventions that have been institutionalized are already yielding increasing numbers of minority students. As the Performance Agreement process has become better understood, it is now apparent that Indicator 1 above is more related to process than a true measure of the desired outcome. Yet, since the institution does indeed carefully track the number of contacts and has made substantial gains in this area, the indicator has been retained for one additional year. It is clear however, that indicators 2 and 3 are the true measures of success for this critical goal. As such, the targets for these indicators have been adjusted up and their relationship to the baseline figure has been clarified. In the next Performance Agreement application (July 2007), it is certain that this goal, or a similar one, will be retained and the university's efforts in this area intensified.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Enhance effectiveness and efficiency of units by using document imaging.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of administrative & academic units converting paper files to online files	3 administrative units and 0 academic units	TY 1: 2 additional units adopt document imaging system TY 2: Select new institutional goal TY 3: N/A		

Number of new student paper files converted to document-imaged files	0 graduate files & 0 departmental files entered	TY 1: All remaining GR student files converted and all new UG students files from 4 academic units starting January 2007 TY 2: Select new institutional goal TY 3: N/A		
Number of faculty & staff trained to use document imaging	0 faculty trained	TY 1: 65 additional staff & faculty trained to use document imaging system TY 2: Select new institutional goal TY 3: N/A		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Enhance effectiveness and efficiency of units by using document imaging.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of administrative and academic units converting paper files to online files

Data Collection: Count the number of administrative and academic units converting to document imaging. Administrative units would include areas such as the Graduate Office, Office of Admissions, Office of Development, etc. Academic units include academic programs/departments/colleges such as the Department of Biology, the College of Business Advising Center, the Undeclared Majors Program, etc.

Targets: Based on the projected units to be converted to document imaging. It should be noted that this conversion is a difficult and time-consuming process. In addition to the acquisition of hardware and software, staff training, workflow analysis, and new policies must be implemented. The time required to build the archival components of the newly implemented systems are also labor and time intensive. The targets represent significant opportunities for creating more effective and efficient data systems, but the institution will be challenged to maintain this pace of expansion. Consequently, a focus on achieving these targets will cause the institution to be stretched.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of new student paper files converted to document-imaged files

Data Collection: Count the number of student files

Targets: Based on the projected administrative or academic units to be converted to document imaging.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of faculty and staff trained to use document imaging

Data Collection: Count the number of faculty and staff in each unit using document imaging

Targets: Based on the projected units to be converted to document imaging. As in the adoption of any new computerized system, certain barriers arise and impede progress toward full acceptance and implementation. Document imaging is no different in that regard. Replacing a paper-based advisement system with a fully computer-based one will stretch the university. Identifying and training 65 faculty and staff in CY07 will challenge the university’s support staff.

Comments: After a successful piloting of the document imaging system in three academic units (departments), the system will be made available to all departments, including its availability for both faculty and staff use. The university foundation has decided to adopt document imaging for archival purposes and will begin to migrate toward the system during 2007. In addition, the University Health Center is implementing a new computerized management system that includes document imaging as a core system component. The university has successfully embraced document imaging and extended its reach and impact through its inclusion in the Performance Agreement process. Having achieved considerable transformation of document manipulation, access, and retrieval, through document imaging technologies, this particular goal will be replaced in the university’s Performance Agreement application that will be submitted in July, 2007.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 5: Enhance the matriculation of high performing students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of new students attending PSU w/ACT >22	Baseline – 320 Mean number of new students entering w/ACT >22 in WF02, WF03, and WF04	TY 1: 4% increase over baseline TY 2: 6% increase over baseline TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		
Amount of scholarship funds available for high performing students	Baseline – \$377,715 The amount of scholarship funds awarded to high performing students during Fall 04 semester	TY 1: 11% increase in scholarship funds designed for high performing new students TY 2: 12% increase in scholarship funds designed for high performing new students TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Enhance the matriculation of high performing students

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of new students attending PSU with ACT >22

Data Collection: Count the number of new students with ACT > 22

Targets: Performance will be measured as the percentage of increase over the baseline established in 2004. Because the composition of the student population has remained fairly stable over time, increasing this percentage even the smallest amount will not be without difficulty. Hence, very modest, but significant, rates of increase have been identified as the targets, recognizing that even these incremental changes may be difficult to achieve.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Amount of scholarship funds available for high-performing students

Data Collection: The university Budget Office will provide the amount expended to recruit these high-performing students.

Targets: The percentage of increase will be based on targets established in 2004

Comments: Restructuring the allocation of scholarships and communicating this information to prospective students have led to increased numbers of high-performing students enrolling in Pittsburg State University. The overarching goal of increasing the presence of these students continues to be a high priority for the university, even though its accomplishment is not assured. However, the capacity of the institution to move this number even higher may well be exhausted in the remaining two years of the current agreement. Therefore, it is very probable that this goal will be retired following CY 2008.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 6: Increase student and faculty access to and use of online resources.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of fully online courses offered	Baseline – 42 established as mean number of fully online courses offered AY04	TY 1: 30% increase TY 2: 50% increase TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		
Number of courses supported by online materials	Baseline – 450 established as number of courses supported by online materials AY04	TY 1: 30% increase TY 2: 50% increase TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		

Student use levels of Blackboard	Baseline – 15,007 established by determining student Blackboard use level in AY04	TY 1: 15% increase TY 2: 20% increase TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		
Use levels of online library resources	Baseline – 206,733 established by use level of online library resources in AY04	TY 1: 8% increase TY 2: 10% increase TY 3: Select new Institutional Goal		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6: Increase student and faculty access to and use of online resources.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of fully online courses offered

Data Collection: Count the number of courses offered that are fully online. For a course to be offered fully online, it must be approved through the Office of Continuing and Graduate Studies. This office reports on a semester-by-semester basis the number of courses offered and maintains historical records of this activity as well.

Targets: Compare to baseline established in 2004. These targets represent aggressive efforts and if achieved, will result in real growth in the university’s online delivery of academic courses.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of courses supported by online materials

Data Collection: Count the number of courses supported by on-line materials. The Office of Information Systems maintains the Blackboard server and support services. Blackboard is the proprietary software that facilitates the online posting of supplemental course materials by professors. Through Blackboard’s administrative system, OIS can produce detailed reports indicating the number of courses offered in a given semester that utilizes online information.

Targets: a) Compare to baseline established in 2004. Again, these targets represent significant growth and heightened use of the capacity to post information online for student use.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Student use levels of Blackboard

Data Collection: Count the number of students in courses using Blackboard.

Targets: Compare to baseline established in 2004.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Use levels of online library resources

Data Collection: Count the number of ‘hits’ of online resources made available to Pittsburg State University students

Targets: Compare to baseline established in 2004

Comments: While considerable growth has been documented in student use of and access to online resources, it is recognized that this goal's timeframe has covered an era of dramatic transition. Nonetheless, the university has invested in the support systems necessary to drive and sustain this growth. It should be noted that in previous years a fifth key performance indicator was included for this goal, but that indicator has been removed in this year's application. The indicator, which addressed the implementation of a wireless network on campus, has been completely achieved. The wireless network has been deployed throughout the campus and is fully operational. Its availability has led to many of the gains in the four continuing indicators. As noted in TY3 for each indicator, the university plans to replace this goal.

KBOR use only: Pittsburg State University
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement Goals and indicators are very similar to last years.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement The last performance agreement was approved with the comment, " <i>Recommend approval with the understanding that the institution will continue to stretch its targets in future performance agreements.</i> " Parts of the narrative have been expanded to justify the amount of stretch.
Recommendation and Comments Baselines have not been updated from the previous performance agreement. Therefore, in order to make directional improvement, performance must exceed not the baselines presented here; but performance must exceed the values reported at the close of 2006. Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement.

Institution: University of Kansas - Lawrence Campus	Contact Person: Kathleen McCluskey-Fawcett	Contact phone & e-mail: 785.864.4904 kamf@ku.edu	Date: 7/13/06 rev 9/28/06
--	---	--	------------------------------

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 1: Enrich the undergraduate learning experience

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Participation in first-year learning initiatives	1,624 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 1,850 2. FY 08: 2,000 3. FY 09: 2,100		
2. Number of students awarded Global Awareness Program (GAP) certification	97 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 175 2. FY 08: 225 3. FY 09: 275		
3. Number of students earning service learning certification (SLC)	Eligibility and program components put into place (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 150 2. FY 08: 200 3. FY 09: 250		
4. Number of students earning research experience program (REP) certification	Eligibility and program components put into place (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 150 2. FY 08: 200 3. FY 09: 250		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Enrich the undergraduate learning experience

Key Performance Indicator 1: Participation in first-year learning initiatives

Data Collection: The total number of experiences in first-year learning initiatives by first-time freshmen

Targets: Targets represent expansion in the number of first-year student experiences in learning initiatives such as learning communities, orientation seminars, honors tutorials, and academic support programs for groups such as first generation college students and students of color. Each of the initiatives supports student transition to college and student academic engagement. Such initiatives represent a substantial investment of financial and human resources, so programming will be added gradually.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students awarded Global Awareness Program (GAP) certification

Data Collection: Number of certificates awarded

Targets: Targets represent a steady increase in certifications awarded through this new program, with certifications estimated to increase from the first 97 awarded in FY 2005 to 275 in FY 2009.

Students fulfill the certification requirements through a combination of studying abroad, taking language and international courses, or participating in activities with an international focus. <http://www.international.ku.edu/programs/GAP/programsummary.shtml>.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of students earning service learning certification (SLC)

Data Collection: Number of students earning certification on transcript

Targets: The first 91 certifications were awarded in FY 2006 and are projected to nearly triple to 250 by FY 2009.

The four certification components: 1) classroom experience emphasizing academic coursework, 2) directed readings focusing on a basic knowledge service learning principles, 3) independent project emphasizing the application of principals, and 4) written reflection piece integrating coursework, readings, and independent project. <http://www.servicelearning.ku.edu/certification.shtml>

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of students earning research experience program (REP) certification

Data Collection: Number of students earning certification on transcript

Targets: The first 90 certifications were awarded in FY 2006 and are projected to nearly triple to 250 by FY 2009.

The Research Experience Program includes two components: 1) a research competency that emphasizes coursework in research/creative methods, and 2) an independent research/creative project that focuses on the completion of a research/creative product. <http://www.research.ku.edu/kucr/fundops/rep.shtml>.

Comments: The indicators for Goal B are part of KU's continuing commitment to enhance the undergraduate learning experience and support student success as articulated in KU's strategic initiative to build premier learning communities. The initiative calls for increasing opportunities for undergraduates to participate in international experiences, research, and service learning. The certifications in global awareness, research, and service learning have strong links to the KU Goals of General Education that include critical inquiry, an appreciation of diversity, an awareness of contemporary issues, and social responsibility. The requirements for each of these three certification programs are over and above typical degree requirements and certifications earned are noted on students' transcripts.

Indicator 2: Examples of evidence for GAP certification includes a C or better in foreign language courses or international coursework.

Indicator 3: Examples of evidence for SLC includes a passing grade in selected coursework, an independent project, or a written reflection piece that integrates the coursework, directed readings, and the independent project.

Indicator 4: Examples of evidence for the REP certification includes a C or better in research methods courses, an academic publication, presentation at a conference/symposium, or a work of art/performance.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 2: Enhance workforce development in Kansas through training and degree availability				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of bachelors, masters, doctorate, and first professional degrees awarded	5,482 (FY 03-05)	1. FY 05-07: 0.5% 2. FY 06-08: 0.5% 3. FY 07-09: 0.5% (Pct increase based on 3-year rolling avg)		
2. Number of degrees awarded at the Edwards Campus	459 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 400 grads 2. FY 08: 405 grads 3. FY 09: 410 grads		
3. Number of participants in continuing education and training for the professions	26,394 (FY 03-05)	1. FY 05-07: 5% 2. FY 06-08: 5% 3. FY 07-09: 1% (Pct increase based on 3-year rolling avg)		

4. Number of participants in fire service training	8,060 (FY 03-05)	1. FY 05-07: 1% 2. FY 06-08: 1% 3. FY 07-09: 1% (Pct increase based on 3-year rolling avg)		
5. Number of participants in law enforcement training	3,134 (FY 03-05)	1. FY 05-07: 1% 2. FY 06-08: 1% 3. FY 07-09: 1% (Pct increase based on 3-year rolling avg)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Enhance workforce development in Kansas through training and degree availability

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of bachelors, masters, doctorate, and first professional degrees awarded

Data Collection: Number of degrees awarded as reported in the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Targets: Targets based on current enrollment, retention, and graduation patterns.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of degrees awarded at the Edwards Campus

Data Collection: The number of degrees awarded to students enrolled in the Edwards Campus programs are counted using data provided in the KU student records system and are a subset of the degrees reported in IPEDS.

Targets: The projected number of degrees awarded to graduates at the Edwards Campus is based on declining enrollments, stable program offerings, and increasingly competitive market conditions. The targets indicate efforts to rebuild the number of graduates given the challenges presented by tuition harmonization and competition from nontraditional degree programs that have reduced Edwards Campus credit hour production by almost 20%.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of participants in continuing education and training for the professions

Data Collection: KU Continuing Education (KUCE) maintains statistics on participation in training and education programs.

Targets: KUCE responds to changing demands for professional training and education as well as dynamic economic and financial environments, thus making accurate long term projections difficult. Participation targets are based on a combination of historical program analyses, program forecasts, and available funding and grant opportunities.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of participants in fire service training

Data Collection: Annual participation numbers reported by KUCE to the Kansas Fire and Rescue Training Commission.

Targets: Participation levels are based upon demand for, and certifications required of, fire service personnel and are contingent upon funding. Required state fire service training needs have reached a steady state.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of participants in law enforcement training

Data Collection: Annual participation numbers reported by KUCE to the Kansas Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training.

Targets: Participation is based on projected demand for, and certifications required of, law enforcement personnel and is contingent upon available grant funding.

Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 3: Increase external funding				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Growth in federal science and engineering research expenditures at KU	\$110,768,000 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 3% 2. FY 08: 3% 3. FY 09: 3% (Pct increase)		
2. Growth in federal life sciences research expenditures at KU	\$83,061,000 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 3% 2. FY 08: 3% 3. FY 09: 3% (Pct increase)		
3. Level of philanthropic support	\$75,974,281 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 4% 2. FY 08: 5% 3. FY 09: 5% (Pct increase)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Increase external funding

Key Performance Indicator 1: Federal science and engineering research expenditures

Data Collection: Federal science and engineering research expenditures annually reported to the National Science Foundation (NSF)

Targets: The targets are based on a combination of factors at the Lawrence campus and the Medical Center, including bond obligations for new facilities, increased research capacity, and federal funding expectations.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Federal life sciences research expenditures

Data Collection: Federal life sciences research expenditures annually reported to the National Science Foundation (NSF)

Targets: The targets are based on a combination of factors at the Lawrence campus and the Medical Center, including bond obligations for new facilities, increased research capacity, and federal funding expectations.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Level of philanthropic support

Data Collection: The KU Endowment Association annually reports support for current operations (excluding capital support and deferred giving) to the Council for Aid to Education through the Voluntary Support of Education survey.

Targets: Targets are based on the momentum of the major capital campaign that ended in 2004, but tempered by more typical annual giving patterns.

Comments: The research indicators are the same for the Medical Center and the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas because KU considers research at both campuses to be part of a single research enterprise. For example, KU reports combined research expenditures for both campuses to the National Science Foundation (NSF), the primary national agency for research reporting.

Collaborative research is common across the two campuses. For example, the Lawrence campus currently has 45 active grants that involve KUMC researchers, and KUMC has 16 active awards that involve subcontracting research to Lawrence investigators. In addition, four large grants totaling almost \$10 million involve significant participation across the two campuses.

A number of KU research centers have substantial participation by researchers from both campuses. Two significant examples include Kansas Masonic Cancer Research Institute at KUMC, and the Kansas Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Center at Lawrence.

Kansas Board of Regents

2006 Performance Agreement

University of Kansas – Lawrence Campus

ADDENDUM

At the University of Kansas - Lawrence campus, we have made several changes in our proposed agreement from the prior submittal. These modifications are briefly explained below.

We recognize we may submit more than the three institutional goal minimum required by Regents policy (Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, adopted October of 2003). After due consideration, we chose to focus on the three goals that represent major initiatives currently underway at KU, rather than diffuse our efforts across too many goals as cautioned in the Performance Agreements guidelines. The KU initiatives include efforts to enhance the learning experiences of students, degree productivity and continuing education for working professionals, and external financial support.

We join the Regents in "declaring victory" regarding Goal A. We believe we have accomplished much in the areas of efficiency, effectiveness, and seamlessness in working with other Regents institutions. In fact, the margin for further improvement on the indicators within this goal was quite small with no room for stretch. We will continue to strive for improvements in our collaborations but no longer have that as a performance goal.

In line with the Regents mandate, we are placing greater emphasis on undergraduate learning experiences and will continue with our three direct measures of certifications in global awareness, research experiences, and service learning. We have refashioned the indicator that tracked students participating in thematic learning communities to be more inclusive, and we will now track all first-year learning experiences.

