CHAPTER 3
PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

It is well established that no organization can prepare for and successfully meet the challenges of the 21st century by simply planning to continue with “business as usual.” Technology, internationalization, global economic competitiveness, and a variety of other factors are working to create a future significantly different from the past. Accordingly, the Higher Learning Commission no longer affirms an organization’s future based solely on how the organization responded to change in the past and the efficacy of the planning processes in place. Now, the Commission requires an accredited organization to demonstrate that:

- it realistically plans for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends,
- its resource base supports its educational programs and its plan for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future,
- its ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement,
- all levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

The following analysis and self-evaluation for Criterion Two is centered on two key statements elucidating the goals of Marietta College, the Mission Statement and glossing text (see Chapter 1, pp. 9-10) and the Core Values (see Chapter 1, pp. 20-21).

3.1 Core Component 2a - The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

The College prepares for its future by continually monitoring its internal and external environments and by realistically identifying and assessing its resources and their capabilities within those environments. Preparation is three-pronged, as the College:

- identifies and assesses its resources to optimize their use in pursuing its Mission and in manifesting its Core Values,
- monitors local, regional, national, and global market conditions and the College position within those markets to promote its understanding of American higher education and assure its pertinence therein,
• develops and modifies planning and assessment processes to promote the collegiality and
timeliness of the process and the creativity, applicability, and effectiveness of the
outcomes.

3.1.1 Resource Assessment
Evidence of wide-ranging and comprehensive resource assessment comes from several
major planning processes and the resulting documents and actions; all of the processes and
documents mentioned below are in consonance with the Strategic Plan and its extension.

Academic Program and Administrative Unit Reviews
Central to accomplishing the educational Mission of Marietta College are its academic
programs and the administrative units that support them. The resources available to academic
programs and administrative units and the manner in which those resources are used to pursue
the objectives of the Strategic Plan, and therein the Core Values and Mission of the College, are
formally assessed through program review. The Planning Committee (see pp. 41-42, Chapter 1
for a description of the committee’s charge and composition) reviews all academic programs and
administrative units on a four-year cycle. As part of this review, academic programs are required
to respond to the following five questions:

1. What progress has the department made toward objectives listed in the Strategic Plan?
2. Based on the enclosed data on the number of majors in your program and the total
   number of students served (supplied by the Director of Institutional Research), explain
   the factors that contributed to enrollment trends in your department. What are the
   implications regarding staffing and your plans for the future?
3. What efforts are you making to work with Admission and the Career Center to attract
   additional majors, to expand career opportunities, and to track the graduate school and
   professional information for majors that supports outcomes assessment?
4. What adjustments have you made as a result of the Strategic Plan? How effective have
   these adjustments been?
5. Describe your vision for your program for the next five years.

Administrative units are directed to respond to seven questions within the context of the
Strategic Plan:

1. What is the mission of your administrative unit? What goals and outcomes do you
   pursue?
2. What functions and activities does your administrative unit currently perform?
3. What have been your successes and failures over the past 3 to 4 years? Evaluate them.
4. What are the benchmarks or aspirations against which you measure your unit
   performance? Please provide and analyze quantitative/statistical data comparing your
unit to benchmark/aspirations. Include an analysis of how your unit’s performance compares to your benchmarks/aspirations. Also describe activity changes brought about by benchmarking efforts.

5. Who are your customers and what are their satisfaction levels? How do you measure customer satisfaction? How do you use customer feedback to improve operations?

6. Within institutional capabilities, what are your plans to make your unit more effective and efficient over the next 5 years? How do your plans support the College Strategic Plan?

7. What are your aspirations for your unit for the next five years?

Reviews are presented to the Planning Committee in writing and, if requested, in person. Committee members read each review and discuss them in session. On a case-by-case basis, the Committee, through a designated liaison(s), seeks further information or clarification from the reporting program or unit. The program or unit ultimately receives formal feedback which may include instructions to accomplish follow-up action and report the outcomes to the Committee in a timely manner. In addition, where appropriate the Planning Committee may recommend to the administration that additional resources be allocated to the program or unit or encourage the same to apply for additional funds during the normal budgeting process.

As the annual review process progresses from year to year, the Committee also assesses the process itself. Most recently, the Committee developed a common structured evaluation system (checklist) for administrative unit review reports, complementing the system in place for the evaluation of academic program review reports (see Appendix 17). By evaluating reports in a uniform manner, the Committee can generate more pragmatic recommendations and assignments.

All academic program and administrative unit review reports and Planning Committee feedback generated since the adoption of the Strategic Plan are available for inspection (Resource Room 13 and 11, respectively).

Viewing the workings of the College in broad terms, the available resources may be classified as facilities, technology, human resources, and financial resources. Accordingly, the College has assessed its current capabilities in each of these areas and has developed written plans for their future use toward achieving the objectives of the Strategic Plan.
Facilities

The College developed a Physical Plant Master Plan (Resource Room 14) in 1997; a new plan will likely be commissioned in 2005. The plan ranks deferred maintenance needs and has been the source document for measuring progress in reducing deferred maintenance requirements since that time. The plan was developed by the Physical Plant Director with field support from in-house mechanics and tradespersons familiar with the facilities and building systems being inspected and evaluated. The College also sought expertise from contracted architects and engineers throughout the process.

Support from the Board of Trustees for the use of reserve funds has permitted significant repair and renovation of facilities and subsequent reduction of major deferred maintenance needs from $16 million to $10 million. The Board requires a deferred maintenance progress report at each trustee meeting and also requires the College to grow the deferred maintenance fund by $50,000 annually in the operating budget. In 2004-05, funded deferred maintenance was $171,000.

The Physical Plant Master Plan goes beyond deferred maintenance to describe the condition of each building and the grounds and articulates facility needs for each in order to support programs articulated in the Strategic Plan. Senior leadership monitors the Physical Plant Master Plan to assure appropriate space and amenities for programs and activities. Financial restrictions prohibit ideal accommodation of many programs in facilities as they currently exist, but the College adapts spaces and amenities as financially possible to fit program needs. For example, in the summer of 2004, end-of-fiscal year funds enabled the College to install central air conditioning in the Hermann Fine Arts Center and replace all the plumbing in one of the residence halls.

The College completed a Space Utilization Plan (Resource Room 15) in 2005. Part of the plan is an assessment of current facilities and their capacity to accommodate current and planned programs. It focuses on academic space, library, and student housing needs as well as the interdependence of campus zones (academic, housing, and recreational). The process involved meetings among the College’s space planners (Burgess and Niple) and a wide array of
campus constituents including faculty, students, administrators, staff, and contract bookstore and food service leadership. The space planning process is expected to provide a direction for future use of campus facilities in consonance with the extension of the Strategic Plan. The final report also includes cost information. The space planning effort pays particular attention to the Dawes Memorial Library as a specialized area. To that end, the College contracted with a library consultant to assess the current library program and its space and amenity needs in light of contemporary small college library programs. The new head librarian, anticipated to be hired during the 2005-06 academic year, will play a central role in decision-making, through the Library Steering Committee, with respect to future use of library space. Moreover, a web site (http://mariettalibrary.blogspot.com) is in place to facilitate a discussion among members of the campus community regarding the same.

Technology

Information Technology (IT) is a critical component of the College’s Mission. Its role is articulated in the Technology Core Value. Recent IT advances were made possible as a result of a Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) that provides $1.75 million ($350,000 annually) between 2001-02 and 2005-06 for IT programming. The College matched the grant with $750,000 over five years. Given the advances made possible by Title III and the need to continue IT operations at a high level after the Title III grant ends, the College recently assessed its IT capabilities for academics and administration. The College first sought outside counsel from Collegis, a for-profit IT service provider, then revised its staffing and organizational structure to better fit current and anticipated IT needs. It then developed an IT Support Plan² (Resource Room 16 and Appendix 39) which details planned IT activities and programs and their funding sources through 2006-07. The plan was developed by the Chief Information Officer (CIO) in consultation with the Technology Advisory Group (TAG), an administrative committee comprised of faculty, administrators, staff, and students. The CIO worked closely with a College trustee who has expertise in IT operations in developing the plan and then invited a higher education IT consultant to review the same. The plan was discussed by the TAG, the Faculty Council, the Planning Committee, and the President’s Cabinet before being presented to the Board of Trustees for acceptance in February 2004. The first major component
of the Plan, the installation of a College-owned fiber optic ring around campus, is nearly complete.

**Human Resources**

Human resources include faculty, staff, and students. Matters related to faculty and staff (hiring practices, new employee orientation, compensation, evaluation, and professional development) are discussed elsewhere in this self-study report. With regard to students, a student body of appropriate size and composition is critical to the health of Marietta College, being a “tuition-driven” institution.

In 2001, the office of Admission developed an **Enrollment Marketing Plan**\(^2\) (Resource Room 17). The plan calls for the improvement of the College web site as a recruiting and image tool and the continued judicious application of financial aid to optimize student yield and net tuition revenues. Recent upgrade of the College web site, made possible by new financial and staffing support, has expanded beyond admission requirements. Admission is paying particular attention to student candidates from the surrounding region. The *Service to the Region Core Value* provides for a commitment to the region which the College is at least partially fulfilling through its Gateway grant program, first mentioned in Chapter 2 of this self-study report. Gateway grants of up to $5,000 annually are offered to academically-eligible students who reside within the eight-county region, including Ohio and West Virginia, surrounding the College.

Moreover, the College considers its diversity to be a valuable aspect of its human resource base, enriching the lives and learning of its community members (*Internationalization Core Value*).\(^3\) As reported in Chapter 2 (pp. 68-69), an ad hoc committee appointed by President Scott in 2002-03 presented a plan, *“The Report of the Diversity Committee,”*\(^2\) to address issues ranging from recruitment of minority students to facilities accommodations for persons with disabilities (see Appendix 11). The College is acting on several recommendations, including expansion of diversity programming in student affairs and undertaking building accessibility improvements.
Building accessibility improvements are in fact programmed into the Physical Plant Master Plan, facility construction, and renovation projects. The master plan established an east-west accessibility axis between the lower housing area and the upper academic campus. McCoy Hall and the Dyson Baudo Recreation Center anchor that axis. McCoy Hall is fully accessible. A bridge connects McCoy Hall to the recreation center. The recreation center is fully accessible and includes an elevator from the bridge entry doors to the concourse level and the upper academic campus. The connected Ban Johnson Arena was renovated to be accessible and now has handicapped seating in the bleachers and a sound system for the hearing impaired. The Rickey Science Center addition includes handicapped restrooms and state-of-the-art laboratories with accessible hoods and benches; access to the Selby and Bartlett science wings was improved by the addition as well. Renovations to the first-year student housing complex provided accessible restrooms in the three accessible halls. Public restrooms in the Hermann Fine Arts Center were renovated to improve accessibility. Campus Services and the primary student activities programming area (The Gathering Place) were relocated to renovated space with improved access, handicapped restrooms, and parking. The Pioneer Park baseball facility and Don Drumm Stadium have received handicapped seating improvements. Fayerweather Hall, currently being renovated back to a residence hall, will be fully accessible when completed in August 2005.

A complete discussion of the College’s diversity initiatives, including those strategies contained in the Strategic Plan and its extension, may be found in Section 2.2, Core Component 1b, of this self-study report.

Financial Resources

A major resource assessment occurs annually with development of the annual operating budget and the monthly monitoring of operations revenues and expenditures against that budget. The annual operations budgeting process requires each budget unit to evaluate its financial needs and to request funds accordingly. A formal budgeting process begins each January with the development of recommended tuition, fee, room and board (TFRB) rates for the next academic year. Following approval, in February, of the TFRB rates by the Board of Trustees, the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) requests budget submittals for the upcoming fiscal period (01 July
through 30 June) from departments and programs; written budget requests for operating, capital, and personnel funds are submitted. Budget units are charged to link budget requests to strategic initiatives. Requests are compiled by the CFO; program maintenance requests are submitted to the Budget Advisory Group (BAG), an eight-member committee comprised of representatives from faculty, staff, and mid-level administration while strategic initiatives requests are sent to the Planning Committee. Strategic initiatives priorities are derived from the Strategic Plan and essentially are the tasks required for continued Plan implementation during the upcoming year. The BAG meets with budget unit heads and deliberates through mid-April. The BAG then submits a report and recommendations to the Planning Committee, which discusses the recommendations; the Planning Committee then submits program maintenance and strategic initiatives budget recommendations to the President and the Cabinet for further discussion. The Cabinet recommends a balanced budget, for approval, to the Board of Trustees in May. When students enroll in August, the budget is once again reviewed for accuracy, as actual enrollment counts are compared to budget projections. The budget is adjusted accordingly and again submitted in final form to the trustees in October. Appendix 18 contains a compilation of documents that illustrate the budgeting process (for the 2005-06 academic year). The BAG and Planning Committee evaluate and, if necessary, refine the budgeting process each year.

