Instructions for Completing the Performance Agreement Application and Reporting Form

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

1. Identify the **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR** (i.e. data) that will be used to determine progress toward goals. Be as specific and as succinct as possible. The key performance indicator (data) may be quantitative or qualitative.
2. Show the **THREE YEAR PERFORMANCE HISTORY**, i.e., value of the key performance indicator (data) for December 31, 2007, 2006, and 2005, if available. If the key performance indicator is an average, be sure to show the appropriate average for each of the past three years.
3. Show **TARGETS** for the next 3 years. Targets must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) identified in the first column.
4, **PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES** must be expressed in terms of the key performance indicator (data) listed in the first column.
5. **EVALUATION** of performance, i.e., target met, target not met, directional improvement or no directional improvement.
6.

7. The narrative should not repeat information in the table. Instead, the narrative should provide explanation of anything in the table that may not be obvious to the reader. If applicable, the narrative for the performance report should also describe any circumstances that prevented the institution from making directional improvement and specific future plans for improving performance.

Instructions for Narrative to Accompany the Performance Agreement Application

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

Key Performance Indicator 1 (Data point 1): Identify the data to be collected using

Performance Agreement/Report

Institution: Wichita State University	Contact Person: Gary L. Miller; Martha Shawver	Contact phone & e-mail: 978-3010	Date: July 15, 2009; revisions September 4, 2009

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

Institutional Goal 1: Increase effectiveness/efficiency/seamlessness by providing academic support for students' transitioning from high school and community colleges to the university.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	**3-Year Performance History**	**Targets**	**Performance Outcome**	**Evaluation**
Increased percentage of students who pass Math 111/131 College Algebra/Contemporary Mathematics with a grade of C or better on first attempt.	Pass rates for %/# students 2006: 67.8/700 2007: 70.3/697 2008: 72.6/717 3 year average of 70.2%	2010: 74% 2011: 76% 2012: 78%		

Increased percentage of WSU Math/

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Increased percentage of first time freshmen enrolling in a student success course

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments: The key to a seamless system is ensuring student success at the point of transition from one sector (high school or community college) to the next. This is an area of concern to WSU because we serve a diverse population with a wide range of academic abilities. This set of indicators focuses on student success at the transition to university studies. The work in FY2009 with the Foundations of Excellence has helped us understand many areas where we can strengthen the first year experience for students. One major hurdle for many students is college algebra. Students take a placement test and based on their performance either enter college algebra directly or embark on two 5 credit remedial courses which they must pass before taking college algebra. For a number of reasons, sometimes through a lack of proper advising or inappropriate course placement, students will enroll in the college algebra and fail because they are not prepared. Our intervention will focus on proper advising and math placement. The Upward Bound Math Science Program (a program that works with ethnic minority high school students bound for college) is hosted by WSU and funded by

national/state certification examinations.	2008: 5 of 6 depts 3 year average: 4 of 6	2012: 6 of 6		
Increased percent of College of Education students demonstrating the fully met level of proficiency in the use of technology.	C & I % /# 2006: 74/133 2007: 56/143 2008: 74/198 C&I 3 year average: 68% HPS: %/#			

Target: The targets for the next three years would increase the mean in 2010 to 59 which is at the 50th percentile; in 2011 to a mean of 61 which is at the 55th percentile; and in 2012 to a mean of 63 which is at the 65th percentile. Moving to this level will definitely require intervention. The Barton School will begin to incorporate exercises in multiple classes explicitly designed to improve students' critical thinking skills.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Increased number of CHP departments who perform above the national average on national/state certification examinations.

Data Collection: Data will be collected from all health programs (communicative sciences and disorders, dental hygiene, medical technology, nursing, physical therapy, and physician assistant) having a national/state examination. Departments are given (g)10(rat0i)-11(saiony)20(gieTe24 r (T)·

to increase their percentage to 81%, which is 5 points higher than the baseline but will reverse the downward trend of the last three years. Both departments are faced with increasing class sizes and declining technology support because of the budget recisions this past year so this will take some effort to increase at these levels. The College of Education finds the use of technology in the P-12 classrooms and with clients an essential skill which they will measure with standard rubrics. The COE's C&I students are expected to use technology while teaching students in the classroom. The HPS students must use such technology as a metabolic cart, Dyanmometers, and electromyography and must be proficient as they assess clients.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Increased percentage of overall "actual" score above the expected level for Liberal Arts and Science students taking the Collegiate Learning Assessment.

Data Collection: LAS anticipates testing 100 seniors annually using the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), an on-line assessment of problem solving, critical thinking, analytic reasoning and writing. The assessments are evaluated nationally and produce normed scores of "actual" performance and "expected" performance based on the students' SAT/ACT scores. The difference in the actual and expected score will be used to calculate the percentage above the expected level.

3-Year Performance History: In the past, the CLA was given to a sample of WSU students across the university. We abstracted just the LAS students even though the sample size was small. True baselines are difficult in this situation since each year the level of participants "expected" scores are adjusted based on their ACT/SAT scores. LAS performance, with the small sample, was below expected level based on their ACT scores while University level performance was above the expected level.

Targets: Since the past performance for LAS seniors was below the expected level, the target the first year is for LAS students to perform at the expected level. In the second and third year, we are hoping to raise at least 2.5% and 5% actual points above the expected level. Example: If the expected level is 1214 during the second year, LAS target would be to score at the 1244 level. The target will always be based on each year's participants' "expected" level. The actual scores from year to year are not related. What is comparable is the relationship of the " actual" performance to the "expected" level of performance.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only): Increased percentage of engineering graduates demonstrating successful performance on teams

Data Collection: A scoring rubric is used by student peers to evaluate their team members' contribution and effort to the team. There is a total of 100 points and a score of 85 or better is considered successful performance on the team. All engineering students are required to participate in a capstone design group project. At the end of the project, group members are asked to evaluate team members. These scores, along with the faculty evaluation, are combined for the final score and percentage.

3-Year Performance History: The baseline was formed from the scoring of 59 students in the spring of 2009. The data for this outcome was not collected prior to this time. Using the scoring rubric, 84.7% of the students achieved the score of 85 or better on the 100 point rubric scale, demonstrating successful performance.

Targets: The three year goal is to have at least 90% of the graduates who perform at the successful level (85 out of 100) on successful teamwork. The 2010 target is not much higher than the 2009 performance, because without three years worth of data, we are a bit uncertain about past performance. We believe the 90% will be a stretch for the three years. This indicator is seen as a critical learner outcome. One of the most frequent characteristics desired of graduates as cited by employers of engineers is that they be able to work effectively in teams. The College of Engineering has focused on this as an important learner outcome for all graduates by requiring all graduates to complete a capstone design group project. This senior design project requires students to work in teams.

Comments: Each academic dean was asked to choose one learner outcome measure for his/her college that would measure key learning outcomes for students graduating from their college. Five of the college outcome measures have been selected for inclusion as performance indicators. Three colleges have nationally normed assessments such as the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking test, the College Learning Assessment, (CLA) and the national/state licensing examinations. Two colleges are evaluating critical skills (technology proficiency and teamwork) demanded of graduates. As part of the Voluntary System of Accountability, the CLA has been administered to a sample of 100 freshmen and seniors from across the university for the past three years. In 2010, only the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will be administering the assessment. The subset of the LAS students from the last three years is small so the analysis is weak but with a focus of this in the college, performance should improve in the next three years. The College of Education and the College of Engineering have focused their outcome measures on hands on (technology) and soft skills (team work) that are needed for graduates to be successful in their careers.

Regents System Goal (Click on Arrow to view selections) C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 3: Enhance economic alignment				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	**3-Year Performance History**	**Targets**	**Performance Outcome**	**Evaluation**
Increased number of graduates in STEM areas (Sciences,Technology, Engineering, and Math, including teacher ed graduates in the Science, Technology, and Math areas)	Number of graduates in STEM areas: 2006: 307 2007: 318 2008: 308 3 year average: 311	Increase 9 % in 3 years: #/% over baseline 2010: 315 /1.3 2011: 325 / 4.5 2012: 339 /9		
Increased number of cooperative education and internship placements for STEM students in LAS, Engineering, and Education.	Number of placements: CY 2006: 295 CY 2007: 310 CY 2008: 340 3 year average: 315	#/% over baseline 2010: 321/1.9 2011: 328/4 2012: 334/6		
Number of College of Education graduates with special education endorsement	# 2006: 23 2007: 16 2008: 15 3 year baseline: 18	#/% over baseline 2010: 20/11 2011: 24/33 2012: 27/50		
Enrollments in short courses targeted to engineers and aircraft workers offered through the College of Engineering and National Institute of Aviation Research (NIAR.)	# 2006: 74 2007: 53 2008: 103 3 year average: 77	Projected targets: #/% over baseline 2010: 150/ 94.8 2011: 220/186 2012: 300/290		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3(Title Only): Enhance economic alignment.

