# 2024 Concordia University Strategic Goals

By January 2016, Concordia University met 0, partially met 6 and has not yet met 4 2024 Strategic Goals.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Attainment</th>
<th>Intentional Enrollment</th>
<th>Physical Presence</th>
<th>Student Success</th>
<th>Transformative Alumni</th>
<th>Faculty and Staff Excellence</th>
<th>Strategic Partnerships</th>
<th>Impactful Innovation</th>
<th>Continuity and Communication</th>
<th>Stewardship and Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research &amp; Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Institutional Leadership Area</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees Finance Committee</th>
<th>Marketing/Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15 &amp; Jan 16</td>
<td>• Chief Vision Officer</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>• VP Enrollment</td>
<td>• Campus Management Team</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Jan-April 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td>• VP Student Affairs</td>
<td>• Deans</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deans</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief Strategic Partnerships Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Marketing</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief Development Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Athletics</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Campus Ministry</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chief Innovation Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Director of Alumni</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• VP Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Director of Service Learning</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• VP Student Affairs Jan 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council of Trustees Communication Team</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Met = 100% of measured (non-n/a) benchmarks fully met, Partial = 50-99% of measured (non-n/a) benchmarks fully met, Not Met = 49%, or less, measured (non-n/a) of benchmarks fully met.
Theme Attainment

Concordia will ensure high levels of attainment of the Core Themes (Lutheran, Rigor, and Servant Leadership) in the midst of a changing environment.

Part Met ²

3 of 7 measured benchmarks were met.

The updated theme attainment report will be presented in October 2016. The October 2014 theme attainment report indicated overall achievement of theme attainment.

In 2015, 54.7% (+4.7% above target) of respondents indicated awareness that Concordia Law is part of a Lutheran, Christian university.

Results pending freshmen, mid-point and senior Here I Study Lutheran Concepts quizzes.

In 2015 76% (+6% above target of 70%) of alumni indicated success in their chosen professional field or graduate students after graduation.

In Fall 2015, 73% of the freshmen from Fall 2014 returned to Concordia (-2% below target of 75%) which was +3% above the prior three year rolling average (70%).

In Fall 2015 48% of the 2009 class of incoming freshmen graduated from Concordia (-8% below target of 60%) which was +4% above the prior three year rolling average.

In 2015, 79% of faculty and 69% of staff participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week (+4.8% and -6.0% from 75% target, respectively).

In 2014, 64.4% of current students participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week (+4.4% above 60% target).

In 2015, 70.8% (-9.2% from target of 80%) of alumni participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

Shared Process

² MET if 100% of benchmarks are met; PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met; NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met.
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Deans, Provost, Vice President of Enrollment Management, Vice President of Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders, Council of Trustees

- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** Consider suggestions from the Student Success and Intentional Enrollment reports.

From: Center for Applied Lutheran Leadership - faculty, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership, faculty, Deans, Provost, Stakeholders, faculty and staff welfare groups

- **Benchmarks 1 and 7.** Consider suggestions from the Lutheran Brand mission objective report.

From: Stakeholders, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Stakeholders, Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 9.** Consider suggestions from the Transformative Alumni report.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Area Leadership
To: Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 1.** Mission Objective dashboards will be collaboratively designed and first presented in October 2016.

From: Provost, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee and Council of Trustees

- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** Consider suggestions from the Student Success report.
Benchmark 1: Meet or exceed thresholds for core theme attainment.
The updated theme attainment report will be presented in October 2016. The October 2014 theme attainment report indicated overall achievement of theme attainment.

Benchmark 2: 50% or more of the community will indicate “yes” or “somewhat/think so” that they are aware that Concordia Law is a part of a Lutheran, Christian university.

Results: In 2015, 54.7% (+4.7% above target) of respondents indicated awareness that Concordia Law is part of a Lutheran, Christian university.

Analysis: While the overall benchmark was exceeded by 4.7%, it is significant to note that two current students, and three donors, were “not much” aware that Concordia Law is part of a Lutheran, Christian University. Conversely, it is significant to note that 44.9% of the prospective students (including 35.9% of LSAT registrant prospective students) were at least minimally aware that Concordia Law is part of a Lutheran, Christian University. While this may speak to sampling bias, nonetheless, these results are encouraging given the recent founding of the Law school.

---

The annual Concordia University / Riley Research Group Survey purposes to document the awareness and perceptions of Concordia and the Concordia Brand, as well as to measure the impact of University activities, promotional efforts, and communications, among the communities in which Concordia resides. In Fall 2015, Riley Research surveyed current students, donors, local organizations and prospective students of the Concordia Law School in Boise, ID. The response rate was __%. Awareness Question 3d asks “How aware are you that Concordia is part of a Lutheran, Christian university.” Response options/coding: Very much (3), somewhat (2), not much (1), not at all (0), unfamiliar/unsure (0). Of the Fall 2015 respondents, 29 of 29 current students (100% of respondents), 21 of 21 donors (100% of respondents), 108 of 135 key influencers/local organizations (80.0% of respondents), and 98 of 152 prospective students (64.5% of respondents) answered this question.
Benchmark 3: The mean freshmen score will be 50% or greater on the Here I Study: Lutheran Concepts quiz given at the beginning of freshmen orientation. The mean senior score will be 75% or greater on the Advanced Here I Study quiz given at the beginning Faith & Life REL401. The mean senior score will be 50% or greater on the Advanced Here I Study quiz given at the end of Faith & Life REL401.

Results: In 2014, the mean score for 146 freshmen was 97%. However, these students took this quiz after receiving instruction regarding these Lutheran concepts. In 2015, the methodology was changed to provide a true incoming indication of student knowledge of these Lutheran concepts in order to measure the impact Concordia has in this area of student development. This pre-test will be aligned with a mid-point test and a post-test to investigate formative and summative impact. The 2015 results, therefore, cannot be measured directly against the 2014 results. The Fall 2015 results are pending processing.
**Benchmark 4:** In 2016, 70% of alumni will indicate success in their chosen professional field or graduate studies after graduation (in 2017, 80% with redesigned surveying).

**Results:** In 2015 76% (+6% above target of 70%) of alumni indicated success in their chosen professional field or graduate students after graduation.\(^4\)

**Analysis:** In 2015, strong improvement for alumni earning an undergraduate degree was seen in Concordia assisting alumni in their current job (+9.9% from 2014) and in Concordia increasing earnings potential of alumni (+10.4% from 2014). Strong declines were seen in preparation for graduate school for alumni earning an undergraduate degree (-15.1% from 2014) and for alumni earning a graduate degree (-16.8% from 2014). Further refinement of the survey question is crucial, at this stage.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni who earned a CU undergraduate degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU assisted me in my current job</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU prepared me to (potentially) succeed in graduated school</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU enhanced my upward mobility</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU increased my earnings potential</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni who earned a CU graduate degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU assisted me in my current job</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU prepared me to (potentially) succeed in graduated school</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU enhanced my upward mobility</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU increased my earnings potential</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alumni who earned CU undergraduate &amp; graduate degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU assisted me in my current job</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU prepared me to (potentially) succeed in graduated school</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU enhanced my upward mobility</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU increased my earnings potential</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) See footnote 2. Question 11 asks, “Please, indicate the extent that your education at Concordia...Assisted you in performing your current job; prepared you to (potentially) succeed in graduate school; enhanced your upward mobility; increased your earning potential.” Response options: Large extent, moderate extent, slight extent, not at all, unknown.” Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,270 (94.6%) answered this question. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,222 (93.1%) answered this question.
Benchmark 5: Concordia students will retain at a minimum rate, per cohort per program (75% for freshmen), and will retain at a higher rate than the prior three year rolling average.

Results: In Fall 2015, 73% of the freshmen from Fall 2014 returned to Concordia (-2% below target of 75%) which was +3% above the prior three year rolling average (70%).

Analysis: In addition to an increase of 3% over the prior three year rolling average, the Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 retention of freshmen also increased 5% over the Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 rate (68%).

Note: Graduate student retention rates, as well as term-to-term persistence after freshmen year, is forthcoming.\(^5\)

\(^5\) Future data to include:
- Retention rates for Ed. D., M. Ed., MAT, MBA, MAIDs, MAP, JD, undergraduates transferring in and undergraduates transferring out
- Comparison rates for on-line and on-ground programs
- Comparison rates to peer and to aspirational schools
**Benchmark 6:** Concordia students will complete at a minimum rate, per cohort per program (60% for freshmen) and will complete at a higher rate than the prior three year rolling average.

**Results:** In Fall 2015 48% of the 2009 class of incoming freshmen graduated from Concordia (-8% below target of 60%) which was +4% above the prior three year rolling average.

**Analysis:** In addition to an increase of 4% over the prior three year rolling average the recent graduating cohort completed -7% less than the cohort completing in 2013-2014.