Assessment of budget requests is continual throughout this process. Budget unit requests are routinely adjusted as opportunities and challenges occur. Examples of events that foster ongoing assessment are replacement of terminating or absent employees, matching of grant awards, post-season athletic play, and review of employee benefits costs. Even though some events, like the review of employee benefits costs, can be planned and incorporated into the operating budget, the cycle of benefits costs review may not coincide with the budgeting cycle. Therefore, the College must retain some flexibility in the budget to accommodate changes that occur outside the budgeting cycle.

Budget assessment continues throughout the year with monthly reports from the controller to budget unit heads of their spending performances versus their operating budget. The controller also provides interim financial statements to senior leadership and trustees in February and May. The controller and the CFO also monitor overall budget performance to
project and report in advance the budget status at year end (30 June). Starting in June 2004, the College business office implemented a policy of ceasing the processing of fiscal year expenditures in late May in order to support timely closing of the general ledger within the first nine days of July. The controller and the business officer manager monitor cash flow on a daily basis through an on-line connection to the College operational bank accounts. The CFO also monitors cash flow during known times of high cash demand (e.g., end of month payroll) or low cash reserves (e.g., November and July, the months furthest from the tuition payment dates).

The College endowment is currently valued at around $56 million. It is invested with five professional investment managers, in a planned effort to diversify investments, who are monitored by an endowment advisor hired by the College. The managers make routine transaction reports, monthly reports, and quarterly reports to the College. The advisor also assesses manager performance against appropriate benchmarks and personally reports three times per year on findings and recommendations to the Investment Committee of the Board of Trustees. The committee has rewritten the endowment investment and spending policy and has developed written investment guidelines for each manager. The committee chair regularly monitors endowment activity and maintains a dialogue with the College’s CFO and the advisor on endowment issues.

Monitoring of philanthropic activities is undertaken by the Chief Advancement Officer (CAO) and her staff. The CAO and the President, with assistance from Advancement staff, assess the potential of donors at all levels for gifts to the annual fund, major gifts, deferred gifts, and alumni activities. Assessment includes the use of subscriptions to search engines and databases (LexisNexis) and anecdotal research from College friends, associates, and other benefactors. The College Advancement Office also maintains its own database and research records. These are updated regularly by a research associate.

Student-generated revenues are the primary revenue source for College operations. It is therefore critical that the College allocate resources to optimize student recruitment and retention. In pragmatic terms, this means allocation of resources to enrollment management programs and student financial aid. Enrollment management and financial aid are fundamental
to the “shaping” of the student body profile and thereby to fulfilling several Core Values, namely those related to forming a Residential College, providing Service to the Region, developing student leaders (Leadership) and preparing them for life in a diverse and global society (Internationalization). Accordingly, the College pays close attention to the resources allocated to enrollment management and financial aid.

Enrollment management resources are assessed annually as part of the budgeting process and are adjusted in accordance with the Admission Operational Plan\(^2\) (Resource Room 18), first developed in 2001-02 by the Dean of Enrollment Management and updated annually since that time, and the recommendations of an external recruitment consultant who, since the start of the 2002-03 academic year, has maintained a working relationship with the College. Primary among the changes in resource allocation was reassignment of significant funds from traditional printed recruiting materials to the overhaul of the College web site and the adaptation of the web site to permit on-line enrollment application. Flexibility is retained within the printing and postage budgets to customize responses to student candidates on the basis of geographic location, areas of interest, and/or academic prowess.

The College annually spends about $10 million, about 28% of its operating budget, for student financial aid. The purpose of awarding aid is to ensure student access, meet enrollment goals, and yield a student body that facilitates fulfillment of the pertinent Core Values (e.g., Residential College, Internationalization, etc.). The policy of the College is to fund student financial aid as a percentage of tuition. Each year the College assesses the level of financial aid funding; the benchmark was increased from 41% of projected tuition revenues to 43% in 2003-04. The rationale behind the increase is the belief by enrollment management that financial aid needs will increase as the size of the student body increases. Student enrollment increased significantly from 2002-03 to 2003-04 and a further increase was realized for 2004-05. Therefore, the College has assessed financial aid needs and reallocated funds accordingly.

The Financial Aid Office also assesses financial aid packaging each year with the goal of maximizing enrollment within the aid budget. For the most part, the College first spends external funds from governmental or private sources, spending College aid resources after these...
have been committed. In recent years, the College has allocated increasing amounts of student financial aid to international students, particularly students from China, in pursuit of the \textit{Internationalization Core Value}. The College also allocates more financial aid funding to need-based aid than for merit-based aid. The purpose is to provide access to a wider range of student candidates and to attract those candidates who have historically matriculated successfully at Marietta College.

\textbf{Resource Mix}

Some functional areas draw on a mixture of facilities, technology, human resources, and financial resources and accordingly assess their capabilities in each area. The \textit{Student Life} division conducts resource assessment on an annual basis, driven primarily by changes in student life programming and budget matters. Student Life annually assesses its organizational structure and often restructures to better accommodate programming and activities. For the past several years, Student Life has maintained that it is understaffed as compared to peer institutions and as necessary to adequately create and implement student life programs. Focusing on specific programs such as diversity, personal counseling, and residence life safety awareness, Student Life has assigned multiple and cross-disciplinary duties to individual staff members to provide at least minimal coverage for important out-of-classroom programs. Stagnant enrollment and even enrollment declines resulted in staff reductions in 2001 and again in 2003. These events underscored the need to assess human resources and to reallocate duties among fewer professionals. More recent enrollment increases have permitted reinstatement of a Director of Student Activities and the enrichment of diversity and residence life programming, including position adds in this area. More human resources are still needed for personal counseling; as of this writing, a search is underway for a one-half time counselor and one-half time psychology faculty member to partially address this need. This is in addition to a full-time Director of Psychological Services.

Student Life also assesses its facilities on an annual basis in order to maximize the quality of the out-of-classroom experience for the students. Annually, the Director of Residence Life inspects residence halls with the Director of the Physical Plant. They identify upgrade, repairs, or replacement needs for building systems, building cosmetics, and furnishings. Building-related
issues are addressed as funds become available. The College applies at least $40,000 annually toward the cyclical replacement and repair of residence hall furnishings. Part of the annual assessment of residence halls also includes evaluation of the synergy between facilities/furnishings/building design and the student activities that they support. The Director of Residence Life assesses how well a facility accommodates student activities and recommends corresponding facilities changes, whether they are repairs or upgrades, redesigned and renovated space, or new furnishings. Similar facilities/furnishings assessments occur episodically for student activities spaces in the dining hall (Gilman), the café (Izzy’s), and the Gathering Place. As program or habitability needs are identified, the Dean of Student Life addresses them with the Physical Plant Director and the CFO to determine work scope and funding options.

Student Life also regularly assesses the budgets that support its human and facility resources. Its history is to spend within budget limits and to maintain budget flexibility that permits reallocation of funds for unexpected opportunities that emerge after budgets have been set. Student Life also formally submits its capital needs to the CFO as part of the annual budgeting process. Capital needs are identified as described earlier, priced by the Physical Plant Director or other estimator, and submitted in priority order for funding consideration.

Resource assessment by the Academic Affairs division occurs in a manner similar to that employed by Student Life. Because Academic Affairs and Student Life programs occupy most of the physical plant, their methods of facility assessment are similar. The Provost is the point of contact for academic facilities assessment, although individual faculty department chairs and division heads take an active role as well. Recent assessment of classroom and laboratory spaces has focused on the condition and adequacy of furniture and furnishings for teaching in the 21st century. Many of the College’s classrooms have furnishings dating from the 1960s. Contemporary teaching methods, particularly those using technology, are compromised when furnishings are not compatible. As mentioned earlier, the College has engaged a space planning study to optimize classroom and laboratory scheduling and to assess furnishings needs. Climate control is also an issue across much of the campus.
Classroom scheduling and instructor assignments are also the subject of assessment prior to each semester and the summer, as the Records Office manually assigns courses to rooms with appropriate size, equipment, and features. Rooms whose use is compromised by inadequate climate control, lighting, or furnishings are identified. Related repair or upgrade needs are reported to the Physical Plant Director for pricing and to the CFO for inclusion in capital needs budgeting.

Faculty assessment is accomplished by student survey at the end of each semester and by the traditional promotion and tenure process, the latter discussed in detail on pages 124-125 of this chapter of the self-study report. The Provost oversees both processes, assuring in the former case that faculty members are able to gain constructive criticism from their students. The College strives for a 12:1 student-to-faculty ratio. Accordingly, the College routinely assesses its progress toward that goal by reviewing reports to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), and College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPAHR). (Note: Some discussion of the appropriateness of the College’s goal of a 12:1 student-to-faculty ratio has taken place; while a 12:1 ratio makes for an ideal classroom environment, 14:1 represents a healthier financial picture. Internal Recommendation #2 (Section 3.5) speaks to this issue).

The Provost regularly reviews spending and, like the Dean of Students, maintains flexibility with budgets to fund unexpected expenses that emerge after the budget has been set. For example, funds may need to be reallocated for adjunct faculty to accommodate extra sections of classes or to regular faculty who have taken on extra teaching or administrative duties. In 2004, the BAG recommended that money be set aside for academic division coordinators and the Provost to use for one-time-only purchases for academic departments since operating funds have not been increased in many years. This has allowed for the purchase of many instructional aids for classrooms. Furthermore, the Director of Human Resources and the CFO contribute to assessment of faculty resources by identifying appropriate compensation standards and by designing models for matching College compensations with those standards.
A unit in the Academic Affairs division that is integral to the World of Work and Service to the Region Core Values is the Career Center. The staff consists of a Director, a recently-hired Associate Director responsible for identifying and developing internships, and an Assistant/Recruiting Coordinator. Material describing the services offered by the Career Center may be found in the Resource Room 19.

The Career Center makes efficient use of resources to provide career development opportunities for students and graduates. The Director has established a successful career services operation that depends on minimal funding and staffing and capitalizes on networking resources and consortia opportunities. The Director uses membership in the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) and the Midwest Association of Colleges and Employers (MACE) to stay abreast of ethical standards, hiring trends, and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) compliance matters. The Director has served as a NACE board member and president of MACE, facilitating her staying current on career services issues and as a means of networking with other college career services operations, employers, and regulatory agencies. The Director also maintains an active role in the National Society of Experiential Education (NSEE) as a means of developing internship and cooperative job opportunities for Marietta College students. Networking is also accomplished by participation of the Career Center in the College Central Network, allowing for securing database access, posting student resumes, cultivating employer relationships, coordinating employer visits and career fairs, and maintaining contact with alumni.

3.1.2 Benchmarking and Market Monitoring

The College benchmarks its academic and administrative organization and activities and monitors the marketplace to ascertain the College market position and its appropriateness. Benchmarking and monitoring occurs in several ways, both formally and informally, and involves benchmark data from various educational and business sources.

Academic Affairs
- Course enrollees and number of majors and graduates (Records Office data) are benchmarked against peer or aspirant colleges.
- Curriculum content is compared against similar programs at other colleges.
- Staffing is compared against similar programs at other colleges.
• Teaching loads are compared over time within and outside the College.
• The College’s currency with trends in higher education is benchmarked through regular contact with East Central Consortium (ECC) provosts and attendance at Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) conferences and American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and American Council on Education (ACE) meetings.

Athletics (Affiliations: NCAA Division III, Ohio Athletic Conference (OAC))
- The NCAA regulates student-athlete recruitment, practices and competition, travel, officials’ pay, etc.
- OAC rules and regulations, some more stringent than those of the NCAA, further mandates benchmarks for athletics’ programming.
- Athletic Department staffing and compensation are compared with other OAC members and schools of similar profile.
- Beyond intercollegiate athletics, the Dyson Baudo Recreation Center (DRBC) has a full-time director who internally scans the needs of the campus community, through ongoing dialogue with student organizations and DBRC facility users, in order to develop responsive recreational programs.
- Recreational activities at colleges of similar profile are scanned and adapted to Marietta College as appropriate.

Career Center
- Publications from NACE are monitored.
- NACE monitors EEOC practices and other legal, legislative, and ethical matters on behalf of its members.
- Close communication is maintained with the College’s employer pool in order to stay current on hiring practices and trends, directly impacting students who use career counseling services.

