Standard #6 - Organizational Performance Results, Table 6.1

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	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. Key indicators may include: graduation rates, enrollment, improvement in safety, hiring equity, increased use of web-based technologies, use of facilities by community organizations, contributions to the community, or partnerships, retention rates by program, and what you report to governing boards and administrative units.				
			Analysis of Results		
Performance Measure	**What is your measurement instrument or process?**	**Current Results**	**Analysis of Results**	**Action Taken or Improvement made**	**Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)**
Measurable goal **What is your 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?**	
Reach enrollment target (which was reset in consultation with the dean in the face of COVID-19 and institutional projections to flat for fall 2020, 1% increase in fall 2021, and 2% increase in fall 2022).	Annualized enrollment data reported by Institutional Research from freeze date files. (Note: this measure is annualized and includes summer enrollment, which is a slightly different measure than what is reported from the end of term files in the enrollment management report - both measures provide useful views of student enrollment).	In 2014-15, the programs hit 448 FTE just shy of the aspirational goal of 450 FTE. The Programs maintained enrollment within the 420-450 FTE range as described in the strategic plan during 2013-2017, but in 2017-18, enrollment fell to 379 FTE, well below the projected decrease to 412 FTE.	Program enrollment has tracked fairly closely with University enrollment, with year over year declines. In particular, enrollment in accounting has declined. However, based on admissions deposits, enrollment for the University and both Programs are tracking ahead of last year.	The enrollment issue involves both recruitment and retention strategies, and as result of these declines, the University contracted with Ruffalo Noel Levitz (RNL) to study the issues and develop strategies. The University implemented RNL's demand builder program specifications built upon a two-prong search model, list purchase management, and multiple outreach strategies (e.g., email, direct mail, telemarketing, and digital ads). Financial aid optimization strategies have also been implemented. Program faculty have participated in every area that the Enrollment Management Office has asked including traditional recruiting events (e.g., open house and campus visits) to new/re-constituted activities like phon-a-thon, academic webinars, and developing more precise program talking points by departments for admissions counselors. Program representatives are also participating in online (due to COVID-19) orientation.	**Chart 6.1: Business and Accounting Programs Enrollment**

Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement made	Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)
Increase combined in-major retention rate to 65% or higher by and stabilize variability.	Retention rates for the freshmen cohort reported by Institutional Research after fall freeze date.	The combined retention shows a positive trend over the past several years until to fall 2017 cohort for business and fall 2018 cohort for accounting, which for the fall 2017 cohort, was the lowest overall retention rate in almost 10 years. Fortunately, the overall rate rebounded in 2019 to 63%, near the target in-major retention rate.	In addition to the variability in Program retention rates, the University also saw a significant decline with the fall 2017 second-year retention rate to 64.6%, down from 70.2%, though business seemed to be hit harder. This does appear to be an anomaly, but may be partially explained by change in the SAT scoring and not fully adjusting admissions guidelines accordingly.	Pursuant to the RNL studies, the University's recruiting strategies have been designed to leverage outreach to students who are characteristic of those proven to be successful at LHU and to provide more financial support; financial need is one of the key factors that impedes success of the LHU student, both in terms of academic performance and financial wherewithal to continue studies. Aside from that, the Programs continue to engage in numerous retention initiatives based upon best practices and AAC&U's high impact practices such as summer and fall orientations, freshmen mentoring programs, learning communities, and first-year seminar (introduction to business) course. Social activities, open lectures, and co-curricular activities that connect new students with faculty, students, and alumni were provided. These actions will continue as faculty solicit feedback from key constituencies about continuously improving them. For fall 2020, assignments in MANG105 will focus more on engaging students, including an assignment geared at having the student meet with their academic advisors regarding topics that should help them learn about the advisor as a person and make connections.	**Chart 6.2: 2nd-Year Retention Rates**

Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement made	Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)
75% of students respond that they are satisfied with availability of computer equipment and facilities and with classroom facilities.	Graduating Senior Survey completed at the end of each semester to produce an annual report.	Met expectations in fall 2019-20 on both survey items, but not for satisfaction with classrooms in 2018-19	Positive trend data point to adequately supporting students with access to computer facilities, but trend data also point to the need to update classroom facilities.	Each year, the department has received around $10,000 in student equipment funds to upgrade the computer labs, software, etc. Students also have unlimited access to the open labs for which the University provides updated software. We will continue to monitor student satisfaction as well as procure technologies that will enable faculty and students access to what is currently used in business and industry. For classrooms, students have begun to express their desire to see classroom upgrades perhaps with more comfortable furniture and more outlets. While monies were spent to upgrade instructional technologies and common gathering areas on the first floor, the classrooms have not been updated as recently. These comments have been shared with the dean who has worked collaboratively with the faculty to seek private funds for a finance lab and facilities.	**Chart 6.3: Computer and Classroom Facilities** Percent of Students Satisfied: 100%, 85%, 70%, 55%, 40%, 25% Years: 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 ■ Computer Equipment/Facilities ■ Classroom facilities

Performance Measure	What is your measurement instrument or process?	Current Results	Analysis of Results	Action Taken or Improvement made	Insert Graphs or Tables of Resulting Trends (3-5 data points preferred)
At least 100 students participate in course-embedded projects and serve at least 25 businesses annually.	Student and organizational data reported by faculty each semester on the Student Community Activity Spreadsheet.	Exceeded expectations for both the number of students involved and number of organizations served.	The number of students involved exceeds expectations, but declined somewhat. It is important to note that higher numbers seen in this two-year reporting period result from more faculty using course-embedded projects, the addition of a service learning requirement, and a new tracking system that may have provided better numbers than in the past. Although the number of students has increased significantly, the number of organizations served has declined in part due to greater use of groupwork with larger groups and fewer partners and to COIVD-19. Also, while the tracking system has really helped identify student numbers, some refinements need to be made to track partners served.	Emphasized by alumni and graduating seniors, service learning through real-world projects creates a mutually beneficial experience for students and local organizations. Even though the Programs surpassed the initial goals in the current 5-year strategic plan, the Programs still receive feedback from the Business Advisory Board and alumni that more hands-on, real-world experience should be integrated into the curriculum. With the addition in this reporting period of two courses designated as experiential learning (EL) and the service learning requirement, the Programs expect to the number of organizations served to increase. Smaller entering cohorts over the past couple of years will likely have a negative impact on the number of students doing service learning with the hope of an eventual upswing in enrollment moving forward.	**Chart 6.4: Community Service** 2013-14 2014-15 2015-16 2016-17 2017-18 2018-19 2019-20 ■ # of Students Serving ■ # of Organizations Served