**Note:** Graduate student completion rates, as well as persistence from sophomore to junior and junior to senior years is forthcoming. A table of completion totals is provided at this time.

---

### Graduate Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in International Development</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Psychology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor of Law</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Future data to include:
- Graduation rates for Ed. D., M. Ed., MAT, MBA, MAIDs, MAP, JD, undergraduates transferring in and undergraduates transferring out
- Comparison rates for on-line and on-ground programs
- Comparison rates to peer and to aspirational schools
**Benchmark 7:** 75% or more full-time faculty and 75% of staff will participate in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

**Results:** In 2015, 79% of faculty and 69% of staff participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week (+4.8% and -6.0% from 75% target, respectively).

**Analysis:** Full-time faculty agreement (96.3%) was considerably above target (+21.3% above 75% target). Part-time faculty agreement (75.5%) was slightly above target (+0.5% above 75% target). However, staff agreement (69%) was below target (-6.0% below 75% target).

---

7 The annual Concordia University Faculty and Staff Surveys are sent to all full-time and part-time faculty and staff on the Northeast Portland, Columbia River, Boise and online campuses to address mission attainment, training, staffing, working relationships, resources and university climate. The Spring 2015 response rate was unknown. Question 23 asks for agreement that “the university provides me with adequate supplies, equipment, technology, training, support services community building opportunities. Response options: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, don’t know/not sure. Of the 419 Fall 2015 faculty respondents, at least 403 (96.2%) answered at least one of these questions.
**Benchmark 8:** 60% or more current students will participate in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

**Results:** In 2014, 64.4% of current students participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week (+4.4% above 60% target).  

**Analysis:** From 2013 (60.5%) to 2014 (64.4%), students increasingly (+4.1%) are participating in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week. While all other student levels contributed to this increase, freshmen service participation decreased -7.5% from 2013 (91.7%) to 2014 (84.2%). However, in 2013 and 2014 this survey was administered during Fall term before, perhaps, freshmen had experienced the full impact of the Concordia Servant Leadership theme.

---

8 The annual Concordia University Student Satisfaction Survey is sent to all students to enhance and improve the educational experience by securing information about student motivation, experience and expectations. In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the response rate was unknown. Question 20 asks, “In the past year, have you participated in community/volunteer service?” Response options: yes, no. Of the 633 2013-2014 respondents, 587 (92.7%) answered this question. Of the 489 2014-2015 respondents, 450 (92.0%) answered this question.
**Benchmark 9:** 80% or more alumni will participate in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

**Results:** In 2015, 70.8% (-9.2% from target of 80%) of alumni participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.²

**Analysis:** While the overall benchmark was not met, improve was seen for alumni earning an undergraduate degree (+8.4% from 2014), alumni earning an undergraduate and a graduate degree (+13.7% from 2014) and alumni earning a graduate degree (+1.8% from 2014).

² See footnote 2. Question 18 asks, “In the past year, on average how many hours did you spend participating in community/volunteer service each week?” Response options: Integers. Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,251 (93.2%) answered this question. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,222 (90.6%) answered this question.
In Fall 2015, enrollment decreased for both total undergraduates (-75 students) and for total graduate students (-178 students) from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015.

In Spring 2015 83.9% (+2.4% from 2014) of on-ground undergraduate students participated in community service activities.

In Fall 2015, 91.4% of incoming undergraduates (+1.7% above the prior three year rolling average) met the standard admission requirements.

To investigate if Concordia University holds an enhanced match of gender and ethnic diversity of students to the respective recruitment region(s) improved data collection and metrics are in development.

### Intentional Enrollment
Concordia will serve an increasing number of qualified and diverse students who respect its values and mission.

**Part Met**
2 of 3 measured benchmarks was met.

### Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Area Leadership</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/Foundations</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td><em>Deans</em></td>
<td><em>Deans</em></td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Vision Officer</td>
<td><em>Marketing Jan 16</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Vice President of Enrollment Management
To: Stakeholders and Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 1.** The Fall 2014 enrollment count included one additional M. Ed. cohort which was not included in Fall 2015 due to the calendar versus census date cycles – interpret results accordingly; also:
  - Develop and market competitive and intriguing new degree programs which are aligned with prospective student interest and which are aligned with projected national and regional job growth;
  - Employ specific enrollment goals for discrete pools of new freshmen students;
  - For Fall 2016, recruit an additional 60 transfer-in students via enhanced relationships with community colleges;
  - Develop competitive transfer and articulation agreements to decrease completion time from 2.5-3 years to 2 years;
  - Improve recruitment staff to prospective student ratio (600-700 prospectives to 1 staff) to align with standards for regional private institutions similar to Concordia (350 prospectives to 1 staff);
  - Enhance training for admissions and enrollment staff.

- **Benchmark 4.** Develop relationships outside of the university to fund scholarships for students of underrepresented minority groups.

**COT recommends:**
- Council of Trustees should establish a task force to lead the process of drafting a mission-centric and compelling statement articulating the university’s commitment to advancing equity and diversity, for consideration by the trustees. This statement will should serve as a guiding document to inform policy, and program development moving forward.
- Addition of Director of Diversity and Engagement for the Office of Multi-Cultural Services to engage faculty, staff, and students in advancing diversity efforts and cultural competency on campus
- The Vice President of Human Resources should have the role and responsibilities expanded to include equity in the workforce, including recruitment, retention, compliance, and diversity strategies for workforce.
- The Title IX Coordinator role should be enhanced and modified to report directly to the Provost.
- Recommend that the university consider establishing a position of vice president for community engagement in Boise, reporting to the University’s Chief Strategic Relations Officer, and with responsibilities to strengthen the brand of the Concordia School of Law, expand it’s reach and support in the Boise area, and advance the emphasis on our three core themes.

From: Deans, Provost
To: Stakeholders and Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 1.** Employ the redesigned admissions calendar for incoming freshmen.

From: Deans, Provost, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Stakeholders and Area Leadership

- In Spring 2016, Institutional Effectiveness, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs and academic leadership will utilize an informed and dynamic three-part framework for enrollment including:
  - Projected landscape of incoming students (GPA, test scores, resilience), high school graduation, interest of prospective incoming students, competitive market;
  - Current review of Concordia programs, historical trends, retention, graduation rates, predictive analytics for completion;
  - Future projections of field/career growth trends, market dynamics, alumni data.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Stakeholders and Area Leadership
- **Benchmark 1.** Refine benchmark to reflect the discrete enrollment pools for Fall 2016 as designed with Provost, Deans, VP Enrollment.
- **Benchmark 3.** Include conditionally admitted graduate student metrics.
- **Benchmark 4.** Future benchmarks to include further diversity-related statistics per recent literature; also include average incoming high school GPA, test scores, ethnicity, and more; for all metrics, investigate longitudinal comparisons and comparisons to peer and aspirational schools; considering collaborating with both internal and external research groups to secure this data.

*From: Vice President of Enrollment Management
To: Area Leadership and Council of Trustees

- **Proposed new benchmark 5.** To investigate Concordia’s timely/efficient/effective relationship building with prospective students within the current environment of increase number of applications/prospective, consider comparative benchmarks for ratios of Concordia recruiters to prospective students via similar institutions nationwide (Noel-Levitz, etc).*
Benchmark 1: Increase the total size of the undergraduate and graduate student body compared to both the immediate preceding academic year and compared to the immediately preceding three year rolling average.\(^{11}\)

Results: In Fall 2015 enrollment decreased for both total undergraduates (-75) and for total graduate students (-178) from Fall 2014 to Fall 2015.\(^{12}\)

Analysis: While total enrollments decreased from 2014 to 2015, the 2015 total enrollments hold mixed results when compared with a prior three year average: 2015 undergraduate enrollment is below (-94) the rolling prior three year average of 1,276. 2015 graduate enrollment is above (+594) the rolling prior three year average of 5,406 students.

---

\(^{11}\) Future benchmarking will include comparative metrics to peer and to aspirational institutions.

\(^{12}\) Fall enrollments as reported to the U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) via the official Concordia Census Day. The final day for students to add/drop class(es) with a full refund is Friday of the second week of classes; Census Day is the Friday of the third week of classes. Census Days: 9/12/2009; 9/11/2010; 9/16/2011; 9/14/2012; 9/13/2013; 9/11/2014; 9/11/2015.
Benchmark 2: Increase student participation in community service activities.

Results: In Spring 2015 83.9% (+2.4% from 2014) of on-ground undergraduate students participated in community service activities.\(^{13}\)

Analysis: A year-over-year increase has occurred for each of the past three years which represents a net increase of 9%.


\(^{13}\) In late 2015, Student Life acquired GivePulse software which will enable tracking and research regarding undergraduate community service hours. The data presented here is based on hand-tracked data. Student affairs provides additional background: These are the on ground undergraduate student population results. These only contain student participants that either worked with our department specifically or other departments (such as athletics) who worked to report to us as a part of our assessment.
**Benchmark 3:** In the incoming undergraduate class, the proportion of students meeting the standard admission requirements will exceed the prior three year rolling average.\(^{14}\)

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 91.4% of incoming undergraduates (+1.7% above the prior three year rolling average) met the standard admission requirements.

**Analysis:** In Fall 2015, 34 of 394 (8.6%) incoming students were classified as conditionally admitted.\(^{15}\) An average of 10.4% of incoming students in Fall 2012 to Fall 2014 (148 of 1,424 students over three years) were conditionally admitted. This represents a slight decrease from 10.3% from Fall 2011 to Fall 2013 (152 of 1,471 students over three years).

---

\(^{14}\) Undergraduate conditional admission status at Concordia University is an indication that, typically, a new freshmen or transfer student has either a low test score or GPA, or both. A student admitted under this status must follow an academic student success plan (limit of 15 semester hours, regular meetings with their advisor, etc) which provides institutional support for their success. Concordia University reviews new students on a holistic process, so these determinations are differentiated. The President and Provost have given the Vice President of Enrollment the authority to make these decisions based on a holistic review of the student and in consideration of the balance between a restricted total academic load, time to graduation, subsequent financial loads, and holistic factors.

\(^{15}\) See above.
Benchmark 4: Concordia University will hold an enhanced match of gender and ethnic diversity of students to the respective recruitment region(s).

Improved data collection and metrics are in development.
In Fall 2015, 25.11% (-39.9% below target of 65%) of the Boise community indicated that Concordia holds a high-quality campus and community experience.

Results pending processing of Fall 2015 alumni perception of campus/community experience.

In Fall 2015, 100% (+35% above target of 65%) of Concordia Law students agreed that Concordia holds a high-quality campus and community experience.

In 2015-2016, 42.2% of deferred maintenance was funded.

Results pending current student, alumni and surrounding community perception of Concordia’s connection to the community.

**Physical Presence**
Concordia will continue to enhance and expand its physical campuses and collegiate and community activities as sources of institutional strength.

**Part Met**
2 of 3 measured benchmarks were met.\(^ {16}\)

---

**Shared Process**

| Jan 16 | Chief Vision Officer  
| Financial Officer  
| Strategic Partnerships | Dec 15 |
| Dec 15 | Dean of Law  
| Dec 15 | Marketing  
| Jan 15 |  
| Jan 16 | Deans  
| Dec 15 | Management Team  
| Jan 16 |  
| Jan 16 |  
| Feb 16 |  
| Jan 16 | ✓ |

\(^ {16}\)OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS  
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met  
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met  
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Dean Silak
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 1.** The detailed results suggest staying the course and continuing to interactively more of the Boise community to experiences of Concordia Law.
- **COT recommends**
  - Council of Trustees should establish a task force to lead the process of drafting a mission-centric and compelling statement articulating the university’s commitment to advancing equity and diversity, for consideration by the trustees. This statement will should serve as a guiding document to inform policy, and program development moving forward.
  - Addition of Director of Diversity and Engagement for the Office of Multi-Cultural Services to engage faculty, staff, and students in advancing diversity efforts and cultural competency on campus
  - The Vice President of Human Resources should have the role and responsibilities expanded to include equity in the workforce, including recruitment, retention, compliance, and diversity strategies for workforce.
  - The Title IX Coordinator role should be enhanced and modified to report directly to the Provost.
  - Recommend that the university consider establishing a position of vice president for community engagement in Boise, reporting to the University’s Chief Strategic Relations Officer, and with responsibilities to strengthen the brand of the Concordia School of Law, expand it’s reach and support in the Boise area, and advance the emphasis on our three core themes.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Dean Silak
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 1.** Investigate the response/sample rates of Riley Research; explore pathways to include the voice of the many non-profit community groups/members who interact with Concordia Law.

From: Chief Financial Officer and Director of Physical Plant Services
To: Stakeholders and Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 4.** Consider a national/comparative mechanism for our deferred maintenance definitions and levels.
**Benchmark 1:** 65% or more of the community will indicate that Concordia holds a high-quality, positive campus and community experience.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 25.11% (-39.9% below target of 65%) of the Boise community indicated that Concordia holds a high-quality campus and community experience.17

**Analysis:** All respondents who were sure of their answer agreed that Concordia holds a high-quality campus and community experience (25.11%) and no respondents disagreed (0% “not much,” 0% “not at all”). However, 74.89% of respondents were unfamiliar/unsure as to any impact of the campus and community impact of Concordia.

---

17 The annual Concordia University / Riley Research Group Survey purposes to document the awareness and perceptions of Concordia and the Concordia Brand, as well as to measure the impact of University activities, promotional efforts, and communications, among the communities in which Concordia resides. In Fall 2015, Riley Research surveyed current students, donors, local organizations and prospective students of the Concordia Law School in Boise, ID. The response rate was __%. Awareness Question 1g asks “Do you think that Concordia lives up to the statement, ‘Concordia provides a high quality campus and community experience’?” Response options/coding: Very much (3), somewhat (2), not much (1), not at all (0), unfamiliar/unsure (0). Of the Fall 2015 respondents, 21 of 21 donors (100% of respondents), 108 of 135 key influencers/local organizations (80.0% of respondents), and 98 of 152 prospective students (64.5% of respondents) answered this question.
**Benchmark 2:** 65% or more of on-ground alumni will indicate that Concordia holds a high-quality, positive campus and community experience.

**Results:** This question was first asked on the Fall 2015 Concordia Alumni Survey – results pending.

**Analysis:**

**Benchmark 3:** 65% of more of current, on-ground students will indicate that Concordia holds a high-quality, positive campus and community experience.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 100% (+35% above target of 65%) of Concordia Law students agreed that Concordia holds a high-quality campus and community experience.\(^\text{18}\)

**Analysis:** 65.38% (17 students) of Concordia Law students indicated that Concordia “very much” lives up to the statement that Concordia provides a high quality campus and community experience. 34.62% (9 students) of Concordia Law students indicated that Concordia “somewhat” lives up to the statement.

---

\(^{18}\) The annual Concordia University / Riley Research Group Survey purposes to document the awareness and perceptions of Concordia and the Concordia Brand, as well as to measure the impact of University activities, promotional efforts, and communications, among the communities in which Concordia resides. In Fall 2015, Riley Research surveyed current students, donors, local organizations and prospective students of the Concordia Law School in Boise, ID. The response rate was __%. Awareness Question 1g asks “Do you think that Concordia lives up to the statement, ‘Concordia provides a high quality campus and community experience’?” Response options/coding: Very much (3), somewhat (2), not much (1), not at all (0), unfamiliar/unsure (0). Of the Fall 2015 respondents, 26 of 29 current students (89.7% of respondents) answered this question.
Benchmark 4: Across all campuses, the percentage of deferred maintenance funded or reserved will be greater than, or no less than 5% below, the previous year.\textsuperscript{19}

**Results:** In 2015-2016, 42.2\% of deferred maintenance was funded.

**Analysis:** 2014-2015, and prior, baselines are currently being analyzed and a national comparative measure is being pursued.

---

Benchmark 5: Current students, alumni and the community will agree that “Concordia is a school which is connecting the campus to the community.”

**Results:** This survey question has not yet been asked on the Student Satisfaction Survey and the Riley Research Survey. This question was first asked on the Fall 2015 Concordia Alumni Survey – results pending.

**Analysis:** N/A.

---

\textsuperscript{19} Previous benchmark: Concordia will hold decreasing levels of institutional capital deferred maintenance. Previous (draft) metric: “percentage of major capital components (roofs, HVAC, technology, turf, etc.) beyond their useful life.”
In Spring 2015, students did not agree that Concordia provided them support for their academic success (-1.0% below target of 90%), their financial success (-5.6% below target of 80%), their cultural success (-16.6% below target of 75%) or their spiritual success (-24% below target of 75%).

In Spring 2015, 62.4% of current students report developing meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-12.6% below target of 75%) and 50.1% with staff (-24.9% below target of 75%).

In Fall 2015, 58.7% of alumni report having developed meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-16.3% below target of 75%) and 61.7% with staff (-13.3% below target of 75%).

In Spring 2015, Concordia held one of ten engagement indicators which was significantly lower than other private West Coast institutions (the Supportive Environment indicator) for both first year and senior students.

In Fall 2015, 73% of the freshmen from Fall 2014 returned to Concordia (-2% below target of 75%) which was +3% above the prior three year rolling average (70%).

In Fall 2015 52% of the 2009 class of incoming freshmen graduated from Concordia (-8% below target of 60%) which was +4% above the prior three year rolling average.

### Student Success
Concordia will provide strong support for student choice, access and success.

**Not Met**

0 of 6 measured benchmarks were met.

### Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Leadership Committee</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/ Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Chief Vision Officer</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>VP Enrollment</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provost Jan 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Deans, Provost, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders

- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** In Spring 2016, Institutional Effectiveness, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs and academic leadership will utilize an informed and dynamic three-part framework for enrollment including:
  - Projected landscape of incoming students (GPA, test scores, resilience), high school graduation, interest of prospective incoming students, competitive market;
  - Current review of Concordia programs, historical trends, retention, graduation rates, predictive analytics for completion;
  - Future projections of field/career growth trends, market dynamics, alumni data.
  - Academic program outcome achievement should be a benchmark to investigate student success.

From: VP Student Affairs, Deans
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 1.** The office of multicultural students was initially staffed in Fall 2014 through AmeriCorps/Vista volunteers. Permanent staffing has been requested and would be needed for improvement. The new campus pastor began Fall 2015; future results will inform accordingly. Implement the financial aid roadmap.

- **Benchmark 2.** Investigate by online/on-ground to identify target engagement interventions for undergraduate and graduate students. Deans, student affairs, bridge program will provide broader, services to targeted incoming students via collaboration with Institutional Research and Effectiveness. Consider faculty development regarding mentoring

- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** Consider retention and completion separately within majors; consider the role of student change of major within overall persistence.

From: Provost
To: Area Leadership, Council of Trustees

- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** Consider an 80% retention target by 2024 and a 65% graduation target by 2024.

From: Vice President of Enrollment Management
To: Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 1.** Acquire/implement the financial aid auto-dialer system to promote better student financial success.
- **Benchmark 4.** As we compare ourselves via this metric, and as potential students compare us with, other west coast private institutions, consider campus livability, fitness center, residence halls, student center, etc.
- **Benchmarks 5 and 6.** Enhance training for admissions and enrollment staff; enhance collaboration to ensure service to students from the admissions process through their experience as Concordia students to graduation; investigate and address students who did not enroll after admissions deposit (Clearinghouse); partner with IRE to evaluate the competitive landscape.

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 1 and 2.** Work with CALL and faculty to create and test more precise wording for survey questions; mind longitudinal data.

From: Deans
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 2.** Implement a work group (Deans, Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Student Affairs, etc) to further investigate the results, consider a follow up survey and identify further interventions.

**COT RECOMMENDS**
- Council of Trustees should establish a task force to lead the process of drafting a mission-centric and compelling statement articulating the university’s commitment to advancing equity and diversity, for consideration by the
trustees. This statement will should serve as a guiding document to inform policy, and program development moving forward.

- Addition of Director of Diversity and Engagement for the Office of Multi-Cultural Services to engage faculty, staff, and students in advancing diversity efforts and cultural competency on campus
- The Title IX Coordinator role should be enhanced and modified to report directly to the Provost.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Area Leadership and Institutional Research and Effectiveness, VP Student Affairs
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee and Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 1 and 2.** Enhance Benchmark 2 with nationally comparable measures of student/faculty/staff relationships from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE and LSSSE); add an importance/satisfaction matrix to the survey questions (benchmark each); add a follow up question for negative responses to learn what elements of support are missing.

From: Provost
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee and Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 5 and 6.** Enhance with nationally comparable measures from peer and aspirational schools; layer onto the graph incoming GPA, test scores, size of class, etc, to further investigate.

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 5 and 6.** Banner is our system of record for admitted and enrolled student data. Banner contains our standardized, cleansed data typically based on fall semester or the entire academic year. While data from TargetX and partners like HotChalk is useful for operational reporting it is not our system of record. Our present inability to provide retention data for graduate programs and other pools of students not required by federal reporting requirements (undergraduate students who transfer, etc), is in part due to the lack of a data warehouse with cleansed data frozen at specific times. Our introduction to online education with a rolling calendar of starts compounded reporting issues from Banner which, like other student information systems, employs terms. These reporting deficiencies will be addressed as part of the 2024 IRE Strategic Initiative.

From: Deans
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 2.** Focus the language of the survey questions. Consider investigating student/faculty ratio, frequency of meeting with adviser/mentor. Add follow up question to plumb negative responses. Add importance/satisfaction matrix. Randomly pilot a new wording of the question; or, randomly insert a following question, please define your interpretation of what a meaningful and caring relationship.
Benchmark 1: Current students will agree that Concordia is providing them with the support needed to ensure their academic success (90% agreement), financial success (80% agreement), cultural success (75% agreement) and spiritual success (75% agreement).

Results: In Spring 2015, students did not agree that Concordia provided them support for their academic success (-1.0% below target of 90%), their financial success (-5.6% below target of 80%), their cultural success (-16.6% below target of 75%) or their spiritual success (-24% below target of 75%).

Analysis: While the target for academic support was nearly met in both 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the level of perceived support is trending away from target from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 for financial support (-5.5% year to year) and cultural support (-5.1%). The trend for perceived spiritual support is trending up from 2013-2014 to 2014-2015 (+4.2%). Importantly, the below chart indicates that the confidence of self-response, as seen by self-reported uncertainty, is negligible when considering academic and financial support. Self-reported uncertainty was measured by analyzing those responses which indicate “don’t know/not sure.” This may further emphasize the reported under-target levels of perceived financial support. Significant levels of uncertainty are reported regarding cultural and spiritual support for success averaging 8.8% for cultural (across both years) and 8.7% for spiritual (across both years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don't know or am not sure if, overall, Concordia is providing me with the support needed to ensure my success in the following areas:</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 The annual Concordia University Student Satisfaction Survey is sent to all students to enhance and improve the educational experience by securing information about student motivation, experience and expectations. In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the response rate was unknown. Question 13 asks students to “indicate their level of satisfaction that Concordia is providing support needed to ensure my success in academic, financial, cultural, and spiritual areas.” Response options/coding: strongly agree (2), agree (1), neither agree nor disagree (0), disagree (-1), strongly disagree (-2), don’t know/not sure (no #). Of the 489 2013-2014 respondents, 471 (96.3%) answered one or more of these four questions. Of the 633 2014-2015 respondents, 613 (96.8%) answered one or more of these four questions.
**Benchmark 2:** 75% or more current students will feel that they are developing meaningful and caring relationships with faculty and with staff.

**Results:** In Spring 2015, 62.4% of current students report developing meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-12.6% below target of 75%) and 50.1% with staff (-24.9% below target of 75%).

**Analysis:** Early longitudinal results mirror current results in not achieving benchmark.

---

22 The annual Concordia University Student Satisfaction Survey is sent to all students to enhance and improve the educational experience by securing information about student motivation, experience and expectations. In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the response rate was unknown. Question 17 asks for agreement about the statement, “I am developing meaningful and caring relationships with faculty and with staff.” Response options/coding: strongly agree (2), agree (1), neither agree nor disagree (0), disagree (-1), strongly disagree (-2), don’t know/not sure (no #). Of the 633 2013-2014 respondents, 601 (94.9%) answered one or both of these two questions. Of the 489 2014-2015 respondents, 458 (93.7%) answered one or both of these two questions. In 2013-2014, 113 undergraduates responded and 468 graduate students responded. In 2014-2015, 94 undergraduates responded and 348 graduate students responded.
Benchmark 3: 75% or more of alumni will feel that they are developing meaningful and caring relationships with faculty and with staff.

Results: In Fall 2015, 58.7% of alumni report having developed meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-16.3% below target of 75%) and 61.7% with staff (-13.3% below target of 75%).

Analysis: Early longitudinal results may indicate a declining trend. However, it is important to note that the methodology of the Spring 2014 alumni survey is unknown; thus, longitudinal conclusions would be tentative at best.

---

The annual Concordia University Alumni Survey is sent to alumni to assess the broad impact of Concordia on all alumni, to assess university-wide outcomes and satisfaction, and to investigate alumni employment, current services and activities. In odd-numbered years, alumni from academic years ending in odd numbers are surveyed. In even number years, alumni from academic years ending in even numbers are surveyed. The Spring 2014 response rate was unknown. The Fall 2015 response rate was 18.4% (1312 of 7121).

Question 2 asks, “During my time at Concordia, I developed meaningful and caring relationships with: a) faculty; b) staff.” Response options/coding: strongly agree (2), agree (1), neither agree nor disagree (0), disagree (-1), strongly disagree (-2). Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1270 (94.6%) answered one or both of these questions. Of the 1312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1305 (99.5%) answered one or both of these questions.
Benchmark 4: Concordia’ first year and senior students’ results will show no areas of engagement significantly lower than other West Coast Private institutions and will show year-over-year improvement compared to prior performance by Concordia.

Results: In Spring 2015, Concordia held one of ten engagement indicators which was significantly lower than other private West Coast institutions (the Supportive Environment indicator) for both first year and senior students.24

Benchmark 4: Concordia’ first year and senior students’ results will show no areas of engagement significantly lower than other West Coast Private institutions and will show year-over-year improvement compared to prior performance by Concordia.