For the workforce development goal, we have simplified the Edwards Campus indicators to track graduates, rather than graduates and number of programs. Several engineering programs have been consolidated under one umbrella program so it appears the program numbers have declined when in actuality the changes represent greater efficiency. You will see that detailed in our progress report next March. For the next three years, we will focus on number of graduates.

For the external funding goal, we have kept the same indicators but, rather than comparing with national averages, we are tracking our increase in external funding over time. This method will provide a more concrete assessment of these indicators and will not be subject to the time lag that occurs when making comparisons with national data.

August 31, 2006

KBOR use only: University of Kansas Lawrence Campus
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement
The following goal has been deleted: Continue to develop consortia arrangements with other Regents institutions to leverage resources and expertise. Otherwise, the performance agreement is very similar to last years.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement
Not applicable
Recommendation and Comments
Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement

Institution: University of Kansas - Medical Center	Contact Person: Allen Rawitch, PhD	Contact phone & e-mail: 913.588.1258; arawitch@kumc.edu	Date: July 14, 2006	
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Increase system efficiency / effectiveness / seamlessness				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Enrollment of Associate Degree Registered Nurses (RNs) in the University of Kansas School of Nursing BSN completion program (baccalaureate completion)	58 in 2005	2007: 60 2008: 62 2009: 63		
2. A web-based program for MS prepared Physical Therapists to advance their education and receive a post professional clinical doctorate in Physical Therapy	Development of online program (anticipated in 2006)	2007: Complete development of all post professional clinical doctorate coursework and enroll 5 students. 2008: Enroll at least 10 students. 2009: Enroll at least 10 students and have graduated at least 8 students since program inception.		
3. The number of participants in the 'Scholars in Rural Health Care' program	10 participants currently	2007: 12 2008: 14 2009: 16		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase system efficiency / effectiveness / seamlessness

Key Performance Indicator 1: Enrollment of Associate Degree Registered Nurses (RNs) in the University of Kansas School of Nursing BSN completion program (baccalaureate completion)

Data Collection: Progress on this indicator will be measured by enrollment data in the PeopleSoft Student Administration System.

Targets: Students in this program all work as nurses on a full time basis and often complete the courses on an intermittent basis. Therefore, enrollment in the program fluctuates from year to year. These students are able to graduate in a period of 12 to 18 months, but may take a longer time. Due to the need for increased numbers of baccalaureate and higher educated nurses in our region, our goal is to recruit more nurses to this college degree-completion program. 63 students is the maximum number of students we can accommodate at any one time given the numbers of faculty and the resources available to us today.

Key Performance Indicator 2: A web-based program for MS prepared Physical Therapists to advance their education and receive a post professional clinical doctorate in Physical Therapy

Data Collection: Progress on this indicator will be measured by completion of online coursework in the first target year and, in subsequent target years, by the number of students enrolled.

Targets: A reasonable expectation of enrollments in this new online program is 5 students in 2007, and 10 in each of the two following years.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The number of participants in the 'Scholars in Rural Health Care' program

Data Collection: The number of participants in the 'Scholars in Rural Health Care' program will be tracked by the School of Medicine.

Targets: The Scholars in Rural Health Care program accepts qualified undergraduate college students in Kansas colleges and universities who have the ability to pursue a career as a physician and a desire to practice in rural areas of the state. Students who successfully complete the program are automatically accepted into the School of Medicine. With the approval of the Admissions Committee of the School of Medicine and the Executive Committee of the Medical Faculty, the School of Medicine will increase the number of participants in the program beyond the current level of 10 participants.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. A new, fully integrated curriculum for medical student training	(New initiative)	2007: Complete planning and implementation of an integrated year 1 medical curriculum. 2008: Complete planning and implementation of an integrated year 2 medical curriculum. 2009: Complete assessment of new year 1 and 2 curricula, and revise as appropriate.		
2. Pass rate of BSN graduates on the NCLEX-RN (National Certification Licensing Examination for Registered Nurses)	Our baseline is the Kansas average (85%).	2007: 2% above the Kansas average pass rate of 85% 2008: 3% above the Kansas average pass rate of 85% 2009: 4% above the Kansas average pass rate of 85%		

3. The number of students in the School of Allied Health (SAH) who satisfactorily complete an international clinical experience.	4 students in 2005	2007: 75% increase in students from 2005 baseline. 2008: 100% increase in students from 2005 baseline. 2009: 125% increase in students from 2005 baseline.		
--	--------------------	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve Learner Outcomes

Key Performance Indicator 1: A new, fully integrated curriculum for medical student training

Data Collection: The status of the new, fully integrated curriculum for medical student training will be reported by the School of Medicine.

Targets: The revision of a medical curriculum is a major challenge. A major change in our approach to medical teaching has been outlined. The final planning and implementation of these changes will be completed over a 3 year period beginning with the academic year 2006-2007 for year 1 of the medical curriculum, with year 2 implementation to follow in 2007-2008, and the completion of changes to all of the years of the medical curriculum to occur in 2008-2009. The 2007 target (for year 1) includes the initiation of extensive use of tablet computers, electronic textbooks and resources, plus at least five new integrated modules. The 2008 target applies the same changes to year 2. The 2009 target includes a comprehensive review of years 1 and 2, as well as the analysis of required clerkships and elective modules in years 3 and 4, and appropriate changes to assure satisfactory achievement of defined clinical competencies and outcome measures for graduating medical students. This effort will require the investment of significant resources (both fiscal and faculty time) as well as the development of new technology and curriculum delivery methodology.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Pass rate of BSN graduates on the NCLEX-RN (National Certification Licensing Examination for Registered Nurses)

Data Collection: First-time passing percentages for each year will be calculated for NCLEX-RN tests taken that year.

Targets: Since our pass rates are already high on the licensure exams, these pass rates are already a challenge to achieve. Pass rates fluctuate from year to year due to changes in the national exam and changes in our curriculum to accommodate health care industry needs. Our goal is to achieve the highest pass rate possible.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The number of students in the School of Allied Health (SAH) that satisfactorily complete an international clinical experience.

Data Collection: The number of students who undertake an international clinical experience each year will be reported and the number of those who attain a passing grade based on criteria set by their department for the international elective experience will be tracked by the School of Allied Health.

Targets: Given the importance of health professions students learning to live and work in a global society and the fact that health issues are international in nature, we are committed to increasing our linkages with universities and healthcare facilities abroad and to encouraging students to increase their experience with clinical care in an international context. The current baseline of 4 students for this indicator is lower than we would like for international student options for the allied health professions. The departments in the School of Allied Health are thus working to increase the numbers of their students who participate in international clinical experiences for course credit. Satisfactory completion of these electives will be determined by criteria set by their departments. It is our expectation that all Allied Health students who choose to have an international clinical experience as part of their program will meet these criteria.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Improve Workforce Development				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of physicians, nurses and Allied Health professionals produced each year	An average of 167 physicians, 181 nurses, and 173 allied health professionals graduated in the years 2004-2006	2007: At least 160 physicians, 170 nurses, and 185 allied health professionals graduated 2008: At least 160 physicians, 170 nurses, and 190 allied health professionals graduated 2009: At least 160 physicians, 170 nurses, and 195 allied health professionals graduated		

2. Percentage of referrals provided through KUMC's Kansas Recruitment Center, which assists rural communities in finding qualified physicians and other health care professionals	70% in 2005	2007: 67.5% 2008: 70.0% 2009: 72.5%		
3. Enrollment in the Master's and PhD programs in Nursing.	214 in 2005	2007: 15% increase over 2005 baseline 2008: 20% increase over 2005 baseline 2009: 23% increase over 2005 baseline		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Improve Workforce Development

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of physicians, nurses and Allied Health professionals produced each year

Data Collection: The number of students who graduate each year (July 1 – June 30) will be counted and compared against the targets to measure progress on this measure.

Targets: Our targets for graduates in 2007-2009 are higher than those in previous Performance Agreements. However, they are at or slightly below our performance in the baseline period, which was a period with an unusually high number of graduates due to increases in the number of degrees in Respiratory Care, in Master's degrees in Nurse Anesthesia, and in the number of MD students in an extended program. Enrollments are highly stable in the School of Medicine, and only the Schools of Allied Health and Nursing are planning for a slow increase in the number of their graduates. Our targets are thus challenging because they are tightly bound to a stable number of enrolled students and the maintenance of our very high graduation rate (95% in 2006 for students in the MD and BSN programs).

Key Performance Indicator 2: Percentage of referrals provided through KUMC's Kansas Recruitment Center, which assists rural communities in finding qualified physicians and other health care professionals

Data Collection: The Kansas Recruitment Center assists the state's rural communities in recruiting and retaining physicians and other health care providers. The percentage of successful Recruitment Center referrals, as reported by KUMC's Office of Rural Health Education and Services, will be used to measure progress on this indicator.

Targets: We have set the targets for 2007-2009 at 67.5% - 72.5% because performance at this level represents a considerable challenge given the difficulty of recruiting and retaining health care providers in rural Kansas and the newness of the program.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Enrollment in the Master’s and PhD programs in Nursing.

Data Collection: Enrollment includes the following MS Programs: Family Nurse Practitioner; Adult/Gero Nurse Practitioner; Psych/Mental Health Nurse Practitioner; Nurse Midwifery; Organizational Leadership; Public Health Nursing; Healthcare Informatics and Health Educator Certificate Program.

Targets: The School of Nursing is working toward a considerable increase in the graduate enrollments in the School. More of these nurses are needed for teaching of nursing students at area schools of nursing and advanced practice clinical nursing in our region. Achievement of these goals will bring us to the maximum number of students we can accommodate in the graduate programs in view of the number of faculty and resources available to us today.

Regents System Goal E: Increase External Resources				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase external resources				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Growth in federal science and engineering expenditures at KU	\$110,768,000 (FY 05))	1. FY 07: 3% 2. FY 08: 3% 3. FY 09: 3% (Pct increase)		
2. Growth in federal life sciences research expenditures at KU	\$83,061,000 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 3% 2. FY 08: 3% 3. FY 09: 3% (Pct increase)		
3. Level of philanthropic support	\$75,974,281 (FY 05)	1. FY 07: 4% 2. FY 08: 5% 3. FY 09: 5% (Pct increase)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase external funding

Key Performance Indicator 1: Federal science and engineering research expenditures

Data Collection: Federal science and engineering research expenditures annually reported to the National Science Foundation (NSF)

Targets: The targets are based on a combination of factors at the Lawrence campus and the Medical Center, including bond obligations for new facilities, increased research capacity, and federal funding expectations.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Federal life sciences research expenditures

Data Collection: Federal life sciences research expenditures annually reported to the National Science Foundation (NSF)

Targets: The targets are based on a combination of factors at the Lawrence campus and the Medical Center, including bond obligations for new facilities, increased research capacity, and federal funding expectations.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Level of philanthropic support

Data Collection: The KU Endowment Association annually reports support for current operations (excluding capital support and deferred giving) to the Council for Aid to Education through the Voluntary Support of Education survey.

Targets: Targets are based on the momentum of the major capital campaign that ended in 2004, but tempered by more typical annual giving patterns.

Comments: The research indicators are the same for the Medical Center and the Lawrence campus of the University of Kansas because KU considers research at both campuses to be part of a single research enterprise. For example, KU reports combined research expenditures for both campuses to the National Science Foundation (NSF), the primary national agency for research reporting.

Collaborative research is common across the two campuses. For example, the Lawrence campus currently has 45 active grants that involve KUMC researchers, and KUMC has 16 active awards that involve subcontracting research to Lawrence investigators. In addition, four large grants totaling almost \$10 million per annum involve significant participation across the two campuses.

A number of KU research centers have substantial participation by researchers from both campuses. Two significant examples include the Kansas Masonic Cancer Research Institute at KUMC, and the Kansas Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Center at Lawrence.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 5: Enhance access to health care				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Percentage of the counties in Kansas each year that are provided with health-related services through the KUMC Health Technology and Outreach Office	An average of 93% in the period 2003-2005	2007: 94% 2008: 96% 2009: 97%		
2. The number of annual telehealth participants served by the KUMC's Center for Telemedicine and Telehealth	Five-year rolling average for 2005 is 2,402	2007: Increase by at least 5% over the 5-year rolling average 2008: Increase by at least 5% over the 5-year rolling average 2009: Increase by at least 5% over the 5-year rolling average		
3. The variety of clinical practice sites for Schools of Nursing and Allied Health students in Kansas and the Greater Kansas City Area	373 clinical practice sites in 2005	2007: 380 2008: 390 2009: 400		
4. The size of the clinical faculty in the School of Medicine	314 clinical faculty in 2005	2007: 316 2008: 317 2009: 318		
5. Delivery of Community Outreach/Public Service Programs	8,364 participants in 2005	2007: 8,380 2008: 8,400 2009: 8,480		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Enhance access to health care

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percentage of the counties in Kansas each year that are provided with health-related services through the KUMC Health Technology and Outreach Office

Data Collection: This indicator will be measured by services provided by the Area Health Education Centers in Hays, Garden City and Pittsburg; the Center for Telemedicine and Telehealth and Continuing Education Departments in Kansas City; and the Rural Health Office in Wichita.

Targets: We strive to provide health-related services to all counties in Kansas. We plan to achieve a sustained high rate of provision with a base target of at least 94%, and slowly increase it to a stable 97% (or more) by 2009.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The number of annual telehealth participants served by the KUMC's Center for Telemedicine and Telehealth

Data Collection: The number of annual telehealth participants served by the KUMC's Center for Telemedicine and Telehealth will be used to gauge progress on this measure.

Targets: KUMC is planning for a 5% yearly increase in the five-year rolling average in the number of telehealth participants.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The variety of clinical practice sites for Schools of Nursing and Allied Health students in Kansas and the Greater Kansas City Area

Data Collection: Clinical practice sites are essential for the training of students in the practice of health care. The source for this data will be reports from the School of Allied Health and the School of Nursing on the number of clinical practice sites in Kansas and the Greater Kansas City Area.

Targets: The two schools are increasing the minimum number of clinical practice sites above the original benchmark of 250, and are planning on an increase of at least 10 per year in the number of practice sites in the period 2007-2009.

Key Performance Indicator 4: The size of the clinical faculty in the School of Medicine

Data Collection: The number of full-time faculty in the clinical departments of the School of Medicine in Kansas City will be used to measure progress on this measure.

Targets: The School of Medicine plans to increase the number of clinical faculty to 318, but this is contingent on funding and further assumes that the competitiveness of the market for new faculty does not increase.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Delivery of Community Outreach/Public Service Programs

Data Collection: This indicator will be measured by continuing education services provided by the Area Health Education Centers in Hays, Garden City and Pittsburg.

Targets: Despite the fact that the population of potential participants is declining in rural Kansas, our target is to slowly increase the level of participation in continuing education programs for healthcare professionals.

**Kansas Board of Regents
2006 Performance Agreement
University of Kansas Medical Center**

ADDENDUM

In the Performance Agreement for the University of Kansas Medical Center, the great majority of targets are “stretch” targets. However, a small number of targets are close to our baseline measures. These targets have been chosen because they are intimately tied to either our educational mission, which is to provide healthcare practitioners for the State of Kansas and to prepare biomedical researchers, or to our service mission, which is to provide healthcare services to the people of Kansas. While a few of these targets are quite close to the baseline measures, the baselines themselves are high. Maintaining these levels of performance is critical to our success and requires a stretch of both effort and resources.

Furthermore, many of the parameters available to primarily undergraduate campuses are either not available to us or are inappropriate, given the nature of a medical center campus. Our students are very different from those that compose the student body at institutions that are predominantly undergraduate. Our students are either enrolled at the Medical Center in a professional degree program in medicine, nursing, or one of the allied health professions, or in a graduate program focused on biomedical or healthcare research. Because we have limited capacity and a good reputation, we are able to be very selective in admitting students to our programs. As a consequence, the great majority of our fulltime students graduate in the minimum time. We thus “top out” on many traditional measures of student outcome, and cannot effectively use “stretch” measures of student outcome as targets.

The targets we choose therefore reflect the unique character of our mission in the Regents System and in the state, and the nature of our students. We believe that measures such as pass rates on licensure exams (which are already very high) and numbers of professionals we graduate (which are stable, rather than increasing) are appropriate. They are central to our educational mission, and are also effective indicators of accomplishment because they challenge us to maintain a high level of achievement.

KBOR use only: University of Kansas Medical Center

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Goal 2 indicators 1 and 3 are new. Two indicators have been deleted from goal 3. Otherwise, the performance agreement is very similar to last years.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The last performance agreement was approved with the following comment, *“In several cases, target values are below the baseline value. In future performance agreements, the institution may wish to include goals and indicators that allow more stretch – that are not so close to maximum performance.”* As noted in the addendum, some targets are still very close to the baselines. In addition, the baseline reported for goal 2 indicator 2 is less than the baseline reported last year.

Recommendation and Comments

Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.

