

Act on 2012 – 2013 Performance Agreements

Summary and Recommendations

In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d and the Board's Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, the following performance agreements are presented to the Board for action. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee recommends the Board approve agreements for thirteen institutions. Staff agrees with BAASC's recommendation to approve these agreements. (12/1/11)

Background

Attached are thirteen proposed performance agreements covering calendar years 2012 and 2013*. New funding awarded in July will be dependent upon the institution's compliance with its performance agreement. (Because of the volume of the performance agreements, the agreements were mailed to Board members under separate cover.)

Thirteen proposed performance agreements were due to Board staff July 15, 2011. These agreements are the result of an extensive review process that includes substantial communication between Board staff and the individual schools. Major steps in the process are: (1) initial review and subsequent analysis by Dr. Jean Redeker, Director of Academic Affairs; (2) review of proposals by a team of Academic Affairs directors; (3) for proposals that include a technical education component, review by a member of the workforce development staff; (4) a conference with each institution for the purpose of providing feedback on how to strengthen the agreement.

Proposed performance agreements were then reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President/CEO, and BAASC.

*Performance agreements are usually approved for three years; however, BAASC recommends approving these performance agreements for two years. BAASC is developing a model to better align institutional performance agreements with Foresight 2020 and a two-year cycle will allow a model, once approved by the Board, to be phased in more quickly.

Recommendation

BAASC recommended approval of thirteen performance agreements: six at its October 16, 2011, meeting, and seven at its November 16, 2011, meeting. Staff agrees and recommends approval of the following thirteen performance agreements: Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, Barton County Community College, Cowley College, Dodge City Community College, Fort Scott Community College, Highland Community College, Johnson County Community College, Labette Community College, Neosho Community College, Salina Area Technical College, Washburn Institute of Technology and Wichita Area Technical College.

Table of Contents

Institution	Page
Emporia State University	3
Fort Hays State University	15
Barton County Community College	22
Cowley College	29
Dodge City Community College	33
Fort Scott Community College	38
Highland Community College	46
Johnson County Community College	52
Labette Community College	58
Neosho Community College	63
Salina Area Technical College	69
Washburn Institute of Technology	74
Wichita Area Technical College	78

2012-2013 - Performance Agreement – Emporia State University

Emporia State University	Dr. Tes Mehring	620-341-5171 tmehring@emporia.edu	Date: July 15, 2011	
Foresight 2020 Goal 2: Achieve participation in the state's higher education system that better reflects the state's demography and more fully engages adult learners.				
Institutional Goal: To expand access to and awareness of higher education for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds and provide programs which will assist targeted populations in matriculating into a degree program.				
Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds enrolled in degree programs.	2008 = 1451 2009 = 1557 2010 = 1622 Mean = 1543	2012: 1574 2013: 1605 2014: 1637		
2. Increase percentage of full-time baccalaureate students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained from first to second year.	2008 = 75.26% (73/97) 2009 = 73.81% (62/84) 2010 = 78.35% (76/97) Mean = 75.89%	2012: 76.6% 2013: 77.4% 2014: 78.2%		
3. Increase number of baccalaureate degree completers from diverse ethnic backgrounds.	2008 = 81 2009 = 74 2010 = 99 Mean = 85	2012: 88 2013: 91 2014: 94		
4. Increase number of graduate degree completers from diverse ethnic backgrounds.	2008 = 62 2009 = 87 2010 = 60 Mean = 69	2012: 67 2013: 69 2014: 72		

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL: To expand access to and awareness of higher education for students from diverse ethnic backgrounds and provide programs which will assist targeted populations in matriculating into a degree program.

Indicator 1: Increase number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds enrolled in degree programs.

Data Collection: Data collected from the Office of Institutional Research based on self-reported ethnic diversity. Ethnically diverse backgrounds are defined as Black, Hispanic, Asian or Pacific Islanders, and American Indian or Alaskan Native. Consistent with federal guidelines, Hispanic individuals may be of any race; they are counted only once so no duplication exists. Those of mixed races are also counted only once.

