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Higher education isn’t where it wants to be. North American colleges and universities struggle to focus on their mission of educating students and advancing knowledge in the face of distractions such as slashed budgets, ballooning costs, and increased state and federal scrutiny. Expectations are growing at the same time resources are dwindling. This is all the more frustrating because institutions have worked incredibly hard under difficult circumstances. Faculty, staff, and administrators have committed themselves to the painful process of reform during a period of economic hardship. Institutions from the smallest liberal arts college to the largest land-grant state universities—as well as urban community colleges, elite art schools, and advanced research institutes—have responded to the call for change. Considering the unprecedented circumstances of the Great Recession and its aftermath, they’ve accomplished a great deal, and their thoughtful, creative responses must be commended.

But the pressure isn’t letting up. The demands keep growing. And colleges and universities must continue to adapt to their new reality.

APPA constructed the 2014 Thought Leaders symposium to examine the gap between where higher education wants to be and where it actually finds itself. Participants first examined the goals of colleges and universities. Rather than envisioning some imaginary ideal institution, they sought to identify the key characteristics of successful campuses. Then they looked at what institutions are actually achieving— the disagreeable reality of unsustainable funding models, unsuccessful students, and poorly utilized resources.

Participants discussed how to bridge the gap between the goal and the reality. They proposed and evaluated numerous ways colleges and universities could position themselves for a successful future. True to APPAs role as leader of the higher education facilities community, the group considered the challenge from a facilities point of view alongside other institutional perspectives. The result is a list of strategies that can be adapted for individual campuses and combined to make real strides in tackling persistent higher education challenges.

The most important take-away from the 2014 symposium is this: higher education facilities can help colleges and universities achieve their goals. Facilities are more than a passive backdrop. They can contribute in meaningful, measurable ways to the mission of the institution. Successful campuses will be those that leverage their facilities assets and operations to maximize their potential.
Optimal versus actual higher education outcomes

Colleges and universities are failing to meet several critical goals for the future.

- Instead of **student success** they have frequently **inconsistent educational outcomes**.
- Instead of **high rates of recruitment and retention** they often have **poor recruitment and retention**.
- Instead of **affordable tuition and fees** many have limited access and **lack of affordability**.
- Instead of a **financially sustainable business plan** they have a **cumbersome and unsustainable business model**.
- Instead of **responsible use of space and other resources** they regularly experience ineffective policies toward space management and utilization.
- Instead of a **clear mission and focus** some suffer from **lack of focus and an unclear mission**.
- Instead of an **environmentally sustainable campus** they sometimes experience **failure to prioritize environmental sustainability**.

To bridge the gap and move the institution closer to its goals, colleges and universities need to adopt the following strategies:

- **Increase emphasis on student success.** Understand what gets in the way of a successful education and systematically tackle these barriers.
- **Improve affordability.** Employ a variety of strategies to cut costs, increase funding, and improve access for students, including streamlined degree programs, simplified approaches to tuition and discounting, and locked-in tuition prices.
- **Focus on the mission of the institution.** Instead of being all things to all people, focus on what the campus does best.
- **Allocate resources based on institutional priorities.** Align the use of resources with the mission of the college or university.
- **Increase reliance on data and business analytics to support decisions.** Identify the strategic questions that can be answered with data and use business intelligence systems to make smarter decisions.

- **Prioritize environmental sustainability.** Keep sustainability as a goal even as multiple issues compete for attention.

The facilities contribution to optimal outcomes

Facilities assets and operations can advance institutional goals in sometimes unexpected ways. The built environment may seem like it would have little effect on student learning, when in fact well-designed classrooms support new teaching strategies such as problem-based and team learning. Other ways facilities help colleges and universities achieve their goals include the following:

- **Higher rates of recruitment and retention.** The campus plays a major role in creating positive impressions and building student engagement.
- **More affordable tuition and fees.** Efficient facilities operations can significantly reduce costs for the institution.
- **Contribute to clear mission and focus.** Strategic facilities planning enables the built environment to support the institution’s mission.
- **Responsible use of space and other resources.** Effective space management makes the most of the institution’s single-greatest sunk cost.
- **Environmentally sustainable campus.** Rightsizing the campus and minimizing operational impacts is required to improve institutional sustainability.

To maximize their contribution to the institution, facilities organizations should adopt the following strategies:

1. **Understand how facilities affect student success and employ best practices for student recruitment and retention.** Facilities organizations can significantly contribute to student success through smart strategies and creative use of buildings and grounds. Facilities influence student success more than most administrators realize. Smart institutions recognize the value of the built environment in attracting, retaining, and teaching students; they invest in making their campus more student-friendly.
2. **Use total cost of ownership (TCO) as a guiding principle for all facilities decisions.** Employing TCO enables institutions to make better investments in buildings and systems. Discussion about the costs of facilities is usually divided into the same two categories that show up on balance sheets: initial construction costs and ongoing maintenance, operations, and renewal costs. What’s missing is an understanding that the two costs are related. In fact, facilities can cost twice as much to maintain and renew as they do to build. TCO takes this fundamental fact into account by calculating and communicating the lifetime costs of a facility.