Institution: Wichita State University	Contact Person: Gary L. Miller	Contact phone & e-mail: Gary.Miller@wichita.edu 316-978-5051	Date: August 10, 2006
--	--------------------------------	--	-----------------------

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Expand academic services for faculty, staff and students through development of new facilities and expansion of electronic services

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
The number of student credit hours at the West Campus	Rolling average for last three calendar years:2003, 2004, 2005 16,022 SCH	2007: 5% increase or 16,823 2008: 3% increase or 17,304 2009: 3% increase or 17,784		
The number of college advisors who use CAPP (Curriculum Advising and Program Planning), the electronic degree audit available with SunGardHE Banner computer system.	CAPP is not completed for any college and thus is not being used by any college advisors.	Within 3 years, CAPP will be completed and used by the majority of college advisors for student advising and degree validation. 2007: 80% of the advisors in Colleges of Health Professions, Business, and Engineering will use CAPP. 2008: 80% of advisors in Colleges of Education and Fine Arts; 90% advisors in HP,BA, EN 2009: 80% of advisors in the LAS Advising Center and all graduate programs; 100% in HP,BA,EN; 90% in ED, FA.		

<p>The number of classrooms equipped with audio/video/data projection capabilities.</p>	<p>125 of 336 classrooms</p>	<p>45 additional technology-equipped classrooms over the next three years 2007: 15 2008: 15 2009: 15</p>		
<p>The number of queries by end users of the Data Extractor within the new Sungard HESCT system.</p>	<p>12 queries in 2005 by academic colleges</p>	<p>2007: 4000 queries by end users in the academic colleges 2008: 8000 queries by end users in academic colleges 2009: 12,000 queries by end users in the academic colleges and in academic support areas(e.g student health, housing, and registrar)</p>		
<p>The number of uses of the electronic workflow (business) processes in the newly implemented ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) software.</p>	<p>No electronic workflows are developed and none are currently being used.</p>	<p>Within three years, WSU will develop, test, evaluate, 6 new workflow processes. 2007: 250 uses of 2 workflows 2008: 500 uses of 4 work flows 2009: 1000 uses of 6 workflows</p>		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Key Performance Indicator 1: Expansion of West Campus

Data Collection: Student credit hours(SCH) are maintained in the student database

Targets: This indicator will enhance the seamlessness for west side high school students taking dual credit at the West Campus. It will also enhance the efficiency/seamlessness for all west side students when they can attend classes and purchase their textbooks at a University campus nearer their home. Modest growth is possible at the new West campus facility through increased daytime usage and increasing collaboration with west side industries and high schools. It is the dependence on external agency collaboration as well as WSU's essentially stable enrollment and the current higher education competitive market forces within the metropolitan Wichita area and south central Kansas that make this target a stretch.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The number of college advisors using CAPP, the electronic degree audit system

Data Collection: Data regarding implementation and use of CAPP within the colleges will be recorded.

Targets: The target is to phase-in the implementation of CAPP (the electronic degree audit system) college by college within three years, resulting in 80% advisor usage the first year in the identified colleges, 90% in the second year of implementation, and 100% in the third year.

Effectiveness/efficiency/seamlessness will be enhanced with an increased number of college advisors using CAPP (Curriculum Advising and Program Planning), the electronic degree audit available with SunGardHE Banner computer system. Eventually, after CAPP is implemented in all colleges, increased numbers of students, especially transfer students, will be able to use the system to determine what courses they need if they change majors in a different college or for degree completion at WSU. For the next three years, we expect to have advisors using the system for degree validation and advising. This target is a stretch because of the need to implement the system, train advisors, and change from paper to a paperless system, a major culture change.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Technology equipped classrooms

Data Collection: The Media Resources Center monitors the equipment in WSU classrooms and will report progress on implementation

Targets: The target is completion of 45 classrooms fully equipped with audio-video-data projection capabilities. The number of requests for data projectors has grown from 6 in 1996, 1,500 in 2000, to 2,700 in 2005. WSU responded by equipping 125 classrooms of its 336 classrooms with digital projection equipment. The University is committed to ongoing expansion of digital projection to enhance the efficiency of services to faculty to support more effective teaching. The challenge in this target is that it is a costly endeavor to implement and maintain but internal reallocation will be done as well as grant funds will be sought. In the end, this will allow for greater efficiency because it will eliminate the need to manually distribute this equipment to each classroom.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Extracting data for effective and efficient decision making at the college level

Data Collection: Training logs and usage will be monitored.

Targets: Currently most departments and colleges request data centrally. The data extractor in banner was only used 12 times in 2005 by end users in the academic areas of the campus. With the advent of the new computer system, we plan to train individuals across campus to use the data extractor and reporting services to meet commonly recurring informational needs. There are only a few people with even the basic skills for extracting data from the system. Overcoming reluctance to a change in practices is the challenge for this target as well as assuring training for proficiency and comfort in using the system. Documentation of the success of these endeavors will be the actual counts of the number of times individuals use the extractor for retrieval of information. Efficiency and effectiveness of decision making will be greatly enhanced with easy data access to the data at the unit level.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Workflow projects

Data Collection: Documentation of new workflow processes will be part of the next phase of the SunGardHE Banner implementation

Targets: The target is increasing usage of the six newly completed workflows in the next three years. “Workflow” is a tool that automates a business process so that business events trigger user notifications, business process logic, external or internal e-mails, and automated activities. As the Wichita State Information Network (WIN) Team becomes technically proficient in its use (implementation of the Workflow tool is scheduled for Fall 2006-Spring 2007), Banner Workflow will be incorporated into many system-wide and departmental-based processes. Each process will be analyzed and flowcharted in detail by the staff associated with that process, and an automated solution (workflow) will be designed, developed and implemented. Developing these workflows is complex and requires major collaborative work by the information technology specialists and the end users. Six in three years is a stretch. During 2007, 2 new workflows will be developed in consultation with the SunGardHE Banner personnel. During 2008 and 2009, WSU staff will be developing the additional processes independently.

Comments: This goal was revised as part of the initiation of the three year reporting cycle. The indicator related to the West Campus has been revised. The new West Campus facility, opened in January, 2006, is a potential growth area for the university. The WSU competitive market and the recent enrollment issues at WSU makes growth in any segment of the university a stretch. The indicator related to the new computer system (Banner) has also been revised. Banner will be completed in early FY2008; however, implementation is only the first step. Additional efforts are needed to make the system an effective and efficient tool for faculty, staff and students. Completion of three vital but difficult business practices have been selected as new indicators i.e. degree audit system, workflow, and data extraction.

The degree audit system will be used for both advising and degree validation. This audit system (1) will assist advisors in determining quickly and efficiently the transfer of credit hours from other post secondary schools; (2) will allow current students to identify on-line the requirements met and courses still needed; and (3) will provide validation of requirements prior to awarding the degree. Much of this work is now being done manually-a process that is inefficient, inconvenient and labor intensive. The degree audit system will impact the entire student body. The indicator related to the usage of on-line services by faculty, staff and students has been retired.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve learner outcomes by engaging students in effective educational practices				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
The percentage of French/Spanish majors meeting or exceeding the intermediate mid level on the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) in the capstone courses French 525/Spanish 525. (Direct measure)	84.5% of French and Spanish students in French 525 and Spanish 525 reached the intermediate mid level of proficiency on the OPI	The percentage of students meeting or exceeding the Intermediate Mid Level on the OPI will be 2007: 86 2008: 87 2009: 88		
The percentage of students who perceive they have course work that emphasizes synthesis of ideas and making judgments as measured by the National Survey for Student Engagement(NSSE) (Indirect measure)	1) % students reporting a focus in their course work on synthesis as "quite a bit" or "very much": 58% 2) % students reporting a focus in their course work on making judgments as "quite a bit" or "very much": 61%	At least one of the following must be met. 1) Ultimately increase response rate to 75% by third year: 2007: 65% 2008: 70% 2009: 75% 2) Ultimately increase response rate to 75% by third year: 2007: 65% 2008: 70% 2009: 75%		
The achievement scores of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering students on the Senior Design Project. (Direct measure)	The past 4 year average achievement scores of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering on the senior design project was 68%	The average achievement scores will be 2007--72 % 2008-75 % 2009-78%		

<p>The percent of nursing students who achieve the 60th or higher percentile on the Assessment Technologies Institute (ATI) results. Students who perform at the 60th or higher percentile on the ATI subject exams are predicted to pass NCLEX (the nursing licensure exam) at a higher rate. (Direct measure of learner outcomes)</p>	<p>Baseline scores: The current average percent of students scoring at the 60th percentile or above for each of the tests is as follows:</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Fundamentals</td><td>44%</td></tr> <tr><td>Pharmacology</td><td>44%</td></tr> <tr><td>Mental Health</td><td>45%</td></tr> <tr><td>Medical-Surg.</td><td>27%</td></tr> <tr><td>Nsg of Children</td><td>36%</td></tr> <tr><td>Mat.I-Newborn</td><td>33%</td></tr> <tr><td>Community</td><td>41%</td></tr> <tr><td>Leadership & Management</td><td>52%</td></tr> <tr><td>Critical Care</td><td>50%</td></tr> <tr><td>Comp.Predictor</td><td>54%</td></tr> </table>	Fundamentals	44%	Pharmacology	44%	Mental Health	45%	Medical-Surg.	27%	Nsg of Children	36%	Mat.I-Newborn	33%	Community	41%	Leadership & Management	52%	Critical Care	50%	Comp.Predictor	54%	<p>The majority of increased percentages at the 60th percentile level for each test must be met:</p> <p>2007:</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>Fundamentals</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Pharmacology</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Mental Health</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Med-Surg</td><td>6%</td></tr> <tr><td>Nsg Children</td><td>6%</td></tr> <tr><td>Matern-NB</td><td>6%</td></tr> <tr><td>Comm</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>L & M</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Crit Care</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Predictor</td><td>3%</td></tr> </table> <p>2008: Same increase in percentages per test over 2007</p> <p>2009: Same increase in percentages per test over 2008</p>	Fundamentals	3%	Pharmacology	3%	Mental Health	3%	Med-Surg	6%	Nsg Children	6%	Matern-NB	6%	Comm	3%	L & M	3%	Crit Care	3%	Predictor	3%		
Fundamentals	44%																																											
Pharmacology	44%																																											
Mental Health	45%																																											
Medical-Surg.	27%																																											
Nsg of Children	36%																																											
Mat.I-Newborn	33%																																											
Community	41%																																											
Leadership & Management	52%																																											
Critical Care	50%																																											
Comp.Predictor	54%																																											
Fundamentals	3%																																											
Pharmacology	3%																																											
Mental Health	3%																																											
Med-Surg	6%																																											
Nsg Children	6%																																											
Matern-NB	6%																																											
Comm	3%																																											
L & M	3%																																											
Crit Care	3%																																											
Predictor	3%																																											

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2:

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increased level of performance on Oral Proficiency Interview

Data Collection: Trained interviewers will perform the interviews using standard guidelines (rubrics) to assess speaking.

Targets: The target is to increase 3.5% over the baseline in the next three years. The Oral Proficiency Interview is a nationally recognized exam in which interviewers have taken a four day intensive training workshop which prepares them to evaluate the students with standard guidelines. This exam is administered to French and Spanish students in their capstone courses by the faculty who have had this training. The department sees this as a stretch, even though the percentage is small, and has had these goals for improvement in their departmental assessment plans.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Synthesis of ideas and making judgments as measured by NSSE

Data Collection: Results of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a national standardized student survey examining educational practices as viewed by freshmen and seniors will be repeated in the 2006-07 academic year. Scores will be available for review late calendar year 2007.

Targets: The target is to reach at least 75% of students reporting "quite a bit" or "very much" on at least one of the two items related to course work emphasizing synthesis and making judgments. The items related to Academic Challenge in the NSSE reflect some concerns as reported by students. WSU has decided to focus on the two vital areas: teaching synthesis of concepts and ideas and making judgments based on information. The other areas in NSSE previously included in the performance agreements (i.e. active and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction) will continue to be addressed by faculty and staff but are not included in this document. We expect to increase the percentage of responses in each these areas to 75 percent in three years but we have as our target that we must reach at least one. Any movement in NSSE scores is a stretch based on nationally reported information as well as the three previous administrations at WSU.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Improved performance on Senior Design Project

Data Collection: The project is evaluated by departmental faculty and the Industrial Advisory Board using specific guidelines.

Targets: The target is to increase the average percentage achievement levels of Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Seniors on this project by 10% over the next three years. The Senior Design Project is the culminating project where students demonstrate their engineering skills. The Engineering Dean sees this target as a stretch given the nature of the project and the evaluation process.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Nursing assessment in designated content areas

Data Collection: Data are collected, maintained and analyzed by the nursing department faculty.

Targets: The Nursing faculty has set targets to increase the percentage of students who pass at the 60th percentile on each exam. The overall target will be met when the majority of percentages for all tests (as identified) is reached, meaning that 6 of the 10 tests must reach their target percentage increase. Nursing students are now taking a standardized test purchased from Assessment Technologies Institute (ATI). Each nursing student takes a proctored computerized test at the end of selected nursing courses. They take 11 tests during the program including a Comprehensive Predictor test during the Capstone Course. These tests are predictive of passing NCLEX (the national nursing license examination). The faculty has determined that a student needs to score at the 60th percentile of the national standard on each test as students who score at or above the 60th percentile are predicted to pass NCLEX.

Comments: The goal and indicators for this system goal have been totally revised in response to the Board's direction to strengthen this goal through direct measures of learner outcomes. Each of the colleges was charged three years ago with designing assessment plans that include direct measures of learning outcomes. Selected plans from three colleges (i.e. Liberal Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Health Professions) are now included in this goal.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Respond to workforce needs by increasing the number of graduates prepared in the sciences and engineering				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
The number of baccalaureate graduates in the sciences/mathematics (i.e. mathematics, biology, chemistry, computer science, geology and physics), and engineering	Average last three calendar years: 2002-2005 Math/Sciences: 147 Engineering: 144	5% increase each of the next 3 years: M/SC Eng 2007 154 151 2008 162 158 2009 169 166		
The number of cooperative education and internship placements for engineering students	53% of undergraduates in engineering are doing an internship or cooperative education Calendar year 2005: 185 placements	By 2009, 45% increase in undergraduate placements in cooperative education experiences or internships. CY 2007: 213 CY 2008: 240 CY 2009: 268		
The number of Watkins Summer Fellowship	2 fellowships in 2006	2007: 4 fellowships 2008: 6 fellowships 2009: 8 fellowships		
The number of retention scholarships awarded to mathematics, sciences and engineering students from the general scholarship fund.	Currently awards from the general scholarship fund are designated as recruitment scholarships rather than retention scholarships and are awarded only for the first year.	\$1000 retention scholarships will be given to sophomore, junior, and senior math/science and engineering based on the following counts: 2007: 50 students 2008: 60 students 2009: 70 students		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3:

Key Performance Indicator 1: Graduates in the sciences and engineering.

Data Collection: Student records database

Targets: The target is an increase in the the number of Bachelor's degrees in mathematics, sciences and engineering in response to the growing demands for these graduates in the workforce. Degrees in these areas have fluctuated from as low as 278 to as high as 317 during the last 5 years. The target is to increase these numbers to 335 graduates. Meeting this target will require major recruitment efforts as well as reallocation of financial aid scholarship dollars, making this a stretch.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Cooperative education and internships with the College of Engineering.

Data Collection: Records are maintained by the Office of Cooperative Education and the College of Engineering.

Targets: Beginning in Fall 2007, all engineering undergraduates will be required to complete three out of the following five options: cooperative education/internship experience, undergraduate research project with a faculty member, a community leadership experience, study abroad or global learning experience, or a multidisciplinary project. The College of Engineering has set a 69% target from the current 53% for their students selecting the cooperative education experience. To achieve this target, Coop Ed has agreed to increase the number of placements by 45% in three years. This is done without extra resources and will require internal reallocation making this a stretch. Students with a cooperative education credits are more likely to have experience that makes them marketable in the workforce.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Watkins Summer Fellowships

Data Collection: Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will manage the data collection

Targets: The target is to increase the number of Watkins Fellowships to 8 in three years. The Watkins Summer Fellowship provides fellowships for high school teachers, two-year college faculty, and smaller private or public four year college faculty to work with a WSU scientists in chemistry, biology, geology or physics for the summer. This increase in fellowships is small in number; however, the impact is significant. For every Fellow, we can potentially impact 100 high school or college students each year. Ultimately the program may affect as many as 800 potential college students annually. Also the alliances between the WSU faculty and the Watkins fellows will potentially enhance recruits into these majors. This target is a stretch because the endowed funds are not sufficient and reallocation of central funds will be necessary. This indicator should lead to better prepared high school students or transfer students with science courses and perhaps more graduates in this area.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Reallocation of scholarship dollars

Data Collection: Monitoring by the Scholarship Office and the Colleges

Targets: The target is to award \$1000 retention scholarhips in three years to 70 mathematics, science and engineering majors. Currently the general fund scholarships have provided scholarships for new students during their freshman year. This reallocation is a change in focus that will provide funds for students in the math/sciences and engineering during the sophomore, junior and senior years. Students must stay in their specific majors and must be in good academic standing to be considered for these monies. This is a new approach and will require reallocation which makes this a stretch target. With this increase in financial support we expect to see more graduates from the math/science areas for which there is considerable demand in the workforce.