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Increased number of graduates in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math areas) including teacher education majors in these areas.

Data Collection: Spring, summer, and fall graduates in biology, physics, chemistry, earth science, geology, math, engineering, and computer science, as well as, teacher education majors in these areas will be calculated from the student data base.

3-Year Performance History: In the last three years, LAS graduated 454 STEM students overall with a mean of 151 per year; Engineering graduated 442 total with a mean of 147 per year; teacher education graduated a much smaller number of students in the science, math,and technology areas with only 37 total and a mean of 12 per year. The overall mean for the total group is 311 graduates.

Targets: The target is to increase over the baseline average by 9 percent in the next three years, making the 2012 target at 339 students. The increment in the first year is less because these students are already at the junior and senior level and there may be less chance for intervention. We intend to give scholarships to help retain these students to graduation. The College of Education, although a much smaller group, may show greater growth because of the high demand for these graduates in the classroom.

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Number of Cooperative education/internship placements in the STEM, including Teacher Ed STM majors.

Data Collection: The Office of Cooperative Education keeps a data base of all placements and will report these for the spring, summer and fall time frame.

3-Year Performance History: In the calendar years 2006, 2007, and 2008 cooperative education/internship placements for science, technology, engineering, and math majors in the colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Education (teacher education majors) was 295, 310, and 340 with a 3 year mean of 315. In calendar year 2008, the employment scene was still quite robust but placements so far in 2009 have diminished somewhat in many of the STEM areas due to the economic downturn.

Targets: This is an extreme stretch goal given the dramatic negative effect of the local economy on the ability to find cooperative education experiences for students. Data for the beginning of the academic year 2009-2010, show decreases in opportunities in all areas. We elect to keep this in the performance agreement because the coop program is so important to the engagement imperative of the urban serving university. Targets are set at modest increases over the three year baseline average, for the next three years. Cooperative education placements for STEM majors have been primarily in aircraft and related companies. The teacher education majors in the science, technology, and math areas have been within the school system. We anticipate a downward trend in placements in the aircraft complanies because many of them have laid off thousands of employees in the last six months. The placements in the school settings should continue but that is a low portion of the STEM majors. It will be a real challenge to increase over the baseline of 315 placements to 321, 328, and 334 in the next three years' performance agreement period given these circumstances in the employment environment.

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only): Increased number of special education endorsements.

Data Collection: Students who complete the specified 9 hours required for one of the three high need special education endorsement tracks and

achieve a 3.00 grade point average in these courses will be counted. These tracks are special education functional (students who are able to work with supervision;) special education adaptive (students who are not ever expected to reach a level where they can work with supervision;) and early childhood unified (special needs in the very young children.) There is another special education track for the gifted, but this is not a high need area and will not be included in this performance indicator.

3-Year Performance History: The number of students who completed the 9 hours successfully (3.00 GPA on all 9 courses) ranged from 15 to 23 with an average of 18 students. Students must have been in a bachelor's program or a master's level program and earned these hours toward their degrees. They must have completed the nine hours of special education courses in order to be included in the data for this indicator.

Targets: The goal is to increase the number of graduates in the next 3 year average by 50% which will be a stretch because it is often difficult to recruit students to this area. With the assistance of scholarships for students in this area, we anticipate being able to attract more students to take this set of courses and become certified to teach in special education. Also, rcently, WSU and KU received funding from the U.S Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to fund Project ALIVE, a four year statewide project to prepare low-incidence teaching personnel to work in school districts where they are needed, and encourage the retention of a satisfactory supply of these teachers in targeted areas across the state of Kansas. This grant will provide for scholarships and stipends for students coming into the program. ALIVE is a web based platform that will allow student participants anywhere in the state, through their choice of a regional university, to complete the courses and practicum necessary for Kansas special education functional endorsement that is an extension of the Kansas teaching license. The project is funded to allow for 20 new students (statewide) into the program annually for four years. This will allow them to receive a provisional functional endorsement within one year. Their progress toward full endorsement will be completed in 2-3 years. As this program gets underway, we anticipate an impact on the enrollment at WSU in this area which will help us reach our goal of graduates in the area.

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only): Increased enrollments in short courses targeted to engineers and aircraft workers.

Data Collection: With the increase in the use of composites in aircraft and other transport vehicles, there is a demand for retraining of the workforce in the companies that manufacture and use these materials. Enrollments in short (one and two day) courses that focus on composites, nondestructive testing (NDT), and other related areas specifically targeted to engineers and aircraft workers will be counted. Many of these courses are offered through the College of Engineering, NIAR, and managed by Continuing Education. In some cases, such as NDT, we will be partnering with the Wichita Area Technical College (WATC) to offer the courses.

3-Year Performance History: The three year peformance includes short courses offered to Boeing, Spirit, Cessna, and other aircraft companies as well as companies that specialize in composites materials. Most recently, in 2008 and 2009, three composites courses were funded by the WIRED grant monies from the U. S. Department of Labor. The three year baseline average enrollment is 77. With the Workforce Innovation Regional Economic Development (WIRED) funds, we enrolled 83 students in composites courses in 2008, accounting for the increase in the last year.

Targets: Targets for the 2010, 2011, and 2012 were set keeping in mind that WIRED funds for composite courses would be diminishing after 2010, and we would be more reliant on companies paying the tuition for the students, which in this economic downturn will make these targets a stretch. While we are committed to sustaining the composite course offerings and other customer paid short courses, we do not expect drastic changes in either of these areas. However, the nondestructive testing (NDT) courses will be implemented at the new National Center for Aviation Training in Wichita which will focus on another high demand area of information needed to work with composites. The targets represent composites course and

other short course enrollments at a steady level while increasing enrollments in NDT.

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments: There is a sense of urgency in America today to prepare graduates in the science, math and engineering areas. To do this we need to spark this interest in Pre K-12 areas. The STEM Education Coalition, comprised of about 35 different professional groups including teachers, scientists, engineers, and others, has worked with Congress "to address issues related to the global competitiveness of our nation, and especially the need to ensure that more of our best and brightest students

	History			
Increased number of ethnic/minority degree seeking first time freshmen and transfer students enrolled	#/% of all new students 2006: 529 /18 2007: 614/18.3 2008: 694/20.5 3 year baseline average: 612	#/% over baseline 2010: 700/ 14.4 2011: 708/ 15.7 2012: 715/ 16.8		
Increased percentage of first time, full time ethnic minority freshmen persisting to the sophomore level.	Cohorts: %/ # Fall 2005: 69.5/148 Fall 2006: 65/ 154 Fall 2007: 73/165 3 year baseline average: 69 %	2010: 74 % 2011: 76 % 2012: 78 %		
Increased percentage of ethnic minority community college transfers who graduate within three years of admission to WSU.	Cohorts: %/# 2003--34.6/28 2004--30.6/30 2005--29.9/26 3year mean --31.7%	2010: 32% 2011: 34% 2012: 36%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4(Title Only): Increase participation and persistence of ethnic minorities

Key Performance Indicator 1(Title Only): Increased number of ethnic minority first time, full time freshmen and first time transfer students enrolled.

Data Collection: The data will b

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only): Increased percentage of first time, ethnic minority students retained to the sophomore year.

Data Collection: This indicator focuses on the persistence of the incoming ethnic/minority freshmen students. The number of full time, first time students (freshmen) who self report in one of the ethnic minority categories, who are enrolled in the fall semester will be tracked to the subsequent fall semester. These data are collected annually and reported to the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE). More than 450 universities report their data to this consortium. The methodology used for that reporting will be used.

3-

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments: WSU is committed to not only recruiting students of color, but to helping them be successful and graduate at efficient speed. For this reason, our first indicator focuses on enrolling more ethnic minority new freshmen and new transfers. The second and third indicators focus on persistence--the second indicator focuses on ethnic minority freshmen persistence to sophomore level and the third indicator focuses on ethnic minority transfers persistence to graduation. The University has many resources such as the Office of Multicultural Affairs, Student Support Services, Math and Science Upward Bound, mentoring thro

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 2(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 3(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 4(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Key Performance Indicator 5(Title Only):

Data Collection:

3-Year Performance History:

Targets:

Comments:

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

Recommendation and Comments

561.09