3. **Make better use of campus space.** Colleges and universities can cut costs and improve efficiency by maximizing the use of their space. Underutilized space is a wasted resource. Colleges and universities should be finding every opportunity to maximize the utilization of resources, and that means taking seriously the problem of space.

4. **Expand data collection and analysis to support decisions to cut costs and increase efficiency.** By increasing the amount of data they collect and providing new tools to analyze that data, institutions can strengthen their decision-making processes. Business analytics has enormous potential for institutions seeking to make their operational decisions more data-driven. Higher education has lagged behind other industries in adopting business intelligence systems, but well-designed analytics systems have the potential to help institutions measure progress on strategic and tactical goals, support decision making, provide rapid feedback on ongoing efforts, and validate or discredit assumptions.

5. **Use the campus as a classroom to expand awareness of sustainability and facilities best practices.** Facilities organizations can develop innovative ways to use the built environment as a teaching tool and directly involve students with sustainability and efficiency efforts. Facilities staff typically have only limited interaction with students, and most students have no idea what goes into keeping the campus running. Yet facilities play an important role in the educational experience, and a peek behind the curtain at facilities operations can give students greater insight into issues of sustainability and energy use and raise awareness of facilities throughout the institution.

**The Thought Leaders process**

The issues discussed in this Thought Leaders report are the result of an intensive process that draws on the wisdom and insight of higher education experts from the United States and Canada. At a two-day symposium, higher education experts both in facilities management and in operations from finance to HR meet to analyze issues, discuss the effect of these issues on the built environment, and propose strategies to prepare for the future. The yearly Thought Leaders report summarizes the discussions at the symposium as well as provides additional context about major trends.

The purpose of the report is both to inform and to prompt discussion. Senior campus facilities officers use this report as a resource both within their own departments and with their counterparts in space management, IT, finance, HR, student services, and administration. Past Thought Leaders reports have focused on the rising cost of higher education, space management and utilization, workplace demographics, the role of technology, and energy and sustainability.

**Harnessing every available resource for the institution**

Higher education has settled uncomfortably into the knowledge that the tight budgets and increased demands on their institutions aren’t going away. All the quick fixes have been exhausted. Campuses must figure out how to succeed in this new normal.

One strategy that deserves more attention is to dig deep and make the most of existing resources. Colleges and universities have invested billions in their buildings, grounds and infrastructure. They continue to spend millions to operate, maintain, and renew their facilities.
The campus should be considered as valuable to the institution as its endowment. In fact, the campus is a sort of physical endowment, an investment that provides ongoing returns to the college or university. No institution would squander its financial endowment; careful administration ensures the resource is preserved and managed to benefit future generations. The same should be true of facilities. Colleges and universities should leverage their facilities investment for the maximum return for the institution.
Section II: Challenges for higher education institutions

What will determine success?

Participants at the Thought Leaders symposium began with this goal in mind, and they set the parameters that will determine success in higher education.

In the future, successful colleges and universities will demonstrate the following:

Student success. No matter what else they seek to accomplish, the primary goal of colleges and universities is to educate their students. Symposium participants agreed a good education should be both broad and deep; it should provide specific skills and information in a chosen area of study as well as more generalized knowledge to be a well-rounded member of society.

Symposium participants emphasized goals such as “students leave the institution prepared for their careers,” “students show good citizenship and leadership,” and “students are critical thinkers.”

Similarly, the American Federation of Teachers proposes that student success has three elements: knowledge, intellectual ability, and professional/technical skills. Knowledge includes both an appropriate level of knowledge in a selected area of study and exposure to knowledge of the physical and natural world, cultural and intercultural knowledge, civic knowledge and engagement, and ethics. Intellectual abilities encompass critical thinking, problem solving, independent learning, analysis of information, and synthesis.

Data Point: Best practices in retention

Effective retention strategies by institution type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four-year private</th>
<th>Four-year public</th>
<th>Two-year public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic support programs or services</td>
<td>1. Honors programs for academically advanced students</td>
<td>1. Tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Programs designed specifically for first-year students</td>
<td>2. Programs designed specifically for first-year students</td>
<td>2. Academic support programs or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning</td>
<td>3. Academic support programs or services</td>
<td>3. Honors programs for academically advanced students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Honors programs for academically advanced students</td>
<td>4. Providing supplementary instruction</td>
<td>4. Mandatory advising by professional staff, one-on-one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tutoring</td>
<td>5. Learning communities</td>
<td>5. Giving students practical work experiences in their intended major to apply their learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional and technical skills include skills for specific areas of study as well as abilities such as written and oral communication, information literacy, and teamwork.