Comments: This goal was totally re-written for the three-year project. We decided to concentrate on engineering and the sciences to address local, state and national needs for prepared workers in these areas. Student interest in science, mathematics and engineering is a national issue and WSU's attempt to address this area is a major stretch.

Comments About Deleted Goals: Due to the magnitude and breadth of the tasks involved in addressing the goals for the three system goals above, WSU decided not to include major targets in this area. WSU continues to recruit and serve students from all backgrounds and continues to emphasize participation by students from under represented groups.

Due to the magnitude and breadth of the tasks involved in addressing the goals for the three system goals above, WSU decided not to include major targets within this area. WSU continues its focus on securing external dollars for research and training grants and from donors.

Due to the magnitude and breadth of the tasks involved in addressing the goals for the three system goals above, WSU decided not to include major targets within this area. WSU continues to be very involved in south central Kansas for various scholarly, creative, civic, cultural and educational activities.

KBOR use only: Wichita State University
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement Major changes have been made from the last performance agreement.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement <i>The last performance agreement was approved with the following comment, “Three of the four indicators in goal 2 are self-report. The fourth indicator impacts a relatively small number of students. Recommend approval with the understanding that the learner outcomes goal will be strengthened in future performance agreements.”</i> The learner outcomes goal has been revised to address this comment.
Recommendation and Comments Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.

Institution: Washburn University	Contact Person: Ron Wasserstein, VPAA	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-670-1649, ron.wasserstein@washburn.edu	Date: July 5, 2006 revised 9/14/06
---	---------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 1: Provide the opportunity for a “transformational learning experience” for every undergraduate student

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in community service	70% (of those students electing the community service alternative) will have a significant transformational learning experience (see assessment, below)	Calendar 2007: 75% Calendar 2008: 80% Calendar 2009: 90%		
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in leadership	70% (of those students electing the leadership alternative) will have a significant transformational learning experience (see assessment, below)	Calendar 2007: 75% Calendar 2008: 80% Calendar 2009: 90%		
Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in international education	70% (of those students electing the international education alternative) will have a significant transformational learning experience (see assessment, below)	Calendar 2007: 75% Calendar 2008: 80% Calendar 2009: 90%		

Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience through scholarly or creative activity	70% (of those students electing the scholarly or creative activity alternative) will have a significant transformational learning experience (see assessment, below)	Calendar 2007: 75% Calendar 2008: 80% Calendar 2009: 90%		
---	--	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Provide the opportunity for a “transformational learning experience” for every undergraduate student

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in community service. Students who elect community service as their required experience will complete 150 hours of service under the guidance of a mentor. While engaged in direct service, community service students will meet with their mentor and other students at least four times per semester to reflect on their experiences and to develop a service focus complementing their interests and academic pursuits. Each student will conclude with a final report that not only describes what took place but what was learned from the experience, and how the experience has affected the student's view of the community and his or her role in it. An oral presentation of these findings is also required. Students will complete a survey pre- and post-experience which measures change in attitudes related to social justice, community building, civic engagement, and diversity

Data Collection: Students will use the aforementioned survey developed by the Bonner Foundation to self-report the quality of their experiences. Direct measures include (1) direct evaluation of the students' development as a result of service, and (2) review of the students' final reports and oral presentations. Using a rubric, each student's "transformation" will be assessed on a 1 (low)-5(high)scale. A score of at least 4 means the student had a significant transformational learning experience.

Targets: Since the program is just starting this fall, the baseline is an estimate of current success level. We hope to move quickly to a much higher rate.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in leadership. Students who elect leadership as their required experience will complete at least three semester hours of college coursework in leadership and serve in one or more functional leadership roles for a minimum of 150 hours. Students will work with a mentor to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their leadership skills and to learn how to become effective change agents. Students will complete their experiences by providing both written and oral reports addressing what they learned about themselves and their own leadership skills, and how this learning has impacted their view of leaders and leadership.

Data Collection: As an indirect measure, students will self-report the quality of their experiences. Direct measures include (1) direct evaluation of the students' development as a result of their leadership experiences, and (2) review of the students' final reports and oral presentations. Using a rubric, each student's "transformation" will be assessed on a 1 (low)-5(high)scale. A score of at least 4 means the student had a significant transformational learning experience.

Targets: Since the program is just starting this fall, the baseline is an estimate of current success level. We hope to move quickly to a much higher rate.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience in international education. To identify an appropriate international experience, students will work with a faculty member or the study abroad coordinator. Students will write a research paper on a relevant topic prior to their international experience to help them prepare for the experience. At the end of the experience, a written final report describing how it has impacted the student's view of the world is expected. An oral presentation about the student's experience is also expected.

Data Collection: As an indirect measure, students will self-report the quality of their experiences. Direct measures include (1) direct evaluation of the students' development as a result of their international experiences, and (2) review of the students' written reports (before and after) and oral presentations. Using a rubric, each student's "transformation" will be assessed on a 1 (low)-5(high)scale. A score of at least 4 means the student had a significant transformational learning experience

Targets: Since the program is just starting this fall, the baseline is an estimate of current success level. We hope to move quickly to a much higher rate.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase percentage of graduating baccalaureate students who have had a significant transformational learning experience through scholarly or creative activity. Students will work on a significant scholarly or creative project under the tutelage of at least one faculty member. Students must submit a detailed preliminary proposal, which must be approved before the project may begin. The proposal review will help ensure the student is focused and well prepared to complete the project. Students choosing this experience will present their work in a public forum (often at research conferences) appropriate for the type of work completed, and must also complete a final written report.

Data Collection: As an indirect measure, students will self-report the quality of their experiences. Direct measures include (1) direct evaluation of the students' development as a result of their scholarly or creative experiences, and (2) review of the students' written reports and oral presentations. Using a rubric, each student's "transformation" will be assessed on a 1 (low)-5(high)scale. A score of at least 4 means the student had a significant transformational learning experience

Targets: Since the program is just starting this fall, the baseline is an estimate of current success level. We hope to move quickly to a much higher rate.

Comments: This goal is continued from previous performance agreement, but with a change in indicators. This is a major initiative for Washburn University, involving a substantial commitment of time and resources. We believe it will have an enormous impact on learning and the learning environment on campus. While some universities have focused on one or perhaps two of these kinds of experiences, we are to our knowledge the only institution of our size to require every student to complete one of these experiences. Over the years, Washburn has excelled at providing these types of experiences to some of our students. We have seen that these experiences have a significant positive impact on the students involved. Our goal with this program is to ensure that every baccalaureate degree-seeking student completes at least one of the four experiences (community service, leadership, international education, scholarly or creative activity). We believe that, as a result, every student will be challenged to accomplish more during their undergraduate education than they would have thought possible. Our vision is that, in the end, not only will students be transformed, but the University will be transformed as well.

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 2: Strengthened partnerships with Kansas community colleges through the PLAN 2+2 Program				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of general education courses available on-line	21	Calendar 2007: 25 beyond that: goal met, and we will eliminate this indicator		
Number of additional PLAN partnerships with Kansas community colleges	16	Calendar 2007: 18 Calendar 2008: 20 Calendar 2009: NA (goal to be reached by 2008)		
Number of online courses reviewed by teams of inter-institutional faculty.	1	Calendar 2007: 5 Calendar 2008: 10 Calendar 2009: 15		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Strengthened partnerships with Kansas community colleges through the PLAN 2+2 Program

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of general education courses available on-line

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: Based on previous performance agreements and our analysis of need. The general education courses that are of interest to the greatest number of students will be online by the end of 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of additional PLAN partnerships with Kansas community colleges

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: Our goal continues to be a partnership with every public community college in Kansas.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of online courses reviewed by teams of inter-institutional faculty.

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: Baseline is the pilot review being conducted this year on an on-line history course. We will review 5 courses per year beginning in 2007. These are intensive reviews, so a review of a new set of five courses annually is a full-scale review involving many people.

Comments: This goal is continued from previous performance agreements, but with changes to the indicators. The Partnership for Learning and Networking (PLAN 2+2) is a degree completion program for community college students, and continues to be a small but important program at Washburn. The bulk of our participants are from Johnson and Wyandotte counties, but we have students from almost all community colleges. The program continues to provide a seamless educational experience for place-bound students. Regarding general education courses, like most other institutions, our own students are the principal subscribers to our on-line courses. Key Indicator 1 continues from previous performance agreements, but our goals will be reached by the end of the 2007 performance agreement. Key Indicator 2 continues from previous performance agreements, with baseline and targets extended. Key Indicator 3 is new, representing a collaboration with the institutions in the KCREACHE consortium (a group of schools offering distance ed programs in the Kansas City metropolitan area) to improve the quality of our on-line courses.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: New relationship with Kaw Area Technical School				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Signed agreement between Washburn and Kaw Area Technical School detailing the new relationship	currently, we simply have program articulation	fundamentally new relationship (see narrative)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: New relationship with Kaw Area Technical School

Key Performance Indicator 1: Signed agreement between Washburn and Kaw Area Technical School detailing the new relationship

Data Collection: see comments

Targets: By the end of calendar 2007, we aim to have an agreement in place, to take effect by July 1, 2008.

Comments: This new goal for 2007 (was part of 2005 agreement but not part of 2006 agreement) is very much a stretch goal for Washburn University. If we are successful, the combination of our institutions will unite and strengthen technical and associate degree education in Shawnee County and northeast, to the positive benefit of students and to workforce development in this part of the state. One of the goals in Washburn's 2005 Performance Agreement was to develop a new strategic relationship with Kaw Area Technical School. Because of limited success during 2005, this goal was suspended from the 2006 agreement. We have continued to work on this agreement on many levels, and because of the State's interest in workforce development in general, and technical education in particular, we are adding it back for 2007. In brief, we propose to combine the governance of WU and KATS under the WU Board of Regents, bringing KATS under WU's accreditation umbrella (through the HLC "institutional change" process). Leveraging the combined resources of the two institutions, we would provide seamless technical, two-year, and four-year education to the citizens of Shawnee County and northeast Kansas. We note our only Key Indicator is a binary indicator, but trust the Board to recognize how directional improvement might still be made even in the unlikely event that we cannot arrive at an agreement.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 4: Grow and strengthen both the BSN and MSN programs (note: also meets Regents Goal D, increase targeted participation/access)				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
increase number of BSN graduates	112/year	Calendar 2007: 112* Calendar 2008: 141 Calendar 2009: 141		

increase number of MSN candidates	15	Calendar 2007: 21 Calendar 2008: 27 Calendar 2009: 27		
number of additional Ph.D. qualified nursing faculty	2 (per previous agreements)	Calendar 2007: add third faculty member Calendar 2008: three-year goal from previous agreements reached		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Grow and strengthen both the BSN and MSN programs (note: also meets Regents Goal D, increase targeted participation/access)

Key Performance Indicator 1: increase number of BSN graduates

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: *Baseline is average number of BSN graduates currently. Pending funding, we will begin to admit more students beginning Fall 2006, but this new larger cohort will not complete their study until May 2008. Thus, the increase in the number of graduates will begin in calendar 2008.

Key Performance Indicator 2: increase number of MSN candidates

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: Baseline is the current number of MSN students. Targets based on need for growth in the program.

Key Performance Indicator 3: number of additional Ph.D. qualified nursing faculty

Data Collection: self-explanatory

Targets: This target has been our aim in previous performance agreements, and will be completed by the start of the Fall 2007 semester.

Comments: This goal is continued from the previous performance agreement, but with some change in indicators. Using funding from the Nursing Shortage Initiative, we will increase the number of nursing graduates in our BSN program. Key Performance Indicator 3 is the continuation and completion of an indicator that appeared in previous performance agreements.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 5: Improve facilities for the natural sciences				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Addition to and Renovation of Stoffer Hall (science building)	construction will begin in Fall 2006	calendar 2007: phase one (addition) complete calendar 2008: phase two (renovation) complete		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Improve facilities for the natural sciences

Key Performance Indicator 1: Addition to and Renovation of Stoffer Hall (science building)

Comments: Because of the size of and the dollar investment in this project, and because of State and national interest in improving science education and increasing the number of science graduates, we feel this building project continues to be appropriate as a performance agreement goal. Thus, this goal is continued from the previous performance agreement, but with a change in indicators. (The visual arts portion of this goal is being completed in calendar 2006, so is removed from this performance agreement.) This project represents the largest dollar investment in an academic building in Washburn's history.

KBOR use only: Washburn University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

The learner outcomes goal has been modified; minor changes have been made to goal 2. Otherwise, the performance agreement is very similar to last years.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The last performance agreement was approved with the following comment, *“Recommend approval with the understanding that assessments of the educational experiences in goal 4 will be included in the next performance agreement.”* The learner outcomes goal has been revised to address this comment.

Recommendation and Comments

In goal 2, indicator 2, the target for 2007 is the same as the target for 2006.

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee praises the institution for its willingness to negotiate the terms of the performance agreement.

Recommend approval as a one-year performance agreement.

Institution: Allen County Community College	Contact Person: John Masterson	Contact phone & e-mail: (620) 365-5116 masterson@allencc.edu	Date: August 31, 2006	
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Collaborate with Other Regents Institutions				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of program articulation or 2+2 agreements developed	8 total agreements in 2005	Target yr 1: 9 Target yr 2: 10 Target yr 3: 11		
GPA of ACCC transfer students vs all transfer students and native students at ESU and PSU	2005 Fall GPA's for ACCC transfer students, all transfer students, and native students at ESU and PSU	Target yr 1: Increase GPA for ACCC transfer students and increase GPA in comparison with all transfer students and with native students. Target yr 2: Same Target yr 3: Same		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Collaborate with Other Regents Institutions

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Program Articulation or 2+2 Agreements Developed

Data Collection: Using 2005 as the base year, eight (8) formal program articulation agreements and/or 2+2 agreements between ACCC and other Regents Institutions existed. Each newly developed agreement will be used to measure progress.

Targets: A minimum of one formal program articulation agreement or 2+2 agreement will be completed and implemented each year. A minimum of nine agreements will be in place by the end of 2007, ten by 2008, and 11 by 2009. This will represent an increase of 83% since the inception of this goal and a 37.5% increase during these three years. The time involved in completing this process between institutions makes this target a challenge. Tracking the actual number of students who take advantage of these agreements is difficult and not very accurate since the only time that we hear from the students regarding the success of transfer into the program is when there are difficulties.

Key Performance Indicator 2: GPA of ACCC Transfer Students vs All Transfer Students and Native Students at ESU and PSU

Data Collection: Using the transfer performance reports sent by Emporia State University and Pittsburg State University for fall semester 2005, the baseline will be the average cumulative GPA indicated for ACCC transfer students, all other transfer students, and native students at the two universities.

Targets: Reported fall cumulative GPA for ACCC students will increase each year as well as increase in comparison to all transfers and native students:ESU Fall 2005 (90 students)=ACCC 3.10, All transfer 3.06, native 3.03; PSU fall 2005 (30) students=ACCC 2.99, All transfer 3.18, native 3.17. Increasing the GPA for ACCC transfers as well as showing positive movement in comparison to all transfer students and native students at two universities makes this a difficult goal to achieve.

Comments: We dropped our previous indicator "Develop and implement statewide outcomes for programs and courses". We did this for two reasons. First, we have implemented every one of the course competencies developed at the statewide meetings. The second reason is that KBOR has never endorsed these statewide meetings or their outcomes. As a result, some universities refuse to accept the same courses for which competencies have been developed and agreed upon, making this a somewhat futile effort.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve Success of Students in Developmental Courses				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Within course retention rates of developmental students	Average within course retention rate for 2004 and 2005=71.5%	Target yr 1: 72% Target yr 2: 72.5% Target yr 3: 73%		
Success rate of developmental course completers	Average success rate for 2004 and 2005=75.5%	Target yr 1: 76% Target yr 2: 76.5% Target yr 3: 77%		
Success of developmental students in subsequent, sequential courses (math, reading, or English)	Average success rate in next sequential course in 2004 and 2005=81.65%	Target yr 1: 82.15% Target yr 2: 82.65% Target yr 3: 83.15%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve Success of Students in Developmental Courses

Key Performance Indicator 1: Within Course Retention Rates of Developmental Students

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, course retention data for developmental courses, after 20th day of classes, will be extracted and compared to the benchmark average of 71.5% for the years 2004 and 2005. This will include approximately 325 students. Comparison involves all students who are enrolled after the 20th day of classes.

Targets: Within class retention will increase .5% in each of the target years.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Success Rate of Developmental Course Completers

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, the average success rate (75.5%) in developmental courses during 2004 and 2005 will be used as a the benchmark. The percentage of students who successfully complete developmental courses will be determined. Success is defined as completing the course with a grade of C or better. This will include approximately 325 students. Comparison involves all students who are enrolled after the 20th day of classes.