Targets: The goal is to increase the number of students from diverse ethnic backgrounds at all levels (undergraduate and graduate) and enrollment statuses (full-time, part-time, and visiting). Projected targets represent an approximate 2% increase over the three-year (2008-2010) mean. While ESU recognizes that projecting the 2012-2014 targets from the three-year mean rather than the achievements of 2010 makes it seem that ESU is planning to decrease its performance in this area, these targets were established after careful evaluation of the current year's enrollment population

and thorough review of the demographic profile of ESU's potential constituency. Programs such as African-American Leadership Day, Hispanic Leadership Day, and Si Se Puede are among the recruitment initiatives focused on ethnically diverse populations, and these efforts will continue apace. However, external factors, such as the region's economic downturn, significant job losses, and first-generational concerns hinder growth in this area. The restructuring of operations at Tyson Foods in Emporia and the resultant massive layoffs had a disproportionately high impact on the ethnic populations in the area. Because those layoffs took place in the spring of 2008, the attrition rate among the student population was expected to manifest over the subsequent twelve to eighteen months, an expectation born out by the 15% discrepancy in the 2010 to 2011 enrollment among this population. ESU has therefore elected to use the mean from which to project conservative growth in this area; targets remain a stretch goal, however.

Indicator 2: Increase percentage of full-time baccalaureate students from diverse ethnic backgrounds retained from first to second year.

Data Collection: The retention percentage of full-time students from diverse ethnic backgrounds is calculated by comparing the enrollment figures for students in this group in the current fall semester with the enrollment figures from the previous fall semester. Because ESU's retention is reported and analyzed as a percentage, this indicator is reported as a percentage to maintain consistency.

Targets: ESU's performance in persistence among its ethnically diverse student population has been relatively stable over the past three years. The sustained lack of employment opportunities in the area continues to be a barrier to retention, however, and the ethnically diverse populations have been especially hard hit by the economic depression in the region. Targets represent an approximately 1% projected increase in retention over the three-year average and reflect extant external factors, including socio-economic barriers and first generation student challenges.

Indicator 3: Increase number of baccalaureate degree completers from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The graduation tally of baccalaureate students from diverse ethnic backgrounds is reported by the Office of Institutional Research based on self-reported ethnicity.

Targets: Targets represent a projected 3% growth over the three-year (2008-2010) mean. The three-year history shows a relatively level performance in achieving this goal. The massive layoffs at Tyson in 2008 disproportionately affected the Emporia community's minority population and negatively impacted degree completion of a significant number of ESU's students, as evidenced by the nearly 10% drop between 2008 and 2009. In addition, the decrease in enrollments of diverse students outlined in Indicator 1 will impact this indicator. Thus ESU has elected to project optimistic targets (3% growth) from the three-year average, rather than from the last year for which data was collected. Continued assessment of the many issues negatively impacting student persistence and degree completion and identifying areas for improved intervention and the implementation of strategies to ensure that ethnically diverse students are successful will be key to achieving the projected goals.

Indicator 4: Increase number of graduate degree completers from diverse ethnic backgrounds.

Data Collection: The graduation tally of graduate (MS/MA and PhD) students from diverse ethnic backgrounds is reported by the Office of Institutional Research based on self-reported ethnicity.

Targets: Targets represent a projected 1% growth over the three-year (2008-2010) mean and are predicated on an increased institutional focus on and support for advanced-degree-seeking students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Socio-economic factors remain significant barriers to this population, evidenced by the precipitous decline in completion among this population from 2009 to 2010, so ESU's targets represent stretch goals.

Foresight 2020 Goal 4: Ensure that students earning credentials and degrees across the higher education system possess the foundational skills essential for success in work and in life.

Institutional Goal: Expand student learning, use, and performance in writing skills.