High rates of recruitment and retention. Retention is receiving increased attention in higher education, with several states adopting performance-based funding systems that allocate some degree of funding based on performance indicators, including course completion and time-to-graduation. Institutions have also recognized that it’s far more cost-effective to retain existing students than to recruit new ones.

The most effective strategies for improving retention are related to academic goals, academic-related skills, and academic self-confidence. These strategies include high-quality academic advising, tutoring, and academic support programs. Successful institutions focus their efforts on programs for first-year students, since students are more likely to drop out of higher education during their first year than any other time. Programs designed for first-year students were identified as the second-most-important strategy for retention by a survey of four-year private institutions by educational consulting firm Noel-Levitz, right behind academic support programs and services.

Recruitment is an essential factor in institutional success. Smart colleges and universities will rely on data-driven marketing to appeal to students most likely to enroll. They’ll focus on strategies that have proven successful, such as campus visits and open house events, rather than those with low rates of success, such as billboard and bus ads and radio promotions.

Affordable tuition and fees. Higher education affordability is tied to economic prosperity. A college degree provides greater economic security for individuals as well as entire nations. When access to higher education is constrained by ballooning costs, fewer people can reach the middle class, and the entire economy suffers. The situation will only become more extreme as the information and creative sectors of the economy grow; three-quarters of the fastest-growing occupations require education and training beyond a high school diploma. Without a degree, many young adults will be shut out of the future.

Successful institutions will find creative, sustainable ways to ensure that a college education is within reach of every student, without the burden of crippling debt. Participants at the Thought Leaders symposium called for “higher education access to all those who want to go.”

Financially sustainable business plan. Successful institutions will rely on an operating and funding model that is sustainable over the long term. The elements of this model remain unclear and will likely vary from institution to institution. However, it seems likely that major changes will be needed at many colleges and universities. Those institutions that will thrive going forward will be those that find ways to significantly cut costs and increase income over the long term.

Data Point: Rethinking the higher education business model

When the bag of tricks is empty

“[Higher education business officers] have been using a set of strategies to try to do what they already do better, but they’ve exhausted the bag of tricks they’ve been using to try to keep it all together. There’s not another rabbit in there. They get that the business model isn’t working, but they don’t quite see the bridge to the next model. And they seem to have some concern that maybe there isn’t a bridge.”


Responsible use of space and other resources. Successful institutions will take nothing for granted. Every resource will be conserved and shepherded for the benefit of the institution. This will mean reevaluating long-term practices and policies—including unwritten policies—that have governed how colleges and universities use their space. Space will no longer be an abused resource.
at successful institutions. Institutions will track the use of space and make data-driven decisions that take into account both costs and institutional priorities.

Other resources will be as carefully managed. Successful campuses will collect data on all aspects of their operations and rely on business intelligence technology to make informed, cost-effective decisions.

**Clear mission and focus.** Thought Leaders participants called for institutions to “demonstrate effective/meaningful concentration on the institution's core mission.” Individual institutions need to evaluate their strengths, consider their core constituencies, and hone their mission. It’s as important for colleges to stop doing some things as it is for them to start doing others. For example, adding new majors that support the core mission is far easier than eliminating majors that distract from it, but this unpleasant task is critical to sharpen the focus of the college or university.

This process is paying off for savvy institutions such as Unity College, a private school in Maine with about 550 students. When Mitchell Thomashow became president of the college in 2006, he felt the institution had too many vague, undefined majors. In an intensive process, the college developed a unifying vision of itself as a leader in sustainability and science-based liberal arts education; it organized its academic departments into five centers with 18 well-defined majors. Thomashow said about the process, “We had to clarify our strengths and amplify them. We couldn’t offer everything.” Today, Unity is widely recognized as a leader in sustainable higher education and is highly ranked in national surveys.

**Environmentally sustainable campus and practices.** Colleges and universities have made enormous strides in how they think about sustainability; it is now a core principle on most campuses. Successful colleges and universities will continue to strive toward greater sustainability that encompasses every aspect of the campus. Mitchell Thomashow's recent book *The Nine Elements of a Sustainable Campus* describes sustainability as “a cultural process linked to the habits of everyday life. At its core, sustainability addresses how people live, think, and behave.” Thomashow calls for a profound shift in how institutions make decisions every day. Successful colleges and universities will make this shift not only for the financial benefits but also to fulfill their leadership mission within the global community.
**What are we actually achieving?**

The optimal outcomes described above are a long way from what colleges and universities are experiencing today:

**Inconsistent educational outcomes.** Some students get an excellent education and leave higher education prepared for the future, but many others do not. In a 2013 survey of about 700 U.S. employers by the public radio program *Marketplace*, in cooperation with *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, nearly a third said colleges and universities are doing a “fair” to “poor” job of producing “successful employees.” Despite high unemployment figures, more than half of employers said they had trouble finding qualified candidates for job openings. They specifically cited communication skills, problem solving, and decision making as lacking in recent graduates. “It’s not a matter of technical skill but of knowing how to think,” said David E. Boyes, president of Sine Nomine Associates, a tech consulting firm, in an interview with *Marketplace*.

**Poor recruitment and retention.** Retention is receiving attention across higher education for good reason. According to ongoing research by ACT, in 2013 only 65.8 percent of students entering college continued to their second year; the figure is lower, only 55 percent, for two-year public institutions. However, this data is actually somewhat misleading, since it only applies to students attending full-time. Four out of ten public college students attend part-time, and research by Complete College America shows that only a quarter of part-time students graduate within an eight-year period. Low-income students and students of color especially struggle to get a diploma. And while half of students seeking an associate degree require remediation, fewer than 10 percent of remedial students graduate with a two-year diploma in three years.

Recruiting is a necessary expense for institutions, but it can be a costly one, especially for private colleges. While they may be able to bear the expense more than public institutions, a cost of $2,433 per new student is a heavy burden. (In contrast, four-year public institutions spend $457 and community colleges $123 per student on average, according to educational consulting firm Noel-Levitz.) It’s especially important to consider recruiting costs alongside retention figures, since every student lost must be replaced, thus generating new recruiting expenses. No wonder a survey of higher education chief financial officers (CFOs) by *Inside Higher Ed* found that 92 percent ranked “retaining current students” among their top-five revenue-producing strategies.

**Limited access and lack of affordability.** The rate of annual tuition increases has slowed, at least at public insti-

---

**Data Point:**

**Higher education retention**

**The crisis in minority and low-income graduation rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Part-time students</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year associate’s in 3 years</td>
<td>4-year bachelor’s in 6 years</td>
<td>2-year associate’s in 3 years</td>
<td>4-year bachelor’s in 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7.5 percent</td>
<td>39.9 percent</td>
<td>2.1 percent</td>
<td>14.5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.1 percent</td>
<td>46.5 percent</td>
<td>2.6 percent</td>
<td>16.7 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older student (25+ at entry)</td>
<td>14.4 percent</td>
<td>27.0 percent</td>
<td>4.6 percent</td>
<td>10.6 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income (Pell Grant recipient)</td>
<td>11.8 percent</td>
<td>45.2 percent</td>
<td>4.3 percent</td>
<td>17.3 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—Time is the Enemy, *Complete College America, September 2011*. 
tutions—the College Board reports a 2.9 percent increase in in-state tuition and fees at public four-year institutions in 2013-2014, the smallest percentage increase in more than 30 years. However, grant aid did not increase, so many students are still paying more per year. Furthermore, real incomes remained flat or declined for most Americans, so a college education is less affordable for most families.

The results are well known: crippling levels of student-loan debt, which now totals more than $1 trillion and far outpaces wage growth for college graduates. Research by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau reveals that this debt is significantly impacting the economy by limiting borrowers’ ability to buy homes or cars, save for retirement, or start new businesses. The average college student graduated in 2012 owing $29,400; less than a decade ago, in 2004, debt averaged less than $19,000.

The concern is that rising tuition and high-debt burdens will limit access to higher education. In fact, enrollment declined slightly overall in 2014—by 0.8 percent from the previous spring—although the decline was greatest in four-year for-profits, skewing the numbers downward. (Enrollment actually increased on both public and private four-year campuses, according to the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.) Economists believe this decline is the result of the improving economy and that, so far, high tuition has not put a brake on the demand for high education. However, students and families are finding their choices limited. Many are making more cost-conscious decisions when choosing institutions, selecting lower-cost public schools over small to mid-sized private colleges that depend on tuition dollars. While still able to get a degree, they might not be able to attend the college or university that best fits their needs and aspirations. If current trends continue, low-income students could find the cost of higher education beyond their resources and find themselves shut out of their best chance for moving to the middle class.

Unsustainable funding model. Most analysts of higher education agree that the numbers don’t add up. Institutions can’t go on raising tuition at rates outpacing inflation, states can’t keep slashing higher education funding, and students can’t keep taking on massive amounts of debt. The model is untenable. Higher education CFOs agree—in a survey by Inside Higher Ed and Gallup, nearly a third of CFOs at private institutions expressed lack of confidence in the viability of their business model over ten years. While most agreed that elite private universities and wealthy liberal arts colleges had good long-term prospects, CFOs lacked confidence in the financial sustainability of non-flagship public universities, for-profit colleges, and non-elite private colleges.

Data Point: The financially unsustainable university

An unclear financial future

“If you are the president of a college or university that is not among the elites and does not have an endowment in the billions, chances are cash is becoming increasingly scarce—unless you’re among the most innovative. The reason is simple: Approximately one-third of all colleges and universities have financial statements that are significantly weaker than they were several years ago...

“In the past, colleges and universities tackled this problem by passing on additional costs to students and their families, or by getting more support from state and federal sources. Because those parties had the ability and the willingness to pay, they did. But the recession has left families with stagnant incomes, substantially reduced home equity, smaller nest eggs, and anxiety about job security. Regardless of whether or not families are willing to pay, they are no longer able to foot the ever-increasing bill, and state and federal sources can no longer make up the difference.”

Poor use of space and other resources. Campuses have a poor record of managing their space; in fact, some fail to treat space as a valuable resource. Traditional space practices, such as hoarding offices, labs, and classrooms, have real financial and operational consequences for campuses. The university pays to heat and cool offices that are rarely occupied; the institution builds new classrooms not realizing how many rooms sit empty. Most campuses are still pressed for space between 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, September through May, but are echoing and vacant any other time.

Other resources can also be abused when they aren’t adequately tracked and managed. Data is the critical factor, as in the old management adage, “You can’t manage what you can’t measure.” However, major barriers still stand in the way of adapting cutting-edge business intelligence for higher education, including stand-alone data silos, custom legacy systems, and lack of understanding of the requirements and benefits.

Lack of focus and unclear mission. Thought Leaders participants expressed deep frustration with the lack of focus on their campuses. “The mission is weakly defined,” stated one participant. “We try to be everything to everyone,” said another. When campuses lack a clear, distinctive mission, they risk losing their way. Different constituencies have different priorities. Some faculty want the institution to focus primarily on the task of educating students; others seek support for research. Parents want solid preparation for their kids’ future careers; students want great housing, a cool gym, and reliable Wi-Fi everywhere. Alumni want the football team to win. Governments look to institutions for everything from economic development to urban renewal.

What’s clear is that few universities have the resources to do everything—to support a classics department, a technology incubator, a law school, an architecture program, a teaching hospital, an archeological field school, and a winning football team. A few flagship institutions will continue to be comprehensive; the rest must narrow their focus.

Failure to prioritize environmental sustainability. Sustainability has made enormous strides on campuses. But now it can be a victim of its own success. Sustainability now seems old hat and uninteresting; faculty and staff can have “green fatigue.” A second challenge is that the low-hanging fruit has all been picked, and the next steps in greening the campus will be more costly and more painful. However, failing to take a leadership role in sustainability will have long-lasting consequences for institutions and for society. Colleges and universities are uniquely positioned to develop sustainability best practices that can be applied in other economic sectors. Failing to capitalize on previous investments and make further progress would be to squander a unique opportunity.

Data Point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimal outcomes for higher education</th>
<th>Actual outcomes today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student success</td>
<td>Inconsistent educational outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of recruiting and retention</td>
<td>Poor recruitment and retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable tuition and fees</td>
<td>Limited access and lack of affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially sustainable business plan</td>
<td>Unsustainable funding model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible use of space and other resources</td>
<td>Poor use of space and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear mission and focus</td>
<td>Lack of focus and unclear mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally sustainable campus</td>
<td>Failure to prioritize environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What’s getting in the way of success from within the institution?

If the real outcomes on campuses are so far from the optimal outcomes, what’s generating the actual rather than desired results? In particular, what factors within the institution’s control are hindering progress?

Inflexible and entrenched teaching methods.

The “sage on a stage” model of education persists,
Data Point: Innovation in freshmen retention

A community college keeps incoming students on track

Guttman Community College, the newest college in the City University of New York system, opened in 2012 with a new approach to retention. It would require incoming students adhere to a strict first-year program designed to improve student engagement and retention. First-year students must participate in a summer bridge program, must enroll full-time, and must take a required slate of classes. Students are placed in learning communities that are divided into cohorts of students; these students attend all of their classes together.

The system is rigorous, restrictive—and effective. The first-year retention rate was nearly 75 percent, a significant improvement from the 57 percent rate seen at comparable schools.

Other innovative elements of Guttman’s program include “student-success advocates,” staff that provide academic and social support, working alongside professors in the classroom. Students also have a network of peer mentors. Instructional teams meet weekly to discuss student progress and identify faltering students.

Guttman’s program is the first of its kind at a community college. Its founders believe the approach has the potential to significantly improve graduation rates and better prepare students for jobs or further study.

operate with a discipline that allows them to stay true to their core business. The core is where high-performing institutions invest the most and generate the greatest returns. It is the area where they are clearest about the value they add. It is the domain where they are the most differentiated and the place from which they derive their identity. In short, the core is the strategic anchor for the focused company or the focused university.

Too many campuses lack a clear core. Alternatively, they've articulated a core but have failed to align their assets and operations with that core. If sizable portions of the budget are going to side efforts, the institution is diluting its impact. This is a hard fact for many colleges and universities—it's hard to close down a program begun with high hopes, to lay off hardworking staff, or to hurt and offend alumni with enthusiasm for a particular sport. But if that program, department, or sport is dragging down the institution, sometimes the survival of the institution necessitates hard choices.

Data Point:
The financially unsustainable university

An unclear financial future

“The worst-case scenario for an institution is to be relatively expensive and completely undifferentiated. Who will pay $40,000 per year to go to a school that is completely undistinguished on any dimension?”


The arms race. Competition is a good thing—until it isn’t. Many critics agree that the rating systems that rank colleges and universities are hurting institutions rather than helping them. Colleges determined to increase their standing can game the system by dramatically increasing the pool of applicants just to reject most of them and increase their “selectivity” rating—how does this indicate improved quality? (Not to mention that the process increases the very real costs of recruiting and then rejecting all those applicants.) Even more critically, colleges and universities that spend more money rank higher than those that spend less, perversely incentivizing institutions to aim for higher expenses rather than increased efficiency. A 2009 report by the Center for College Affordability and Productivity noted:

Judging a school by its expenditures per students actually provides disincentives for cutting costs and keeping tuition down. In the U.S. News ranking, if two colleges provide the same academic quality but one does it while spending less, all other factors being equal this school would actually receive a lower ranking than the school that provided the same quality at greater cost to its students (and to taxpayers, if the school is public).

Aversion to risk. When a participant at the Thought Leaders symposium proposed that higher education is averse to change, it prompted a fascinating discussion and decision by the group that the real aversion is to risk rather than change. The costs of many institutional risks are so high that many faculty and administrators fear to make them. As Clayton Christensen and Henry J. Eyring note in a recent article, “No risk-averse department chair can think seriously about cutting courses or degree programs. Even if such a proposal could be pushed through the curriculum committee, the only reward to the chair would be collegial ostracism.” Similarly, an athletic director has few rewards for dropping a popular sport, nor does a president refusing a donor’s offer of a new building. Institutions do not reward risky but potentially highly rewarding decisions—especially when those decisions are unpopular.

Multiple challenges distract from sustainability efforts. With so many priorities jostling for attention, institutions can let their focus slip away from sustainability targets. Sustainability is at the stage where progress means continuing to push forward on hard-to-attain goals. It’s easy to lose ground when you’re not paying close attention.
What’s getting in the way of success from outside the institution?

Other factors outside the institution’s control are also blocking progress.

**Underprepared students.** Different measures of college-readiness agree that many students aren’t up to the challenge of rigorous courses. The College Board reports that just less than half of the students who took the SAT in 2013 are ready to succeed in college. Only 43 percent of test-takers scored 1550 out of a possible 2400; research shows that students who score less than 1550 are more likely to average a C or below their first year of college and less likely to complete their degree within four years. Meanwhile, roughly 60 percent of the 6.5 million students who enroll in community colleges require remedial classes. Underprepared students take longer to graduate and many drop out altogether.

**Changing demographics.** The traditional college student—18 to 23 years old, attending a residential campus—is increasingly a minority. The classroom of 2020 will be far more diverse than today; enrollment is projected to increase by 25 percent each for African-American and Asian students and 46 percent for Hispanic students. Students will also be older; the greatest enrollment increases will come from students 25 to 34 years old (21 percent) or 35 and up (16 percent). Part-time enrollment will grow faster than full-time enrollment. Institutions need to be prepared for the nontraditional student to become traditional.

**Declining resources.** State funding for higher education continues well below pre-recession levels, according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. On average, funding has risen by 7 percent, or roughly $450 per student, but this is still 23 percent less than state institutions received in 2008. (Eight U.S. states actually continued to cut allocations for higher education in 2013.) Returns on endowments have risen along with the economy, but private institutions with small endowments can take no comfort in this fact. A large segment of the higher education sector is increasingly dependent on tuition, and tuition revenue was stagnant in FY 2013. A third of private and public institutions project that net tuition revenues will grow by less than 2 percent or decline, according to a survey by Moody’s Investors Service. Many tuition-dependent institutions find themselves in a destructive spiral of discounting in order to land the “right” students—usually the most academically promising—so the stated price is only paid by a handful of new students.

---

**Data Point:**

**Changing demographics and private institutions**

**Will residential private campuses be hardest hit?**

“Demographic changes may be particularly challenging for some residential private colleges outside of major metropolitan areas. Some of these institutions are largely white and full of traditional college-age students at a time when demographers predict enrollment growth for part-time students, minority students, and students from urban areas. ‘Historically these are not institutions that have been... visible in the minority community,’ said Richard Kneedler, former president of Franklin & Marshall College. ‘It means when their base shrinks it’s really a challenge.’

“The president of Johnson C. Smith University, a historically black college in North Carolina, has similar worries.

“‘Watch this space,’ said President Ronald Carter, ‘see how predominantly white institutions will struggle if there are fewer white Americans to fill their seats. Will they fill them with international students? How many minority students can they really afford with gap funding?’

“Carter said American higher ed needs to negotiate the demographic shift carefully. Minority students are generally coming with less money than white students, so colleges that are trying to plug their enrollment losses with minorities are going to have to find some way to help the students pay.”

enrollees. Every dollar discounted is a dollar that isn’t collected and used for education purposes.

**Rising costs.** The cost to run the average campus has gone up, in part due to the same factors that have driven up costs for businesses. The cost of health benefits, for example, has risen over the past decade for all organizations. Cost increases specific to higher education include a sizable increase in administrative staff. The higher education workforce grew by 28 percent between 2002 and 2014, with the most significant growth in administrative positions such as HR benefits administrators, admissions staff, IT analysts, and counselors, according to the Delta Cost Project. Certainly, the increase in administrative staff is not necessarily negative; many of the new employees provide critical student services, deal with regulatory mandates, and raise and manage funds from a wide variety of sources. The point is that institutions need to understand and adjust to the larger slice of the pie going to administration. (Faculty salaries, on the other hand, have remained flat since 2002, smashing the theory that high salaries are pushing up tuition.)

Research institutions have seen some of the greatest cost increases; a study of spending at Virginia’s public colleges and universities found that colleges and universities have expanded the scope and size of institution-sponsored research. Research spending grew at Virginia’s six research institutions by 62 percent. Construction of instructional and research space has also pushed up higher education costs. For example, a detailed analysis of nonacademic services and costs in Virginia found that, on average, 7 percent of the price of higher education to students was to pay for institutional debt service, primarily on nonacademic capital projects.

**Data Point:**
**Changing expectations**

*Preparing students for the right jobs*

As expectations about higher education shift and evolve, a college education is no longer seen as an end in itself; instead, a degree has a clear purpose: to prepare students for employment. As this attitude has spread, policymakers have begun to insist that colleges and universities equip students not just for any jobs but for the right jobs—the careers that will benefit individuals and the economy the most.

A 2011 report by the National Governors Association makes this point strongly:

Recognizing that universities and colleges are critical to their state’s growth and economic prosperity, many governors and state policymakers have been considering how best to get more students to both enter college and get college degrees . . .

Recently, however, a growing number of governors and state policymakers have come to recognize that higher education, including community colleges, four-year colleges, and research universities, cannot help drive economic growth in their states unless students’ academic success is linked to the needs of the marketplace. Thus, some governors and state policymakers are beginning to move beyond their focus on getting more students to get “degrees” to asking: “Degrees for what jobs?”

The report encourages states to “set clear expectations for higher education’s role in economic development,” “encourage employers’ input in higher education,” and “emphasize performance as an essential factor in funding.” Measures of success should include students’ employment after graduation.

It’s not clear how far this trend will go. (Will states penalize institutions that graduate too many English majors?) What is completely clear is that institutions must be ready to respond to the changing expectations of policymakers and prepared to answer when asked which jobs their students will be prepared for.
Changing expectations. Students, parents, businesses, and governments ask more of higher education than ever before. A recent presentation by Georgia Tech president Bud Petersen noted three ways in which expectations for colleges and universities have changed. First, institutions are expected to “ensure that graduates are both employable and prepared to adapt and lead in an ever-changing world.” Ensuring employability is a far higher standard that providing learning. A generation or two ago, colleges and universities focused on providing an education; now they are asked to almost guarantee a job for graduates. Furthermore, the value of a degree is measured in terms of future income potential, not in terms of what the student has learned or experienced.

Second, institutions are expected to promote economic development in their communities. Petersen specifically discussed how Georgia Tech moves research from the lab to the consumer via start-up support, business incubators, and technology transfer, but an institution doesn’t have to be a research university to be asked to promote the economy of its region.

Finally, institutions are expected to provide an education “to the world,” in Petersen’s terms—but at least to a far more diverse group of students. For most of the twentieth century, higher education was reserved for a fairly elite group of students, and institutions could count on them to be prepared for college-level work. Today, a larger proportion of the population than ever before attends college, and the institution as a whole hasn’t yet adapted to the arrival of the new normal—that is, students that are minority, low-income, part-time, older, and the first generation to attend higher education. These new expectations remain bewildering for some in higher education, and institutions often struggle to adjust to the new reality.

Data Point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimal outcomes for higher education</th>
<th>Actual outcomes today</th>
<th>Barriers to success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student success</td>
<td>Inconsistent educational outcomes</td>
<td>Inflexible and entrenched teaching methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Underprepared students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High rates of recruiting and retention</td>
<td>Poor recruitment and retention</td>
<td>Ineffective retention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable tuition and fees</td>
<td>Limited access and lack of affordability</td>
<td>The arms race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aversion to risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially sustainable business plan</td>
<td>Unsustainable funding model</td>
<td>Declining resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rising costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible use of space and other resources</td>
<td>Poor use of space and other resources</td>
<td>Outdated space policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear mission and focus</td>
<td>Lack of focus and unclear mission</td>
<td>Unclear, unaligned mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally sustainable campus</td>
<td>Failure to prioritize environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Multiple challenges and issues distracting from sustainability efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Strategies for improving institutional outcomes

Closing the gap between the desired outcomes and the current situation means confronting some of the most intractable problems in higher education. Solving these challenges will take time, persistence, and readiness to take risks, but institutions unwilling to innovate face an uncertain future.