Targets: Successful completion of developmental courses will increase .5% in each of the target years. A recent KCIA study revealed a state-wide average of 64% for Kansas high school graduates in 2003-2004 and 55.6% for graduates of out-of-state high schools.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Success of Developmental Students in Subsequent, Sequential Course (mathematics, reading, or English)

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, developmental students will be monitored in the next sequential course taken the following semester and judged for success by completion with a grade of C or better. Baseline data will be the 2004 and 2005 average (81.65%). This will involve approximately 90 students each year. Comparisons will involve those students who are enrolled after the 20th day of classes.

Targets: Successful completion of the next sequential course taken the next semester will increase .5% each target year.

Comments: Targets are based on institutional averages that are above state averages.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 3: Increase Retention of Full-time Students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase Fall to Spring retention	Average retention fall to spring 2001-2003=84.38%	Target yr 1: 84.88% Target yr 2: 85.38% Target yr 3: 85.88%		
Increase Fall to Fall retention	Average retention fall to fall 2001-2003=41.28%	Target yr 1: 42.28% Target yr 2: 43.28% Target yr 3: 44.28%		

Increase four semester retention	Average four semester retention 2001-2005=32.57	Target yr 1: 33.57% Target yr 2: 34.57% Target yr 3: 35.57%		
----------------------------------	---	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Increase Retention of Full-time Students

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase Fall to Spring Retention

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, retention rates for students enrolled in 12 or more hours (not including developmental) will be monitored and reported fall to spring semester. Average for the three years 2001-2003 was 84.38%

Targets: The target is to increase retention fall to spring by .5% each year. This would result in retaining an additional 4 students each semester.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase Fall to Fall Retention

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, retention rates for students enrolled in 12 or more hours (not including developmental) will be monitored and reported fall to fall. Average for the three years 2001-2003 was 41.28%.

Targets: The target is to increase retention fall to fall by 1% each year. This would result in retaining an additional 9 students each year.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase Four Semester Retention

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, retention rate for students enrolled in 12 or more hours (not including developmental) will be monitored for four semesters beginning with the 2004 entering class. Average for 2001 through 2005 was 32.57%

Targets: The target is to increase four semester retention rates by 1% each year

Comments: This institutional goal has been added because of an emphasis on retention that has taken place at ACCC.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase Number of Students Completing Health Care Programs (Allied Health)				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of students successfully completing Allied Health courses	981 Students in 2004-2005	Target yr 1: 1006 Target yr 2: 1031 Target yr 3: 1056		
Number of students successfully completing First Responder, EMT, or ParaMedic Training	103 Students in 2005-2006	Target yr 1: 113 Target yr 2: 124 Target yr 3: 137		

Success Rate of Allied Health Students	State licensure pass rate for 2005-2006=CNA 94%, HHA 98% Pass rate for Allied Health Courses	Target yr 1: CNA 94%, HHA 98% and 85% course pass rate Target Yr 2: At or above State pass rate for 20'07 and 85% course pass rate Target Yr 3: At or above State pass rate for 2008 and 85% course pass rate.		
--	---	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase Number of Students Successfully Completing Health Care Programs (Allied Health)

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Students Successfully Completing Allied Health Courses

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, the number of students who have successfully completed (C or better) an Allied Health Course will be monitored and compared to the baseline of 981 students in 2004-2005

Targets: The target is to increase the number of students successfully completing an Allied Health course by 25 each year.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of Students Successfully Completing First Responder, EMT, or ParaMedic Training

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, the number of students who successfully complete (C or better) a First Responder, EMT, or ParaMedic course will be monitored and compared to the baseline of 103 students trained in 2005-2006.

Targets: The target is a minimum increase of 10 students successfully completing First Responder, EMT, or ParaMedic training each year.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Success Rate of Allied Health Students

Data Collection: Using the State licensure pass rate for CNA and HHA students each year, success rates for students taking the licensure examinations as well as ACCC course pass rates (C or better) for all Allied Health students will be monitored and reported

Targets: in each of the next three years, the licensure pass rate for CNA and HHA students will be at or above the previous year's State pass rate and the pass rate (C or better) for all Allied Health courses will be 85% or higher. CNA pass rate for 2005-2006 was 94%, HHA was 98%.

Comments: We eliminated the performance indicator "Number of New Training Sites Developed". We have established over 21 sites and are going to focus on the Allied Health Academy, which was opened at New Strawn, KS on July 1, 2006. This Academy was started as a result of the demand for trained First Responders, EMTs, and ParaMedics in Eastern Kansas.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 5: Increase the Number and Success of Hispanic Students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase the number of Hispanic students	2005 Fall = 57	Target Yr 1: 62 Target Yr 2: 67 Target Yr 3: 72		
Increase the number of students enrolled in ESL	0 New Program in 2007	Target Yr 1: 10 Target Yr 2: 15 Target Yr 3: 20		
Increase retention of ESL students Fall to Spring semester	0 New Program in 2007	Target Yr 1: 70% Target Yr 2: 75% Target Yr 3: 80%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Increase the Number and Success of Hispanic Students

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase the Number of Hispanic Students

Data Collection: Using data from the IPEDS report, the number of total Hispanic students enrolled in the fall semester will be gathered and compared. The baseline is 57 students enrolled in fall of 2005.

Targets: The target is to grow the Hispanic enrollment by at least 5 students each year. This would result in a 26% increase in the number of Hispanic students over the three year period.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the Number of Students Enrolled in English as a Second Language Classes

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, the total number of students enrolled in ESL classes will be collected each semester and compared to the previous year.

Targets: This will be a new program beginning in the spring of 2007. Target is for 10 students the first year, 15 the second, and 20 the third.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase Retention of ESL Students Fall to Spring Semesters

Data Collection: Using the CARS Management Information System, retention of students enrolled in the ESL classes will be monitored and reported fall to spring.

Targets: Fall 2007 to Spring 2008 = 70%, Fall 2008 to Spring 2009 = 75%, Fall 2009 to Spring 2010 = 80%

Comments: ACCC will be starting a Hispanic Center and ESL classes in the Spring 2007 semester on the Iola and Burlingame campuses. Although the Hispanic population in the ACCC service area is low, we hope to attract Hispanic families to our area to pursue educational and occupational opportunities.

KBOR use only: Allen County Community College

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Goal 1 indicator 2 is new; goal 3 and 5 are new.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

Not applicable

Recommendation and Comments

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee commends the institution for its emphasis on improvement and for the consistent quality of its performance agreements over the past four years.

Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.

Institution: Barton County Community College		Contact Person: Gillian Gabelmann	Contact phone & e-mail: 620.792.9303 gabelmann@bartonccc.edu	Date: 8/10/06
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Students desiring academic advancement will be prepared for successful transfer to other colleges and universities by improving the advising process.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Indicator 1: Students will have the appropriate knowledge of transfer requirements through the advisement process and indicate that they are more satisfied with the advising process	Noel-Levitz SSI Academic Advising/Counseling Performance Gap 1.09 (2005) CCSSE data 49.0 (2006) Support for Learners Benchmark Score	2007: 0.97 NL 2008: 52.1 CCSSE 2009: 0.67 NL		
Indicator 2: Increase the number of students transferring to universities on 2+2 agreements.	Base Year	2007: Base Year 2008: 2007 + 20% 2009: 2008 + 20%		
Indicator 3: Increase number of 2+2 agreements with secondary and other post secondary institutions.	9	2007: 11 2008: 13 2009: 15		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Students at Barton's Fort Riley campus will report increased satisfaction with the advising process.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Students will have the appropriate knowledge of transfer requirements through the advisement process and indicate that they are more satisfied with the advising process.

Data Collection: Students at all venues will be administered the Noel Levitz student satisfaction inventory in 2007 and 2009 and CCSSE (Community College Survey of Student Engagement) in 2008.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it will require a complete shift in the advising process at Fort Riley. There is a significant difference between the performance gap for Academic Advising/Counseling between the Fort Riley campus (1.09) and the Barton County campus (0.67), the target for this goal is to eliminate the difference between the two campuses over the next three years. The CCSSE score for "support of learners" is at the 40th

percentile compared to other community colleges.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the number of students transferring to universities on 2+2 agreements

Data Collection: The number of students transferring to a university on a 2+2 will be determined in the base year (2007). Barton's intention is to increase the number of students using 2+2 agreements by 20% per year. Barton will collect the data based on number of students transferring to universities with a 2+2 agreement per annum.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it involves a complete re-engineering of Barton's current advising system. In the new system students academic plans at Barton would be based on their baccalaureate goal rather than the associate goal. To make this effective extensive and continuous advisor training will be required to ensure advisors are knowledgeable about the 2+2 agreement; the 2+2s will need to be continuously updated and maintained; and student-advisor interaction will need to be increased.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase number of 2+2 agreements with secondary and other post secondary institutions.

Data Collection: Barton currently has nine (9) 2+2 agreements with universities. Barton's intention is to add a minimum of two 2+2 agreements per year to this total.

Targets: This indicator is a stretch goal because it supports increasing the use of 2+2 agreements by increasing the number of plans available to students. Formal 2+2 agreements are the best method to ensure acceptance of transfer credits not only by the university, but also by the specific college and degree program within the university. More importantly, formal 2+2 agreements ensure Barton students have the course work needed for their chosen field of study.

Comments: This goal and key indicator 1 are taken from the Barton Board of Trustees ENDS statements. Barton has revised goal #1 from last year, although indicator 3 is carried over from our 2006 performance agreement. Last year's goal was revised because the indicators had limited scope: the dietary manager program serves a few students, Barton was unsuccessful in establishing the Elementary teachers program at Fort Riley and the ITV program with the High Schools is established. The ITV program also has limited growth potential due to the declining populations in the rural high schools.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Students will be given the opportunity to acquire essential skills by passing their developmental classes with an emphasis on Basic Algebra.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Indicator 1: Pilot and fully implement linked-course schedule for fall and spring developmental courses (Barton County campus)	Pilot a minimum of two courses in each developmental area (English, math, reading)	2007: Pilot a minimum of 6 class sections/semester 2008: 33% of DE course offerings 2009: 50% of DE course offerings		
Indicator 2: Enroll students into linked developmental classes	0	2007: 200 2008: 250 2009: 300		
Indicator 3: Increase the pass rate for Basic Algebra	54.9%	2007: 58% 2008: 60% 2009: 62%		
Indicator 4: Increase the number of students who complete Basic Algebra classes.	85.5%	2007: 87% 2008: 89% 2009: 90%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Students will be given the opportunity to acquire essential skills by completing their developmental classes in a compressed 8 week format.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Pilot and fully implement linked-course schedule for fall and spring developmental courses.

Data Collection: Success in this goal will be the creation of a new scheduling format for developmental courses and the first level college course in math and English and reading. By 2009, at least 50% of the DE courses in math, English and reading will be offered in the new format. This will impact at least 385 of the 769 who annually enroll in developmental math courses, 160 who enroll in reading and 390 who enroll in English.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it will require a complete change in scheduling starting in spring 2007. Barton students will be able to enroll in 8-week developmental classes that meet for 1 hour a day (5 days a week). Students who pass the first 8 weeks will be able to enroll in a second 8-week class, thereby allowing them to complete either two developmental courses in one semester, or to complete one developmental course and the first college-level class in that subject.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Enroll students into linked developmental classes

Data Collection: Number of students enrolled on 20th day of linked developmental classes, Spring 2007 and Fall 2007.

Targets: The targets require a minimum of 12 sections at 90% fill rate to be established for 2007. This will be a stretch because it will require both students, staff, faculty and advisors to support the new process. It will also require faculty who do not teach developmental classes to offer 8 week classes in the second half of the semester to accommodate students who successfully complete their developmental courses.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase pass rate in Basic Algebra.

Data Collection: A percentage calculated by taking the number of students who complete the course with a C or better grade compared to the number of students enrolled in Basic Algebra on Barton's Barton County Campus. The baseline data is for calendar year 05 spring, summer and fall.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it exceeds the pass rates both nationally and regionally. The college has a large number of incoming students who are underprepared (more than 60%) and we are committed to giving them the essential skills that they need to succeed academically.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase the retention rate in Basic Algebra

Data Collection: Number of students who complete the class compared with the number of students enrolled .

Targets: Underprepared students generally have poor study habits, so the drop rate in developmental classes is high. Improving student retention necessarily supports improving pass rates.

Comments: This goal is similar to 2006 goal 2 but has been reworded to reflect the ENDS statement. Barton's performance agreement goal for 2006 was to improve the success rates in both Basic Algebra and Developmental Reading. Despite the best efforts of faculty and student services staff, this has proved to be a very challenging goal. Barton's 2007-2009 institutional goal #2 is focused on Basic Algebra where our pass rates are lower than the state average of 61%.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Barton County Community College will take a leadership role in the development and expansion of employment opportunities				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Indicator 1: Enroll students in LPN program via ITV from Larned State Hospital	6	2007: 10 2008: 15 2009: 20		
Indicator 2: Enroll students in Barton's Paramedic program via ITV from various locations in the state.	Baseline will be establish in 2007 Students enrolled	2007 baseline 2008: increase by 5% 2009: increase by 5%		

Indicator 3: Establish an ITV consortium with service area hospitals	0 hospitals	2007: 3 hospitals 2008: 6 hospitals 2009: 8 hospitals		
--	-------------	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Barton will develop and expand employment opportunities by providing training via distance learning with an empahsis in the healthcare industries

Key Performance Indicator 1: Enroll students in LPN program via ITV from Larned State Hospital

Data Collection: This fall 6 students enrolled from the LSH in a satellite LPN program taught via ITV from the Barton County campus. The goal is to increase the enrollments to the maximum allowed by the KS Board of Nursing of 20

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it is a new way of presenting the didactic material and it represents a new partnership for the college. The number of students enrolled is limited by the KS Board of Nursing.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Indicator 2: Enroll students in Barton's Paramedic program via ITV from various locations in the state.

Data Collection: Total number of students enrolled in didactic portion of Paramedic program delevivered by ITV.

Targets: Barton's Paramedic program is newly accredited and the faculty are aggressively making partnerships with other community colleges and emergency services providers to bring paramedic training to students who are place bound.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Establish an ITV consortium with service area hospitals

Data Collection: Barton will report the number of hospitals that are connected to Barton via the Kan-ed network from its service area and using the network for continuing education or training.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it requires all the hospitals (8) in the service area to connect to Barton for employee training in the next 3 years.

Comments: Again Barton has redirected our goal statements to align with the Board of Trutees' ENDS statements. This goal is similar to our previous goal 3 because it focuses on Business and Industry training needs. The previous goal was related to the establishment of training at the MUPTC, with serveral supporting indicators. This training is now ongoing.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase access for underrepresented populations				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Indicator 1: Increase the number of Hispanic students enrolled at Barton	832	2007: 10% increase 915 2008: 10% increase 990 2009: 10% increase 1089		
Indicator 2: Increase the graduation rate of Hispanic students.	17.2%	2007: 19 % 2008: 21% 2009: 23%		
Indicator 2: Increase the number of incarcerated persons enrolled at Barton.	59	2007: 20% 71 . 2008: 15% 82 2009: 10% 90		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase access for underrepresented populations

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase the number of Hispanic students enrolled at Barton

Data Collection: In 2005, 832 Hispanic students (unduplicated headcount) were enrolled at various Barton locations, including the Fort Riley Campus, Barton County Campus and online. The data collection will determine the number of Hispanic students enrolled during the calendar years in 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because the number of Hispanic students enrolled at Barton has been Working with HALO, the Hispanic Advisory Board and the Center for Adult Education, Barton will focus its efforts on recruiting more Hispanic students from the local service area, as well as increasing Hispanic enrollments at Fort Riley and online.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the graduation rate of Hispanic students.

Data Collection: Determine the percentage of Hispanic students who graduate with an associate's degree within 3 years of enrolling at Barton, for all locations and modes of delivery.

Targets: This is a stretch goal because it is not sufficient just to enroll more students, it is important to ensure that these students meet their educational goals and leave Barton with either an associate degree or a certificate to document their education. Current graduation rates for Hispanic students are significantly lower(17.2%) than for non-Hispanic students (23.3%)

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of incarcerated persons enrolled at Barton.

Data Collection: In 2005, Barton provided educational opportunities to 59 students at the area correctional facilities participating in the BASICS program. In 2007, educational opportunities will include both inmates and staff members. Growth in this area will be demonstrated by the total number of enrollments.

Targets: This is a stretch goal as it expands both existing services students at the Ellsworth Correctional Facility (ECF), the Larned Correctional Mental Health Facility and the Larned Juvenile Correctional Facility and adds workforce training in cooperation with area business & industry, education programs for staff members, advisement services, developmental education coursework, additional ITV classes and seminars.

KBOR use only: Barton County Community College:

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Major changes have been made throughout the performance agreement; major changes have also been made in previous performance agreements.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The following comments were made about the last performance agreement:

The performance agreement is sometimes inconsistent. For example, in Goal 1 Indicator 4, targets in the summary table refer only to enrollments but targets in the narrative refer to both enrollments and number of courses. In Goal 3 Indicator 1 the baseline refers to the number of training sessions but the targets refer to the number of workers.

The specific target values are unclear for Goal 3 Indicator 4.

Although the scope of the performance agreement has been improved, the institution is encouraged to continue to broaden the scope of future performance agreements.

Recommended for approval subject to the comments above.

Baselines and targets are presented more clearly in the current performance agreement. Scope of the agreement has been improved by addition of a fourth goal.

Recommendation and Comments

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement, with the understanding that at least three of these four goals will be included in the next performance agreement and with the understanding that the learner outcomes goal will be strengthened in the next performance agreement.

Institution: Butler Community College	Contact Person: Dr. Leann Ellis	Contact phone & e-mail: 316-322-3110; lellis@butlercc.edu	Date: 8/10/06	
Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 1: Implement and expand the BEST elementary teacher education completion program with Emporia State University (BEST = Butler and Emporia: From Students)				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Number of students enrolling in Butler Introduction to Teaching course.	171 students	Year 1 = 173 Year 2 = 175 Year 3 = 177		
2. Number of students successfully completing Butler Introduction to Teaching course.	85.4%	Year 1 = 86% Year 2 = 86.5% Year 3 = 87%		
3. Number of Butler elementary education program students in Introduction to Teaching who are admitted to ESU Block 1 course each year.	10 students	Year 1 = 19 Year 2 = 22 Year 3 = 23		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Implement and expand BEST program

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of students in Intro to Teaching course.

Data Collection: Using 20th day enrollment data we calculate the aggregate participation rate for the Introduction to Teaching course, which is Butler’s capstone course for elementary education majors entering the BEST program.

Targets: This partnership was implemented in fall 2004. In 2005 enrollment grew to 171 students, from our original baseline of 143 students. At this point we are nearing capacity in the number of students who can enroll in Intro to Teaching, and so foresee a slower rate of growth through 2009. We want to continue our focus on this KPI to seek maximum growth, while at the same time develop new indicators that will further strengthen the BEST program.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students successfully completing Intro to Teaching

Data Collection: Successful completion rate is the percentage of students in the Introduction to Teaching course who receive a C or better in that course.

Targets: To lessen the influence of short-term fluctuations in the data, in the 2007-09 agreement we have moved to using a 2-year average to calculate the base and a 2-year rolling average to measure annual performance. The baseline is the 2-year average for 2004-05. Given that the closer to 90% we come, the more difficult to achieve large improvements, we believe it more realistic to make more modest projections.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of Butler elementary ed. program students admitted to ESU Block 1

Data Collection: As part of the ongoing development of this partnership, in summer 2005 we formalized a process with ESU to document the Butler students who, upon completion of the Butler curriculum, are admitted into the ESU Block 1 courses. We will report the total number of students admitted into Block 1 each year. Block 1 courses are upper division courses offered by ESU on the Butler of El Dorado campus.

Targets: Now that we have a more concrete understanding of growth patterns, we think our targets more accurately reflect the direction of this partnership and the current capacity of ESU, which can admit up to 28 students a year in two admission cycles, spring and summer. Since BEST was started, the partnership has gone through three Block 1 admissions – the first in summer 2005, the second in spring 2006 and the third in summer 2006. Ten Butler students were admitted to Block 1 in summer 2005, but not enough had completed the Butler courses to form a Block 1 class for the spring 2006 cycle. An additional 10 students were admitted in summer 2006. As enrollment in the Butler courses grows, we anticipate the pool of Block 1 applicants will grow.

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 2: Expand partnerships with other entities				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Create at least one new formal partnership a year with another entity.	1 partnership (BEST program with ESU)	Year 1 = at least 1 new partnership Year 2 = at least 1 new partnership Year 3 = at least 1 new partnership		

<p>2. Number of students who enroll in partnership, postsecondary courses or training activities.</p>	<p>10 (BEST partnership with ESU)</p>	<p>Year 1 = 18 students (baseline + 8 new students) Year 2 = 26 students (baseline + 16 new students) Year 3 = 34 students (baseline + 24 new students)</p>		
<p>3. Satisfaction of collaborating entities with partnership</p>	<p>0 level of satisfaction (partnerships yet to be developed)</p>	<p>Year 1 = Entity in new partnership will report at least an acceptable level of satisfaction with partnership. Year 2 = Entity in Year 1 partnership will report directional improvement in satisfaction level; Entity in Year 2 partnership will report at least an acceptable level of satisfaction. Year 3 = Entities in Years 1 and 2 partnerships will show directional improvement in satisfaction level; Entity in Year 3 partnership will report at least an acceptable level of satisfaction.</p>		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Expand partnerships with other entities

Key Performance Indicator 1: Create at least one new formal partnership a year with another entity

Data Collection: We will document partnerships/articulation agreements through a partnership development process.

Targets: Through this goal we seek to create partnerships with other entities that can help Butler contribute to a seamless, effective and efficient system of higher education in Kansas. We define a partnership as a formal, ongoing collaborative agreement with another entity by which postsecondary education/training opportunities are provided to students that neither partner could provide alone. BEST is an example of a partnership that fits this goal. Corporate sponsorship of a technical program would be another example.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of students who enroll in partnership, postsecondary courses or training activities.

Data Collection: We will count the number of Butler students enrolled in the courses or activities offered by our partners.

Targets: In this goal, we challenge ourselves to be more proactive in identifying and capitalizing on partnership opportunities that fill "niche" needs for education and training. Our experience with BEST shows that it takes time for a partnership to mature and enrollment will grow incrementally.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Satisfaction of collaborating entities with partnership

Data Collection: We will measure the satisfaction of collaborating entities through a simple survey instrument. Through this survey, our partners will tell us whether they believe the partnership is an efficient and effective use of their resources and whether the partnership provides educational value to students that they could not provide alone.

Targets: Our baseline is zero because these partnerships are not yet developed. We know also from our experience with the BEST partnership that it can take 1-2 years to refine a partnership to the point that a partner will report more than an acceptable level of satisfaction.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 3: Assessment of Student Learning				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Assessment of analytical thinking skills.	80.3% of students demonstrate analytical thinking skills at least at "acceptable" level for college sophomore work.	Year 1 = 81% Year 2 = 82% Year 3 = 83%		

2. Assessment of communication skills.	80% of students demonstrate communication skills at least at “acceptable” level for college sophomore work.	Year 1 = 81% Year 2 = 82% Year 3 = 83%		
--	---	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Assessment of Student Learning

Key Performance Indicator 1: Assessment of analytical thinking skills.

Data Collection: See “Comments,” below

Targets: We seek improvement in the number of students who perform at a level acceptable or higher. By 2009, we will complete a realignment of our active curriculum to an outcomes-based format and expansion of our assessment program. The number/variety of courses from which we draw a meaningful assessment sample will change significantly. The sample size won’t stabilize until 2009 – and only then will results be based on a comparable number of students from year to year. In the meantime, unpredictable fluctuations in annual results might occur. Our annual results also can be influenced by the turnover in students we see year to year, which is typical of a community college. This means from year to year we are not assessing the same group of students. To lessen the influence of short-term ups and downs, which will continue even after we complete realignment, we have changed the baseline from an annual result to a rolling, three-year average. The targets will also reflect a rolling, three-year average. The change in baseline calculation also moves us into analyzing learning trends, not annual assessment results, which help us uncover real improvement in learning.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Assessment of Communication Skills

Data Collection: See “Comments,” below.

Targets: See the discussion under “Targets” for Key Performance Indicator #1, above.

Comments: Major summative student work artifacts taken from courses across the disciplines that develop and document analytical thinking skills are gathered and scored by faculty on a 6-point scale. In this scale, 6 = exceptional mastery; 5 = strong mastery; 4 = more than acceptable; 3= acceptable, and 2 = less than acceptable. To measure progress toward our goal, we report a rolling, three-year average of the percentage of students who score at least at the “acceptable” level. Communication skills is measured the same way, but the assessment of learning is based on major summative student work artifacts taken from courses that develop and document communication skills. We have deleted the third assessment indicator, the assessment of technology skills through the percentage growth in on-line enrollment, because we concluded that this measure is not a direct indicator of the development of technology skills.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 4: Expand and improve workforce development training				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Participation rate in vocational courses.	41,114 credit hours	Year 1 = 42,347 credit hours Year 2 = 43,617 credit hours Year 3 = 44,925 credit hours		
2. Student success rate in vocational courses.	80.5% success rate	Year 1 = 81% Year 2 = 81.5% Year 3 = 82%		
3. Participation rate in customized training.	783 participants	Year 1 = 822 Year 2 = 863 Year 3 = 906		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4 : Expand and improve workforce development training

Key Performance Indicator 1: Participation in vocational courses.

Data Collection: Using 20th-day data, we will calculate the aggregate participation rate (credit hours) for all vocational courses.

Targets: Baseline is a 3-year average, 2003-2005. Targets are based on a 3% growth every year over previous year. Our targets are based on growth patterns for the last three years and reflect a rate we think is manageable, given our current capacity. To lessen influence of short-term enrollment fluctuations, results are reported on a rolling, 3-year average. For example, 2007 results = ave. for 2005, 2006, 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Success in Vocational Programs

Data Collection: Students who receive C or better in vocational courses are successful completers. Success rate = number of credit hours that earn C or better as a percentage of total vocational credit hours successfully completed in a single year. (spring, summer, fall).

Targets: Baseline is 3-year average (2003-2005). Targets are based on patterns from past three years. Our projections are for modest growth since it appears we are nearing the ceiling in the total number of successful credit hours. To lessen the influence of short-term enrollment fluctuations, results are reports on a rolling, 3-year average. For example, 2007 results = ave. for 2005, 2006, 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Participation rate in customized training.

Data Collection: We measure the number of participants in customized training. In keeping with our new Integrated Workforce Development Model, we define customized training to include any training offered to meet the needs of specific clients, whether offered for credit or non-credit by our Business Performance Group or by another college department. Through this integrated model, we focus on meeting the training needs of our region using the most effective delivery methods. For example, clients may be served through formal BPG classes or by a workshop organized by the faculty of one of our vocational programs.

Targets: Baseline is 2-year average (2004-2005). Targets are based on 5% per year growth. We think 5% is a stretch target in this case because in the last two years we have significantly changed our approach to customized training. We reorganized our Business and Industry Institute into our new Business Performance Group and implemented an integrated approach to workforce development, as described in the “Data Collection” section, above. Activities and results before 2004 are not representative of current practice, and so we are still developing an understanding of the potential for growth under our new approach. To lessen the influence of short-term enrollment fluctuations, results are reported on a rolling, 3-year average. For example, 2007 results = ave. for 2005, 2006, 2007.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 5: Increase Targeted Participation and Access for Hispanic Students from Wichita North and West high schools				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1.Number of Hispanic high school students identified through formal visits at Wichita North and West high schools who apply for admission to Butler.	16 Hispanic applicants per yer from pool generated through formal high school visits at Wichita North and West high schools.	Year 1 = Maintain baseline. Year 2 = Increase applicant pool of Hispanic students from Wichita North and West high schools to 18 (+10%) Year 3 = Increase applicant pool to 20 (+10% over Year 2)		

<p>2. Number of Hispanic applicants from Wichita North and West high schools that enroll at Butler as new, first-time students.</p>	<p>7 Hispanics enrolled per year as new, first-time students from the applicant pool generated from formal high school visits at Wichita North and West high schools.</p>	<p>Year 1 = Maintain baseline Year 2 = Increase enrollment of Hispanic applicants to 10 new students (+30% over baseline) Year 3 = Increase enrollment of Hispanic applicants to 13 new students (+30% over Year 2)</p>		
---	---	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Increase Targeted Participation and Access for Hispanic Students from Wichita North and West high schools

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Hispanic high school students identified through formal visits at Wichita North and West high schools who apply for admission to Butler

Data Collection: We will calculate the number of Hispanic students from selected Wichita North and West high schools who become prospective students through formal high school visits and who complete an application for admission into Butler. This information is contained in our student information system.

Targets: With our focus on improving access to Hispanic students in our region (see "Comments," below) we expect to increase the number of Hispanic applicants from Wichita North and West high schools by 10% per year. (Baseline = 4-year ave., 2002-05). These schools have the highest Hispanic enrollments in our service area. Our research shows currently, Hispanic applicants from our service area who apply after a formal high school visit are 1.5 times less likely to enroll at Butler than are white applicants from our service area who are contacted through formal visits. To achieve our targets, we must establish a new recruiting model that focuses resources on enlarging our pool of Hispanic applicants from North and West high schools and increasing the number of those applicants who enroll. Through this new model, we will dedicate an admissions counselor half time to establish a routine of contacts with students at North and West high schools to increase the pool of prospective students. To succeed, this counselor must maintain positive relations with North and West high schools in order to gain routine access to students, and he/she must build trust in the Hispanic community.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of Hispanic applicants from Wichita North and West high schools that enroll at Butler as new, first-time students

Data Collection: We will calculate the number of Hispanic applicants from Wichita North and West high schools who enroll as new, first-time students each calendar year. This information is contained in our student information system.

Targets: With the increased focus on improving access to Hispanic students in our region (see “Comments,” below) we expect to be able to increase the number of Hispanic applicants from Wichita North and West high schools who enroll at Butler by 30% per year. Baseline is 4-year average (2002-2005). See also the discussion under "Targets" for indicator 1, above.

Comments: Two of our strategic priorities target improvements in access to underserved populations in our region. Our current focus is on providing greater access to Hispanic students, primarily because the Hispanic population in south-central Kansas is the fastest-growing.

We retired our institutional goals "Improve student satisfaction with Student Services" and "Improve Student Engagement." We believe that student satisfaction has improved to an optimum level. We also have determined we need to define more effective approaches to student engagement before we can set meaningful improvement goals.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 6: Improve Access through Online Learning for Time- or Place-Bound Students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Headcount of students enrolled in online courses.	2,018 students	Year 1 = 2,220 students (+10% over baseline) Year 2 = 2,442 students (+10% over baseline) Year 3 = 2,686 students (+10% over Year 2)		
2. Credit hours generated by online courses.	9,277 credit hours	Year 1 = 10,205 credit hours (+10% over baseline) Year 2 = 11,226 credit hours (+10% over Year 1) Year 3 = 12,349 credit hours (+10% over Year 2)		

3.Accreditation of online degree program by Higher Learning Commission	Currently unaccredited	Year 1 = Attain accreditation; receive feedback from Higher Learning Commission Year 2 = Incorporate Higher Learning Commission feedback in improvement of online degree program. Year 3 = Incorporate Higher Learning Commission feedback in improvement of online degree program.		
--	------------------------	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 6: Improve Access through Online Learning

Key Performance Indicator 1 : Headcount of students enrolled in online courses.

Data Collection: Unduplicated annual headcount of the students who enroll in online courses at Butler.

Targets: Baseline is a 5-year average, 2001-02 to 2005-06, which includes the year we began tracking online enrollments through the most current academic year. Targets are based on a 10% growth every year over previous year. To lessen influence of short-term enrollment fluctuations, results are reported on a rolling, 3-year average. For example, 2007 results = ave. for 2005, 2006, 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Credit hours generated by online courses

Data Collection: Total number of credit hours generated through online enrollments.

Targets: Baseline is a 5-year average, 2001-02 to 2005-06, which includes the year we began tracking online enrollments through the most current academic year. Targets are based on a 10% growth every year over previous year. To lessen influence of short-term enrollment fluctuations, results are reported on a rolling, 3-year average. For example, 2007 results = ave. for 2005, 2006, 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Accreditation of online degree program by Higher Learning Commission

Data Collection: The application for accreditation will be submitted in fall 2006. Notice of the Higher Learning Commission's decision and its feedback on further improvements for our online degree program is expected in early 2007.

Targets: Given the state of development of our online degree program and the action of the commission on the accreditation of programs from other schools, we anticipate approval of our request. However, we also anticipate that the commission will have a series of recommendations for us to consider in the continuous improvement of our online program. We will incorporate the feedback we consider appropriate to our institutional mission and vision into an improvement plan for our online program.

KBOR use only: Butler Community College
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement Goals 1, 3 and 4 are very similar to last years performance agreement.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement Not applicable
Recommendation and Comments Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee reminds the institution that “directional improvement” requires improvement over baseline.