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase the percentage of students who demonstrate the expected rate of progress or above, based on linkage analysis of ACT-CAAP scores in writing skill.	2007-2010 = 78.84%	2012: 79.63% 2013: 80.43% 2014: 81.23%		
2. Increase the Student Writing Index (SWI)	2007-2010 = 100	2012: 101 2013: 102 2014: 103		
3. Increase the Program Writing Index (PWI)	2007-2010 = 100	2012: 101 2013: 102 2014: 103		
4. Increase the average pre-post test gain scores on an embedded General Education essay.	New indicator; 2011 will provide data to establish baseline	2012: Baseline 2013: +1% 2014: +1%		

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL: Expand student learning, use, and performance in writing skills.

Indicator 1: Increase the percentage of students who demonstrate the expected rate of progress or above, based on linkage analysis of ACT-CAAP scores in writing skill.

Data Collection: Using linkage analysis, ESU compares each student's performance on the ACT with the ACT's Collegiate Assessment of Academic Progress (CAAP) in correlative areas (e.g., English). The nationally standardized CAAP exam is typically taken by ESU students in their junior or senior year. The linkage methodology is driven by ACT and enables a comparison between an individual student's scaled score (where the scaled score is associated with a national ranking) on the English portion of the ACT and that same student's performance on the CAAP's cognate area. ACT has established a specified relationship between ACT (i.e., pre-test) and CAAP (i.e., post-test). According to ACT, "The CAAP test requires greater knowledge of more complex cognitive skills than the ACT assessment. Therefore, students scoring at the same 'level' on both tests must have increased their knowledge and cognitive skills" (ACT Linkage Reports ACT CAAP 2001-2002, p. 3). ACT scaled scores in writing are reported to ESU via high school transcripts or electronically from ACT; they are converted to deciles using 2007-2010 cumulative frequencies of ACT scaled scores in writing. The data analysis is organized to yield an aggregate result; thus, individual years cannot be parsed from the three-year data. The scaled scores from the ACT/CAAP test linkage studies are therefore reported as cumulative frequencies, and targets are projected from that aggregate.

Targets: The linkage study yields three possible performance outcomes, as defined by ACT: 1) expected progress, meaning the student's performance from the pre-test (ACT) to the post-test (CAAP) has progressed at approximately the same rate as the national average; 2) more than expected progress; or 3) less than expected progress. The CAAP English exam is challenging, and the national percentile used compares ESU

students exclusively with students from other four-year colleges and universities, rather than with everyone who takes the ACT. The baseline was established by analyzing the 2,349 ESU students for whom both ACT and CAAP writing skills data are available between 2007-2010. As this is a new performance indicator for ESU, the data were not organized to facilitate individual year analysis to establish baseline; thus, it is reported as an aggregate for the inclusive years 2007-2010.

Indicator 2: Increase the Student Writing Index (SWI)

Data Collection: The Student Writing Index (SWI) is a student-focused evaluation that measures the writing intensity (quantity and quality) of individual undergraduate student writing across the curriculum. It differs from writing across the curriculum in that it measures both breadth and depth. Classification is based on assessment of student learning in writing where Level 1 (L1) courses indicate moderate performance requirements, Level 2 (L2) courses indicate expanded performance requirements, and Level 3 (L3) courses indicate intensive performance requirements. It is a comparison of writing intensive to non-writing intensive courses in each specific student's curriculum, which yields a weighted ratio (i.e., index). Classification of levels is determined by guidelines specifically designed for this assessment. Each writing course/section is weighted by the number of credit hours and writing level (L1-L3); the sum of all writing courses/sections is divided by the total number of non-intensive writing credit hours for a given student. As an example, a three credit hour course at Level 2 is assigned a value of $2L \times 3CH = 6$, divided by the total hours attempted. These values are summed and then divided by the summation of Level 0 courses (non-writing intensive courses)—e.g. $2L \times 3CH$. Using an index number, an indicator of average percentage change where the base is assigned an arbitrary value of 100 and the other figures are adjusted in proportion to that base, in order to project targets for improvement, the beginning SWI equals $1.00 \times 100 = 100$. A higher SWI indicates improvement. Increasing the SWI is tied to increasing the PWI, as outlined in Indicator 3 below. The SWI is an indirect measure of the student's skill and knowledge acquisition relative to writing.

Targets: The targets represent a one percentage point increase over the established baseline.