Advancement (Fund-raising, Alumni relations, Trustee relations)
- External market issues, including legal and legislative matters, are monitored via membership in professional organizations like the Council for the Advancement of Support to Education (CASE) and the Council for the Advancement of Education (CAE).
- Contact is maintained with advancement personnel at similar colleges through memberships in the ECC and professional acquaintances.
- Key trustees advise on strategies and approaches to potential benefactors.
- Staffing and campaign activities are compared to the staffing levels and hierarchy of similar colleges in similar philanthropic circumstances.
- An external fund-raising consultant was engaged for the recent comprehensive campaign and recommended staff size and organization based on demographics from other colleges with recently completed successful campaigns.
- The cost per dollar raised during the recent campaign was monitored and compared to campaign costs at other colleges; a very efficient cost of less than $0.10 for each dollar raised was achieved.
Enrollment Management (An Admission function)

- Student candidate application and matriculation behavior are carefully monitored.
- Point-in-time comparisons of student candidate demographic data from selected geographic and political regions of the United States, based on prior recruitment history and/or planned recruitment focus, are tracked.
- The academic prowess of student candidates is scanned, allowing for personalized contact with candidates (letters, telephone calls, e-mails, personal contacts). For example, a candidate with interests in the sciences may be contacted by a science faculty member and perhaps invited to a science event as part of a campus visit.
- Competitors’ admission web sites are regularly visited to measure what others are doing.
- Trends in admission logistics are monitored to make the application process as easy as possible for student candidates, including on-line application opportunities. Recent web site activities at the College have involved a sophisticated network of web site screens that are personalized and customized to the student candidate’s status in the recruitment process.

Finance and Administration

- Operating and capital financial ratios are calculated as a measure of the College’s financial performance and health as compared to Standard & Poors’ and Moody’s standards and ratios at peer and aspirant colleges.
- Comparative data regarding tuition, fees, room and board, endowment sizes and performance, and various operating costs are regularly gathered using ECC data and published data from the Chronicle of Higher Education, the NACUBO Business Officer magazine, University Business magazine, and their on-line counterparts.
- Financial officers at ECC schools are regularly polled to learn details of their budgeting processes; the applicability of said processes to Marietta College is assessed. NACUBO communications and activities (publications, internet announcements, and seminars) are scanned throughout the year for similar purposes.
- Internally, at least five years of enrollment data and operating budget details are maintained, both of which are used annually to model enrollment levels and to project operating budget capacities during the budget development process.
- The Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees annually reviews financial data provided by Ernst & Young, the College’s external auditors, comparing Marietta College to other private colleges.

Financial Aid

- Legislative activities are tracked on nearly a daily basis through several national associations, including NACUBO and the National Association of Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), as well as the U.S. DOE.
- Peer operations and professional associations for practices and procedures are monitored to identify methods to streamline delivery of financial aid services to student clients; the Financial Aid Office has successfully become a high-tech operation, performing direct lending functions with little or no paperwork.
- Historical financial aid data are maintained and used to model and predict future financial aid needs and to support optimal aid packaging.
Human Resources Management
- Salary and compensation survey data for faculty, senior level, and mid-level administrators, published annually by CUPAHR, are scanned.
- Local data from the U.S. Department of Labor is used to benchmark compensation levels for wage-earning employees.
- CUPAHR data provides a recognized benchmark for supervisors to annually review position descriptions and judge their match to the duties actually being performed.
- College benefits programs are measured against other colleges through regular (at least annual) comparisons of benefits programs; an on-line listserv expedites this analysis.

Information Technology
- Resources and capabilities dedicated to IT at other schools of similar profile are assessed.
- *Educause*, a journal addressing the status of IT in the small college environment, is reviewed regularly.
- College staffing, resources, and activities are benchmarked against those at similar colleges by active participation in the Datatel user’s group. Datatel manufactures the administrative software used by the College.
- The CIO maintains e-dialogue with other Datatel users and Datatel as a means of measuring College IT activities and capabilities against those at other schools.

Physical Plant
- Construction and renovation costs are benchmarked regularly based on recent internal actual costs and national and regional data made available from R.S. Means and Company, a nationally-recognized construction estimating resource.
- Historical data are used to project operating and utility costs for College facilities.
- Operating costs, staffing levels, and organization are compared to those made available from the Association of Physical Plant Administrators (APPA) and utility costs available from local utility service providers.
- APPA provides benchmark data on housekeeping services, providing guidelines for the College in determining the levels of housekeeping possible with current staffing and whether those levels of housekeeping are in accordance with the expectations of the campus community.
- Legal and legislative issues are monitored through APPA and related on-line services.
- Currency in plant operations is benchmarked by examining the policies and practices of peer colleges.
- The Physical Plant Director is a civil engineer who maintains formal and informal contacts with colleagues as part of maintaining his certification.

Student Life
- Programming is benchmarked against *Student Personnel Point of View* (1937), the longtime foundation of student life in American higher education.
- Active membership is maintained in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).
• Student Life administrators routinely read NASPA publications, including the legal journal, *The College and the Courts*, to stay current on student life trends and issues.
• Residence Life administrators participate in an informal group of Ohio college housing officers.
• Ongoing dialogues with Student Senate, residence hall councils, Greek organizations, and special-interest groups are maintained by attending meetings with these organizations and working daily with student representatives to keep abreast of student needs.
• The Student Handbook (Resource Room 06), the Residence Life Handbook (Resource Room 20), and the Resident Assistant Handbook (Resource Room 21) serve as a basis for policy, procedures, rules, and regulations. These publications are regularly updated to reflect changes in student life at the College and in legal, legislative, and ethical matters.

3.1.3 Plan Modification and Assessment
The Marietta College Strategic Plan and supporting program and departmental plans continually evolve to promote their applicability and feasibility. The Planning Committee meets regularly during the academic year to monitor Plan implementation, assess implementation successes and failures, and progressively extend the Plan based on current factors. Inasmuch as Plan implementation is subject to the availability of funds, specific program plans are modified to enable implementation within limited budgets. For example, starting graduate programs in the areas of Psychology and Corporate Media has been accomplished on limited budgets such that both programs functioned initially as financial “break evens.” Similarly, the Plan identified the need for academic computer lab upgrades following the installation of a campus-wide fiber optic network. The need for lab upgrades became critical, however, leading the College to reverse the sequence of lab upgrades and fiber optic installation.

The College also modifies the Plan in response to market conditions, adjusting resource allocations to respond to opportunities or threats. For example, despite plans to grow the student population to 1,250 students over the next few years, the College experienced an enrollment drop from 2001-02 to 2002-03. In order to minimize the drop and to promote return to growth in 2003-04 and beyond, the College reallocated funds to the enrollment management operation to compensate an admission consultant, add financial aid capabilities, and overhaul the College web site.

The Plan is also adaptable to unforeseen opportunities. For example, the Plan does not identify a major allocation of resources to the athletics program. However, during 2002 the
Marietta City School District approached the College about purchasing Don Drumm Stadium, the home field for Marietta College football games and Marietta City Schools’ football games and band events. The facility was in dire need of an upgrade and the College was the only local entity capable of funding such. With the support of trustees, the Advancement Office undertook a successful $2.2 million campaign to fund improvements at Don Drumm Stadium and also to build a new soccer field and a softball field (The Fields Project, described under Significant Physical Changes at the College since 1995, p. 16). Unique to this effort is the speed and flexibility of action that enabled the College to successfully undertake a fund-raising initiative that was not developed and planned in a traditional way, but began as an unexpected appendage at the end of a major comprehensive campaign. Additionally, the College seized the opportunity to incorporate two long-standing athletics needs (the soccer and softball fields) into the project.

Another example of Plan flexibility is the ongoing effort to acquire two properties adjacent to the campus. The College cannot predict the availability of either property but is vigorously pursuing actions that could lead to the acquisition of one or both. One property is ideally suited for accommodation of the College physical plant operation and could permit housing for a re-chartered fraternity (Lambda Chi Alpha) chapter in the vacated current physical plant building. None of these activities were anticipated and none were part of the Plan. However, they are being accommodated into the Plan as it evolves.

It has been documented that the Plan requires formal review of academic programs and administrative units every four years. The initial sequence of reviews was developed to first review those areas identified as key components of the Plan. For example, because Academic Computing is a major component of the Plan, it was reviewed in 2001-02 to enable the College to take appropriate actions early during the implementation of the Plan and to build on the resulting enhancements. By contrast, the Plan permits delay of unit evaluation. Student Activities was originally sequenced for review in 2003-04 but was first delayed to 2004-05 because of a vacancy in the Student Activities Director position, then delayed again to 2005-06 to give the new director an opportunity to assess the unit and its needs. Similarly, review of the Mass Media program is delayed until 2005-06, after the new department chair has assumed his position.
The Strategic Plan is sufficiently quantifiable to permit development of tactical plans and implementations. This is evidenced by the number of successful implementations over the past four years of the Plan (see Appendix 08). Regular meetings of the Planning Committee oblige the College to maintain focus on the Plan implementation and update. Regular reporting by the President to campus constituents, including faculty, students, alumni, and trustees reinforces the role of planning in the life of the College.

Marietta College has a rich history, beginning with its chartering in 1835 and the establishment of the Gamma of Ohio chapter of Phi Beta Kappa in 1860, to its charter membership, in 1913, in the newly organized North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and the development of Leadership and China Programs in the last two decades of the 20th century. The Strategic Plan and its extension, which all levels of planning at the College are done in consonance with, reflect this heritage. Given that the first step in the strategic planning process began in 1999 was to reaffirm and clarify the aims of Marietta College, which resulted in a renewed commitment to the College’s Mission, followed by crystallizing the Core Values from that Mission, it is evident the history and heritage of Marietta College are preserved in today’s planning processes.\(^6\)

Moreover, it is evident in today’s planning processes with whom authority lies for decision making about organizational goals—the Planning Committee and, ultimately, the President’s Cabinet.\(^7\) As has been shown in this section of the self-study report, the Planning Committee:

- oversees the Strategic Plan, which all planning at the College is done in consonance with,
- reviews all academic programs and administrative units on a four-year cycle and makes any necessary recommendations,
- as part of the annual operating budget development process, derives strategic initiatives priorities from the Strategic Plan.

Certain recommendations of the Planning Committee, for example, program maintenance and strategic initiatives budget recommendations, are forwarded to the President and the Cabinet for further discussion and approval.
Examples of Evidence Cited
1 = The organization’s planning documents reflect a sound understanding of the organization’s current capacity.
2 = The organization’s planning documents demonstrate that attention is being paid to emerging factors such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.
3 = The organization’s planning documents show careful attention to the organization’s function in a multicultural society.
4 = The organization’s planning processes include effective environmental scanning.
5 = The organizational environment is supportive of innovation and change.
6 = The organization incorporates in its planning those aspects of its history and heritage that it wishes to preserve and continue.
7 = The organization clearly identifies authority for decision making about organizational goals.

3.2 Core Component 2b - The organization’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

       Marietta College’s resources permit the College to achieve the educational quality it claims to provide. The student learning outcomes-based assessment program in place, described in detail in Chapter 4, pages 171-175, demonstrates that academic programs’ desired student learning outcomes and the corresponding educational goals are regularly met, and when they are not, corrective action, typically no/low cost changes in the method of delivery of course material, the integration of additional material, etc., is taken. With the introduction of Improvements Through Assessment Grants in the spring of 2005, however, programs may now access funds for more costly needed program improvements, as identified through the assessment process, to increase student learning.

       Nearly one-third of Marietta College’s operating expenditures in any year are in academic support and instruction, both of which directly support the College’s educational programs. Operating expenditures data for 2003-04 (see Figure 3.1), as of this writing the most recent academic year for which complete data are available, support this claim. According to comparative data acquired from IPEDS for the same time period, only eight schools in the College’s IPEDS auto-peer group of 55 schools (Appendix 12) spent more on instruction expenses per FTE than Marietta College while 17 schools spent more in academic support. When compared to OAC schools in the auto-peer group (Mount Union College, Ohio Northern University, Otterbein College, and Wilmington College), Marietta College spends more per FTE than all but Ohio Northern University in both areas. The referenced expense data is provided in Appendix 19.
Furthermore, the College demonstrates, through resource development and investment, a forward-looking concern for ensuring educational quality. The following examples are simply recorded here for illustration; each item listed below is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this self-study report.

- The Rickey Science Center and Dyson Baudo Recreation Center were opened in 2003 (funded through the $63 million comprehensive campaign).
- The Academic Resource Center was established in 1999 (initially funded through a grant from the Teagle Foundation).
- The Career Center was relocated and services enhanced in 2000.
- The Investigative Studies Program was launched in 1997.
- A number of academic programs have been enhanced through additional faculty positions and/or additional funding in the last five years.
- Three new graduate programs have recently been developed.
- A multimillion dollar technology plan is in the process of being implemented (funded primarily through a Title III grant).
- The Dawes Memorial Library joined the OhioLINK consortium of libraries in 1999.
- Technology Improvements Grants are available (funded through a Title III grant).
- Improvement Through Assessment Grants are funded by the Provost.
- The Provost views faculty development as a priority and funds it accordingly, accessing restricted funds if necessary.
- Faculty enjoy a variety of faculty development opportunities.
- “Higher Ground,” the extension to the Strategic Plan, specifically assigns to the Vice President for Advancement resource development in conjunction with goal 3 (to enhance the quality, depth, and distinctiveness of the College’s educational programs) and goal 6 (to maintain and improve the College’s infrastructure to support the educational goals and administrative needs of the campus).
Results of Marietta College’s 2003-04 audit, conducted by Ernst and Young, suggest the College’s fiscal situation continues to improve. As a part of the audit, a financial analysis comparing Marietta College to select Baccalaureate I and Baccalaureate II colleges and universities in the six-state region surrounding and including Ohio was conducted. Comparisons were made in Market Position Indicators (five indicators), Capital Structure Ratios (five ratios), and Operating Results Ratios (three ratios). Data were derived from IPEDS. Summary interpretation of the line graphs indicates positive progress on most of the indicators. Figures referenced below may be found at the end of this chapter (pp. 147-159).

- **Net tuition per student FTE (Figure 3.2) increased**, suggesting students are willing to pay for a Marietta College education, an indication of market strength.
- **Tuition discount percentage (Figure 3.3) remained level**, indicating that tuition and fees and financial aid maintained the same ratio. This is expected because, as previously discussed, financial aid is budgeted as a fixed percentage of tuition.
- **Educational expenses per student FTE (Figure 3.4) increased**, indicating expenditure patterns more closely aligned with Baccalaureate I colleges and universities.
- **Unrestricted net assets per student FTE (Figure 3.5) remained about the same** from 2003 because both unrestricted assets and student population grew. The College remains mid-range between Baccalaureate I and Baccalaureate II schools.
- **Student FTE per Faculty FTE (Figure 3.6) declined slightly**, indicating very close alignment with Baccalaureate I schools and manifestation of the College’s policy of high levels of contact and interaction between students and faculty.
- **Unrestricted net assets-to-total expenses (Figure 3.7) declined slightly**, but remains at about 120%. This indicates that if no operating income was realized for a period of time and unrestricted assets were used to cover expenses during that same period, the College could operate for about 1.2 years. This measure should be at least 100% for a college to be considered financially healthy.
- **Long-term investments as a percentage of assets (Figure 3.8) remained at about 40%**, well below the average levels of other Baccalaureate I (60%) and Baccalaureate II (48%) schools, indicating that the College’s endowment is not as large as other schools when measured as a percentage of total assets.
- **Return on long-term investments (Figure 3.9) rose sharply**, indicating the success of endowment investments during the past year. Success is partially because of market improvements, but also because of proactive investment strategies.
- **Net assets-to-total assets (Figure 3.10) recovered nicely** from 2003 as the result of the aforementioned endowment investment success.
- **Capital expenses-to-operational expenses (Figure 3.11) rose sharply** from 2002 to 2003 because of spending for investment in facilities (Dyson Baudo Recreation Center, Rickey Science Center). It stayed level between 2003 and 2004.
- **Net income percentage (Figure 3.12) rose sharply** from 2003, reflecting efforts to balance revenues and expenditures.
- **Tuition and auxiliary services revenues (portion of budget paid by source of revenue pie charts, Figure 3.13) cover about 70% of the College’s operating expenses,
followed by private gifts and endowment income. This pattern varies from other Baccalaureate I and Baccalaureate II schools whose tuition and auxiliary services revenues cover about 54% to 58% of their operating expenses. The pie chart indicates that Marietta College is more tuition dependent than the average among its peers.

- **The budget component as a percentage of total budget pie charts (Figure 3.14) indicate the College spends more of its budget to the direct benefit of students than does its peers.** About 88% (Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, Auxiliary Services, Financial Aid) is spent on students, with only 9% overhead (Institutional Support). Peers spend about 81% directly on students, with 13% to 14% overhead.

It should be noted that although the College has, in recent years, made substantial progress toward achieving financial stability, the importance of reducing the current drawdown on the endowment is recognized. A goal of lowering the drawdown from 7-8% to 4½-5½% is being pursued, which will bring the College in line with its benchmark institutions.

In sum, Marietta College’s resources and the manner in which they are invested permit the educational quality desired by the College to be realized. A significant portion of the annual operating expenses fall in the area of instruction and academic support and the College spends generously in these areas compared to its peer group. Assessment of student learning outcomes demonstrates that the academic program’s educational goals are regularly met.

### 3.2.1 Resource Allocation to Individual Educational Programs

The relationship of the College’s resource base to support of its educational programs is revealed by examining three groups of resource allocation actions taken by the College in the last five years. These include program enhancements, program maintenance, and program reductions and reorganizations.

**Program Enhancements**

Certain educational programs were identified through academic program review by the Strategic Planning Committee and its successor, the Planning Committee, as deserving additional resources (e.g., new faculty positions, enhanced funds, etc.) due to their enrollment potential and the commitment by the College to maintain quality educational offerings. Specifically,

- Graphic Arts was introduced as an interdisciplinary major and received a new faculty position and a new computer laboratory featuring the latest graphic design software.
- Another faculty member was hired in Psychology, permitting the department to expand its offerings and leading to opportunities and flexibility in scheduling to help make the
Center for Families and Children (see Chapter 5, 244) and the master’s program in Psychology become a reality.

- Biology received a new faculty member to promote interest in the area of cellular and molecular biology.
- Most recently, the Department of Economics, Management and Accounting hired lead instructors for the newly approved Management Information Systems and Finance majors.
- Program enhancement funds were added to the Honors, Investigative Studies, and Asian Studies Programs.

Program Maintenance
Since 2000, the College has not worked under the assumption that a vacated faculty slot will automatically be filled. In most cases, however, the College found justification for replacing faculty members when they resigned from the College or retired. Over the last five years, approximately a dozen faculty have retired, six either did not receive tenure or were asked to leave before coming up for tenure, and some eight faculty left the College to take other positions or as a result of spouse transfers or new opportunities.

Program Reductions and Reorganizations
Taking advantage of faculty retirements, the College, with the advice of the Strategic Planning Committee, chose to eliminate undersubscribed major and minor courses of study and their accompanying faculty positions. This occurred in the disciplines of Philosophy (elimination of major) and Sociology (elimination of minor). In other cases, it was decided that programs with low enrollments would be eliminated or reduced, as in the case of French (elimination of major), Gender Studies (elimination of major), and German (elimination of minor). Additionally, a position in Music was dropped resulting in the elimination of the music education major; however, the general music major was maintained and a musical theatre major was developed through the joint efforts of the Music and Theatre Departments. Finally, through the generosity of an alumnus, the Physics major, rather than being eliminated, was enhanced.

Opportunities to reorganize departments have been taken advantage of as well. In the last five years, the departments of Geology and Petroleum Engineering have merged, as well as Computer Science and Math, and Biology and Environmental Science. Merging departments allows for efficiencies in maximizing faculty resources to deliver complementary courses in related areas as well as streamlining the pragmatic, day-to-day requirements of operating an
The merger of Geology and Petroleum Engineering resulted in the elimination of one faculty position as well.

While the resource allocation decisions described above demonstrate the College’s commitment to supporting and strengthening the quality of the education it provides, these actions also reveal the planning processes in place are flexible enough to allow for unanticipated opportunities for program reallocation, downsizing, or growth. For example, decisions to downsize a program by taking advantage of a faculty retirement may require a relatively quick evaluation of said program. While all academic programs are scheduled for review on a four-year cycle, flexibility in the process allows for accelerating or delaying a particular program’s review, as described on page 110 of this chapter of the self-study report. Moreover, the new Psychology and Corporate Media graduate programs evidence flexibility in planning in as much as both are being accomplished on limited budgets, in effect functioning initially as financial “break evens.” The Planning Committee is committed to implementing the Strategic Plan and its extension but at the same time has consistently demonstrated the ability to respond to unanticipated events. Additional examples are provided on pages 109-111 of this chapter. It is important to note that any actions taken, however, are carried out in concert with the goals of the Strategic Plan and, by extension, the Core Values and Mission of the College.

3.2.2 Concerns about Academic Staffing

Earlier in this chapter of the self-study report, the question of whether the College will be able, as it grows, to maintain its historically low student-to-faculty ratio (reported as 12:1 in the 2004-05 Catalog) was raised. One selling point of a Marietta College education is close interaction between faculty and students. As more students matriculate or as the College makes staffing choices that create larger class sizes, will the classroom environment devolve into one that is less personal or uses teaching/learning techniques common in large classes?

Similar issues can be raised about the quality of the academic experience when adjunct faculty are used. The In-Depth Programs of Study Core Value states, “Marietta College is committed to offering programs of in-depth study that prepare students for both challenging careers and admission to well-respected graduate and professional schools. Marietta College
offers majors, minors, and other academic programs in those select areas that are consistent with the mission of the College and where it has the expertise and resources [emphasis added] to meet or exceed baselines of excellence.” In areas where adjuncts teach introductory level courses, student interaction with the College’s full-time faculty (and potential academic advisors) early in the student’s college career (resources) is limited. When adjuncts are used in upper-level courses, students can benefit from the professional experience and expertise of these adjuncts (such as in business law, mass media, or education) but questions about their experience as teachers might be raised. Currently, the use of adjuncts poses no problems, but as the institution grows and enrollments put pressure on the full-time faculty, the academic leadership will need to consider these staffing questions.

3.2.3 Resources in Support of Academic Life at Marietta College²

Several learning support services, the existence of many of which can be linked directly to the College’s Core Values, play important roles in maintaining and strengthening the College’s academic environment. Effectively-functioning support services depend on the proper allocation and use of financial and human resources.⁵ A fuller discussion of some of the services introduced here, but in the context of the College’s learning environments and the use of the College’s resources to support student learning and effective teaching, is found in the fourth chapter of this self-study report.

Academic Resource Center

The Academic Resource Center (ARC) was established in 1999 to “provide resources and services to assist all Marietta College students in the acquisition of information and development of skills to achieve their academic potential.” The services provided by the ARC and an assessment of its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission are explained in Chapter 4, pages 210-212.

Campus Writing Center

The Campus Writing Center has been in existence, in various forms, since 1978. The mission of the Writing Center is to “provide a collaborative, supportive, and instructional environment where students work closely with peer tutors to strengthen their college-level writing skills.” The services provided by the Writing Center and an assessment of its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission are also explained in Chapter 4, pages 212-214.
Career Center

As a part of providing career-related services for the College’s students (and alumni), the Director of the Career Center works with faculty teaching the First Year Seminar, providing all first-year students with an introduction to the center’s services and helping them understand that career planning starts their first year in college. She also works with individual faculty to develop workshops and seminars targeted at specific disciplines. Additionally, as first cited in Chapter 1, Significant Academic Changes at the College since 1995, page 18, career planning courses were recently added to the curriculum. Career Planning 200 serves students who are undecided about an academic major and career direction; students taking this course sharpen decision-making skills and focus on the variety of paths available to achieving career satisfaction, beginning with choosing an academic major. Career Planning 400 is for juniors and seniors embarking on internships and/or seeking their first job; the course covers all aspects of the job search. Attention is given to helping students articulate the skills they have developed through their liberal arts education.

Dawes Memorial Library Staff Enhancements

When an opportunity to replace a support staff member in the Dawes Memorial Library occurred in the mid-1990s, the Head Librarian redesigned positions and workloads to allow the College to hire a professional librarian instead of a support staffer. This action did not increase the number of people working in the library; rather, it shifted resources to enhance the number of professional librarians serving the academic community.

Instructional Technologist

Planning for a professional to guide faculty through the process of integrating information technology into their teaching was in process for a number of years. With the receipt of a Title III grant in 2001, funds were provided to acquire and enhance the College’s information technology infrastructure for academics and to hire an Instructional Technologist, all in line with the Technology Core Value.

The Instructional Technologist conducts a variety of seminars and workshops focused on the integration of information technology into teaching and learning at the College and provides individual support to faculty using WebCT on-line course management. Other duties of the
Instructional Technologist, as well as additional benefits realized as a result of the Title III grant and implications for their continued funding once the grant period concludes, are described in Chapter 4.

International Programs

The International Student Office (ISO) serves as one of the most visible and concrete examples of a resource in support of the Internationalization Core Value. The ISO handles all aspects of international students’ lives including answering prospective students’ questions, issuing all paperwork for and dealing with immigration laws and student visas, assisting and orienting students upon their arrival in Marietta, and offering guidance for their academic, social, and emotional well-being. One of the most prominent programs of the ISO is the Mentor Family Program which pairs every international student with a family in the Marietta community. More than 60 families are involved. This caring connection helps international students cope with culture shock and homesickness while at the same time offering insight into family life in the United States. The Mentor Family Program is described more fully at http://www.marietta.edu/~mcip/index.html. In 2004, the International Student Program conducted a self-study under the auspices of administrative unit review. The report may be found in the Resource Room in the administrative unit review reports binders (Resource Room 11).

The College’s Study Abroad Program serves students who wish to study outside of the United States for a summer, semester, or academic year. The College has relationships with several study abroad consortia and exchanges with universities in Brazil and China. Additionally, a number of regular course offerings provide for international experiences. Students in all disciplines are encouraged to take advantage of overseas study opportunities and each semester approximately 10 students do so. The Study Abroad Program is described more fully in Chapter 4, page 200.

Since the early 1990s, Marietta College has hosted a number of visiting Chinese professors. The visiting professors may team-teach a course with a member of the College faculty or offer their own course, generally in Chinese language or political science. In other cases, the visiting professors are here to become immersed in American culture and enhance
their English language skills and thus take courses while sharing their wealth of international experience with the campus community.

A final point regarding Marietta College’s plans for maintaining and strengthening the quality of its educational programs in the future merits mention. The Strategic Plan contains a number of goals and objectives aimed at meeting the Core Values of the College. Of particular relevance to the educational programs are the Liberal Arts Foundation and In-Depth Programs of Study Core Values. A plan is effective only if action is taken to accomplish the strategies contained therein. The current administration has established a remarkable track record in this area. As was noted in the second chapter of this self-study report, when work commenced on the extension to the Strategic Plan during the 2003-2004 academic year, 142 of the 158 recommended actions (i.e., 90%) had been implemented or were in the process of being implemented (Appendix 08); many of the strategies are directly related to the two Core Values just cited with the same level of accomplishment realized. The College is currently moving forward on the goals and objectives of the extended Plan. Moreover, this self-study report offers several internal recommendations for continuous improvement, many of which impact the College’s educational programs. As of this writing, some of the recommendations have already been implemented. In sum, it is clear that Marietta College’s planning goals and accompanying strategies are achieved.6

Examples of Evidence Cited
1 = The organization’s resources are adequate for achievement of the educational quality it claims to provide.
2 = The organization’s history of financial resource development and investment documents a forward-looking concern for ensuring educational quality (e.g., investments in faculty development, technology, learning support services, new or renovated facilities).
3 = Plans for resource development and allocation document the organizational commitment to supporting and strengthening the quality of the education it provides.
4 = The organization’s planning processes are flexible enough to respond to unanticipated needs for program reallocation, downsizing, or growth.
5 = The organization uses its human resources effectively.
6 = The organization has a history of achieving its planning goals.

3.3 Core Component 2c - The organization’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Each academic program and administrative unit at Marietta College engages in ongoing evaluation and assessment to determine the effectiveness of that program or unit in meeting its
goals as well as the overall *Mission* of the College.\(^1\) When it is evidenced that a program or unit is underachieving, adjustments are made so that ineffective or outdated methods do not interfere with continuous improvement. The discussion of this Core Component is organized around the various programs and units at the College. For each, information is provided concerning who collects the needed data, what instruments are used, how the data is evaluated, how the evaluation leads to continuous improvement of the institution, and how the results of the evaluation are in concert with the *Core Values* and *Mission* of the College. Most significantly, numerous examples of continuous improvement are provided that demonstrate the efficacy of the processes in place.\(^2,3\) These data and their analysis eventually form the basis of academic program and administrative unit review.

As outlined in Goal IV of the Strategic Plan, each academic program and administrative unit undergoes formal review by the Planning Committee according to a four-year cycle (refer to pages 93-94 in this chapter of the self-study report). The review schedule, found on pages 22-23 of the Plan, is summarized in Table 3.1. As previously noted, flexibility in the planning process allows for deviation from this schedule on an as-needed basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Academic Programs</th>
<th>Administrative Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Art, Communication, Economics/Management/Accounting, Gender Studies, Leadership, Theatre</td>
<td>Athletics, Billing(Accounts Receivable), Career Center, International Students, McDonough Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>English, History/Political Science, Modern Languages, Philosophy, Sports Medicine</td>
<td>Campus Public Safety, College Relations, Continuing Education, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Repeat Schedule</td>
<td>Repeat Schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review process, including the feedback generated by the Planning Committee, contributes to the improvement of the College.\(^4\) All academic program and administrative unit review reports
and Planning Committee feedback generated since the adoption of the Strategic Plan are available for inspection (Resource Room 13 and 11, respectively). It is important to note that the College fully supports the evaluation and assessment processes in place, both philosophically, in terms of attitudes and actions, and (increasingly) financially; evidence of the latter may be found in the discussion of the evolution of assessment practices at the College in the fourth chapter of this self-study report (pp. 161-171).

Each academic program at the College now has a published vision, mission, goals, and objectives, the latter in the form of student-learning outcomes. As a result of administrative unit review, administrative units routinely evaluate their successes and failures, benchmark their performance, and assess customer satisfaction levels. Some units have developed statements of mission and goals; beginning in 2005-06, the Planning Committee will require all administrative units to develop an explicitly-stated mission and goals in conjunction with their unit review. Although administrative units have been productively assessing their effectiveness through the collection of data and evaluation of the resulting evidence, this step will further enhance the review process.

3.3.1 Evaluation of Academic Programs and Support Services

General Evaluation

Academic program review (pp. 93-94, Chapter 3 and p. 176, Chapter 4) is discussed elsewhere in this self-study report. To summarize, general information regarding academic programs is collected by the Registrar and the Director of Institutional Research. This information includes class size, student-to-faculty ratios in the classroom and as part of the advising process, faculty course loads, number of majors per program, total number of students served, and other critical information. This information is communicated to the programs and made a part of their review by the Planning Committee; the review results in a recommendation to maintain, enhance, reduce, or reorganize the program. Although certain programs will always be sustained in order fulfill the College’s Core Values, ongoing staffing issues are monitored to ensure that each program can successfully deliver quality instruction. Recent staffing decisions made as a result of academic program review are found on pages 115-117 of this chapter of the self-study report.
Support Services

Services directly supporting the academic programs are discussed in detail on pages 210-217 (Section 4.4.1, Resources to Support Student Learning) of this self-study report in the context of the College’s learning environments and the use of the College’s resources to support student learning and effective teaching. In the same section, the methods in place to evaluate these services are discussed.

Career Center

The Career Center conducts a yearly survey of graduates to assess their post graduation status, i.e., graduate/professional school enrollment or employment. Graduates are asked “What advice do you have for the Career Center to better serve students and alumni?” Results are used to enhance services and offerings. Monday Message, a means of regular communication with the campus community, was born out of a comment suggesting that the center provide weekly information. College Central Network was leased to provide students improved access to jobs and internships.

Additionally, as a part of administrative unit review, the Career Center recently administered a Faculty Awareness Survey. Results of the survey show that 87.2% of the respondents are familiar with Career Center services, 61.5% believe students are aware of Career Center services, and 68.4% recommend the Career Center to their students. The survey provided information to assist in marketing specific programs the center offers. Overall, 92.1% of the respondents believe the Career Center provides value-added service to Marietta College students.

A Student Satisfaction Survey was conducted as part of unit review as well. The results of the survey assisted the center in identifying additional services and programs. For example, the survey indicated students didn’t know what took place in the Career Center. To address this issue, regular open houses were instituted to invite students to the center in a non-threatening way.

Faculty Evaluation

The evaluation of faculty is a critical component of academic assessment. Obviously, effective instruction is required in order for the College to meet its educational Mission. The
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Committee is charged with the review and evaluation of faculty based on the process stated in the Faculty Handbook found in The Faculty Manual: “Marietta College is by tradition a teaching-oriented liberal arts college. As part of this emphasis on teaching and on professional competence in general, the College annually reviews faculty performance. The ultimate goals of the review are to recognize excellence and to assist faculty members to improve. The faculty reviews also provide information for decisions on reappointment, tenure, promotion, and raises. All faculty, regardless of rank and tenure status, will be reviewed on a periodic basis.”

Faculty applying for promotion or tenure, or those on tenure-track in their third year of continuous service, submit a portfolio to the RTP Committee. This portfolio includes evidence of effective teaching (e.g., student course evaluations), professional growth and development (e.g., published papers), and service to the College and community (e.g., letters from committee chairs). In addition to reviewing the portfolio, RTP Committee members make classroom visits; two committee members attend one week of a course for each faculty member being evaluated. Department chairs and the Provost also visit classes of faculty being reviewed (as well as those of new faculty).

These data are used to evaluate the effectiveness of individual faculty in meeting the College’s expectations for teaching, professional development, and service. RTP reviews this information and makes recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, or reappointment to the Provost, who in turn makes recommendations to the President and by extension, in tenure cases, to the Board of Trustees. The evaluation is intended to be constructive, particularly in the case of faculty undergoing their third year review. Feedback from the committee and Provost can be used to make any necessary changes so that the individual will be in line with the expectations for granting tenure after the fifth year. In some instances, faculty undergoing their third year review are not recommended for reappointment and are dismissed by the College if it is determined that they are not meeting the basic expectations for faculty. First-year faculty are evaluated by their chair and the Provost; a decision to continue the faculty member must be made by March 15 of their first academic year.
In addition to the activities of RTP, department chairs also conduct a yearly evaluation of the faculty in their respective departments; the evaluation form is included in Appendix 20. Since 2003, this evaluation includes a review of each faculty member’s annual goals in the areas of teaching, research, and service. (A new policy was adopted in 2004 in which full professors’ course evaluations and goals are reviewed annually with a full review every third year). This evaluation is sent to the Provost for review. The Provost then meets with each department chair to discuss the evaluations. Recommendations are made at that time regarding any changes that individual faculty need to make in order to meet the College’s performance expectations.

Curriculum Development

Ongoing discussions between administration and faculty, student evaluations of courses, and monitoring trends in higher education all led to the recent revision of the College’s general education curriculum. In the spring of 2001, the Curriculum Committee, charged in part with the maintenance of the general education program, was assigned this task. The committee and the Provost attended a conference on general education in Asheville, North Carolina in the summer of 2001. That fall, the committee began general discussions with the faculty. The goals of the committee were to integrate the College’s Core Values into the curriculum, develop a distribution model based on disciplines and cognate areas rather than administrative structures, and build on curricular changes made in 2000-01.

In the spring of 2002, committee members began meeting with departments to propose their ideas for the new general education requirements. The broad changes included moving from requirements tied to departments to requirements tied to cognate areas. Expert panels representing multiple disciplines were assigned to each cognate area to develop criteria courses must satisfy to be included in that area. As a result, requirements may be satisfied in the traditional department but may also be satisfied through courses in other departments. For example, a drama course focused on reading great works became a part of the literature cognate area. An imaging course in biology became a part of the fine arts cognate area. New requirements also included six hours in global issues and diversity coursework in keeping with the Core Value of Internationalization, advanced studies in keeping with In-Depth Programs of
Study, and leadership and ethics (Leadership Core Value). The new 21st Century General Education Curriculum took effect coincident with start of the 2003-04 academic year.

A general education assessment plan, described in detail on pages 171-175 in the fourth chapter of this self-study report, was also implemented at that time. Instructors proposing a course to fulfill general education requirements are required to include an assessment plan with the course proposal; each time the course is delivered, the success in meeting at least one of the pertinent cognate-specific student learning outcomes must be measured. The Assessment Committee is charged with collecting, evaluating, and reporting on this data to ensure that the new curriculum is meeting its goals and is in keeping with the Core Values of the College.

3.3.2 Evaluation of Athletics

In September 2003, President Scott asked the Campus Life and Athletics Committee to conduct a full review of intercollegiate athletics at Marietta College. The President presented a list of twenty specific questions for an ad hoc Athletics Review Committee to answer; their response, dated April 27, 2004, may be found in Appendix 21.

The review process began with the Athletics Department contracting an external consultant to conduct an external audit of the department. The audit was undertaken in an effort to provide an objective view of the current state of the athletics program by examining department leadership, personnel, facilities, budget, etc. The goal of the audit was to elucidate the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of and to the program. The audit report was utilized by the Athletics Review Committee to conduct its review. The review process led the Athletics Department to develop a formal statement of its vision, mission, and objectives, akin to those developed by the academic programs, for assessment purposes. The department also formulated a list of specific outcomes tied to its objectives that can be measured to help determine if the latter are being met.

The audit and review processes pointed to a need to engage the campus in a broad discussion of the role of athletics at Marietta College. Consequently, such was held during the fall 2004 semester; administration and faculty met in 12 small groups led by facilitators. The
specific goals of the discussions were to determine if the vision, mission, and objectives of the Athletic Department were consistent with the Mission and Core Values of the College and if athletics were viewed as an integral part of its students’ education. The information gathered from these discussions, as well as responses to a survey distributed at the 2004 Fall Convocation, were used to move the Athletics Review Committee forward. Findings (Appendix 21) were shared with the President’s Cabinet and, at their February 2005 meeting, the Board of Trustees.

The entire process of audit, review, and discussion, which consumed nearly 18 months, ensured that all members of the Marietta College community have a clear understanding of the role of intercollegiate athletics on campus and further accomplished the integration of athletics and education at all levels of involvement at the College. Examples of specific outcomes resulting from this process include:

- a new coaches’ evaluation process was developed for implementation in 2005-06,
- guidelines for use by faculty in advising student-athletes were developed and first used during the summer 2005 new student academic advising sessions,
- standardized forms were developed for reporting, beginning in 2005-06, student-athletes’ academic progress and missed class resulting from participation in athletic contests.

3.3.3 Evaluation of Admission

The evaluation of Admission is directly linked to the strategic planning process. The central goal of the Strategic Plan is “to increase the enrollment of the College to at least 1250 by 2005-06.” Most of the other goals assist in reaching this central goal. The nine Core Values and the means by which the College demonstrates their reality are always viewed in terms of enrollment, and together they provide the framework for defining the College in the marketplace. A plan for how the College might take the Core Values and mold them into a coherent definition or institutional brand was proposed in the 2001-02 Admission Operational Plan written by the Dean of Enrollment Management. The plan makes the following recommendations:

1. Establish the longevity of the College through its roots in the Muskingum Academy and through the College being named one of the 37 “Revolutionary Colleges.”
2. Establish the long history of quality through the early chapter of Phi Beta Kappa and bring up-to-date with references to selective guides and the College’s US News and World Report ranking.
3. Emphasize the characteristics of a small college (e.g., small classes, individual attention).
4. Emphasize the distinctive aspects of the College:
   a. Liberal arts foundation with connection to “real world,”
   b. In-depth and advanced study in chosen major,
   c. Emphasis on areas critical to success in the 21st century: technology, leadership, and internationalization.

The admission staff is then responsible for marketing these aspects of the College to prospective students. In order to do so successfully, they must remain knowledgeable with regard to what is happening at the College and in the general market; to this end, staff members meet at least once a year with department chairs. The chairs update staff on new initiatives and achievements in their programs. Chairs also compose letters to prospective students interested in their programs; the letters are updated annually.

Remaining current with outside trends is more challenging. The Dean of Enrollment Management must continually monitor the market. This is achieved by first defining the College’s student base. Data is kept regarding the demographic characteristics of the student body, e.g., geographic location, family income, reasons for choosing Marietta College, etc. These data are compared with the overall pool of available students and the student body at benchmark colleges. General trends in higher education enrollment can be monitored through publications such as University Business.

Every five years the Admission Operational Plan is updated. In addition to that document, a New Student Enrollment Plan is completed each year. These plans are evaluated by administrators and the Planning Committee to ensure they set forth goals in keeping with the Strategic Plan. The New Student Enrollment Plan for 2002-03 was the first document to report on the admission strategies for implementing the Strategic Plan. Unfortunately, the 2002-03 new student enrollment fell well below the goal of 450 new students. The admission staff worked hard to collect and evaluate data that would inform them why this goal was not met.

Several changes in the local and global community were determined to be responsible for this drop in enrollment. First, the September 11 tragedy of 2001 may have resulted in some students staying closer to home. Second, international students had difficulty obtaining visas to the United States, thus causing a decrease in the China Program and other initiatives in place to
diversify the student body. Locally, West Virginia initiated the Promise Grant Program which provides free tuition to many students who choose to stay in-state for college. Internally, problems with athletic staffing made recruitment of new student athletes less successful. Disruption of the campus by two major building projects (Dyson Baudo Recreation Center and the Rickey Science Center) was likely a contributing factor as well. These issues were all carefully outlined and, more importantly, responded to in the New Student Enrollment Plan for 2003-04. The first priority was to increase local applications. The action plan for this goal was to more strongly emphasize the Gateway Grant which offers additional financial support for students from those counties in Ohio and West Virginia surrounding the College. The Gateway Grant was implemented in the fall of 2000 and was supported by a significant marketing campaign, resulting in 23 additional deposits in 2001. Due to the changes outlined above, it was determined that it was critical to rely on the College’s local market. The reinstatement of the grant, coupled with a significant marketing campaign, led to the enrollment of 142 students from the Gateway area in 2003 (up from 57 the previous year).

Other changes directly related to ongoing evaluation by the admission staff led to the largest class in 25 years (463 new students). For example, the football team, which had always produced a large number of new students, had poor recruitment success in 2002; with the hiring of an entirely new coaching staff, a new recruitment plan was initiated. Significant efforts were also made to enhance on-line marketing strategies by hiring two marketing firms (Connexxia and Stein Communications) and the previously-mentioned enrollment management consultant. The general market trends reveal that students are most likely to use the internet for their initial college search. Therefore, enhancing the College’s web page and on-line links is critical to remain competitive.

While the central goal of reaching 1250 students by 2006 remains, the admission staff continues to evaluate the future direction of the student body as well. It is important that the student body is shaped to meet the Core Values of the College. Enhancing the diversity of the student body (Internationalization Core Value) is one objective. Previously-cited efforts to reshape the curriculum toward this end may help to attract a more diverse population of students. However, the admission staff must also market this important initiative. The staff is also
committed to marketing the commitment of the College to link the *Liberal Arts Foundation* with the *World of Work*. The opportunities for *In-Depth Programs of Study* and internships are also critical marketing tools. Finally, based on the ongoing evaluation of the current student body, it is essential that the College make an effort to enhance the academic quality of its students. Although student enrollment has improved, the College is still not satisfied with its retention rate. “Higher Ground” makes the improvement of student quality and resulting expected increase in graduation rates a high priority.

Retention of students, particularly for the key year (first year to sophomore), has in fact been an ongoing item of attention at Marietta College. An ad hoc Retention Committee was formed some eight years ago; the committee was eventually designated a standing committee. Early on, the committee reviewed historical retention data, undertook specific actions (e.g., a rework of the College’s academic advising system), envisioned new initiatives which were brought to fruition (e.g., Academic Resource Center, Early Academic Warning System), undertook retention studies (e.g., Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory), interviewed student subsets (e.g., transfer students, minority students), and tested commonly held assumptions about attrition/retention (e.g., student-athletes are not well retained). The committee regularly reviewed annual retention data and discussed the meaning of annual surveys (e.g., Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)).

Over the years, it became clear that first year-to-sophomore retention was in the hands of first-year male students; good retention with men translated into good overall retention. Poor retention of men generally reduced the College’s overall retention to 70% or lower. Women are consistently retained at over 80%.

In general, retention is on the rise. For example, the 2000 entering class had a first year-to-sophomore retention of 75.5%, the highest in ten years. The 2002 class was retained at 77.3%, the highest since 1989. Despite stumbling back last year, the trend is definitely upward. “Higher Ground” puts forth a goal of achieving a first year-to-sophomore retention of 84%.
3.3.4 Evaluation of Human Resources Management

All Marietta College employees undergo an annual performance appraisal. (The evaluation of faculty is described on pages 124-126 of this chapter of the self-study report). At each level of the organizational hierarchy of the College, non-teaching employees are evaluated (‘‘exceeds job requirements,’’ ‘‘meets job requirements,’’ or ‘‘needs improvement’’) by their immediate supervisors in the areas of communication, service, work knowledge, problem solving/decision making, dependability, teamwork, and leadership/followership (see Appendix 22). Supervisors are required to include specific examples to justify the highest and lowest ratings and to work with employees in setting goals for the upcoming year. The evaluation must be reviewed and signed by the employee. It should be noted that there is no institutional summary of these evaluations and there is no opportunity for employees to evaluate their supervisors, with the exception of the President and the Provost, who are evaluated by the faculty every two years. However, beginning in 2004, administrative unit heads are evaluated across campus in conjunction with their units’ review by the Planning Committee (see Appendix 22).

Increasing costs of health insurance continues to be a concern for the College. In the past five years, the annual increases have varied widely from a low of about 2% for 2004 to a high of approximately 22% in 2001. The increase for 2005 was 18.5%. In the fall of 2003, the Director of Human Resources established an ad hoc committee (Health Insurance Review Committee) to study the various options available to the College and provide a greater choice of plans for employees. The committee consisted of employees from each classification, a retired faculty member, and a member of the Board of Trustees. As a result of this committee’s work and decisions made by the College administration, three plans, which vary in the deductibles and coinsurance, are offered to employees of the College. In addition, those employees with gross salaries less than $25,000 now pay smaller premiums. Another ad hoc committee examined early retiree health benefits. The most significant recommendation was to change employee eligibility from 58 years of age plus at least 12 years of consecutive full-time service at the College to 60 plus 15 years; trustees approved the recommended changes in February 2005.

In order to monitor staffing levels, the Director of Human Resources prepares monthly reports that list the number of full-time and part-time employees in the categories of teaching,
For each category, comparisons are made to the previous month and previous year and the student-to-staff ratio is calculated. These reports are used internally to monitor trends in staffing and are presented to the Board of Trustees at their meetings in February, May, and October.

3.3.5 Evaluation of Information Technology

Information Technology operates according to the IT Support Plan (Resource Room 16) which details planned IT activities and programs and their funding sources through 2006-07. Most of the activities deal with tangible, easily recognized improvements (e.g., installation of a College-owned fiber optic backbone network, implementation of an authentication process, installation of wireless access points across campus, etc.). However, some activities address issues such as providing the campus community with quick and efficient service, maintaining appropriate IT staffing and expertise, and providing ongoing general IT support for all academic programs. At this time, ongoing surveys of user satisfaction to aid in assessing accomplishments in such areas have not been implemented, but their potential usefulness is recognized. To this end, a “customer” survey is planned at the time of IT’s next administrative unit evaluation, currently scheduled for 2006-07. At the time of IT’s last review, Administrative Computing and IT were separate functions; each unit completed a report according to the guidelines described on pages 93-94 of this chapter of the self-study report. Both reports are available for inspection (see administrative unit review reports binders, Resource Room 11).

The $1.75 million Title III grant (2001-06) is being assessed in a number of ways. The U.S. DOE required an interim progress report at the end of the first six months of the grant period. After that, an annual performance report is required within three months of the completion of the grant year. This report examines qualitative and quantitative data. Some of the data used to gauge the effectiveness of the grant are the number of faculty trained in instructional technology use, the number of courses that successfully integrate technology, and the number of students enrolled in technology-enhanced courses. Title III grant reports are available for inspection (Resource Room 22).
The individuals charged with assessing the grant work closely with the project director to also gather attitudinal data regarding the impact of the increased technology use. Every year, faculty complete the Computer Anxiety (CANX) instrument, a variation of Spielberger’s self-evaluation questionnaire (a 20-item, four-point, Likert-scale instrument), and the Stages of Concern (SOC) instrument (Hall and George, 1979) to measure computer anxiety and concerns that faculty have about the use of technology in the classroom. Student data are also collected regarding use of technology and self-reported levels of expertise.

Finally, each recipient of a Technology Improvement Grant, described on page 217 in the fourth chapter of this self-study report (Section 4.4.2, Resources to Support Effective Teaching), is required to assess the result of the improvement in a qualitative or quantitative form and is occasionally called upon to report the results of their activities at a Faculty Development Forum.

The results of these assessment processes indicate that over the Title III grant period, computer use among students is increasing and students are using computers in more varied ways. Among faculty, use of instructional technology is increasing. The number of students taking at least one course incorporating technology has increased nearly twenty-fold (from 63 students to 1179). The number of faculty members trained in the use of technology has increased by a factor of 11 (from 8 at the beginning of the grant to 88). After each training session, participants evaluate the session and offer suggestions for other training that would be helpful to them.

Results from the SOC instrument completed annually by faculty have been in line with expectations from a successful implementation. Interestingly, the CANX instrument showed a spike in year three of the grant period; in response, the project director (i.e., Instructional Technologist) has concentrated more on one-on-one sessions with faculty who are less proficient in the use of technology than their colleagues instead of formal classroom-based training exercises.

The TAG also makes recommendations for continuous improvement. The design of multimedia classrooms was modified, for example, based on evaluation and assessment.
Originally, desk-type multimedia stands were purchased. As a result of a survey of the faculty by the TAG, it was found that podium-style lecterns were more appropriate as most faculty taught standing up and disliked stooping or sitting to use the desk-type multimedia equipment.

3.3.6 Evaluation of Physical Plant Operations

Like most colleges and universities, Marietta College continues to struggle to find the funds needed for the repair, maintenance, and upkeep of its buildings and grounds. The Director of the Physical Plant oversees an operation that consists of approximately 45 buildings and 100 acres, and a total of 33 full-time employees along with additional part-time staff. In recent years, three major buildings were added to the responsibilities of the Physical Plant staff: McCoy Hall, the Dyson-Baudo Recreation Center, and the Rickey Science Center. At the same time, only one major building was eliminated (Timblin Hall, a student residence). In a program review report to the Strategic Planning Committee in March 2000, the Director noted that Marietta College has 29% more gross square feet than comparable colleges, has facilities to support a student FTE of 1390, but spends 13% less on facilities operations and maintenance than comparable colleges. Ongoing budget review and planning has resulted in recent modest increases in staff.

In 1998, two major studies were completed in an effort to improve residence life and make the College more energy efficient. Burgess and Niple, an architectural and engineering firm, completed a Residence Hall Master Plan (Resource Room 23). This plan assessed the condition of the structures and utilities of the residence halls. It also estimated the costs for repairs, improvements, and new construction. This plan resulted in the construction of McCoy Hall and the demolition of Timblin Hall, as well as the development of new parking facilities and intramural fields, as described further in the next section of this self-study report. Also in 1998, Honeywell completed a Utilities Asset Modernization Program (Resource Room 24). As a result of this study, the centralized campus steam generation and distribution system was replaced by a series of energy efficient satellite boilers. Other upgrades were completed to decrease consumption of electricity and water. It is estimated that these improvements have resulted in $122,000 annual savings in utility bills.
At least annually the Director of the Physical Plant updates a comprehensive list of prioritized safety and deferred maintenance items for all College buildings. In his report of May 2005, the list included items totaling $720,000 in the most urgent category (urgency rating of 5), and $1,148,000 in the urgency 4 category. This information is used by the Cabinet in determining budget priorities and it is reported to the Board of Trustees twice a year. In the past few years, the Board committed over $2,500,000 for the most urgent projects.

In an effort to provide prompt and effective responses to the campus community’s needs, the Physical Plant has developed a facilities maintenance and repair work order system and database that allow individuals to report requests for service and maintenance. The requests can be reported electronically, by phone, or in writing. Work is completed by College employees or outside contractors. Some reported items are added to the list of deferred maintenance.

In the fall of 2003, a detailed review of the Physical Plant administration and service was completed. This included a campus survey and an on-site review by an outside third party; the resulting report is available for inspection (Resource Room 25). As a result of this review, the Director identified several general issues that need to be addressed. These include communication between the Physical Plant and members of the College community, safety concerns, productivity of the Physical Plant staff, completing the work order system, and clarifying the expectations for the Physical Plant according to the evolving needs of the College.

Examples of improvements implemented, as of this writing, include:

- In each building, Building Coordinators are identified to streamline and facilitate communication between the Physical Plant and members of the campus community.
- Faculty, staff, and students are invited to and frequently participate in the planning and execution of all construction, renovation, and large repair projects in the facilities they use.
- All Physical Plant staff attend formal, documented safety training at least quarterly. Older powered equipment, especially grounds equipment, that lacked required safeguards has been phased out or replaced.
- Investments have been made in training and equipment that can improve productivity and quality in housekeeping floor care, heating and air conditioning diagnostics, and lawn and athletic field maintenance.
- Additional Physical Plant staff have been hired for services, maintenance, and repair of new facilities. Productivity has been improved by hiring new staff with multi-trade skills, allowing completion of a wider variety of work.
The completed work order system allows Building Coordinators to make on-line requests for work and review the real time status of work in progress.

### 3.3.7 Evaluation of Student Life

The activities of the Student Life administration and staff are critical to the success of a Residential College. Based on the just-cited 1998 Residence Hall Master Plan and internal student satisfaction surveys, as well as national trends demonstrating that today’s students have higher expectations regarding privacy, computer access, and living arrangements than the College’s outdated residence halls could meet, it became a central goal of the College in general and Student Life in particular to upgrade the residence halls.

The Residence Hall Master Plan called for a new residence hall to take the place of Timblin and Parsons Halls, the most outdated of the student residence halls, and also called for renovation of the other residence halls. In 2001, a new residence hall was built and named for the McCoy family, long-time supporters of the College. The residence hall was funded with building loans; annual payments are made from the operating budget. In the summer of 2003, the most dilapidated end of the Timblin/Parsons complex was demolished and replaced with a parking lot. This demolition completed one of the most important goals for Student Life in recent years. Moreover, as of this writing, Fayerweather Hall, a former residence hall, is being remodeled and will return to service in the fall of 2005; it will house 54-58 upperclassmen. This work is funded by future housing revenues.

With significant progress made in the area of student housing, the Student Life staff set their sights on addressing the Residential College Core Value. Obviously, the quality of residence life goes well beyond building structures. The Student Life staff emphasizes the value of the residential college environment, beginning with an on-campus first-year student orientation program before the beginning of the fall semester. The First Year Seminar, coordinated by the Assistant Dean for First Year Seminar and Advising, exposes students to the academic expectations of college life and the many issues they will face outside of the classroom. The concurrent College Life and Leadership Lab, coordinated by the Dean of Students, educates students about the available resources on campus as well as tackling issues such as drug and alcohol abuse and sexual harassment. In 2003, a grant from the McGregor
Foundation provided funding for a faculty-student mentoring program entitled Hartel Fellows. This program is administered by the Dean of Students and the Provost. Faculty members work with first-year students in their residence halls to develop programming and provide another source of support and counsel. All of these activities serve to help support students and enhance their experiences as residents of Marietta College. Their success in doing so is assessed by student evaluation as well as evaluation by the participating faculty and staff.

Student Life also addresses the needs of students by providing direct services such as health care and psychological counseling. Data regarding student utilization of these services and student needs has recently led to major changes. In 2002, the College outsourced student health services. The College engaged Broughton Health Care Services; their facility is located just across from the campus on Seventh Street and provides a number of services (e.g., lab testing) that could not be offered by the on-campus health service. Analysis by the Student Life staff and administration also revealed an increasing need for psychological services. In addition to basic counseling services, it was clear that many students had serious psychiatric diagnoses and were on medication. To meet this need, a full-time psychologist was hired in 2003, replacing a part-time counselor. There are plans to add an additional half-time counselor, concurrent with the start of the fall 2005 term, as well.

The Student Life staff has also attempted to implement other Core Values set forth in the Strategic Plan. To focus on the World of Work Core Value, Student Life expanded campus visits by professionals in specific careers. Activities that focus on diversity (Internationalization Core Value) have been enhanced through campus speakers and programs. In addition, the staff is working to find a suitable place on campus for international students to worship. Surveys are administered to first-year students on a regular basis (e.g., College Student Expectations Questionnaire (CSXQ), College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)); these surveys focus on students’ expectations regarding campus life. The results assist in administrative decision making regarding student life and provide insight into which of the College’s Core Values are met in this area. Survey results are available for inspection (Resource Room 26).
Examples of Evidence Cited
1 = The organization demonstrates that its evaluation processes provide evidence that its performance meets its stated expectations for institutional effectiveness.
2 = The organization maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using organizational information.
3 = Appropriate data and feedback loops are available and used throughout the organization to support continuous improvement.
4 = Periodic review of academic and administrative subunits contribute to the improvement of the organization.
5 = The organization provides adequate support for its evaluation and assessment processes.

3.4 Core Component 2d - All levels of planning align with the organization’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

As shown earlier in this chapter of the self-study report, planning and evaluation of all kinds takes place across the Marietta College campus. To avoid having academic programs and administrative units function at cross-purposes, all planning at the College is grounded in the goals and strategies of the College’s Strategic Plan and its extension, and consequently, is driven by the Mission and Core Values of the College. This is evidenced, in part, by one central issue each academic program and administrative unit must respond to every four years as part of program review—what progress has the academic program made toward the objectives listed in and what adjustments have been made as a result of the Strategic Plan, and how does the administrative unit’s five-year plan support the College’s Strategic Plan? In other words, all units on campus are expected to reconcile their plans with the College’s Strategic Plan. Part of the work of the Planning Committee is to ensure this takes place. The end result is a number of coordinated planning processes centered on the Mission and Core Values of the College.¹

The Core Values, described in full on pages 20-21 of Chapter 1 of this self-study report, provide evidence of the College’s recognition of the multiple factors influencing the world in which the College and its students exist and the importance of addressing these factors in the planning process.² For example:

- **In Depth Programs of Study** reflects recognition of the importance of offering a quality education, one that “…prepare(s) students for both challenging careers and admission to well-respected graduate and professional schools.” The College offers only those academic programs “…consistent with the mission of the College and where it has the expertise and resources to meet or exceed baselines of excellence.”
- **Liberal Arts Foundation** stresses “…the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and effective communication skills” through a general education in the liberal arts. Moreover, the extension to the Strategic Plan makes the assessment of student learning a specific expectation.
Internationalization makes clear the College recognizes the importance of having systems in place that prepare Marietta College students “…to thrive in a diverse, global society.”

Technology commits the College to preparing students “…to succeed in our increasingly technological society.” Securing the Title III grant, and the College’s commitment to continue funding those initiatives resulting from the grant once the grant expires, exemplify actions taken to address recognized influencing factors.

Leadership promotes the College’s belief that “the role of citizen-leader must become a way of life if we are to create a livable, sustainable, ethical future.”

As has been discussed, the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan and its extension aim at satisfying the Core Values.

It is equally important that planning processes link with budgeting processes. A description of Marietta College’s annual operations budgeting process may be found on pages 98-99 of this chapter of the self-study report. In addition, Appendix 18 contains a number of documents that guide the reader through the development of the 2005-06 budget, serving as a detailed example of how the process works. Linkage between the College’s planning and budgeting processes is evidenced by the fact that strategic initiatives priorities are derived from the Strategic Plan and used by the Planning Committee to make strategic initiatives budget recommendations. Moreover, program maintenance budget recommendations developed by the BAG are also evaluated by the Planning Committee.

3.4.1 Role of the Planning Committee in Planning for the Future

The role of the Planning Committee, as demonstrated throughout this self-study report, is integral to all planning that takes place at Marietta College. The Committee’s work may be categorized in two ways: ongoing activities and ad hoc issues. Ongoing activities include academic program and administrative unit reviews, interaction with the BAG, and monitoring progress toward achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan. For example, as discussed in Chapter 2 and documented in Appendix 08, the Planning Committee had overseen action on 142 of the 158 recommended strategies outlined in the Strategic Plan by the time the Committee commenced with work on the extended Plan. Moreover, the Committee’s interaction with the BAG during the annual operations budgeting process clearly demonstrates the role of planning in budgeting, and, accordingly, the College’s operations. Academic program and administrative
unit reviews have also resulted in a number of actions described elsewhere in this self-study report; all decisions made are measured against the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan. Impromptu issues include, for example, updating the College’s Strategic Plan, holding faculty and staff salary discussions, and considering what it means to be student-centered.

3.4.2 Role of the President’s Cabinet in Planning for the Future

The President’s Cabinet consists of the President, Provost, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Dean of Enrollment Management, Vice President for Advancement, Dean of Student Life, and Director of Athletics. Meeting for two to three hours each week and having all-day retreats every six months or so, the Cabinet is the core body responsible for short- and long-term planning and decision making for the College. The Cabinet’s broad membership ensures that issues are evaluated from diverse perspectives. The Dean of Enrollment Management considers how decisions will appear to prospective students and their families. The Provost views issues with an eye toward academic quality. The impact of decisions on the College’s fund-raising efforts and its donors is assessed by the Vice President for Advancement. The Vice President for Administration and Financeexamines topics and their impact on the short- and long-term budget, while the Dean of Student Life reflects on the effects of decisions from a student life and co-curricular perspective. The Athletics Director evaluates situations and how they impact student-athletes.

Relying on the Strategic Plan as a guide, members of the Cabinet consider short- and long-term matters that touch all divisions of the College. However, while the Plan does serve as a guide, the Cabinet must not ignore opportunities for innovation and progress not specifically identified in the Plan.

Short-Term Planning and Decision Making

Throughout the year, members of the Cabinet work with models prepared by the Director of Financial Aid that forecast enrollment three years out. Using four years of historical data broken down by semester (fall, spring) and by gender, the models forecast attrition rates from one semester to the next, the percentages of students that remain in the same class from one semester to the next, and the percentages of students that advance to the next class after each semester. As tuition revenue makes up approximately 80% of the College’s total annual
revenue, the Cabinet pays close attention to the data and responds accordingly. The Admission Office provides the Cabinet with weekly summary updates of admission data. The Cabinet monitors the reports to anticipate staffing needs (e.g., multiple sections of courses may be required) and housing needs (e.g., number of beds required in the residence halls). For example, at the end of April 2004, the Provost was able to alert department chairs that one to two extra sections of each first-year course might need to be offered in the fall 2004 term based on data from the admission reports.

