Complete the following table. Provide three or four examples, reporting what you consider to be the most important data. It is not necessary to provide results for every process.

Table 6.1 Standard 6 - Organizational Performance Results

Organizational effectiveness results examine attainment of organizational goals. Each business unit must have a systematic reporting mechanism for each business program that charts enrollment patterns, student retention, student academic success, and other characteristics reflecting students performance.
Results

Results

Results

| | , | oards and administrative units. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | | Analysis of Results | | T | | | | | | | | | | |
| Performance Measure | What is your measurement instrument or process? | Current Results | Analysis of Results Analysis of Results | Action Taken or Improvement made | Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Measurable goal | (Indicate length of cycle) | What are your current results? | What did you learn from the results? | What did you improve or what is your next step? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What is your goal? Increase our "year to year" Freshman Undergraduate and Transfer Undergraduate retention rates to consistent | Retention rates as tracked once a year (Fall Semester) by Office of Institutional Assessment and reported to | 95% Year 1 to Year 2 for Freshman, 85% for Transfers. | For the past two years, SOM faculty and staff has focused on early warning course participation data to quickly | Our next step is to address retention issues stemming from loss of financial aid (especially athletic scholarships). | Со | ncore | | | | | | nt -Undergra | | | n Data |
| >85%. | University Provost office. | | identify and address individual "at risk" students in | | - 11 | | | | | | | and Transfer Co | | | |
| | | | partnership with student advising / counseling. In | | | SON | A Fresh | men F | II 2012 | SON | Freshme | n Fall 2013 | SOM F | reshmen | Fall 2014 |
| | | | addition, dean reviews course evaluation data each semester and works with | | | Fall Enrolle | | um rads F | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Cum d Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolled | Cum Grads | Retention |
| | | | faculty to improve engagement and student | | Cohort Year 2 | 31 26 | | | 100% | 24 16 | | 100% 62% | 21 | | 100% 95% |
| | | | satisfaction of courses. The results reflect improved | | Year 3 | 19 | | | 61% | 14* | | 58% | 20 | | 93% |
| | | | outcomes from our efforts | | Year 4 Year 5 | 18* | | | 58% | | | | | | |
| Increase our overall undergraduate course | Course enrollment is tracked by the registrar's office and | Current results reflect enrollment growth in our SOM | | We improved attracting undeclared major students, and | Year 6 | * Pre- | Census | Enrolls | nent | * Pre- | ensus Enr | ollment | * Pre-Cer | nsus Enre | ollment |
| enrollment to support overall university student interest in business degree minors, and | reported to the University Provost. For this metric, SOM uses total SOM | undergraduate courses. Specifically, the three year academic year course | focusing on an optimal blend of online and classroom based on a course by course | non SOM major students to enroll in introductory business courses, or pursue a minor. | A A | SON | d Tran | sfers Fa | II 2012 | SOM | FTransfer | s Fall 2013 | SOM F | Transfers | Fall 2014 |
| conversion of undeclared students to business majors. | undergraduate course enrollment (courses with the SOM course designations of | enrollment trend was positive. The data shows an increase from 1,221 (AY '14-'15) to | basis. During this time frame, we held to a constant ratio of online and classroom | However, we need to address the conversion of undeclared majors to business majors, and | | Fall | | um rads l | letention | Fall | Cum | Retention | Fall Enrolled | Cum | Retention |
| | ACT, MKT, SPT and BUAD) | 1,362 (AY '16 - '17). This is a | | address retention in our major | Cohort | 24 | - | raus r | 100% | 23 | G Grads | 100% | 20 | Grads | 100% |
| | for the academic year. | three year annualized compound growth rate of 6%. | | programs. Next steps are to review our undergraduate core | Year 2 | 17 | | 1 | 75% | 19 | | 83% | 17* | | 85% |
| | | | | business courses for overall alignment to CPC and | Year 3 Year 4 | 2* | | 5 13 | 63% | 13* | + | 57% | | | - |
| | | | | contribution to CU - SOM university goals and objectives. | Year 5 Year 6 | | + | - | | | | = | | | |
| increase our overall "declared major / program" School of Management (SOM)enrollment of quality students in both subdents in both our orderpraduate and MBA programs by 10% a year. | Declared major student enrollment is tracked by Office of Institute of Post Office of Institute of Post Assessment, and reported to the University Proofs. SOM uses the annual Fall Term to the Control of Post of tracking of this metric. | Current results reflect two different rends over the past two years. Our MRA ground and undergraduted degree declared majors are years. Put and the past of the pa | Transitioning our online MBA marketing and recruitment to up internal resources proved to be overwhelming for our limited marketing resources. In particular, our tormer secoptional search regine and affiliate web site marketing capabilities that Concordal University does not have among internal resources. | For the Academic Year 17-18 budget, Concordia has significantly increased digital marketing funds and is in process of hiring an assistant wice president (AVP) level head two president (AVP) level head the function was run by a director level position). The AVP job description has significant emphasis on proven online marketing skills, in addition, and a significant emphasis on proven online marketing skills, in addition, and the significant emphasis on proven online marketing skills, in addition, and a significant emphasis on proven online marketing skills, in addition, and the significant emphasis on proven online individual systems of the significant emphasis of the significant emphasis on the significant emphasis of | (RA degree 460 800 m AG 100 310 300 250 200 150 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1 | T AD BA Online | ACT and A (Vall tes | CT majors m — calend CT MA Ground III III III III III III III III III I | ngram – SOM UG MiliA degree: Grou Ar year) 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 1 | ser 4a Std 1se 327 | | | | | |
| Manage the rigor of our SOM academic programs in compliance with Provost guidelines of overall college GPA of \$3.0 for undergraduate and \$ for graduate students. | By semester, overall SOM by declared major GPA as reported and tracked by the Registrar's office for the Provost. | Current results indicate SOM is in compliance with Provost by college GPA metrics in accordance with University assessment of rigor. | While the SOM results comply with Provost guidelines, the undergraduate data displays a large variance by program. In addition, upperclass major courses should be aligned with CPC topic assessment to insure alignment of grade with learning achievement. | Our next SOM step is to insert CPC topic formative assessments into select upperclass courses and evaluate alignment with course GPA. | GPA By Declared Majo Undergraduate Accountin Business Adm Marketin TOTA MBA All program | SU SU | 3.01 2.90 2 2.99 2 | 2.94 2.89 2.94 | AY 2014 FA SP 5 3.27 3.42 2 2.97 2.94 2 2.90 3.09 3 2.98 3.01 2 | 2.52 3.22 2.65 3.00 3.12 2.85 2.71 3.02 | P | | | | |