Indicator 3: Increase the Program Writing Index (PWI)

Data Collection: The Program Writing Index (PWI) analyzes the intensity (quantity and quality) of writing through a comprehensive assessment of literacy skills across ESU's curriculum. The PWI is not an expressly student-focused indicator, because it measures writing across the curriculum in a quantifiable manner. The PWI measures the culture and commitment to writing at ESU. Assessing the culture of writing is essential to and inseparable from the SWI in order to best improve student writing skills across the curriculum. The data classification follows the same classifications and weights as Indicator 2; this forms the numerator for each student in comparison with Level 0 (L0) courses that do not assess substantive writing ability in the denominator. The aggregate means for the measured year and the base year provide an index number, which is 100 in the base year.

Targets: The targets represent a one percentage point increase over the established baseline.

Indicator 4: Increase the average pre-post test gain scores on an embedded General Education essay.

Data Collection: Essay pairs in designated General Education courses with mutually aligned student learning outcomes will be evaluated by trained teams of evaluators using a shared rubric designed to measure foundational writing skills. Each essay will be evaluated using an internally developed rubric where thesis/position statement; evidence to support stated position/thesis statement; organization and vocabulary usage; grammar and syntax; and concise summation are identified as critical core components of skill in writing. The rubric uses a standard five-point Likert scale, where 1 = deficient; 2 = weak; 3 = adequate; 4 = good/competent; and 5 = excellent/outstanding. Summative scores, with five (5) being the lowest and twenty-five (25) being the highest, will be computed for each essay. This is a new initiative for ESU, designed to measure and help target areas for improvement of writing across the curriculum as an essential foundational skill. Its focus on writing aligns it with the SWI and PWI indicators.

Targets: Baseline will be established based on the implementation of the above-described pre- and post-test paired essay during the Fall 2011 semester and reported as an average gain score from the core sample of students. Targets will be reported once the data have been collected and analyzed.

Foresight 2020 Goal 5: Enhance alignment between the work of the state's higher education system and the needs of the Kansas economy.				
Institutional Goal: Serve the needs of Kansas and enhance the Kansas economy by producing highly qualified graduates prepared for careers in critical-need and emergent professions.				
Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase the number of grant proposals submitted.	2008 = 18 2009 = 28 2010 = 22 Mean = 22.6	2012: 25 2013: 27 2014: 30		
2. Increase the number of program completers in teaching areas that have critical needs in the state of Kansas.	2008 = 54 2009 = 74 2010 = 95 Mean = 74.3	2012: 82 2013: 90 2014: 100		
3. Increase the number of students entering professional, medical, and doctoral programs in the state of Kansas.	Indicator has not been tracked; 2012 will establish baseline	2012: Baseline 2013: +1% 2014: +1%		
4. Increase the number of small business start-ups supported by the ESU Small Business Development Center (ESU SBDC).	2008 = 14 2009 = 14 2010 = 19 Baseline = 15.6	2012: 16 2013: 17 2014: 18		

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL: Serve the needs of Kansas and enhance the Kansas economy by producing highly qualified graduates prepared for careers in critical-need and emergent professions.

Indicator 1: Increase the number of grant proposals submitted.

Data Collection: ESU will increase the number of external grant proposals submitted that tie directly back to Kansas workforce development and training. All submitted grants must be processed through the Research and Grants Center at ESU. The Research and Grants Center Manager will provide these data on an annual basis.

Targets: Externally funded grants bring increased revenue to the state of Kansas, as well as provide critical training and educational opportunities that benefit the present and future Kansas workforce. There are numerous examples of grants which positively impact vital-need areas within the state and intersect with other key emphases and goals within the current Performance Agreement. STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) grants specifically target the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math, identified nationally as lagging areas and of critical need. The Jones Institute is awarded grants which provide professional development training to teachers; Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) grants provide language training for individuals to work with English-as-a-second-language speakers; and Emporia Diversity Initiative (EDI) funds provide for the training of minority students in library services. The targets represent an increase of 10% over the mean number of grants over the past three years (2008-2010). The mean from 2008-2010 was 22.6.