Institution: Cloud County Community College	Contact Person: Kimberly W. Krull VP for Academic Affairs	Contact phone & e-mail: (785) 243-1435 (ext) 249 kkrull@cloud.edu	Date: 7/15/06
--	---	--	---------------

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Continue to improve and expand collaborative efforts with other institutions of higher education

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Number of students enrolled in cooperative Wind Energy Technology offered by Cloud County Community College (CCCC) and Manhattan Area Technical College (MATC)	Number of students enrolled in courses including applied wind energy courses and general education courses. Students for baseline year of 2005 = 0	Enroll 8 students (1st yr.) Increase program enrollment by 5 students (2nd yr.) Negotiate establishment of program in conjunction with NCKTC, increase program enrollment by 8 students (3rd yr.)		
Increase Gen Ed credit hours generated at MATC	Average number of credit hours per yr. for previous 4 years = 1182	1300 credit hours (1st yr.) 1324 credit hours (2nd yr.) 1347 credit hours (3rd yr.)		
Increase number of students taking upper division courses offered at CCCC by other higher education institutions	Average number of students taking courses offered at CCCC by other higher education institutions = 20 (2002 - 2005)	5 additional students above baseline (1st year) 8 additional students above baseline (2nd year) 10 additional students above baseline (3rd year)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: CCCC will continue to improve and expand collaborative efforts with other institutions of higher education.

Key Performance Indicator 1: In cooperation with MATC, CCCC will offer a joint Wind Energy Technology program.

Data Collection: Starting in the fall of 2006, initial enrollment into the Wind Energy Technology program will begin. Using 2005 enrollment as a baseline, any enrolled student will be empirical evidence used to measure progress in the development of the program and will validate movement towards meeting the targets.

Targets: Eight students will be enrolled the first year and CCCC and MATC will jointly evaluate the program and determine what modifications, if any, are needed in the program.

In the second year (2007), the 2006 program review modifications will be implemented and five additional students will be enrolled.

In the third year (2008), consideration will be given to developing a joint program with NCKTC and increasing enrollment by 8 additional students.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the number of general education credit hours generated by CCCC at MATC.

Data Collection: Starting with the fall 2000, spring 2001 academic year, CCCC computed the average number of credit hours generated each academic year for four years by its general education offerings at MATC. This average of 1182 credit hours, will be used as the baseline to determine measure progress. Increases in credit hours are estimates based on added class sections due to expected initial growth in student numbers with the return of U.S. Army troops and troop families to central Kansas.

Targets: The College will work to offer 1300 credit hours for the first year (2006-2007).

The second year the College will seek offer 1324 credit hours for the second year 2007-2008).

During the third year the College's goal will be 1347 credit hours (2008-2009).

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of students taking upper division courses offered at CCCC by other higher education institutions by the establishment of additional articulation agreements and 2+2 agreements.

Data Collection: Using an average of 2002-2005 as a baseline year, 20 students have been enrolled in courses which were offered between CCCC and other institutions. Each new student enrolled in a course offered will be used to measure progress. Additional articulation and 2+2 agreements, installation of additional ITV equipment, and schedule changes will allow students added opportunities for these courses.

Targets: CCCC will seek an increase of 5 students above the baseline in the first year (2007). The second year, CCCC will seek an increase of 8 students above the baseline (2008). The third year, CCCC will seek an increase of additional 10 students above the baseline (2009).

Comments: Indicator #1 is exactly the same as it was in 2005 because of a delay in project implementation. Local wind tower construction was delayed due in part to production shortages. Enrollment numbers are anticipated to be small to start with because this is a unique program in an emerging industry for which people are not very familiar. In prior performance agreements general education courses have been offered by CCCC at NCKTC but the partnership is now limited. NCKTC offers their own general education courses thus Indicator #2 has changed. Wording of Institutional Goal 1 and Indicator #3 have changed to be broader and more inclusive, eliminating specific references to Washburn and FHSU from prior agreements because students have access to additional upper division courses and transfer arrangements with more institutions now than in 2004 when the original agreements were written. It is expected that more students will enroll in upper division courses as more agreements are established in the coming years.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve retention, graduation and transfer rates				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Improvement in the fall to spring retention rate	The average fall to spring retention rate=85.75% or 260 students Average number of first-time, full-time, degree seeking students for baseline years 2002, 2003, 2004 = 303.4	2% increase over the baseline to 87.75% (266 students) in fall to spring retention rate for fall 2005 and fall 2006 cohorts (1st yr) 3% increase over the baseline to 88.75% (269 students) in fall to spring retention for the fall 2006 and fall 2007 cohorts (2nd yr) 4% increase over the baseline to 89.75% (272 students) in fall to spring retention rate for fall 2005 – fall 2008 cohorts (3rd yr.)		

<p>Improvement in fall to fall retention rate</p>	<p>Baseline retention rate=64.88% (197 students) Average fall cohort for baseline years 2002, 2003, 2004 = 303.4</p>	<p>2% increase over the baseline to 66.88% (203 students) in fall to fall retention rate for fall 2006 cohort (1st yr.) 3% increase over the baseline to 67.88% (206 students) in fall to fall retention for fall 2007 cohort (2nd yr.) 4% increase over the baseline to 68.88% (209 students) in fall to fall retention rate for fall 2008 cohort (3rd yr.)</p>		
<p>Improve graduation and transfer rates for students who complete or transfer within three years of their starting date (150% of time expected to graduate)</p>	<p>Baseline graduation rate=40% (117 students) Baseline transfer rate=33% (97 students) Average for baseline years 1998 - 2000 = 292.67</p>	<p>1.5% increase in graduation (121 students) and transfer rates (101 students) for the fall 2004 cohort (as measured in the spring of 2007) (1st yr) 2.5% increase in graduation (124 students) and transfer (104 students) rates for the fall 2005 cohort (as measured in spring of 2008) (2nd yr.) 4% increase in graduation (129 students) and transfer (108 students) rates for fall 2005 cohort (as measured in spring of 2009) (3rd yr.)</p>		

Improve success rate of developmental course completers	Baseline success rate = 69.6 % (Av. of F02 - S05)	1% increase over baseline (1st year) 1.5% increase over baseline (2nd year) 2 % increase over baseline (3rd year)		
Success of developmental students in subsequent, sequential courses in Math and English	Baseline will be established using F04-F06 developmental students	Establish baseline and achieve a 1% increase over baseline (1st year) 1.5% increase over baseline (2nd year) 2 % increase over baseline (3rd year)		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: To improve retention, graduation and transfer rates.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Improvement in the fall to spring retention rate.

Data Collection: Each fall a cohort of first time, full time students is established and tracked for three years. The average of the fall to spring retention rates for the fall 2002, fall 2003 and fall 2004 cohorts will be computed and averaged to determine a baseline using 20-day reports generated at the beginning of the spring semesters. Chosen percent increases in retention rates correspond to identified increases in enrollment in remedial and freshmen success seminars.

Targets: For the first year (2007) CCCC’s goal will be a 2% increase over baseline (266 students) in fall to spring retention rate for the fall 2005 and fall 2006 cohorts. In 2008, CCCC’s goal will be a 3% increase over baseline (269 students) in fall-spring retention for the fall 2006 and fall 2007 cohorts. The third year (2009) goal will be a 4% increase (272 students) in fall to spring retention above the established baseline for the fall 2005, fall 2006, fall 2007 and fall 2008 cohorts.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Improvement in the fall to fall retention rate.

Data Collection: Each fall a cohort of first time, full time students is established and tracked for three years. Using cohorts from the previous three years 2002, 2003 and 2004, retention rates for fall to fall will be computed and averaged to determine a baseline using 20-day reports generated at the beginning of the fall semesters. Fall to fall retention rates are set at the same standard as fall to spring rates.

Targets: In year one CCCC's goal will be a 2% increase over the baseline (203 students) in fall to fall retention for the 2006-2007 cohort. In year 2, CCCC’s goal will be a 3% increase over the baseline (206 students) in fall to fall retention for the fall 2007-2008 cohort. For the third year CCCC’s goal will be a 4% increase over the baseline (209 students) for fall to fall retention for the fall 2008-2009 cohort.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Improve graduation and transfer rates.

Data Collection: Each fall CCCC establishes a cohort of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking students for IPEDS. They are tracked for three years. The College will take the yearly average of the students who graduated or transferred from the three completed cohorts (1998, 1999 and 2000) as the baseline for graduation and transfer rates. Improved fall to spring and fall to fall retention rates in Target years 1 – 3 should improve graduation and transfer rates.

Targets: Year one (2006-2007) CCCC will seek a 1.5% increase in the graduation (121 students) and transfer (101 students) rates for the fall 2004 cohort. Year two (2007-2008) CCCC will seek a 2.5% increase in the graduation (124 students) and transfer (104 students) rates of the 2005 cohort over the baseline established. Year three (2008-2009) CCCC will seek a 4% increase in graduation (129 students) and transfer (108 students) rates of the 2006 cohort over the identified baseline.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Improve success rate of developmental course completers

Data Collection: Using CAMS and Jenzebar Management Information Systems and 20-day reports generated at the beginning of the semester, success rates of students in developmental courses will be tracked using a baseline of 69.6% (F02-F05). Success will be defined as students completing courses with a grade of C or higher each semester.

Targets: CCCC will work to achieve a 1% increase over the baseline the first year (2007). A 1.5% increase over the baseline will be the target for the second year (2008). A 2% increase over baseline will be the target for the third year (2009).

Key Performance Indicator 5: Success of developmental students in subsequent, sequential courses in Math and English

Data Collection: Using CAMS and Jenzebar Management Information Systems, students will be tracked in the next sequential course taken in the areas of Math and English following completion of the developmental course. Success will be measured as completion of the next level of course with a C or higher. Baseline data will have to be established in the 1st year based on F04-F06 developmental students.

Targets: An average baseline using F04-F06 developmental students will be established and a 1% increase above this baseline will be the target for the 1st year (2007). A 1.5% increase in the baseline will be the target for the 2nd year (2008). A 2.0% in the baseline will be the target for the 3rd year (2009).

Comments: The wording for Institutional Goal #2 has changed from prior agreements to include indicators relating to developmental education students with updated baselines and target years added. CCCC did not show directional improvement in the 1st year targets for last year, so this goal remains essentially the same. Additional support services and strategies have been put into place to work towards improvement in retention, graduation and transfer rates. Performance Indicators #4 and #5 were added this year to establish the foundation for student success at CCCC. Because CCCC did not meet these targets in prior performance agreements, the College wants to insure students are being tracked, helped, and are meeting success goals from the very beginning of their educational program to assist in long term retention, completion, graduation and transfer after additional courses and credit hours are taken. Although the average retention rate for CCCC's baseline years is 85.75% for fall to spring retention, the College's retention rate for individual years of 2004 and 2005 is less. The % increases over the baseline are defined stretch goals when considering the fact that retention for the fall 2004 class was 83% and the fall 2005 class was 84%. Fall to fall retention rates show similar trends. Although the 3 year average is 64.88%, individual cohorts of fall 2003 and fall 2004 show retention rates of 64% and 63% respectively.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 3: To increase accessibility for all learners				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase credit/non-credit course offerings at different senior citizen sites	Baseline number of course offerings at senior citizen sites in 2004=2	Offer at least 10 courses (1st year) Offer at least 12 courses (2nd year) Offer at least 14 courses (3rd year)		
Improve the variety of credit/non-credit course offerings for senior citizens	Baseline number of course offerings for senior citizens in 2004=6	Offer at least four different courses (1st year) Offer at least six different courses (2nd year) Offer at least eight different courses (3rd year)		
Increase the number of senior citizens enrolling in credit/non-credit courses at Cloud County Community College	Average number of students enrolled at CCCC over the age of 63 during the baseline year of 2004 = 174	10% increase (or 17 students) above the baseline in senior citizens enrolled in one or more courses (1st year) 12% increase (21 students) above baseline in senior citizens enrolled in one or more courses (2nd year) 14% increase (24 students) above the baseline in senior citizens enrolled in one or more courses (3rd year)		

Increase the number of adults participating in Adult Basic Education (ABE) services	Baseline average for F04-F06 = 97.66	5% increase (5 students) above baseline (1 st year) 7% increase (7 students) above baseline (2 nd year) 8% increase (8 students) above baseline (3 rd year)		
---	--------------------------------------	--	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: To increase accessibility for all learners

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase credit/non-credit course offerings at different senior citizen sites because senior citizens (63 and older) are a growing percentage of the population in north central Kansas.

Data Collection: Direct observation of the number of course offerings at senior citizen sites will be used to measure progress towards targets.

Targets: During year one (2007) offer at least ten credit/non-credit course offerings at senior citizen sites.
In the second year (2008) the College will offer twelve credit/non-credit course offerings at senior citizen sites.
For the third year (2009) the College will offer fourteen or more credit/non-credit course offerings at senior citizen sites.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Improve the variety of credit/non-credit course offerings for senior citizens.

Data Collection: Direct observation of the number of different course offerings at senior citizen sites will be used to measure progress towards targets.

Targets: During the first year (2007) the College will offer a minimum of four different courses for senior citizens.
In the second year (2008) the College will offer a selection of at least six different courses for senior citizens.
For the third year (2009) the College will offer a selection of eight or more different courses for senior citizens.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of senior citizens enrolling in credit/non-credit courses at Cloud County Community College

Data Collection: The College will use the average of the number of senior citizens enrolling in classes for the last three years as a benchmark. Increases in enrollment for the target years by senior citizens will demonstrate progress in this area and will correspond with increasing numbers of courses being offered at more sites.

Targets: In the first year (2007) CCCC will seek an increase of 10% (14 students) above the baseline in the number of senior citizens enrolling in credit/non-credit offerings. In the second year (2008) CCCC will seek an increase of 12% (21 students) above the baseline in the number of senior citizens enrolling in credit/non-credit courses. In the third year (2009) CCCC will seek an increase of 14% (24 students) above the baseline in the number of senior citizens enrolling in credit/non-credit courses.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Increase the number of adults participating in Adult Basic Education (ABE) services

Data Collection: Program enrollment numbers will be used to measure progress towards meeting targets each year

Targets: During the first year (2007), an increase of 5% (5 students) above the baseline will be achieved. During the second year (2008), an increase of 7% (7 students) above the baseline will be achieved. During the third year (2009), an increase of 8% (8 students) above the baseline will be achieved.

Comments: The wording for Institutional Goal #3 has been broadened to include not only senior citizens as indicated in prior performance agreements, but also additional groups of learners for whom accessibility and participation may have been limited in the past. Baselines have been updated.

KBOR use only: Cloud County Community College
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement The following indicators have been added: goal 2 indicators 4 and 5, goal 3 indicator 4.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement Not applicable
Recommendation and Comments Recommend approval for a three-year performance agreement.

Institution: Coffeyville Community College	Contact Person: Marlon Thornburg	Contact phone & e-mail: 620.251.7700 ext 2035 marlont@coffeyville.edu	Date: 7-14-06 UPDATED 8-22-06
--	-------------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness

Institutional Goal 1: Improve transfer efficiencies with Kansas Community Colleges and Universities

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Increase the number of transfer articulation agreements with area universities to create additional transfer opportunities for Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree completers.	CCC currently has two AAS articulation agreements in place. Success will be based on the number of articulation agreements signed by CCC and collaborating universities.	Year 1: Establish an articulation agreement for AAS degree completers with one Kansas university Year 2: Establish an articulation agreement for AAS degree completers with one additional Kansas University Year 3: Establish an articulation agreement for AAS degree completers with one additional Kansas university		

<p>Increase the number of transfer articulation agreements with area universities to create additional transfer opportunities for Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Science (AS) degree completers.</p>	<p>CCC currently has one articulation agreement in place. Success will be based on the number of articulation agreements signed by CCC and collaborating universities.</p>	<p>Year 1: Establish an articulation agreement with one regional university. Year 2: Establish an articulation agreement with one additional regional university. Year 3: Establish an articulation agreement with one additional university.</p>		
<p>Increase the number of articulation agreements with Kansas Community Colleges</p>	<p>CCC does not currently have an articulation agreement with another Kansas Community College.</p>	<p>Year 1: Sign an articulation agreement with one Kansas Community College. Year 2: Sign an articulation agreement with one additional Kansas Community College. Year 3: Sign an articulation agreement with one additional Kansas Community College.</p>		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase Transfer Opportunities with Kansas Colleges and Universities

Key Performance Indicator 1: Increase the number of transfer articulation agreements with Kansas Colleges and Universities to create additional transfer opportunities for Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree completers.

Data Collection: The College President, Vice Presidents, and Deans will spearhead collaboration efforts to secure articulation agreements with Kansas Colleges and Universities.

Targets: The College is planning to collaborate with one new institution each year to establish transfer opportunities for AAS degree completers and to encourage more students to take advantage of continuing their education. The targets were determined to be challenging goals, but realistic, as the AAS degree has traditionally been a terminal degree primarily for vocational and technical programs. CCC awarded over 80 technical certificates in May 2005 and just under 10 AAS degrees. Universities have recognized the potential for new enrollments for their programs and are developing more bachelor degree opportunities in technical fields. CCC's goal is to capitalize on these degree opportunities to provide more options for CCC students to continue on to complete the AAS degree and transfer into a bachelor degree program. This project has the potential to affect approximately 90 students.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the number of transfer articulation agreements with area universities to create additional transfer opportunities for Associate of Arts (AA) or Associate of Science (AS) degree completers.

Data Collection: The College President, Vice Presidents, and Deans will spearhead collaboration efforts to secure articulation agreements with Regional Colleges and Universities.

Targets: The College is planning to collaborate with one new institution each year to establish increased AA or AS degree transfer opportunities for CCC students. The articulation agreements will be program specific to improve transfer efficiencies. The targets are challenging goals which will take significant efforts by CCC and University departments to establish acceptable agreements. CCC awarded over 220 AA and AS degrees in May 2005. This project will affect over 200 students annually.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the number of articulation agreements with Kansas Community Colleges.

Data Collection: The College President, Vice Presidents, and Deans will spearhead collaboration efforts to secure articulation agreements with Kansas Community Colleges.

Targets: CCC will focus collaboration efforts on articulation with other Kansas Community Colleges to improve program efficiencies and provide desired educational opportunities for the Coffeyville area. The College has determined the goal of one articulation agreement per year is aggressive considering the College has had one collaborative agreement with another Community College only once in over ten years. The project impact will vary depending upon the program areas articulated. This project will affect approximately 20 students annually.

Comments: Currently, community colleges and universities in Kansas have an articulation agreement for transfer of Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree completers. CCC currently has articulation agreements with two institutions in Oklahoma (Rogers State University and Northeastern State University) to accept the transfer of the Associate of Applied Science degree toward a Bachelor of Technology degree program. The College will increase efforts to collaborate with regional universities and community colleges to articulate program areas in an effort to improve efficiencies and continue to meet area needs.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 2: Improve student success from the completion of a developmental course to the subsequent college level course.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Improve success rates of students in developmental courses	Success rate will be determined based on previous year data using fall to fall comparisons: Fall 2001 – 75.6% Fall 2002 – 74.2% Fall 2003 – 76.2% Fall 2004 – 77.1% Fall 2005 - 60.6%	Year 1: Increase success rate to 65% Year 2: Increase success rate to 70% Year 3: Increase success rate to 75%		
Improve success rates of developmental students in their first subsequent college-level math or English course	Success will be determined based on previous year data using fall to fall comparisons: Fall 2001 – 62.5% Fall 2002 – 64.2% Fall 2003 – 45.4% Fall 2004 – 58.7% Fall 2005 - 58.7%	Year 1: Increase success rate to 60% Year 2: Increase success rate to 62% Year 3: Increase success rate to 64%		
Improve passage rate of students enrolled in College Algebra	Success will be based on a three year average using Fall to Fall data: Fall 03 - Fall 05 Average = 73%	Year 1: Increase passage rate to 74% average Year 2: Increase passage rate to 75% average Year 3: Increase passage rate to 76% average		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Improve Student Success from the Completion of a Developmental Course to the Subsequent College Level Course

Key Performance Indicator 1: Improve success rates of students enrolled in developmental courses

Data Collection: Data will be collected by the College Registrar to determine the success rate. The success rate is a percentage of students who successfully completed (Grade A, B, C, or P) a developmental course compared to those students who completed (Grade A, B, C, D, F, or P) the developmental course. Fall to fall comparisons will be used.

Targets: The College has experienced a significant decline in the success rate, which may be attributed to a switch to a computer-based system for offering developmental education courses in the College Learning Lab. The College is working to address this decline and has set the yearly targets to increase a minimum of five percent in an attempt to recoup some of the loss from last year. Year 2 and 3 targets are considered reasonable goals to challenge the institution to improve the success rate back to the 75% level.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Improve success rates of students enrolled in their first subsequent college level math and/or English courses

Data Collection: Data will be collected by the College Registrar to determine the success rate. The success rate is a percentage of students who successfully completed (Grade A, B, C, or P) a course compared to those students who completed (Grade A, B, C, D, F, or P) the course. Fall to fall comparisons will be used.

Targets: The College's success rate on this initiative has dropped dramatically in Fall 2003 to 45.4%, rebounded in Fall 2004 to 58.7% and was static in Fall 2005. CCC has set the year one target to increase the success rate at 60%, then plans to increase the rate 2% each year thereafter. The institution feels this is a challenging goal based on past performance in this area and the increase in the number of students enrolling at CCC that need developmental assistance.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase passage rate of students enrolled in College Algebra

Data Collection: Data will be collected by the College Registrar to determine a three year average of the percent of students who pass College Algebra in the Fall semester. Passage rate is the percentage of students who finish a course with a passing grade (Grade A, B, C, D or P) compared to the number of students who are enrolled in the course as of the 20th day. A three year average of fall to fall numbers will be used.

Targets: The College has set the targets to increase the passage rate by 3% in the three year period. The College feels this is very challenging considering the increasing number of students enrolling at the institution that require developmental math assistance and the perceived difficulty of College Algebra. This initiative will affect approximately 175 students each fall.

Comments:

Key Performance Indicator 1: The College has identified a need to increase the successful completion of developmental math and English courses for students to advance to college level course work the next semester to stay on track for graduation in two years. CCC requires mandatory placement in math and English courses for all students; thus, a student must have a “C or better” to advance to the next course. This initiative affected 164 students in Fall 2003, 223 in Fall 2004, and 231 in Fall 2005.

Key Performance Indicator 2: The College has identified a need to increase the successful completion of developmental math and English courses for students to advance to college level course work the next semester to stay on track for graduation in two years. CCC requires mandatory placement in math and English courses for all students; thus, a student must have a “C or better” to advance to the next course. This initiative affected 108 students in Fall 2003, 138 in Fall 2004, and 104 in Fall 2005.

Key Performance Indicator 3: This initiative will affect approximately 175 students each fall.

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Develop business partnerships to support adult and technical education programs				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Update advisory council memberships. CCC currently has 17 program advisory committees.	Progress will be judged against institutional data of current membership lists. Four program advisory lists were updated last year:	Year 1: Identify and invite potential new advisory council members for two program areas Year 2: Identify and invite potential new advisory council members for two additional program areas Year 3: Identify and invite potential new advisory council members for two additional program areas		

Identify new business partnerships	Progress will be judged against institutional data of current business partnerships. FY 2003 - 6 FY 2004 - 10 FY 2005 - 15 FY 2006 - 31	Year 1: Increase business partnerships for technical programs by three businesses. Year 2: Increase business partnerships for technical programs by three businesses. Year 3: Increase business partnerships for technical programs by three businesses.		
Increase Emergency Medical Services training opportunities for health care professionals in Southeast Kansas	Progress will be based on the comparison number of continuing education courses offered in the previous year: FY 2006 - 19	Year 1: Increase continuing education offerings by six courses. Year 2: Increase offerings by an additional six courses. Year 3: Increase offerings by an additional four courses.		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Develop Business Partnerships to Support Adult and Technical Education Programs

Key Performance Indicator 1: Update advisory council memberships

Data Collection: Data will be collected from advisory council membership lists.

Targets: Targets are based on current advisory council memberships for 17 technical program areas and institutional needs for new people/ideas to develop new partnerships as determined by staff.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Identify new business partnerships

Data Collection: Data will be collected from business partnership lists internally.

Targets: Targets are based on current business partnerships with existing technical programs and potential for expansion of partnerships as determined by staff.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase Emergency Medical Services training opportunities for health care professionals in Southeast Kansas

Data Collection: Data will be collected from the semester course schedules for fall, spring, and summer semesters.

Targets: Targets are based on current course offerings and potential for expansion to meet continuing education needs as determined by staff.

Comments: Key Performance Indicator 2: The institutional goal is to develop business partnerships to support adult and technical educational programs to provide quality learning opportunities for students. CCC plans to continue to update membership on program advisory councils in order to strategically improve the potential for future business partnerships. CCC hopes to identify partnerships to supply physical resources and opportunities for internships for program students. This initiative affects approximately 280 students in 13 technical programs.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The institutional goal is to increase continuing education opportunities for hospital, EMS, Fire, and Police departments in the Southeast Kansas area. This initiative has the potential to impact over 300 people.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access				
Institutional Goal 4: Increase accessibility for low-income, non-traditional, and undereducated students				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
Identify funding to increase the allocation of scholarships for technical training programs	Performance will be based on the number of technical scholarships awarded in the previous year. FY 2003 - 0 FY 2004 - 0 FY 2005 - 2 FY 2006 - 16	Year 1: Increase technical scholarship allocations by six scholarships for FY 2007. Year 2: Increase technical scholarship allocations by four scholarships for FY 2008. Year 3: Increase technical scholarship allocations by three scholarships for FY 2009.		

<p>Increase the number of area residents participating in Adult Basic Education (ABE) services</p>	<p>Based on number of ABE participants each year. FY 2001 – 138 FY 2002 – 139 FY 2003 – 158 FY 2004 – 127 FY 2005 – 137 FY 2006 - 107</p>	<p>Year 1: Increase participants by 10 students over the FY 2006 total. Year 2: Increase by an additional 10 students over FY 2007 total. Year 3: Increase by an additional 5 students over FY 2008 total.</p>		
<p>Increase the enrollment of minority students.</p>	<p>Based on previous minority headcount figures: Fall 2003: 17% Fall 2004: 19% Fall 2005: 18%</p>	<p>Year 1: Increase minority headcount by 2%. Year 2: Increase an additional one percent over year one. Year 3: Increase an additional one percent over year two.</p>		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Increase accessibility for low-income, non-traditional, and undereducated students

Key Performance Indicator 1: Identify funding to increase the allocation of scholarships for technical training programs

Data Collection: Program scholarship lists will be collected by the Financial Aid Office to determine the total number of technical scholarships allocated for FY 2007.

Targets: The College Foundation continues to work on increasing funding for technical scholarships. Prior to the Performance Agreement process, CCC did not allocate funding for technical scholarships. In the first year, the College funded two scholarships for technical programs. The College raised significant funding in FY 2005 and 2006. The yearly targets are based on projected fund-raising efforts for the project. CCC projects fund-raising for the technical scholarship initiative to level off after year one, thus has set the year two and three targets slightly lower than year one expectations. CCC must raise \$15,000 to endow one scholarship.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Increase the number of area residents participating in the Adult Basic Education services provided by the college, which prepares students to complete their GED.

Data Collection: Program enrollment numbers will be used to determine the number of participants in the College's Adult Basic Education (ABE) Center each year.

Targets: The ABE Center is focused on serving area residents to increase their education and employability levels. CCC has experienced a decline in the number of GED participants since FY 2003 and has established this goal to focus on turning around the decline. The yearly targets are based on a past enrollment numbers and the potential for the program to attract new enrollees. The institution has set the year one and two targets at 10 students per year and five students in year three.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Increase the enrollment of minority students.

Data Collection: The College Registrar will collect enrollment data as of the 20th day of each semester to determine the success of the project.

Targets: The College's minority enrollment has averaged 18% over the last three years. Targets have been set to increase four percent over the three year performance period. The College feels this is a challenging goal.

Comments:

Key Performance Indicator 1: CCC has identified a need to offer additional scholarships for technical programs to target low-income families/students to complete a technical program for career advancement or job retraining. Typically, these students are non-traditional students and do not qualify for traditional academic scholarships. This initiative affects approximately 100 students.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Montgomery County has had one of the highest unemployment rates in the State of Kansas (5.5%, compared to the State average of 4.4%). However, over the last year the area has experienced job growth which has affected the number of participants in the Adult Education program. Typically, students requesting services at the ABE Center are from low-income families and need to complete a GED program to secure employment, to improve their employment level, or to advance their career. This project benefits the community, the college, and area businesses and industry. This initiative affects approximately 110 students.

Key Performance Indicator 3: The College has established a goal to increase the minority population at the institution over four percent in the project period. This project will affect approximately 120 students annually.

KBOR use only: Coffeyville Community College

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

The following indicators are new: goal 1 indicators 2 and 3, goal 2 indicator 3, goal 3 indicator 3 and goal 4 indicator 3.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

Not applicable

Recommendation and Comments

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement.

Institution: Colby Community College	Contact Person: Dr. Kristen Bishop	Contact phone & e-mail: 785-462-3984 ext. 245	Date: 7-14-2006
---	------------------------------------	---	-----------------

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 1: Improve under-prepared students' competencies in their academic area(s) of deficiency including reading, writing, and mathematics.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Percent of developmental students completing developmental coursework in reading, writing, and math with a "C" or higher.	66.1% of 519 students	Target Year 1: 3 percent increase over established baseline. Target Year 2: 2 percent increase over Target Year 1. Target Year 3: 72% of all developmental students		
2. Percent of developmental students subsequently completing college-level coursework in reading, writing, and math with a "C" or higher.	88.9% from reading & writing, 68.3% from mathematics	Target Year 1: 3 percent increase over established baseline. Target Year 2: 2 percent increase over Target Year 1. Target Year 3: 90% from reading & writing, 72% from mathematics		

<p>3. Class-wide average percentage gains in pre- vs. post-testing of course competencies in developmental reading, writing, and math courses</p>	<p>17.5% gain in R&SS II 25% gain in R &SS I 7.5% gain in Fund of Writing I 4.11% gain in Fund of Writing II 28.4% gain in Math Essentials 58.2% gain in Beg. Algebra 42.5% gain in Int. Algebra</p>	<p>Target Year 1: Developmental courses will post an average pre- vs. post-test score gain of 9 percent over established baseline. Target Year 2: Developmental courses will post an average pre- vs. post-test score gain of 10 percent over established baseline. Target Year 3: Developmental courses will post an average pre- vs. post-test score gain of 11 percent over established baseline.</p>		
---	--	---	--	--

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Improve under-prepared students’ competencies in their academic area(s) of deficiency including reading, writing, and mathematics.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of developmental students completing developmental coursework in reading, writing, and math with a “C” or higher.

Data Collection: The success rate of all students in each developmental course offered during the fall semester will be examined. A count of the total number of students enrolled in each developmental course that achieve a grade of C or better will be divided by the total number of students in each course.

Targets: In the first target year, a minimum of 69.1% of all developmental students will successfully complete a developmental course. By the end of target year three, over 72% of all developmental students will successfully complete a developmental course. These targets were selected because they exceed the average 66.4% of the 19 Kansas community colleges reported in the fall 2004 and represent a stretch for CCC at over 70% by Target Year Two.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of developmental students subsequently completing college-level coursework in reading, writing, and math with a “C” or higher.

Data Collection: Data will be calculated by reviewing developmental student transcripts and noting grades of “C” or higher in a student’s subsequent college-level coursework in their area of deficiency after completing the developmental course.

Targets: Increases in the number of developmental students who are successful in college-level coursework will indicate student mastery of course competencies in developmental courses. These targets were selected because they coincide with the number of students meeting the targets in indicator 1, and represent a challenge for CCC.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Class-wide average percentage gains in pre- vs. post-testing of course competencies in developmental reading, writing, and math courses

Data Collection: Average pre- vs. post-test gains data will be collected from each developmental course using a locally-developed standard testing device.

Targets: Assessment of pre- and post-test data will assist in the enhancement of current placement practices, allowing for any necessary adjustments. Student mastery of course competencies has increased since the inception of mandatory placement practices at CCC. By tracking student mastery of course competencies in reading, writing, and mathematics, the college can assess the effects of mandatory placement procedures and make changes as data show a need. Targets in indicator 3 were selected because they represent “stretch goals” in that the average percent gains in limited collections of previous assessment data have shown only two to five percent increases in overall competency mastery over the past several semesters.

Comments: The rationale for the percent increases over target years 1 through 3 in Key Performance Indicator 1 represent the ultimate goal of achieving over 70% of developmental students achieving success in developmental courses over the next three years. In 2005, of the students from Reading & Study Skills II and Fundamentals of Writing II who went on to take college level English Composition I, an unduplicated head count of 88.9% passed the college level course with a C or better. Of the students from Beginning Algebra and Intermediate Algebra who went on to take a college level Intermediate or College Algebra course, 68.3% passed the college level course with a C or better.

Regents System Goal A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness				
Institutional Goal 2: Collaborate with Kansas State University to provide the ability to obtain an AAS degree in Veterinary Technology to under-served populations in eastern Kansas using a a hybrid delivery model.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	Baseline	Targets	Performance Outcome	Amount of Directional Improvement
1. Percent of Vet Tech graduates passing the Veterinary Technician National Exam (VTNE).	67% of students taking VTNE achieve 70% or higher.	Target Year 1: 70% of students taking VTNE achieve 70% or higher. Target Year 2: 73% of students taking VTNE achieve 70% or higher. Target Year 3: 75% of students taking VTNE achieve 70% or higher.		
2. Freshman student enrollment in KSU satellite program.	0	Target Year 1: 15 Target Year 2: 20 Target Year 3: 25		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Collaborate with Kansas State University to provide the ability to obtain an AAS degree in Veterinary Technology to under-served populations in eastern Kansas using a a hybrid delivery model.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Percent of Vet Tech graduates passing the Veterinary Technician National Exam (VTNE).

Data Collection: A percentage will be calculated from all students who take the VTNE.

Targets: Each of these targets represents a stretch. Currently 67% of students who take the VTNE exam achieve a 70% or better. To improve upon this rate by 8% over three years while implementing a new satellite program will be a challenge instructors are optimistic about achieving.