Analysis: While Concordia did not hold any indicators significantly above other private West coast institutions in Spring 2015, Concordia held only one indicator which was significantly below other private West Coast institutions – this represents an improvement from Spring 2014 when Concordia held three indicators which were significantly below other private West Coast institutions.

Pending results: year over year results are pending.

See chart on the following page.

24 The annual Indiana University annual National Survey of Student Engagement collects information at hundreds of four-year colleges and universities about first-year and senior student experiences to assess student engagement and university services. The Spring 2013 first-year student response rate was 24% (67 of 279) and the senior response rate was 39% (55 of 141). The Spring 2014 first-year student response rate was 36% (77 of 214) and the senior response rate was 42% (79 of 188). The Spring 2015 first-year student response rate was 27% (42 of 156) and the senior response rate was 36% (62 of 172). NSSE represents multiple dimensions of student engagement via 10 Engagement Indicators calculated form 47 core NSSE questions.
## Engagement Indicators

**FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS**
- Higher-Order Learning
- Reflective & Integrative Learning
- Learning Strategies
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Collaborative Learning
- Discussions with Diverse Others
- Student-Faculty Interaction
- Effective Teaching Practices
- Quality of Interactions
- Supportive Environment

**SENIORS**
- Higher-Order Learning
- Reflective & Integrative Learning
- Learning Strategies
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Collaborative Learning
- Discussions with Diverse Others
- Student-Faculty Interaction
- Effective Teaching Practices
- Quality of Interactions
- Supportive Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Indicators</th>
<th>2013 compared with Far West Privates</th>
<th>2013 compared with Carnegie Class</th>
<th>2013 compared with NSSE 2012</th>
<th>2014 compared with Far West Privates</th>
<th>2014 compared with Carnegie Class</th>
<th>2014 compared with NSSE 2013</th>
<th>2015 compared with Far West Privates</th>
<th>2015 compared with Carnegie Class</th>
<th>2015 compared with NSSE 2014</th>
<th>2016 compared with Far West Privates</th>
<th>2016 compared with Carnegie Class</th>
<th>2016 compared with NSSE 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CU average was significantly much higher (p &gt; .05; ES &gt; .3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU average was somewhat significantly higher (p &gt; .05; ES &lt; .3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU average was not significantly different.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU average was somewhat significantly lower (p &lt; .05; ES &lt; .3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU average was significantly much lower (p &lt; .05; ES &gt; .3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components of the Supportive Environment Engagement Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS responding &quot;very much&quot; or &quot;quite a bit&quot; about how much Concordia emphasized...</th>
<th>Concordia U</th>
<th>Far West Private</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2014 &amp; 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing support to help students succeed academically</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities to be involved socially</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENIOR STUDENTS responding &quot;very much&quot; or &quot;quite a bit&quot; about how much Concordia emphasized...</th>
<th>Concordia U</th>
<th>Far West Private</th>
<th>Carnegie Class</th>
<th>NSSE 2014 &amp; 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing support to help students succeed academically</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing opportunities to be involved socially</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Benchmark 5:** Concordia students will retain at a minimum rate, per cohort per program (75% for freshmen), and will retain at a higher rate than the prior three year rolling average.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 73% of the freshmen from Fall 2014 returned to Concordia (-2% below target of 75%) which was +3% above the prior three year rolling average (70%).

**Analysis:** In addition to an increase of 3% over the prior three year rolling average, the Fall 2014 to Fall 2015 retention of freshmen also increased 5% over the Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 rate (68%).

**Note:** Graduate student retention rates, as well as term-to-term persistence after freshmen year, is forthcoming.  

---

**Future data to include:**

- **Retention rates** for Ed. D., M. Ed., MAT, MBA, MAIDs, MAP, JD, undergraduates transferring in and undergraduates transferring out
- **Comparison rates** for on-line and on-ground programs
- **Comparison rates** to peer and to aspirational schools
**Benchmark 6:** Concordia students will complete at a minimum rate, per cohort per program (60% for freshmen) and will complete at a higher rate than the prior three year rolling average.  

**Results:** In Fall 2015 48% of the 2009 class of incoming freshmen graduated from Concordia within 6 years or 150% time (-8% below target of 60%) which was +4% above the prior three year rolling average.  

**Analysis:** In addition to an increase of 4% over the prior three year rolling average the recent graduating cohort completed -7% less than the cohort completing in 2013-2014.  

**Note:** Graduate student completion rates, as well as persistence from sophomore to junior and junior to senior years is forthcoming. A table of completion totals is provided at this time.

### Graduate Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in International Development</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts in Psychology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor of Law</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Future data to include:  
- Graduation rates for Ed. D., M. Ed., MAT, MBA, MAIDs, MAP, JD, undergraduates transferring in and undergraduates transferring out  
- Comparison rates for on-line and on-ground programs  
- Comparison rates to peer and to aspirational schools
In 2015, 91.3% (6.3% above target of 85%) of alumni were satisfied with their academic program at Concordia; a decrease of only -1.9% from 2014.

In 2015 76% (+6% above target of 70%) of alumni indicated success in their chosen professional field or graduate students after graduation.

In 2015, 70.8% (-9.2% from target of 80%) of alumni participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chief Vision Officer</td>
<td>• VP Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost Jan 16</td>
<td>• Deans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Director of Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dir Service Learning Jan 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Stakeholders, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Stakeholders, Area Leadership

- **Benchmark 3.** This is a lagging indicator; current efforts from student affairs to increase student service, and to enhance the student service mindset will not be seen in this indicator until current students become responding alumni.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Stakeholders, Area Leadership, Council of Trustees

- **Proposed new benchmark 4.** Add questions to the alumni survey to investigate alumni satisfaction with academic support and institutional resources; utilize an importance/satisfaction matrix within alumni survey question 11; add an N/A answer options within alumni survey question 11.
Benchmark 1: 85% or more of alumni will indicate satisfaction with academic programs, academic support and institutional resources; and no greater than 2% less than the immediate prior year in any category of alumni response.

Results: In 2015, 91.3% (6.3% above target of 85%) of alumni were satisfied with their academic program at Concordia; a decrease of only -1.9% from 2014.28

Analysis: While graduate student alumni satisfaction decreased -6.2% from 2014 (94%) to 2015 (87.8%), and satisfaction of alumni earning both an undergraduate and graduate degree from Concordia decreased -6.5% from 2014 (95.8%) to 20125 (89.3%), undergraduate alumni satisfaction increased 1.3% from 2014 (91.4%) to 2015 (92.7%).

---

28 This question was first asked on the Fall 2015 Concordia University Alumni Survey. The annual Concordia University Alumni Survey is sent to alumni to assess the broad impact of Concordia on all alumni, to assess university-wide outcomes and satisfaction, and to investigate alumni employment, current services and activities. In odd-numbered years, alumni from academic years ending in odd numbers are surveyed. In even number years, alumni from academic years ending in even numbers are survey. The Spring 2014 response rate was unknown. The Fall 2015 response rate was 18.4% (1312 of 7121). Question 8 asks, “Overall, how satisfied were you with the academic program that you completed at Concordia?” Response options: Very satisfied, satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied. Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,277 (95.2%) answered this question. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,222 (93.1%) answered this question.
**Benchmark 2:** In 2016, 70% of alumni will indicate success in their chosen professional field or graduate studies after graduation (in 2017, 80% with redesigned surveying).

**Results:** In 2015 76% (+6% above target of 70%) of alumni indicated success in their chosen professional field or graduate students after graduation.

**Analysis:** In 2015, strong improvement for alumni earning an undergraduate degree was seen in Concordia assisting alumni in their current job (+9.9% from 2014) and in Concordia increasing earnings potential of alumni (+10.4% from 2014). Strong declines were seen in preparation for graduate school for alumni earning an undergraduate degree (-15.1% from 2014) and for alumni earning a graduate degree (-16.8% from 2014). Further refinement of the survey question is crucial, at this stage.

---

29 See footnote 2. Question 11 asks, “Please, indicate the extent that your education at Concordia...Assisted you in performing your current job; prepared you to (potentially) succeed in graduated school; enhanced your upward mobility; increased your earning potential.” Response options: Large extent, moderate extent, slight extent, not at all, unknown.” Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,270 (94.6%) answered this question. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,222 (93.1%) answered this question.
**Benchmark 3:** 80% or more alumni will participate in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

**Results:** In 2015, 70.8% (-9.2% from target of 80%) of alumni participated in 1+ hours of community/volunteer service each week.

**Analysis:** While the overall benchmark was not met, improve was seen for alumni earning an undergraduate degree (+8.4% from 2014), alumni earning an undergraduate and a graduate degree (+13.7% from 2014) and alumni earning a graduate degree (+1.8% from 2014).

---

30 See footnote 2. Question 18 asks, “In the past year, on average how many hours did you spend participating in community/volunteer service each week?” Response options: Integers. Of the 1342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,251 (93.2%) answered this question. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,222 (90.6%) answered this question.
In 2015, 81.2% of alumni (+1.2% above target of 80%) highly rated faculty within their area; however, only 62.3% of alumni (-17.7% below target) highly rated faculty in their general education and elective courses and only 76.3% (-3.7% below target of 80%) highly rated staff.

As the faculty review process is currently under redevelopment and piloting and the first full round of evaluations are currently underway.

To investigate if Concordia University is progressing on key faculty and staff diversity measures, improved data collection and metrics are in development including comparative pools for major employee categories and a statistical referent for each.

In Spring 2015, 62.4% of current students report developing meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-12.6% below target of 75%) and 50.1% with staff (-24.9% below target of 75%).

### Faculty & Staff Excellence
Concordia will provide for a qualified, diverse and caring faculty and staff.

**Not Met**

0 of 2 measured benchmarks were met.

---

**NOT MET** if 0-49% of benchmarks are met

**PART MET** if 50-99% of benchmarks are met

**MET** if 100% of benchmarks are met

---

### OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Leadership Committee</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/ Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>Staff welfare committee</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Shared Process

- **Chief Vision Officer**
- **Provost** Jan 16
- **Deans**
- **Staff welfare committee**
- **Faculty welfare committee** Jan 16
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTION IMPROVEMENT

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership and Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 1.** Enhance the use, and usefulness of, course evaluations for faculty by adopting and implementing new course evaluation software which is a match to the current size and needs of Concordia.

**COT RECOMMENDS**

- Council of Trustees should establish a task force to lead the process of drafting a mission-centric and compelling statement articulating the university’s commitment to advancing equity and diversity, for consideration by the trustees. This statement will should serve as a guiding document to inform policy, and program development moving forward.
- The Vice President of Human Resources should have the role and responsibilities expanded to include equity in the workforce, including recruitment, retention, compliance, and diversity strategies for workforce.
- Recommend that the university consider establishing a position of vice president for community engagement in Boise, reporting to the University’s Chief Strategic Relations Officer, and with responsibilities to strengthen the brand of the Concordia School of Law, expand its reach and support in the Boise area, and advance the emphasis on our three core themes.

2016 considerations regarding measurements

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership and Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 1.** Include meaningful results from course evaluations.
- **Benchmark 1.** Refine the survey question to legitimately investigate quality; include a noun for which quality is an adjective.

From: Deans, Provost, Area Leadership, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership and Council of Trustees

- **Proposed new benchmark 5:** include faculty voice by adding at least one benchmark from annual Faculty Survey, perhaps pertaining to resources, compensation (comparative), perception, etc.
- **Proposed new benchmark 6:** include staff voice by adding at least one benchmark from the annual Staff Survey perhaps pertaining to resources, compensation (comparative), perception, etc.
Benchmark 1: 80% or more alumni will highly rate Concordia faculty and staff.

Results: In 2015, 81.2% of alumni (+1.2% above target of 80%) highly rated faculty within their area; however, only 62.3% of alumni (-17.7% below target) highly rated faculty in their general education and elective courses and only 76.3% (-3.7% below target of 80%) highly rated staff.\(^{32}\)

Analysis: From 2013-2014 to 2014-2015, -5.9% less alumni highly rated faculty within their area; -13.8% less alumni highly rated faculty in general education and elective courses and -5.4% less alumni highly rated staff.

32 The annual Concordia University Alumni Survey is sent to alumni to assess the broad impact of Concordia on all alumni, to assess university-wide outcomes and satisfaction, and to investigate alumni employment, current services and activities. In odd-numbered years, alumni from academic years ending in odd numbers are surveyed. In even number years, alumni from academic years ending in even numbers are surveyed. The Spring 2014 response rate was unknown. The Fall 2015 response rate was 18.4% (1312 of 7121). Question 12 asks, “How would you rate the quality of faculty within your academic area?, of faculty in your general education and elective courses?, of staff at Concordia?” Response options: Very high, high, Average, Low, Very low, N/A. Of the 1,342 Spring 2014 respondents, 1,276 (95.1%) answered one or more of these questions. Of the 1,312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1,226 (93.4%) answered one or more of these questions.
**Benchmark 2:** Percent of faculty and staff who meet or exceed expectations in annual performance review.
As 2014-2015 contained a majority of qualitative data, As the faculty review process is currently under redevelopment and piloting and the first full round of evaluations are currently underway.

**Benchmark 3:** Progress on key faculty and staff diversity measures.
To investigate if Concordia University is progressing on key faculty and staff diversity measures, improved data collection and metrics are in development including comparative pools for major employee categories and a statistical referent for each.
Benchmark 4: 75% or more current students will feel that they are developing meaningful and caring relationships with faculty and with staff.

Results: In Spring 2015, 62.4% of current students report developing meaningful/caring relationships with faculty (-12.6% below target of 75%) and 50.1% with staff (-24.9% below target of 75%).

Analysis: Early longitudinal results mirror current results in not achieving benchmark.

The annual Concordia University Student Satisfaction Survey is sent to all students to enhance and improve the educational experience by securing information about student motivation, experience and expectations. In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the response rate was unknown. Question 17 asks for agreement about the statement, “I am developing meaningful and caring relationships with faculty/staff.” Response options/coding: strongly agree (2), agree (1), neither agree nor disagree (0), disagree (-1), strongly disagree (-2), don’t know/not sure (no #). Of the 633 2013-2014 respondents, 601 (94.9%) answered one or both of these two questions. Of the 489 2014-2015 respondents, 458 (93.7%) answered one or both of these two questions. In 2013-2014, 113 undergraduates responded and 468 graduate students responded. In 2014-2015, 94 undergraduates responded and 348 graduate students responded.
As of January 2016, 3 of 3 strategic partnerships are compliant, 3 of 3 are progressing toward goal.

As of January 2016, 3 of 3 strategic partnerships have partially completed risk assessments and 1 of 1 relevant partnership is developing a contingency/mitigation plan.

### Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Area Leadership</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jan 16 | - Chief Strategic Partnerships  
- Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel  
- Chief Development Officer  
Jan 16 | Jan 16 |                     | Jan 16          | Feb 16  | Feb 16              |                     | ✓       |

---

34 OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met

---

Strategic Partnerships
Concordia will develop, expand and diversify strategic partnerships which advance its mission and vision.

**Part Met**
1 of 2 measured benchmarks were met.
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Chief Strategic Relations Officer
To: Stakeholders

- **Benchmarks 1 and 2.** Continue developing current and pending partnerships.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership

- **Proposed new benchmark 3.** Investigate attainment of goals within a period of time relevant to each specific partnership.
**Benchmark 1:** Degree to which current strategic partnerships are in compliance and progressing toward goal.

**Results:** As of January 2016, 3 of 3 strategic partnerships are compliant, 3 of 3 are progressing toward goal.

**Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Level of Compliance</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Goal Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotchalk</strong> – Provide contracted marketing, recruitment and student support for select online programs.</td>
<td>Hotchalk and Concordia will meet NWCCU accreditation standards, U.S. Department of Education standards, and Concordia University standards</td>
<td>As of January 2016 Hotchalk and Concordia hold a high level of compliance in for all three standard areas. The pending upcoming audits in 2016.</td>
<td>Hotchalk and Concordia will grow this partnership at a rate of at least 10% per academic year.</td>
<td>As January 2016, the current enrollment forecast for 2016-2017 is in place, but needs to be aligned with the 10% growth goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Public Schools Provide, with Trillium Family Services, strategic leadership, resources and programming for 3toPhD.</td>
<td>PPS and CU will execute DDA and Governance Agreement; close on interim financing and property transfer to PPS; select contractor and remain on track for completion of facility by 8/1/16; reasonable progress toward lease, operating agreement and related elements; move capital campaign toward closure</td>
<td>As of January PPS and CU hold a high level of compliance on all indicators with DDA signed, interim financing complete, property transfer complete, Governance agreement at 85%, a draft lease expected ASAP, a plan unfolding for completion of the operating agreement, and the capital campaign is at 72.5% with continued momentum on the major gift front</td>
<td>PPS will continue to complete all indicators while building a culture of trust and respect that reflects the unique and consequential nature of a significant nationally-impactful collaboration.</td>
<td>As of January 2016, all indicators are on track; significant disruption in the capital markets could present a challenge to the capital campaigns expected on time completion of 6/30/16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Concordia University System Partnerships** Concordia New York; Concordia Nebraska - create an online collaborative to expanding programming and enrollment

| Partnerships | Each partner will meet accreditation standards, U.S. Department of Education standards, and COEdu MOU requirements | As of January 2016, all accreditation standards, DOE, DOJ, and MOU standards and requirements are in compliance | 1. Enroll and share a “Concordia educational experience” with a maximum number of students in online academic programs.  
2. Provide Participants with the ability to scale and maximize efficiency, revenues, and expenditures of online academic programs.  
3. Ensure and preserve quality, integrity, and student success outcomes, while maintaining accreditation from the United States Department of Education (US DOE), and other compliance entities which serve each of the Participants.  
   • MOU goals are being met, but the COEdu model may is in a state of transition which may impact future goal achievement. |

| Trillium Family Services | Pending |  
| Pacific Foods | Pending |  
| Orbis Education | Pending |  
| Innovative Partnerships | Pending |
**Benchmark 2:** Annual review of risk assessment for each strategic partnership with a contingency plan for each.

**Results:** As of January 2016, 3 of 3 strategic partnerships have partially completed risk assessments and 1 of 1 relevant partnership is developing a contingency/mitigation plan.

**Analysis:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Risk(s)</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Contingency/Mitigation Plan Summary</th>
<th>Contingency/Mitigation Plan in place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hotchalk | Provide contracted marketing, recruitment and student support for select online programs. | - Non-compliance (NWCCU, U.S. Department of Education, CU)  
- Failure to achieve goal | Findings from the Fall 2015 A133 audit are being addressed. Further regular internal and external annual and on-going annual audits are pending. | A plan is currently being developed. |
## Portland Public Schools
Provide, with Trillium Family Services, strategic leadership, resources and programming for 3toPhD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. disruption in the completion of the Governance Agreement;</th>
<th>1. Minimal risk; 2. Minimal risk; 3. Minimal risk; 4. Minimal risk.</th>
<th>1. Not necessary given status/history of negotiation; 2. Not necessary given status/history of negotiation; 3. Even with its complexity, the Governing Council would form a backstop in the event the process hits a sang; Extend the duration of the campaign and rely more heavily on interim financing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Fail to complete lease upon anticipated terms;</td>
<td></td>
<td>As of January 2016, the major remaining open items, other than construction, are the Lease, Operating Agreement (including policies and procedures) and the capital raise from CU (PPS portion has been raised); the ultimate contingency plan on the Lease and Operating elements is relationship with PPS Superintendent; therefore, alacrity in completing those agreements is imperative; the backstop for the capital is the interim financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fail to design process to successfully complete operating agreement(s);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Incomplete capital raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Concordia University System Partnerships
Concordia New York; Concordia Nebraska – create an online collaborative to expanding programming and enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Failure to comply with accreditation, DOJ, DOE, and MOU standards and requirements.</th>
<th>1. Pending DOJ and DOE annual review; Pending future COEdu organizational model</th>
<th>Unknown until specific direction is provided by the COEdu Steering Committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at this time (pending COEdu Steering Committee direction).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Innovative Partnerships

| Trillium Family Services | Pending |
| Pacific Foods | Pending |
| Orbis Education | Pending |
| Innovative Partnerships | Pending |
Impactful Innovation
Concordia will be marked by and known for innovative people, programs, relationships and applications of technology.

Not Met\textsuperscript{35}
0 of 1 measured benchmarks were met.

Results pending Fall 2016 measures of innovation activity and achievement.

In Fall 2015, 63% of alumni agreed that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation (-11.8% below 75% target).

Results pending Spring 2016 measures of current student perception of Concordia’s innovative culture.

Results pending Spring 2016 measures of faculty/staff perception of Concordia’s innovative culture.

Results pending Fall 2016 measures of surrounding community perception of Concordia’s innovative culture.

Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research &amp; Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Institutional Leadership Committee</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/ Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Chief Vision Officer Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{35}\text{OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS}
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

From: Chief Innovation Officer (Interim), Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership and Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 1.** Alumni responses are a lagging indicator. The Spring 2015 installation of the Chief Innovation Officer and the renewed focus on the Innovation and Technology Strategic Initiative across campus are providing actions for improvement. These actions should lead to changes in the alumni perception of Concordia’s level of encouragement and rewarding of experimentation and innovation. Effect of these actions should also be reflected in the pending initial results from achievement of the strategic initiative (benchmark 1) and current students, faculty, staff and regional community perceptions (benchmarks 3, 4, and 5). Within this context, recommended actions for improvement would be to continue to focus, fund and prioritize the Innovation and Technology Strategic Initiative across the Concordia community.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Chief Innovation Officer (Interim)
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 1.** Consider measuring the engagement and impact of innovative initiatives rather than the number; consider measuring the achievement of summative and formative indicators of success for each innovative initiative as an indicator of overall benchmark achievement.
- **Benchmarks 2, 3, and 4.** Consider investigating responses to innovation within context (classroom, co-curricular activities, etc).
- **Benchmark 5.** Reword the questions to the greater community for enhanced precision. For example, “does Concordia exhibit an innovative campus culture” or “regularly demonstrate innovative practices?” Consider potential follow up questions for “strongly agree” and “strongly disagree” to learn what is exceptional or what is lacking.
**Benchmark 1:** The number of pilot programs, experiments, innovation grants, and cross-disciplinary activities which have been attempted or accomplished in the past year.

**Results:** Pending Fall 2016. The Chief Innovation Officer is piloting a number of innovative initiatives across campus including data collection and analysis regarding annual innovation activity across the Concordia community.

**Benchmark 2:** 75% of more alumni will agree that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 63% of alumni agreed that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation (-11.8% below 75% target). \(^{36}\)

**Analysis:** Alumni who earned an undergraduate degree and alumni who earned a graduate degree at Concordia agreed below target (-12.8% and -13.0% respectively). Alumni who earned both an undergraduate and a graduate degree agreed slightly more at 65.8% (-9.2% from target).

---

\(^{36}\) The annual Concordia University Alumni Survey is sent to alumni to assess the broad impact of Concordia on all alumni, to assess university-wide outcomes and satisfaction, and to investigate alumni employment, current services and activities. In odd-numbered years, alumni from academic years ending in odd numbers are surveyed. In even number years, alumni from academic years ending in even numbers are surveyed. The Fall 2015 response rate was 18.4% (1312 of 7121). Question 3 asks, “Please, indicate the level to which you agree that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation. Response options: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.” Of the 1312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1306 (99.5%) answered this question.
Benchmark 3: 75% of current students will agree that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation. This question will be asked for the first time on the Spring 2016 Student Satisfaction Survey as well as online student surveys.

Benchmark 4: 75% of faculty and staff will agree that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation. This question will be asked for the first time on the Spring 2016 Faculty and Staff Surveys.

Benchmark 5: 75% of local community respondents will agree that Concordia’s culture encourages and rewards experimentation and innovation. This question will be asked for the first time on the Fall 2016 Riley Research Portland Survey.
As of 2016, Concordia is continuing development of succession plans for President, Cabinet and Deans which are evolving from a natural succession model.

In Fall 2015, 70.6% (-19.4% below target) of the Council of Trustees agreed that they receive adequate and timely communications from the university to support their role and responsibilities.

Results pending Spring 2016 faculty/staff perception of communication.

Table: Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Chief Vision Officer</th>
<th>Strategic Partnerships</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Jan 16</th>
<th>Feb 16</th>
<th>Feb 16</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Trustees Communication Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuity and Communication
Concordia will design and implement effective and efficient operational and institutional communications systems, and ensure the strength, development and continuity of leadership at all levels.

Not Met
0 of 2 measured benchmarks were met.

Notes:
37 OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Area Leadership, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders, Council of Trustees

- **Benchmark 2.** The Fall 2015 results are a reflection of prior communication patterns. Continue to implement the revised communication strategies begun in Fall 2015 and monitor Fall 2016 COT survey for effects of revised Council of Trustees communication elements including:
  - Overview
  - Schedule (Vision – February, Mission – October, COT quarterly data calendar)
  - Vision dashboards
  - Mission dashboards

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Area Leadership
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness

- **Benchmark 3.** Add the following survey question to the faculty and staff surveys: “I receive adequate and timely communications from the university to support my role and responsibilities.”
**Benchmark 1:** Development (7 by 6/30/2016; 7 by 6/30/2017) and subsequent biannual review of current succession plans for President, all Cabinet positions and Deans.

**Proposed New Benchmark 1:** Succession plans for President, Cabinet and Deans will flow from a natural succession model.

**Results:** Currently, Concordia is continuing development of succession plans for President, Cabinet and Deans which are evolving from a natural succession model.

**Analysis:** The natural model begun in 2015 includes ongoing development of internal talent. Development of internal talent occurs through performance evaluations and appointments to policy and leadership committees, CUP management team, and inclusion in executive leadership decisions. The permanent Presidential successor is appointment by LCMS. The interim Presidential successor is based on internal talent and job descriptions of existing Cabinet. Natural succession plans has been developed for Cabinet and Deans.

**Benchmark 2:** 90% or more of the Council of Trustees will agree or strongly agree that they receive adequate and timely communications from the university to support my role and responsibilities.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 70.6% (-19.4% below target of 90%) of the Council of Trustees agreed that they receive adequate and timely communications from the university to support their role and responsibilities.