| GPA By Declared | | AY 2013 | 3 | | AY 2014 | ļ | | AY 2015 | ; | AY 2016 | | | | |
|-----------------|------|---------|------|------|---------|------|------|---------|------|---------|------|------|--|--|
| Major | SU | FA | SP | SU | FA | SP | SU | FA | SP | SU | FA | SP | | |
| Undergraduate | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accounting | | | | | 3.27 | 3.42 | 2.52 | 3.22 | 3.61 | 2.25 | 3.50 | 3.56 | | |
| Business Admin | | 3.01 | 2.94 | | 2.97 | 2.94 | 2.65 | 3.00 | 3.09 | 2.16 | 3.00 | 3.05 | | |
| Marketing | | 2.90 | 2.89 | | 2.90 | 3.09 | 3.12 | 2.85 | 2.90 | 3.46 | 3.35 | 3.30 | | |
| TOTAL | | 2.99 | 2.94 | | 2.98 | 3.01 | 2.71 | 3.02 | 3.14 | 2.31 | 3.06 | 3.12 | | |
| МВА | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Programs | 3.64 | 3.61 | 3.67 | 3.61 | 3.41 | 3.55 | 3.57 | 3.41 | 3.48 | 3.42 | 3.50 | 3.55 | | |

| | School of Management Freshmen and Transfer Cohort Enrollment and Retention | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|--|---|-----------|--------------|-------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|---|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|
| | SOM Fro | SOM Freshmen Fall 2012 SOM Freshmen Fall 2013 | | | | | SOM F | reshmen F | all 2014 | | SOM Fr | eshmen Fa | all 2015 | SOM Freshmen Fall 2016 | | | |
| | Fall Enrolled | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | ı | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | Fall Er | rolle | Grads | Retention |
| Cohort | 31 | 0 | 100% | 24 | 0 | 100% | 21 | 0 | 100% | ı | 29 | 0 | 100% | | 22 | 0 | 100% |
| Year 2 | 26 | 0 | 84% | 16 | 0 | 67% | 19 | 0 | 90% | ı | 21 | 0 | 72% | | | | |
| Year 3 | 19 | 0 | 73% | 14 | 1 | 88% | 15 | 0 | 79% | ı | | | | | | | |
| Year 4 | 18 | 11 | 95% | 13 | 0 | 100% | | | | ı | | | | | | | |
| Year 5 | 4 | | 57% | | | | | | | ı | | | | | | | |
| Year 6 | - | , | | | • | | | | | | | • | | | | • | |

| | SOM Transfers Fall 2012 | | | SOM Transfers Fall 2013 | | | SOM 1 | ransfers Fa | ill 2014 | SOM T | ransfers Fa | all 2015 | SOM Transfers Fall 2016 | | | |
|--------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------|-----------|--|
| | Fall Enrolled | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | Fall Enrolle | Grads | Retention | |
| Cohort | 24 | 0 | 100% | 23 | 0 | 100% | 25 | 0 | 100% | 35 | 0 | 100% | 27 | 0 | 100% | |
| Year 2 | 17 | 3 | 71% | 19 | 0 | 83% | 16 | 0 | 64% | 25 | 0 | 71% | | | | |
| Year 3 | 12 | 8 | 71% | 13 | 3 | 68% | 10 | 3 | 63% | | | | | | | |
| Year 4 | 3 | 1 | 75% | 6 | 5 | 60% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 5 | 1 | | 50% | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |