



# **Assessment of Strategic Indicators 2007-2008**

*A Progress Report on the Strategic Plan for Guilford College 2005-2010:  
Creative Leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

Kent John Chabotar  
May 2008

## **1. Executive Summary**

The purpose of this annual report is to provide a summary analysis of the effectiveness indicators associated with the implementation of *The Strategic Plan for Guilford College 2005-2010*. Five sets of quantifiable strategic indicators measure the College's progress toward the achievement of the goals in the plan. This "dashboard" is one of two ways that the College assesses the plan. The other is the monitoring of the completion of the many action steps needed to accomplish each objective (that were linked, in turn, to one or more larger goals).

The Strategic Plan (SLRP) contains three continuing goals and two operational priorities:

- Excel at Education that Transforms Our Students and Our World
- Expand Our Academic Community
- Strengthen Our Quaker Presence and Enhance Campus Diversity
- Stewardship and Accountability
- Improve Our Campus Community

The measures help identify major trends in each continuing or operational goal and track related indicators, both internal and comparative.

Monitoring the programmatic and policy outcomes through these indicators become even more critical given current revenue constraints and budget reductions. The Strategic and Long-Range Planning Committee (SLRP) actively uses the strategic indicators as mission-centered, high-level measures of their performance in critical decision areas and have been using them to shape, inform, and support their ongoing efforts.

The *Annual Effectiveness Indicators* are included as an addendum

## **2. Using the Strategic Indicators**

***What is a Strategic Indicator?*** A strategic indicator is a mission-centered, high-level measure of organizational performance in critical decision areas used to shape, inform, and support policy-making. It connects planning and action, provides concrete targets around which to mobilize enthusiasm and resources, promotes the use of data for discussion and decision-making, and improves accountability for results.

Strategic indicators advance benchmarking by using industry standards or the competition to evaluate and often improve key programs and services. Some of the most salient indicators relate to efficiency and

productivity, financial outcomes, student and educational outcomes, and rankings published by *U. S. News and World Report*.

**Evaluation of Strategic Indicators.** The acronym C-A-S-H suggests the four ways that Guilford College could evaluate its strategic indicators: comparatively with similar institutions, with reference to a national average or industry standard, and historically within the same institution over time.

**Comparison.** The strategic plan identified separate groups of peer and aspirant institutions to which Guilford College could be compared.

- *Peer Institutions.* Peer institutions are colleges and universities that are similar to the Guilford of today as well as the Guilford of the near future, during the first few years of the implementation of the strategic plan. Factors that determine similarity include endowment, educational expenses, revenue, enrollment, faculty size, and academic reputation. Peers included Albright College, Oglethorpe University, and Stonehill College.
- *Aspirant Colleges.* Aspirant colleges represent goals. Since Guilford intends to use the strategic plan to strengthen all aspects of college life, Guilford should become more like its current aspirant group and should expect to have a new group of peers in 2010. Aspirants included Furman University, Goucher College, and Sarah Lawrence College.

The unusually high number of adult students at a liberal arts college like Guilford complicates finding appropriate peer and aspirant colleges.

**Averages.** National averages can be gained through the annual IPEDS survey by different size of institution and control as well as from *U. S. News and World Report* and other sources. Another source for Guilford College is the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that is designed to obtain annual information from scores of colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. In the first six years, over 970 different colleges and universities have participated in NSSE. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) is a national longitudinal study of the American higher education system. Established in 1966 at the American Council on Education, the CIRP the nation's largest and oldest empirical study of higher education, involving data on some 1,800 institutions and over 11 million students. Finally, the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) is a consortium of 130 private colleges and universities that supports member institutions through the collection and sharing of national comparative data needed for effective strategic planning.

**Standards.** Standards include our own goals derived from the strategic plan, ratings needed for bond covenants or to achieve a certain bond rating, and industry standards.

**Historical.** This is Guilford College over time. It allows the college or university to detect shifting student satisfaction, academic reputation, revenue dependencies, expense priorities, and other strategic indicators.

### 3. Assessment of Results by SLRP Continuing/Operational Goal Area

Attached are five tables that report Guilford College's progress-to-date on the strategic plan. Each table lists the continuing or operational goal and strategic indicators, both internal and comparative. It shows where the College has been (2004), is now (2007 or most recent), and aims to be when the plan ends (2010). Whenever possible, tables also compare Guilford College to our aspirant and peer groups. A range

within these groups is useful information because reporting only the median or average can be deceptive when a few institutions in the comparison group are much higher or lower than everyone else.