While the Cabinet faces decisions about enrollment and housing every year, some short-term situations demand the Cabinet’s attention less frequently. Several examples can be used to demonstrate this aspect of the Cabinet’s planning and decision-making role. In March 2002, the Cabinet first got a sense of alarming enrollment news. Projections of 100 fewer new students (compared to the previous year) for the fall 2002 term translated into a $1 million budget shortfall. From March through October 2002, the Cabinet labored with projections of where to cut the $1 million from the operating budget. Out of this situation came the Cabinet’s decision to invite proposals for master’s programs consistent with the College’s Mission and Core Values which could bring immediate new revenue streams and new enrollments to the College. Another example of a more short-term decision involves the State of Ohio permitting, as of April 2004, an individual to carry a concealed weapon. The Cabinet met to discuss how to handle this public safety issue; President Scott discussed options with the College’s legal counsel and then issued a statement to the entire campus community regarding the College’s concealed weapon policy.

A recent example illustrating the rapidity with which the President’s Cabinet can act in times of crisis was provided by the September 2004 floods. As the documents found in the Resource Room 27 demonstrate, the quick decisions made, necessitated by the nature of the event, were sound and evidence concern for the safety of the students and employees of the College. Communication with the campus community was excellent throughout the ordeal; at least daily reports and instructions were conveyed by e-mail, voice mail, and on the College web site. Similarly, in response to the events of September 11, 2001, the Cabinet quickly issued an updated emergency crisis management plan (Resource Room 27) to the campus community.
Long-Term Planning and Decision Making

The Financial Planning Core Value states that “the primary goal of budget planning is to provide a framework for decision making that results in a balance between expected revenues and projected expenditures. The primary goal of financial planning is to facilitate the development of long-range policy initiatives.” As described above, in light of the budget situation for the 2002-03 academic year, the Cabinet explored new programs that could enhance the quality of education as well as bring additional revenue to the campus over the long-term in addition to immediate new revenue streams. These new programs would complement the institution’s collection of undergraduate and graduate offerings.

Another matter of increasingly long-term importance is student housing. As enrollment and retention shift over the years, housing matters rise and fall in short-term importance. This is an episodic issue that is generally addressed on an as-needed basis. However, new enrollment and selectivity goals in the Strategic Plan are making the housing question more of a long-term concern. If these goals are met, the College will be recruiting better students who will more likely stay at the College, putting pressure on the institution to increase housing. The Cabinet held an all-day retreat to discuss this issue and as a result, a proposal was made and the Board of Trustees approved a $4 million plan to renovate Fayerweather Hall for additional housing space (described in Chapter 1, Significant Physical Changes in the College since 1995, p. 17).

One of the overarching roles of the Cabinet is to scan the broader higher education environment. This includes networking with administrators at other institutions to discuss how they address various situations. Consistent with the College’s Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Plan, the Cabinet plans and makes decisions that will permit the College to fulfill that Mission.

On the subject of long-range planning, it is important to reemphasize the College’s planning processes allow for reprioritization of goals when necessary because of changing environments. In addition to the examples just described, Section 3.1.3, Plan Modification and Assessment, further illustrates flexibility in planning, but in consonance with the Strategic Plan, as a result of changes in market conditions and unforeseen opportunities.
Examples of Evidence Cited
1 = Coordinated planning processes center on the mission documents that define vision, values, goals, and strategic priorities for the organization.
2 = Planning documents give evidence of the organization’s awareness of the relationships among educational quality, student learning, and the diverse, complex, global, and technological world in which the organization and its students exist.
3 = Planning processes link with budgeting processes.
4 = Implementation of the organization’s planning is evident in its operations.
5 = Long-range strategic planning processes allow for reprioritization of goals when necessary because of changing environments.

In sum, Marietta College effectively prepares for the future. A previously-cited survey collected during Homecoming 2004 (Resource Room 10) asked alumni to respond to the statement: Marietta College seems to effectively prepare for the future. Unfortunately, of the surveys returned, only six respondents understood and responded to the question correctly; the rest responded in terms of how the College prepared them for the future. All six did agree with the statement, citing as supporting evidence:

- McCoy Hall and the Dyson Baudo Recreation Center and other facilities improvements,
- excellent (administrative) staff,
- successful comprehensive campaign,
- changing curriculum,
- working advisory groups,
- emphasis on scholarships for prospective students.

As first described in Chapter 2, a focus group consisting of faculty, staff, students, and external constituents was asked, in the spring of 2004, to respond to a number of issues related to how the College prepares for the future (Resource Room 09). Questions addressed the College’s planning and decision-making processes, efforts made to align planning processes among various units at the College, and how the College’s Mission and Core Values are incorporated into planning for the future. This provided a few (edited) comments about the College’s planning processes:

- Some felt the College needs to provide more details about projects being undertaken.
- The College needs to increase communication with its graduate students. (Note: A graduate student orientation program was started in the fall of 2004).
- More effort is needed to align planning processes among various units at the College.
- Planning and action are consistent with the Core Values.
- Improvements in facilities need to align with increasing enrollments.
It appears that while it is recognized that planning is consistent with the Core Values, better communication with the campus community about how planning occurs at the College in general and the specifics of major planning projects needs to take place.

3.5 Strengths, Challenges, and Internal Recommendations

As related to Criterion Two, Preparing for the Future, Marietta College’s strengths, challenges, and internal recommendations to overcome said challenges were recognized during the self-study process.

Strengths

1. Resource assessment is wide-ranging and comprehensive; all of the processes and documents in place are in consonance with the Strategic Plan and its extension.
2. The College benchmarks its academic and administrative organization and activities and monitors the marketplace to ascertain the College market position and its appropriateness.
3. The Strategic Plan and supporting program and departmental plans continually evolve to promote their applicability and feasibility.
4. Flexibility in planning and resource allocation permits the College to address unexpected challenges and opportunities.
5. The resources committed by the College to educational programs appear to be adequate as evidenced by comparative data and the assessment of academic programs’ student learning outcomes.
6. Resource development and investment by the College evidences a forward-looking concern for ensuring educational quality.
7. The College carefully allocates instructional resources through program enhancements, program maintenance, and program reductions and reorganizations.
8. The administration of the College demands that planning is followed by implementation.
9. Each academic and administrative unit undergoes formal review on a four-year cycle, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, contributing to continuous improvement of the College.
10. The College has a number of ongoing planning processes that are coordinated through the Strategic Plan, and, consequently, are grounded in the Mission and Core Values of the College.
11. The College links its planning and budgeting processes.

Challenges

1. Although considerable progress has been made in dealing with deferred maintenance, the list of needs is still lengthy.
2. Additional upgrades of classrooms and technology to accommodate modern teaching methods will continue to be a challenge for the College.
3. Maintaining the College’s low 12:1 student-to-faculty ratio may pose a challenge as the College grows. Increased use of adjuncts to do so is viewed with some reservation.
4. Academic department budgets have remained approximately constant during recent years.
5. The College’s annual 7-8% drawdown on the endowment to help fund operating and capital expenses is unfavorable compared to benchmark institutions’ level of 4½-5½%.
6. While all academic programs have a published vision, mission, goals, and objectives, only a few administrative units have an explicitly-stated mission and goals.

Internal Recommendations
1. Continue to address, in the annual budgeting process, the needs of deferred maintenance and facilities upgrades.
2. Continue the practice of monitoring the College’s student-to-faculty ratio while evaluating to what level this ratio could increase without adversely impacting the Marietta College experience.
3. Continue the budgeting practice of setting aside funds for the Provost and academic division coordinators to use in meeting specific, one-time needs of academic departments.
4. Each administrative unit should develop an explicitly-stated mission and goals that will become a part of the administrative unit review process.
5. Make a concerted effort to better inform the campus community of planning taking place at the College.

As a result of self-study, it has been shown in this, the third chapter of this self-study report, that

- Marietta College realistically plans for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends,
- Marietta College’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plan for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future,
- Marietta College’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement,
- all levels of planning at Marietta College align with the College’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

In addition to unique material, over 90% of the Examples of Evidence related to Criterion Two, as cited in the Higher Learning Commission’s Handbook of Accreditation, were referenced as evidence in this chapter. Moreover, owing to the evaluative nature of the self-study, several internal recommendations for continuous improvement, some of which have already been acted upon, are made.

In conclusion, Marietta College meets, or exceeds, Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future.
Calculated as follows:

Gross tuition and fees revenue less all scholarship and financial aid expense, divided by the total number of full-time equivalent students.

Note: Full-time equivalent students is calculated as all full-time students plus all part-time students divided by 2.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the average net tuition and fees revenue received from each student. This is an indicator of the school's market strength since it indicates the amount students are willing to pay to attend the school.

** Higher values are generally favorable **
Figure 3.3

Tuition Discount Percentage

Calculated as follows:

All scholarship and financial aid expense, divided by gross tuition and fees revenue.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the percentage financial aid represents of gross tuition and fees, also referred to as the tuition discount given to students.

** Lower values are generally favorable **
Educational Expenses per Student FTE

Calculated as follows:

All expenses, excluding auxiliary services expenses and financial aid, divided by the total number of full-time equivalent students.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the amount of average educational expenses incurred per student and is a broad measure of the institution's educational efficiency.

** Lower values are generally favorable as long as expenditures are sufficient to provide appropriate levels of service**
Calculated as follows:

Unrestricted net assets divided by the total number of full-time equivalent students.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the amount of unrestricted net assets available per student and is a measure of the institution's spendable reserves relative to the number of students served by the institution annually.

** Higher values are generally favorable **
Figure 3.6

Student FTE's per Faculty FTE

Calculated as follows:

Student FTE's divided by Faculty FTE's.

Note: Faculty FTE's is calculated as all full-time faculty plus all part-time faculty divided by 2.

Interpretation:

This ratio is an indicator of the number of students each professor educates. It also is an indicator of the level of individual attention a student expects to receive. Abnormally high ratios in comparison to the peer groups indicate that a school may have a problem delivering the type of attention and service a student expects to receive. An abnormally low ratio in comparison to the peer groups may indicate a school's faculty is larger and therefore more costly, causing the school to be less able to compete from a cost of education standpoint.

** Lower values are generally favorable **
Calculated as follows:

Unrestricted net assets divided by total expenses. Total expenses includes all financial aid.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the buffer provided to the annual operating budget by the institution's unrestricted net assets. In other words, the percentage of the budget that is covered by existing unrestricted net assets.

** Higher values are generally favorable **
Long-Term Investments as % of Assets

Calculated as follows:

Long-term investments divided by total assets.

Interpretation:

This ratio is an indicator of the percentage of the institution's endowment comprises of its assets. A larger investment pool is an indicator of greater flexibility for the institution in managing its operations.

** Higher values are generally favorable **
Calculated as follows:

Total investment income, including unrealized gains & losses, divided by long-term investments.

Interpretation:

This ratio is an indicator of how effectively the institution's assets are invested. A high rate of return, in comparison to peer groups, in a strong market situation may indicate a riskier, more aggressive investment strategy that desired. Whereas, a low rate of return, in comparison to peer groups, in a strong market may indicate an overly conservative investment strategy.

** Higher values are generally favorable as long as the level of risk assumed is appropriate**
Calculated as follows:

Net assets divided by total assets.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures theinstitution's equity position as a percentage of its assets. In essence, it indicates the extent to which donors have invested in the institution as well as how effectively the institution has been able to accumulate operating surpluses.

** Higher values are generally favorable **
Calculated as follows:

Depreciation expense plus interest expense, divided by operational expenses.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures annual capital costs as a percentage of operational expenses by aggregating the depreciation of plant facilities with the applicable cost of borrowed funds.

** Lower values are generally favorable **
Calculated as follows:

The change in net assets (net income) *divided by* all revenue, including realized and unrealized investment gains, and all investment income and excluding any financial aid deduction.

Interpretation:

This ratio measures the degree to which the institution has balanced its annual operating expenses with revenues, support, and net capital gains. This ratio is analogous to the measure of return on sales used by corporations.

**Higher values are generally favorable**
Figure 3.13
Portion of Budget Paid by Source of Revenue

2004 Marietta College

- Net Tuition & fees: 6%
- Auxiliary services: 25%
- Private gifts: 5%
- Government grants: 5%
- Investment income & gains: 26%
- Other: 19%

2003 Marietta College

- Net Tuition & fees: 11%
- Auxiliary services: 1%
- Private gifts: 5%
- Government grants: 22%
- Investment income & gains: 48%
- Other: 18%

2003 Bacc2

- Net Tuition & fees: 5%
- Auxiliary services: 2%
- Private gifts: 3%
- Government grants: 17%
- Investment income & gains: 39%
- Other: 19%

2003 Bacc1

- Net Tuition & fees: 11%
- Auxiliary services: 3%
- Private gifts: 3%
- Government grants: 21%
- Investment income & gains: 34%
- Other: 20%

Calculated as follows:

Each revenue type, divided by the total operating expenses, excluding all financial aid. These ratios indicate the percentage of the operating budget covered by each source of revenue.

** Higher total values are favorable **
Calculated as follows:

Each expense category, including financial aid, divided by total expenses, including financial aid expense. These ratios indicate the percentage of the budget each item comprises.