Indicator 2: Increase the number of program completers in teaching areas that have critical needs in the state of Kansas.

Data Collection: The number of program completers in critical teaching areas is collected and maintained annually by the Dean of the Teachers College. Critical teaching areas identified as foci by ESU include math, special education, and science.

Targets: The targets represent an increase of 10% over the mean number of program completers in math, science, and special education over the past three years (2008-2010). The mean from 2008-2010 was 74.3. The three-year mean is slightly skewed by the large numbers of program completers from the special education program. The Teachers College secured a grant to increase personnel within the department of Special Education and thus was able to increase the number of students who could be prepared within that program. The grant has expired, which could adversely affect the number of students entering the special education teaching program at ESU.

Indicator 3: Increase the number of students entering professional, medical, and doctoral programs in the state of Kansas.

Data Collection: Department chairs will report these data annually.

Targets: Over the next three years, ESU will increase its focus on successfully transitioning its graduating students into doctoral, medical, and professional (e.g., MBA, JD, MS, MAT, and Ed Admin) programs within the state of Kansas. Encouraging students to pursue their graduate-level education and training within the state benefits the Kansas economy by keeping revenue dollars in state during the course of study, while providing a well-educated and well-trained population that will positively contribute to the future workforce of the state.

Indicator 4: Increase the number of small business start-ups supported by the ESU Small Business Development Center (ESU SBDC).

Data Collection: The number of small business start-ups supported by the ESU SBDC is provided by the Regional Director of the SBDC.

Targets: The ESU SBDC has been instrumental in assisting area businesses in manifold ways. For example, it provided assistance with financial advice and marketing to the Granada Coffee Company; helped Kraus Electric, LLC secure a business loan to enable growth and development; and aided The New Breck Café through extensive consultation regarding a business plan, valuation, ownership structure, and employment-related questions. Growth in small business start-ups has been slow but steady; a considerable increase occurred from 2009 to 2010 due to the hiring of an Outreach Consultant. The targets represent a 5% increase from the baseline.

Comments: The declared indicators are aligned with specific goals articulated in ESU's Strategic Plan, which provides a comprehensive blueprint for ESU's contributions to the Kansas economy and the provision of a highly qualified workforce for the state.

Institutional Goal A: Improve assessment and evaluation practices in ESU programs with initiate level program evaluation systems.

Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Faculty Involvement and Creating/Aligning Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessments.	2008 = 57.4% 2009 = 69.4% 2010 = 63.0% Baseline Percentage = 65.0%	Percentages Year 1 = 75.0% Year 2 = 85.0% Year 3 = 95.0%		
2. Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices.	2008 = 31.1% 2009 = 43.3% 2010 = 33.3% Baseline Percentage = 36.4%	Percentages Year 1 = 43.2% Year 2 = 50.0% Year 3 = 56.8%		

3. Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Continuous Improvement Through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.	2008 = 31.1% 2009 = 48.3% 2010 = 39.3% Baseline Percentage = 42.0%	Percentages Year 1 = 47.0% Year 2 = 52.0% Year 3 = 57.0%		
---	---	---	--	--

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL A: Improve assessment and evaluation practices in ESU programs with initiate level program evaluation systems.

Indicator 1: Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Faculty Involvement and Creating/Aligning Student Learning Outcomes and Program Assessments.

Data Collection: The goal and indicators featured here are indicative of an expanded emphasis on program assessment at ESU. Data are collected for each of the three stated indicators via the Program Assessment of Student Learning (PASL). Since 2007, each department or program (in cases where multiple programs exist within a single department) has submitted a PASL every other year, with approximately half of the departments submitting their PASL in an even year (i.e., 2008/2010 cohort) and half submitting it in an odd year (i.e., 2007/2009/2011 cohort). For the period of this Performance Agreement, ESU is focusing on the lower-performing or "initiate" level departments to ensure that all program evaluation designs attain "above standard" quality. All areas practice assessment, but some departments/programs implemented a comprehensive assessment architecture earlier than others and are therefore more advanced. In terms of effective assessment/evaluation systems, "initiate" level departments or programs are at the beginning to intermediate stages of development. Initiate level programs score below standard (i.e., a rating of 1 or 2 on a 4-point scale) on at least one of the 13 rubric factors (as explained below) used in the PASL evaluation, and they have a PASL total score of 38 or below (total score range = 13 to 52). These programs represent the lower half of all rank-ordered programs at ESU, based on the PASL data. Initiate level programs are required to report their PASL on an annual basis in order to encourage significant improvement across all programs and to target resources on their distinct needs. The PASL is rated independently by the Director of Assessment and by the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee, which is comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators from all schools and colleges at ESU. Institutional Goal A-Indicator 1 measures the overall program performance with respect to assessment factors related to practical faculty involvement (i.e., development of learning outcomes/standards, faculty input/involvement, and alignment of outcomes with teaching & with professional standards). This indicator is measured by three rubric factors (see description below). Each rubric factor is rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). The percentage of ratings of "3" or higher is calculated from the set of all rubric ratings from factors 1-3.

Factor 1--Professional Standards: Programs at the "at-standard" level have an assessment system that is based on professional standards/outcomes, and the faculty AND the professional community are involved. At the "above standard level" the assessment system goes beyond the previous level to demonstrate continuous improvement through systematic activities. For example, the department may have continuous involvement with professional groups, employ a departmental assessment committee that is synthesized with other university committees and involve student focus groups. This type of system will appear to be able to quickly respond to changing demands of the profession or the curriculum.

Factor 2--Faculty Involvement: For programs at the "at-standard" level, faculty involvement consists of a small core within the department, but input from other faculty and professionals about assessment issues is evidenced. At the "above-standard" level, faculty involvement is widespread throughout the program or department. All faculty within the department have contributed (and continue to contribute) to the use and maintenance of an assessment plan. At the latter two levels, faculty will be increasingly involved in many of the activities of the plan including managing data, communicating performance to individual students, communicating results to colleagues, and embedding assessments into courses.

Factor 3--Assessment Alignment: At the "at-standard" level, there is a clear and complete alignment between outcomes and assessment and is evidenced by a point-by-point comparison between individual subtest data and the stated learning outcomes. At the "above standard" level, the program courses are included in this alignment, which provides the ultimate mechanism for change.

Targets: The established baseline reported in the performance history is the weighted average percentage for all initiate level programs in the 2009 and 2010 reporting cycle. A weighted average percentage is reported as baseline because of the unequal number of initiate level programs in each yearly cohort (2009 cohort = 12 programs; 2010 cohort = 27 programs). Focus on the initiate-level programs means that all targets are stretch goals. ESU expects to increase the percentage of overall practice ratings achieving an “at standard” or “above standard” rating from a baseline of 65% to a Year 1 target of 75%, a Year 2 target of 85%, and a Year 3 target of 95%. It is important to note the percentages reflected in the baseline and targets are based on criteria with high expectations in the tradition of assessment at ESU.

Indicator 2: Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices.

Data Collection: This indicator represents more complex assessment practices for faculty and administrators and is associated with data management and expanded assessment and evaluation designs to gauge student learning. The overall program performance is evaluated, with respect to factors related to Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices. Measurement is done via five rubric factors (see description below), rated on a 1 to 4 points scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). The reported result is the percentage of ratings across all five rubric factors earning a "3" or higher on this four-point scale. A description of each level of performance for each factor is given below:

Factor 4--Assessment Structure: The assessment plan has to have all three of the following attributes to be at the "above standard" level: 1) multiple direct and indirect assessments; 2) assessments used on a regular basis; and 3) some assessments that provide comprehensive information on student performance at each stage of their program. An "at-standard" level program has two of these three attributes.

Factor 5--Data Management: The "at-standard" data management system can store and process most student performance data over time. The "above standard" data management system goes beyond level three by being able to analyze and report data in user-friendly formats. At this level, data can easily be accessed by all faculty.

Factor 6--Data Collection Points: At the "at-standard" level, data are systematically collected at multiple points and there is strong rationale (e.g., research, best practice) regarding their relationship to student success. At the "above standard" level programs go beyond the rationale and provide statistical evidence for the predictability between the assessments and student success.

Factor 7--Data Collection Sources: At the "at-standard" level, data is additionally collected from other professionals. At the "above standard" level, the data collection is from multiple sources for all of these groups.

Factor 8--Program Improvement: At the "at-standard" level, the scoring/cut-off criteria are established. At the "above standard" level, the scoring/cut-off criteria are examined for validity and utility, resulting in program modifications as necessary.

The percentage of ratings of “3” or higher is calculated from the set of all rubric ratings from factors 4-8. This indicator measures the overall program performance with respect to assessment factors related to Assessment, Evaluation Design and Data Management Practices.

Targets: The expected increase of overall practice ratings achieving an “at standard” or “above standard” rating is from a baseline of 36.4% to a Year 1 target of 43.2%, a Year 2 target of 50.0%, and a Year 3 target of 56.8%. It is important to note the percentages reflected in the baseline and targets are based on criteria with high expectations in the tradition of assessment at ESU.

Indicator 3: Increase percentage of academic program ratings "at standard" or "above standard" for assessment factors related to: Continuous Improvement Through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.

Data Collection: Indicator 3 represents the most advanced practices and is associated with using accurate and integrated methods of inquiry to improve the teaching-learning relationship (i.e., decision-based inquiry at the classroom and program levels). This indicator is measured by five rubric factors, which are rated on a 1 to 4 point scale (1=beginning, 2=developing, 3=at standard, 4=above standard). The percentage of ratings of “3” or higher is calculated from the set of all rubric ratings from factors 9-13 (see description below). This indicator measures the overall program performance with respect to assessment factors related to Continuous Improvement Through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.

Factor 9--Program Improvements: An "at standard" program " has in place an ongoing, systematic, objectives-based process and uses data to make program improvements. At the "above standard" level, this data is additionally used to make decisions university-wide.

Factor 10--Monitoring Student Progress & Managing and Improving Operations and Programs: An "at-standard" level program uses measures to to monitor student progress, manage operations and programs, and make improvements are evidenced. At the "above standard" level, changes based on data are evidenced.

Factor 11--Assessment data usage by faculty: In an "at-standard" level program, assessment data are shared for the purposes of reflection and improvement. At the "above standard" level, remediation opportunities are made available (e.g., course development, program development, operation changes).

Factor 12--Assessment Data Shared with Students: At the "at-standard" level, program data are shared with students for the purposes of guidance, reflection, and improvement. At the "above standard" level, data are shared with guidance, reflection and improvement. Individual performance data is fully used to inform students of their strengths and weaknesses. Remediation opportunities are made available to the student as necessary.

Factor 13--Fairness, Accuracy, and Consistency of Assessments: At the "at-standard" level, preliminary steps have been taken to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of assessments. At the "above standard" level, fairness, accuracy, and consistency have been statistically established through data analysis.

The percentage of ratings of “3” or higher is calculated from the set of all rubric ratings from factors 9-13. This indicator measures the overall program performance with respect to assessment factors related to Continuous Improvement Through Inquiry-Based Decision Making Practices.

Targets: ESU expects to increase the percentage of overall practice ratings achieving an “at standard” or “above standard” rating from a baseline of 42.0% to a Year 1 target of 47.0%, a Year 2 target of 52.0%, and a Year 3 target of 57%. It is important to note the percentages reflected in the baseline and targets are based on criteria with high expectations in the tradition of assessment at ESU.

Institutional Goal B: Enhance the graduate and undergraduate learning experience.				
Performance Indicator	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Increase number of baccalaureate students participating in first year experiences (FYE).	2008 = 331 2009 = 414 2010 = 377 Mean = 374	2012: 393 2013: 413 2014: 434		
2. Increase number of graduate and undergraduate students participating in a study abroad or other international education experience.	2008 = 70 2009 = 94 2010 = 80 Mean = 81	2012: 89 2013: 98 2014: 108		