A major effort has been made to clear anomalies in the data, e.g., inconsistencies in NSSE questions and reporting. *The strategic indicators that are also part of the U. S. News annual rankings are italicized.*

### **Continuing Goal 1: Excel at Education That Transforms Our Students and Our World**

***Classroom and Instruction.*** Areas of better performance in Continuing Goal 1 include average class size (at 16 and below the 2010 goal of 20) and student-faculty ratio (now at 15:1 and better than the 16:1 goal). The percentage of classes under 20 students is currently at 69% versus the 65% goal, better than the averages of both peer (53%) and aspirant colleges (64%). The maintenance of these trends will be critical as enrollment continues to grow until 2010, because the strategic plan calls for increasing the number of faculty positions at the same rate as enrollment growth.

***Guilford Connects.*** Progress lags in the percentage of students annually participating in community service (up from 2004 to 34% in 2007, versus 50% goal). *Guilford Connects* promotes the concept of experiential learning and will encourage students to participate in extra-curricular events and activities, including community service. As this strategic priority is implemented, the percentage of all degree-seeking students participating in the digital portfolio initiative (10% in 2007 versus 40% goal) and the percentage of students receiving a co-curricular transcript (currently at 0% versus 40% goal) will rise markedly. In the fall of 2007, eight sections of FYE lab piloted the beginning stages of portfolio development, including introducing reflection pieces for inclusion in the portfolio. Progress continues, although funding has been a major challenge. Thankfully, \$60,000 grant funding from Lilly and the Initiative on Faith and Practice will provide funding during the next fiscal year to support a programmer for *Guilford Connects*.

***Academic Reputation.*** Guilford College has more work to do in academic reputation in the *U. S. News* peer assessment score (2.8 in 2007 versus the 3.3 goal), a major driver of the *U.S. News* annual rankings. We also need to increase the percentage of students who reported academic reputation as a very important reason for choosing Guilford (42% in 2004 and 49% in 2007 versus the 70% goal; over 10 percentage points lower than the peer and aspirant averages). Academic reputation continues to be the top determinant of college choice (followed by post-graduation job prospects, location, appearance – also known as curb appeal – and cost). The theory is that academic reputation attracts academically talented students who tend to have higher rates of persistence and retention. The College expects that the implementation of *Principled Problem Solving* (PPS) and *Guilford Connects*, along with the QEP focus on writing in students' fields-of-study, will continue to be organizing principles of the curriculum. They will provide a distinctive and central theme of academic programs at Guilford College that will increasingly provide higher visibility among the nation's colleges and universities. These initiatives will help to improve academically-driven scores. The visibility of *Principled Problem Solving* benefited from the 2007 hiring of the director as well as the establishment of the Center.

### **Continuing Goal 2: Expand our Academic Community**

***Admissions and Enrollment.*** The major focus of this goal is the growth of the enrollment. Approximately 78% of the College's general operating revenue comes directly from student enrollment. Increased enrollment also constitutes the major funding source for the priorities of the strategic plan. Therefore, all enrollment analyses and potential changes are accompanied by careful assessment of associated issues

including: the maintenance of admissions standards, trade-offs between changes in enrollment and expenses, housing and facilities, faculty workload, and the academic experience. Guilford decided to reduce the enrollment headcount targets established in the strategic plan (from 3,338 to 2,830 for fall 2009). This is a more conservative estimate. Notable trends include:

- Part of growing enrollment is new admissions, where the yield rate among traditional students (percentage of admitted students who enroll) of 22% is below the goal of 30%. This is part of a national trend as electronic applications make it easier for more students to apply to more schools. Before 2004, the College struggled to recruit 300 traditional first years at an acceptance rate near 80% and a financial aid discount rate over 43%. Since 2004, first year classes have been around 450 with an acceptance rate below 60% and a discount rate last year that was below 39%.
- For the traditional student population (current headcount of 1452), the College is on target to reach its new headcount goals of 1523 by 2010. The traditional totals are lower than the averages of our peers (2086) and aspirants (2389).
- In terms of non-traditional students, after five years of record growth, CCE enrollment leveled off starting in spring 2006. The SLRP Committee recommended and Board approved an enrollment goal change based largely on CCE headcount adjustments (a reduction of CCE students by fall 2009 from 1792 to 1212). Nevertheless, CCE totals are higher than comparable colleges (1141 in 2007 versus peer of 747 and aspirant of 400). Currently, 95 students are enrolled in the Early College at Guilford (ECG), which is also the goal.
- Another aspect of enrollment, where significant attention is being given, is retaining current students. The percentages of traditional students retained to sophomore year (down from 77% during the base year to 72% in 2006 versus the 80% goal) and to the junior year (62% in 2007 versus 70% goal) both represent a decline for Guilford. We must also increase the 6-year graduation rate (down from 68% in 2004 to 58% in 2007, versus the 70% goal) although this fluctuates markedly from year to year.
- Average SAT scores (1120 in 2007 versus the 1225 goal), while optional at Guilford College, are higher than the average of our peers (1114). Our aspirants' average is 1188.
- Internally and from a historical perspective, we have improved in attracting a higher percentage of traditional students in the top 10% of their high school class. The 2007 rate of 20% is up dramatically from 11% in 2004 but remains below the 2010 goal of 25% and the averages of our peers (34%) and aspirants (39%).

***Inter-Institutional Alliances.*** In addition to increasing participation in study-away programs, another way that the plan intends to expand the community is through the development and strengthening of inter-institutional alliances. At present, only 1.5% of Guilford's traditional students enroll for classes at other institutions compared to the 8% goal. This is up 0.5% from 2006. The alliance with UNCG will boost these percentages. Starting this fall 2008, Guilford will have UNCG business faculty teach an initial class of ten or more students in masters level business courses on Guilford's campus. This is a notable achievement and exception to normal educational practice, as it allows undergraduates also to obtain a graduate degree in nine months less than if they enrolled in separate programs. A similar relationship has been established with Duke University for Environmental Studies. The College will continue to meet with division directors and faculty to determine where they see other possible alliances, and continue to work on implementing international alliances. Currently, additional programs with UNCG and Duke are being explored, e.g., sports medicine, and computer management.

In addition to the development and strengthening of inter-institutional alliances, another way that the plan intends to expand the community is through increasing participation in study-away programs. Conversations with officials from INTERLINK language training, a new pilot study-away program in Siena, Italy for spring 2008, and other steps are being taken toward this end.

### **Continuing Goal 3: Strengthen Quaker Presence and Diversity**

The purpose of these strategic priorities is as follows: Guilford College recommit itself to being a college with the values and practices embedded in the Quaker testimonies and to being intentionally diverse and institutionally anti-racist.

***Diversity Plan and Training Initiatives.*** Developed pursuant to the strategic plan, the draft diversity plan is now being vetted on campus. The president, SLRP, the trustee Quaker Life and Diversity committee, and Board of Trustees will review it. Progress been slowed by its careful development, necessary vetting on campus and by funding constraints. The budget was originally \$137,800. This has been adjusted to \$68,000. The reduced funding will constrain workshops as well as staffing and recruitment efforts.

Introductory and advanced anti-racism workshops continue to be held. The 2010 goal is 100% of faculty and staff completing diversity and institutional racism training. Up from 0% of all faculty and staff in 2004, by 2007 Guilford had reached 69% (113 faculty, 127 staff). Additionally, the Board of Trustees held a workshop on diversity at their February 2007 meeting.

***Diversity and Quaker Presence.*** Diversity numbers are currently at or near the 2010 targets. Guilford has broadened the scope of efforts to include initiatives to educate, attract, and retain Latino students, faculty, and staff. Efforts to reinforce our Quaker heritage have been very successful, although additional work is needed to increase the percentage of faculty and staff completing the “Quaker Principles” training program (22% in 2007 versus the 80% goal). While we are concerned about maintaining the 9% proportion as enrollment grows, the number of Quaker students continues to increase and the College has recruited new Quaker faculty and staff. Of particular importance are the following diversity indicators:

#### *Faculty and Staff Composition:*

- The percentage of faculty who are Quaker is currently at the 2010 goal of 9%.
- The percentage of faculty who are people of color (18% in 2007 versus 17% goal) currently exceeds the averages of both our peer (11%) and aspirant (16%) colleges. This is also remarkable because the largest of our nine aspirant colleges is Morehouse College, a historically black institution.
- The percentage of staff who are people of color (22%) is now at the 2010 goal and exceeds the average of our peer (15%) colleges but not our aspirants (29%).
- The percentages of faculty (48%) and staff (63%) who are female are currently above the 2010 goals (46% and 58%) and about at the averages of our peers (50%) and aspirants (48%).

#### *Student Composition:*

- The percentage of students (all) who are people of color (33%) exceeds the 2010 goal (23%) and far exceeds the averages of both our peers (17%) and aspirant (25%) colleges. Obviously, we have benefited in this regard from the large numbers of persons of color among CCE students.
- Yet, even among traditional students, the College has exceeded its goal for the percentage who are people of color (21% in 2007 versus the 18% goal and up from 11% in 2004).
- Additional work is necessary to increase the percentage of traditional students who are international students (up from 1% in 2006 to 2% in 2007 versus the 3% goal).

- The percentage of students who are Quaker (10%) currently exceeds the 2010 goal of 9%.
- The percentages of students who are female—traditional (52%) and non-traditional (73%)—are currently at or very near the 2010 goals (53% and 73% respectively).

The qualitative NSSE data are also encouraging. The percentage of students who are pleased with the campus climate is 65%, hopefully reaching 75% by 2010. About 75% of students are “very satisfied” that there is a commitment to racial harmony at Guilford College; that meets the goal two years early.

### **Operational Goal 1: Stewardship and Accountability**

***A Challenging Context.*** Guilford College is committed to achieving the financial equilibrium that has eluded us over most of our history. This involves preserving a balanced budget with a 5% endowment draw, securing funding for the strategic plan, and enforcing debt control. Operational Goal 1, Stewardship and Accountability, is the most financially-driven of all goals and contains the following strategic priorities: Achieve Financial Equilibrium; Attract the Number and Type of Faculty and Staff Necessary to Support the Academic Mission; and Upgrade Facilities, Infrastructure, and Physical Plant.

The current challenges in these particular areas are substantial given the context. Guilford seeks ongoing improvement despite revenue limitations, no additional debt capacity, and raising in 2002 only \$3 million of the \$10 million in unrestricted funds that was identified as crucial for high priority capital and operating needs and debt covenants. Guilford College must also compete with peer and aspirant institutions with higher average student fees and endowments, higher spending per student, and possibly fewer historically underfunded obligations in facilities and employee compensation.

The current effort to pay off the \$3.9 million balance on the line of credit in five years with expense reductions from operations rather than new gifts has been especially harmful to the strategic plan and campus morale. We must resume needed investments in salaries, facilities, the strategic plan, and other priorities that are now being deferred or depleted to pay back the line of credit. We are trying to pay back – solely from operations – a line of credit that was used not on operations but to make long overdue improvements to capital facilities (mainly the renovations to Duke Hall and King Hall). Finally, we are essentially trying to pay back debt in 5 years that was incurred to create 30-year assets.

***Impact of Budget Reductions on Strategic Initiatives.*** The original strategic plan called for \$3.9 million of additional funding needed for action items in FY 2008-09. That figure was substantially revised in the *FY 2008-09 preliminary budget estimate* to \$2.46 million in additional costs beyond what we need to meet the “core business” of the college. In order to balance the budget and reduce the line of credit, the funding for the FY 2008-09 Strategic Plan was reduced again by \$995,000 in the proposed budget for FY 2008-09. Over \$1.8 million still remains, including \$357,000 for new initiatives, and constitutes 3.4% of the budget. SLRP delayed the achievement of selected targets in the strategic plan; it did not totally abandon them. Some were funded at a reduced rate for the time being. The main sources of savings remaining in the plan are related to: Principled Problem Solving, salary equity, capital campaign, *Guilford Connects*, campus master plan, diversity and anti-racism efforts, and recruiting international students and students from diverse populations. In the short term, financial equilibrium depends mostly on controllable but risky expense reductions. In the long-term, Guilford College must have more revenue.

***Strategic Indicators.*** Monitoring the SLRP programmatic and policy outcomes through these indicators become even more critical given current revenue constraints and budget reductions. Notable trends include:

- At \$32.8 million, the level of debt has been reduced, but still demands careful monitoring and control. Assuming no new debt and prompt payments of debt service, the debt level will return to about its 2004 level by 2010 and reach the \$30.2 million goal.
- Student fee revenue accounts for 78% of total revenue, and is a major factor in whether the budget is balanced. This dependence on enrollment has made shortfalls in CCE and summer school enrollment particularly harmful. The College will need to adjust the 2010 goal of \$24,260 since recent fee hikes have modestly exceeded the 5% assumed in the plan. The goals in 2010 for room and board and total educational and general revenues/student FTE must also be adjusted. At \$24,470, traditional student fees (not including room and board) are below the averages of peer (\$25,598) and aspirant (\$30,353) institutions; CCE fees are at the mid-point of the competitive market.
- Our education expenditures per FTE student (\$14,670) are low compared to peers (\$17,564) and aspirants (\$22,791) and only partly attributable to our higher proportion of lower cost CCE students. U.S. News overall rank in fall 2007 (#170) was constrained by financial resources (#227) and faculty resources (#207). [All per student targets have been adjusted to reflect lower enrollment targets.] This underscores the difficulty of cutting expenses to balance the budget and maintain cash flow when the College already spends less per student than average peers and competitors. The gap will widen if we cut additional expenses.
- The endowment has increased from 2004 (\$56.9 million) to 2007 (\$75.5 million) but must continue to grow to meet Guilford's aspirations. Guilford's endowment is lower than the average of its peers (\$91.7 million) and aspirants (\$223.5 million). Endowment per student—a classic measure of overall financial condition—is slated to be \$30,000 per student by 2010. Current endowment per student (\$30,920) exceeds the goal but continues to trail far behind the averages of both peer (\$38,000) and aspirant colleges (\$92,000). These trends underscore the need to increase our endowment to *at least* the \$75 million envisioned in the plan. While Guilford still lags, the college endowment has been preserved by increased fund-raising and cutting the spending rate to 5%. The use of the line of credit grew in 2007 to replace some of the cash formerly supplied by overspending from endowment and to make overdue capital improvements in Duke and King Halls.
- The percentage of alumni contributing (23% in 2007) may not reach the 30% goal by 2010, although the average gift has risen dramatically. A more student-based approach to annual giving, a more active strategy for solicitation, and a clear message will continue to help. The financial commitments in the strategic plan were based in part on annual and capital revenues from a capital campaign that was delayed over a year. The delay was due to the lack of prospects capable of giving \$25,000 or more and the need to make other essential preparations in a College with a very limited history of successful, large-scale fund-raising.
- Average full-time faculty salaries (\$52,850) are still below market (e.g., \$57,799 peer and \$68,325 aspirant averages). Guilford's target is the estimated 50<sup>th</sup> percentile market salary of \$63,700 for faculty and 45<sup>th</sup> percentile for staff in 2010. Wages and salaries were improved for faculty and staff with the second installment of "catch-up" raises for faculty (6% average) and the first installment for staff (5.5%) funded for 2007. However, additional equity adjustments have been deferred because of the delay in the capital campaign and lower enrollment goals. In all likelihood, Guilford will not reach the objectives by 2010 unless increases in future years are substantially higher than now projected. The budgeted 3.5% is a "keep up" increase in that it should be sufficient not to lose more ground relative to these objectives. Since 2002, the College has increased average faculty salaries by 28% and average staff salaries by 23.5% after two years of no increases at all.

- The ratio of staff FTE to faculty FTE is 1.7 to 1 and almost at the 2010 goal of 1.6 to 1. This measure of administrative efficiency improves as the ratio decreases. However, the impact on workload as well as the effectiveness of academic support, student services, and other departments that serve the academic program must be carefully watched. By this indicator, Guilford College continues to be more “efficient” than both our peer (1.8) and aspirant (1.9) colleges. Faculty and staff have been added to maintain ratios in accordance to the strategic plan. Currently, Guilford has achieved a 15:1 student-teacher ratio versus the 16:1 goal for 2010. Since 2002, the College has added approximately 62% more faculty compared to 46% more students and 21% more staff.
- Efforts continue to reach the goal of 90% of our day classes taught by full-time faculty and 70% of night classes taught by full-time faculty. The percentages have risen from 82% and 59% in 2004 to 88% and 69% respectively.

### **Operational Goal 2: Improve Campus Community**

In the *customer* arena, regular, quantitative measurement of student satisfaction provides a useful indicator to determine present and future institutional health. Guilford will continue to improve student satisfaction by targeting and developing specific areas of academic and campus life that enhance common student experiences, college identity, and promote student engagement. The creation and implementation of time and events for community gatherings and celebration and the revision of the College calendar to include hour-long weekly community gathering are two of the initiatives that have helped build community. Funding for many of these community initiatives has been reduced. For example, while efforts continue, no action steps have been totally abandoned, and expenses have been absorbed whenever possible, the budget allocations for action steps “*Implement approved recommendations from the faculty/staff satisfaction analysis,*” “*Develop faculty and staff equivalent of FYE orientation,*” “*Implement hour-long weekly community gatherings in college calendar,*” and “*Provide incentives for students to become involved in all aspects of campus life*” were all reduced for FY 2008-9 (from \$11,087 to \$5,000, from \$2,700 to \$0, from \$11,475 to \$0, and from \$11,500 to \$0 respectively).

The SLRP Committee analyzed NSSE and other community surveys in November 2006. NSSE is currently being administered again. Although not always related to specific strategic indicators, the number of ways that the College assesses community is amazing.

- The College (currently at 51% in NSSE) remains far from achieving the goal of 71% of traditional students reporting “quite a bit” or “very much” support to thrive socially on campus.
- With only 45% of non-traditional students reporting on NSSE “quite a bit” or “very much” support to thrive socially on campus (versus the 71% goal), the CCE Dean and CCE student government have actively engaged in additional community-building and alumni networking initiatives.
- Most recent HEDS data on the percentage of students who are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their experience at Guilford (95%) or feel a sense of pride about Guilford (77%) are both above the 2010 goals of 75%.
- “The Group Management Questionnaire” (GMQ) measures satisfaction among faculty and staff with eight goal areas determined to be reliable measures of management and group effectiveness. These goal areas are purpose and direction; team climate; conflict; reward, appreciation and recognition; communication; group process and meeting design; leadership; and supervision and performance management. All-college average scores were down in 2008 (6.0) from 2005 (7.0).

The response rate in 2008 was a disappointing 21% that calls into question the reliability of the results.

- In 2008, generally, GMQ respondents were most positive about the sense of goals, purpose, and direction (6.4); campus climate (6.4); and meeting design (6.2). These areas were rated highest of the GMQ goals in 2008, as they were in 2005 (7.4, 7.3, and 7.2 respectively in 2005). Scores declined in each of the eight categories, with the greatest declines in the three areas of conflict, communications, and leadership. The reward, appreciation, and recognition category continues to be an area of challenge at Guilford and the lowest rated category (5.5 in 2008; 6.2 in 2005). The results by campus affiliation (e.g., academic or administrative division, gender, sexual identity) mirror the aggregate results. Reward, appreciation, and recognition was ranked the lowest in most campus groups, while goals, purpose, and direction was ranked highest.
- In spring 2005 and again in 2007, SLRP conducted a campus-wide Climate Survey (students, faculty, and staff) to gauge the “feelings” and impressions the community had about the College. This survey, which is not intended to provide statistical data but to take the “pulse” of the community, continues to be an important part of Guilford’s ongoing improvement and overall commitment to excellence. The qualities of values, small classes, faculty dedicated to students, and beautiful buildings and grounds are themes of the 2007 campus climate survey. Results are available online.
- Of note but not formally in the plan, the College implemented supervisor assessment by subordinates starting with the president and vice presidents in fall 2006. This continued in early 2008. The plan is to perform similar assessments on 25-30% of supervisors each year.

#### **4. Next Steps**

Data will continue to be refined and analyzed; strategic indicators will be updated accordingly to reflect new information. The indicators will continue to be officially reported yearly.

The Strategic Long Range Planning Committee will continue to use these measurements to decide if progress toward goals is acceptable or whether changes in the content or sequencing of action steps are necessary. Monitoring the strategic plan’s programmatic and policy outcomes through these indicators become even more critical given current revenue constraints and budget reductions. At bi-weekly meetings, SLRP routinely discusses the achievements and concerns as Guilford continues plan implementation; this qualitative data provides another perspective to assess the plan. As Guilford begins to develop the next strategic plan, initiatives will be categorized based on those from the current strategic plan that should be institutionalized, continued in the next plan, or newly developed. The measurements of “where we are” and the common acceptance of “where we want to be” are critical considerations in the initial discussion and ongoing tracking.



## ANNUAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

*The Strategic Plan for Guilford College 2005-2010: Creative Leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*

Updated: 4/25/08

<b>Continuing Goal 1</b>							
<b>Excel at education that transforms our students and our world</b>							
Internal Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal			Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)		
1. % of total budget of CPPS from external funding	10%			5%	N/A		
2. % of students participating in institutional community service each year	50%			34%	31%		
3. <i>U.S. News peer assessment score</i>	3.3			2.8	2.7		
4. NSSE: % of all students reporting "good" to "excellent" educational experience	72%			92% in 2006 ('08 survey currently being conducted)		N/A	
5. % of all degree-seeking students participating in digital portfolio initiative	40%			10% (pilot project in Fall '07 in 8 FYE lab sections)		N/A	
6. % of students receiving co-curricular transcript	40%			0%	N/A		
7. Average class size	20			16.0	18.4		
Comparative Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal	Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	Peer Average		Aspirant Average	
	Range		Rank (of 14)	Range		Rank (of 9)	
8. <i>CIRP: % of students reporting academic reputation as a very important reason for choosing Guilford</i>	70%	49%	42%	63%		63%	
				49%-67%	3	61%-67%	3
9. <i>% classes under 20 (2-19)</i>	65%	69%	69%	53%		64%	
				35%-61%	3	39%-93%	5
10. <i>Student-faculty ratio</i>	16:1	15:1	18:1	13:1		10:1	
				12:1-16:1	5	6:1-15:1	9

*The Strategic Indicators that are also part of the U.S. News annual rankings are italicized.*

Continuing Goal 2 Expand our academic community							
Internal Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal			Guilford College 2007/Most Recent		Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	
1. % of traditional students involved in inter-institutional programs <sup>1</sup>	8%			1.5%		1%	
2. % non-traditional students involved in inter-institutional programs <sup>1</sup>	14%			1%		1%	
3. % of total student credit hours taught to non-Guilford College inter-institutional students	5%			1%		1%	
4. % of non-degree student credit hours	5%			1%		1%	
5. Admission yield for traditional students	30%			22%		26%	
6. % of first-year traditional cohort that is retained to junior year	70%			62%		64%	
7. 6 year graduation rate				64%		73%	
	70%	58%	68%	34%-86%	10	54%-86%	8
Comparative Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal	Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	Peer Average		Aspirant Average	
				Range	Rank (of 14)	Range	Rank (of 9)
9. Traditional student enrollment (headcount)	1523	1452	1244	2086		2389	
				1217-3696	8	1450-3073	7
11. Non-traditional student enrollment (headcount)	1212 CCE 95 EC	1141 CCE 95 EC	1181 CCE 86 EC	747		400	
				256-2153	4	236-541	1
13. First-year retention rate (traditional students) <sup>2</sup>	80%	72%	77%	83%		85%	
				72%-93%	8	72%-93%	7
15. Average SAT	1225	1120	1130	1114		1188	
				1015-1270	6	1065-1280	7
17. % of traditional students in top 10% of high school class	25%	20%	11%	34%		39%	
				19%-50%	8	24%-64%	8

Continuing Goal 3 Strengthen our Quaker presence and enhance campus diversity							
Internal Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal			Guilford College 2007/Most Recent		Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	
1. % of faculty and staff completing “Quaker Principles” training program	80%			22%		16%	
2. % of faculty and staff completing diversity and institutional anti-racism training	100%			69% <sup>3</sup>		0%	
3. % of students (traditional) who are people of color	18%			21%		11%	
4. % of students (traditional) who are international students	3%			2%		2%	
5. % of Quaker faculty	9%			9%		9%	
6. % of Quaker students (traditional)	9%			10%		9%	
Comparative Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal	Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	Peer Average		Aspirant Average	
				Range	Rank (of 14)	Range	Rank (of 9)
7. % of faculty who are people of color	17%	18%	17%	11%		16%	
				3%-22%	2	9%-59%	5
9. % of staff who are people of color	22%	22%	22%	15%		29%	
				11%-35%	2	7%-98%	4
11. % of students (all) who are people of color	23%	33%	31%	17%		25%	
				9%-38%	5	11%-92%	2
13. % of students (all) who are international students	3%	1%	1%	3%		7%	
				2%-7%	11	5%-9%	4
15. % of faculty who are female	46%	48%	47%	50%		48%	
				28%-83%	7	29%-64%	5
17. % of staff who are female	58%	63%	61%	61%		59%	
				49%-84%	7	47%-66%	6
19. % of students (traditional) who are female	53%	52%	54%	65%		54%	
				56%-100%	11	0%-77%	6
21. % of students (non-traditional) who are female	73%	73%	73%	74%		64%	
				55%-97%	3	0%-83%	3
23. NSSE: <sup>4</sup> % of students who are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with campus climate.	75%	65% <sup>4</sup>	N/A	61.5% <sup>4</sup>		NA	
				NA	NA	N/A	NA
25. NSSE: <sup>5</sup> “very satisfied” that there is a commitment to racial harmony at Guilford	75%	75% <sup>5</sup>	N/A	N/A		N/A	
				N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Operational Goal 1 Stewardship and Accountability							
Internal Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal			Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)		
1. % of \$ amount of cash received to total campaign goal	57%			N/A	N/A		
2. % of operating budget covered by annual revenue	100%			100%	97.1%		
3. Level of debt	\$30.2*M			\$32.8M	\$29.0M		
4. % of first choice hiring offers accepted for tenure track positions	90%			100%	80%		
5. % of courses taught by full-time faculty (day)	90%			88%	82%		
6. % of courses taught by full-time faculty (evening)	70%			69%	59%		
7. Number of APPA standards met or exceeded	11			11	N/A		
Comparative Indicator	Guilford College FY 10 Goal	Guilford College 2007/Most Recent	Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)	Peer Average		Aspirant Average	
				Range	Rank (of 14)	Range	Rank (of 9)
8. Tuition and fees – traditional students	\$24,260*	\$24,470	\$20,270	\$25,598		\$30,353	
				\$16,849-\$36,282	9	\$18,678-\$38,090	8
10. Room and board	\$7,700*	\$6,860	\$6,330	\$7,997		\$9,034	
				\$6,108-\$11,430	11	\$7,296-\$13,316	9
12. Education expenditures per FTE student	\$15,825*	\$14,670	\$13,231	\$17,564		\$22,791	
				\$10,853-\$24,179	11	\$22,113-\$32,955	9
14. Amount of endowment (per NACUBO)	\$75M*	\$75.5M	\$56.9M	\$91.7M		\$223.5M	
				\$30.6M-\$162.2M	9	\$72.2M-\$544.6M	8
16. Endowment per student FTE (per NACUBO)	\$30,000*	\$30,920	\$29,227	\$38,000		\$92,000	
				\$15,000-\$70,000	8	\$43,000-\$193,000	9
18. % of alumni making contributions	30%	23%	21%	29%		26%	
				18%-37%	8	18%-44%	8
20. Total gifts (per CAE VSE Program)	\$11M*	\$8.4M FY '06-'07; \$3.9M as of 12/31/07	\$4.9M FY '04-'05	\$5.6M		\$8.7M	
				\$3.0M-\$11.6M	3	\$3.0M-\$11.6M	3
22. Average full-time faculty salary (all ranks combined) <sup>6</sup>	\$63,700*	\$52,850	\$46,200	\$57,799		\$68,325	
				\$52,200-\$82,600	11	\$52,900-\$73,100	8
24. Ratio of staff FTE to faculty FTE <sup>7</sup>	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8		1.9	
				1.4-2.3	10	1.4-2.3	5

<b>Operational Goal 2 Improving our Campus Community</b>			
<b>Internal Indicator</b>	<b>Guilford College FY 10 Goal</b>	<b>Guilford College 2007/Most Recent</b>	<b>Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)</b>
1. NSSE: <sup>8</sup> % of traditional students reporting “quite a bit” or “very much” support to thrive socially on campus	71%	51%	35%
2. NSSE: % of non-traditional students reporting “quite a bit” or “very much” support to thrive socially on campus	71%	45%	35%
3. NSSE: % of students reporting “quite a bit” or “very much” academic support available	93%	84%	83%
4. NSSE: Average student score on emphasis on campus life activities items (max = 4)	3.5	2.9	2.7
<b>Comparative Indicator</b>	<b>Guilford College FY 10 Goal</b>	<b>Guilford College 2007/Most Recent</b>	<b>Guilford College 2004 (Base Year)</b>
5. HEDS: % of students who are “generally satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their experience at Guilford	75%	95%	87%
6. HEDS: % of students who are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” in feeling a sense of pride about Guilford	75%	77%	77%
7. FSSE: Average percent of faculty who are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” on the level of satisfaction items on the survey	75%	N/A - This question not on 2006 FSSE Survey. Next survey 2010.	N/A
8. GMQ <sup>9</sup> - All College Average	7.5	6.0	7.0
9. GMQ - Goal #1: Purpose and Direction.	7.5	6.4	7.4
10. GMQ - Goal #2: Group Climate.	7.5	6.4	7.3
11. GMQ - Goal # 3: Conflict.	7.5	5.7	7.0
12. GMQ - Goal # 4: Reward, Appreciation, and Recognition.	7.5	5.5	6.2
13. GMQ - Goal # 5: Communications	7.5	5.9	7.1
14. GMQ - Goal # 6: Group Process and Meeting Design	7.5	6.2	7.2
15. GMQ - Goal # 7: Leadership	7.5	5.9	7.1
16. GMQ - Goal # 8: Supervision	7.5	5.7	6.6

**Notes for Annual Assessment Indicators**

\* In nominal dollars not adjusted for inflation.

<sup>1</sup> More students are enrolled in Spring than in Fall.

<sup>2</sup> Retention data only applies to a cohort of first-time, full-time first year students. Guilford has no more than two or three CCE students who fall into this category.

<sup>3</sup> From 2004-2008: 113 faculty (all), 14 top tier senior staff, 22 next tier staff, 21 middle tier staff, 70 support staff. 8 Board of Trustee members have also participated (not included in indicator).

<sup>4</sup> From 2006 NSSE Survey. Question not on 2006 survey. 65% (first-year 65.7%, senior 64.4%, and corresponding peer institutional data) represent a composite of NSSE scores from multiple questions falling in the "Supportive Campus Environment" classification.

<sup>5</sup> From 2006 NSSE Survey. Question not on 2006 survey. 75% represents a composite of two 2006 questions: (1) The extent students' college experience contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds (first-year 70%, senior 80%); and (2) The extent the institution emphasizes and encourages contact among students from different economic, social and racial, or ethnic backgrounds (first-year 78%, senior 71%). 2008 survey with this question will be completed in June 2008.

<sup>6</sup> AAUP Report on Faculty Salaries not available.

<sup>7</sup> Some institutions are still collecting data on the ratio of Staff FTE to Faculty FTE to be reported in the Human Resources portion of IPEDS.

<sup>8</sup> All NSSE data are based on 2006 Survey. 2008 Survey will be completed in June 2008.

<sup>9</sup> GMQ: Maximum score per variable on GMQ is 9.0. Base year is 2005. The eight variables reported based on the *all-college averages*.