**Analysis:** While only one councilperson strongly disagreed (2.9%), 9 disagreed (26.5%).

**Communications to Council of Trustees**

- Strongly Agree: 8
- Agree: 16
- Disagree: 9
- Strongly Disagree: 1

**Benchmark 3:** 90% or more of full-time faculty/staff, and 75% or more of part-time faculty/staff will agree or strongly agree that they receive adequate and timely communications from the university to support my role and responsibilities.

**Results:** This survey question will be first asked in Spring 2016.

---

38 The annual Concordia Council of Trustees Survey is designed to
**Stewardship & Value**
Concordia will ensure good stewardship of its resources and long-term mission viability while safeguarding a strong value for return on student investment in their education.

**Part Met**
1 of 4 measured benchmarks were met.

Unrestricted operating net assets has grown $1,661,828 from the period ending June 2013 ($4,102,509) to the period ending June 2014 ($1,661,828).

As of 2014-2015, all key financial covenants are fulfilled.

Results pending Spring 2016 current student perception of return on tuition investment.

In Fall 2015, 68.1% of alumni agreed that Concordia provided a good return on their tuition investment (-6.9% below target of 75%).

61% of full-time faculty (-19% from target of 80%), 58.2% of part-time faculty (-21.8% from target of 80%) and 64.3% of staff (-15.7% from target of 80%) agreed that Concordia provides them adequate resources and support to fulfill their assigned responsibilities.

### Shared Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Area Leadership</th>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</th>
<th>Other Stakeholders</th>
<th>Leadership Groups</th>
<th>Cabinet</th>
<th>Council of Trustees</th>
<th>Marketing/ Foundation</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer Jan 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Council of Trustees Finance Committee Feb 16</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>Feb 16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

39 OVERALL STRATEGIC GOAL PERFORMANCE METRICS
MET if 100% of benchmarks are met
PART MET if 50-99% of benchmarks are met
NOT MET if 0-49% of benchmarks are met
2016 RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

From: Deans, Provost, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, Institutional Research and Effectiveness
To: Area Leadership, Stakeholders

- **Benchmark 4.** In Spring 2016, Institutional Effectiveness, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs and academic leadership will utilize an informed and dynamic three-part framework for enrollment including:
  - Projected landscape of incoming students (GPA, test scores, resilience), high school graduation, interest of prospective incoming students, competitive market;
  - Current review of Concordia programs, historical trends, retention, graduation rates, predictive analytics for completion;
  - Future projections of field/career growth trends, market dynamics, alumni data.
  - Add COE survey of alumni inquiring as to if CU made a difference on INTASK standards.
  - Academic program outcome achievement should be an additional benchmark to investigate value.

2016 CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING MEASUREMENTS

From: Area Leadership, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee
To: Stakeholders, Area Leadership, Council of Trustees

- **Proposed new Benchmark 6.** To investigate Concordia’s delivery of more efficient, cost-effective, economical higher education, create a benchmark which would investigate the intersection between resources and return on investment sentiment and which would investigate tuition discounting effects/trends.
  - For example cost/graduated student - a common measure of output costs in higher education
    - This would allow consideration of net tuition + non-institutional aid + institutional aid across time
    - This would allow consideration of context within the Consumer Price Index (CPI-U) and the Higher Education Price Index across time
    - This would allow for comparison to peer and aspirational institutions, across time.

From: Stakeholders
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 4.** Supplement the current survey question with results from the mission fulfillment question to balance the self-reported/self-defined nature of the current survey responses; add a follow up question to students who indicate a positive and a negative return on investment.
- **Benchmark 5.** Add a follow up question to learn what elements of the resource are missing, for negative responses; add all questions from benchmark 5 to the annual Concordia Staff Survey and the annual Concordia Part-time Faculty Survey including the following which should also be added to the annual Concordia Full-time Faculty Survey:
  - Agreement: the university provides me with adequate support services.
  - Agreement: the university provides me with adequate community building opportunities.

From: Provost
To: Institutional Research and Effectiveness Committee

- **Benchmark 3.** Consider refinement/definition of pending survey question for current students; adding follow up questions.
- **Benchmark 4.** Separate recent graduate responses; consider a follow up question if they answer negatively.
- **Benchmark 5.** Add follow up surveys, or at least follow up questions.
**Benchmark 1**: Growth in annual unrestricted net worth.

**Results**: Unrestricted operating net assets has grown $1,661,828 from the period ending June 2014 ($5,041,893) to the period ending June 2015 ($6,703,721).

**Analysis**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Operating Net Assets</td>
<td>$1,424,505</td>
<td>$716,147</td>
<td>$945,672</td>
<td>$939,384</td>
<td>$5,041,893</td>
<td>$6,703,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Unrestricted Operation Net Assets during this period</td>
<td>-$708,358</td>
<td>$229,525</td>
<td>-$6,288</td>
<td>$4,102,509</td>
<td>$1,661,828</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Benchmark 2:** Fulfillment of all key financial covenants (interest, debt to equity, liquidity).

**Results:** As of 2014-2015, all key financial covenants are fulfilled.

**Analysis:**

- **Debt to Equity Ratio**
  - FY 2010-2011: 2.35
  - FY 2011-2012: 2.35
  - FY 2012-2013: 2.64
  - FY 2013-2014: 2.95
  - FY 2014-2015: 2.93

- **Coverage Ratio**
  - FY 2010-2011: 2.13%
  - FY 2011-2012: 2.23%
  - FY 2012-2013: 1.83%
  - FY 2013-2014: 1.56%
  - FY 2014-2015: 1.04%

- **Liquidity Ratio**
  - FY 2010-2011: 6.27%
  - FY 2011-2012: 11.04%
  - FY 2012-2013: 8.45%
  - FY 2013-2014: 8.00%
  - FY 2014-2015: 10.00%

**Coverage Ratio**: Met
**Benchmark 3:** Current students will agree that Concordia provides a good return on their tuition investment.

**Results:** This question will be asked of current students for the first time in the Spring 2016 Student Satisfaction Survey.
**Benchmark 4:** 75% or more of alumni will agree that Concordia provided a good return on their tuition investment.

**Results:** In Fall 2015, 68.1% of alumni agreed that Concordia provided a good return on their tuition investment (-6.9% below target of 75%).

**Analysis:** Of all alumni respondents in Fall 2015, 68.1%, 890 of 1,306 strongly agreed or agreed that Concordia provided a good return on their tuition investment. 68.3%, 606 of 887, of alumni earning an undergraduate degree strongly agreed or agreed. 69.4% of alumni earning a graduate degree strongly agreed or agreed. However, 60.5%, 46 of 76, alumni who earned both an undergraduate degree and a graduate degree strongly agreed or agreed. Further statistical testing, and a second year of results are needed to understand if this represents an impact of significance.

---

40 This question was first asked on the Fall 2015 Concordia University Alumni Survey. The annual Concordia University Alumni Survey is sent to alumni to assess the broad impact of Concordia on all alumni, to assess university-wide outcomes and satisfaction, and to investigate alumni employment, current services and activities. In odd-numbered years, alumni from academic years ending in odd numbers are surveyed. In even number years, alumni from academic years ending in even numbers are survey. The Fall 2015 response rate was 18.4% (1312 of 7121). Question 3c asks, “Please, indicate the level to which you agree that Concordia provided an excellent return on my tuition investment.” Response options: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree. Of the 1312 Fall 2015 respondents, 1306 (99.5%) answered this question.
**Benchmark 5:** 80% or more of faculty and staff will agree that Concordia provides them adequate resources and support to fulfill their assigned responsibilities.

**Results:** 61% of full-time faculty (-19% from target of 80%), 58.2% of part-time faculty (-21.8% from target of 80%) and 64.3% of staff (-15.7% from target of 80%) agreed that Concordia provides them adequate resources and support to fulfill their assigned responsibilities.  

**Analysis:** Both full-time faculty (83.8%; +3.8% above target) and staff (84.3%; +4.3% above target) agreed that the university provides them with adequate supplies. Creating the provision statement further from target, both full-time faculty (34.1%; -45.9% below target) and part-time faculty (58.6%; -21.4% below target) disagreed that the number of faculty in their department was adequate to get the job done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of faculty in my department is adequate to get the job done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time faculty</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of faculty in my college is adequate to get the job done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time faculty</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university provides me with adequate supplies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university provides me with adequate equipment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university provides me with adequate technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university provides me with adequate training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time faculty</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

41 The annual Concordia University Faculty and Staff Surveys are sent to all full-time and part-time faculty and staff on the Northeast Portland, Columbia River, Boise and online campuses to address mission attainment, training, staffing, working relationships, resources and university climate. The Spring 2015 response rate was unknown. Question 23 asks for agreement that “the university provides me with adequate supplies, equipment, technology, training, support services community building opportunities. Response options: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, don’t know/not sure. Of the 419 Fall 2015 faculty respondents, at least 403 (96.2%) answered at least one of these questions.