1. Increase emphasis on student success.

The issue: When students thrive, the institution thrives; when they fail, so does the institution. Colleges and universities need to prioritize student success and seriously consider when, why, and how students stumble. A new focus on success will improve retention rates as well as better prepare students for their futures.

Strategies for success:

First, colleges and universities need to understand what limits success. According to a report by the American Federation of Teachers based on intensive focus groups with students, the biggest obstacles to success are as follows:

- **Lacking enough money and financial aid to go to school.** This is a larger concern for community college students than for those at four-year institutions, but nevertheless can affect students on any campus.

- **Receiving inadequate academic guidance and advising.** Students often don’t understand academic requirements; they don’t know how to set academic goals or execute coursework to meet these goals.

- **Lacking highly developed “soft skills.”** Without strong reading and math abilities, study and time management skills, and adequate self-discipline and motivation, students can fail to advance through college-level coursework.

- **Inability to find time and “balance.”** Coursework is only one of many roles for today’s students, who often have jobs and family responsibilities.

  Colleges and universities can’t solve all of these problems for students, but they can do the following:

- **Create accessible and friendly financial aid offices.** Students can use all the help they can get navigating financial aid.

- **Adopt best practices for academic guidance and advising.** Academic advising is traditionally a low-priority activity on campus, but institutions are recognizing the value of effective advising and investing in improving their advising process.

- **Require orientation programs.** Students who attend summer orientation programs report learning better study and time-management skills, developing supportive peer and mentor relationships, and understanding expectations for coursework.

- **Normalize asking for help.** Students often don’t realize how much help is available to them. Faculty need to encourage students to ask questions, come to office hours, use tutoring centers, and generally take advantage of the support network already in place.

- **Simplify course selection.** Students are often overwhelmed by the variety of courses available and unclear about what they should and shouldn’t take. They end up signing up for classes they don’t need, delaying their time to graduation and increasing their costs. Research shows that limiting course selection and laying out a clear list of requirements is an effective retention strategy.

- **Create shorter, more flexible pathways to degrees.** On the other hand, course schedules should be as flexible as possible. Institutions should offer night classes, compressed courses, mini-terms, and summer courses. Aim for motivated students to complete a degree within three years.
Participants at the Thought Leaders symposium were clear on the importance of student success for higher education. All decisions at the institution, one participant urged, should be made based on whether or not the decision promotes student success.

Questions for institutional dialogue:

- How does our institution define student success?
- How do we measure the success of our students?
- What sort of systems are in place to monitor student progress? What happens if a student is at risk of failure? Is this system effective?
- What is our advising process? Do we have data that shows how well the process works? Does the process need to be revised to meet the needs of today's students?
- How do we help students acquire “soft skills” such as time-management and study skills? Should these programs be expanded, better promoted, or made mandatory?
- Are we making it as easy as possible for students to get the classes they need to get to a diploma? Do we need to offer classes at different times? On different schedules?
- How can we help students develop personal connections on campus?

2. Improve affordability.

The issue: The higher education affordability crisis is a complex problem with multiple causes, and it will require a complex solution. Easy answers do a disservice to sincere college and university leaders seeking real strategies. The institutions that succeed will be those who strategize their approaches, build consensus with different constituencies, and clearly communicate their goals.

Strategies for success:

The following strategies can be considered a starting point for institutions looking to cut costs and increase revenues.

- Stabilize state funding. Higher education needs to engage in a frank conversation with elected officials and policymakers on the value of colleges and universities to the state and the level at which the state should fund postsecondary education. Commitments need to be made that will allow administrators to plan for funding going forward. In return, state institutions can point to gains in productivity as well as ongoing productivity efforts to demonstrate their commitment to keeping down the cost of each degree produced. Colleges and universities need to acknowledge that
the cost of education is not fixed—despite previous claims to the contrary. Some funding will come not from students or the state but be squeezed out of existing operations by improving efficiency.

- **Focus on retaining existing students.** Retention is a financial issue, since serving the students you already have costs less than bringing new students onto campus.

- **Clarify tuition by reducing discounting.** Institutions have dramatically raised tuition at the same time they’ve also increased the practice of discounting—aid from the institution—so that the net price of a year of instruction is on average 45 percent less than the sticker price. Many colleges and universities plan to raise revenue in coming years by reducing discount rates (51 percent of private institution CFOs noted this as a strategy in the Inside Higher Ed survey), but critics charge that discounting strategies have “hit a wall,” according to TIAA-CREF. A more sustainable approach is needed, and colleges and universities should revise stated tuitions close to the average discounted rate.

- **Develop new revenue streams.** Institutions should look to new programs—such as online courses and international campuses—to tap new markets and new sources of income. The challenge is to develop these programs in cost-effective ways that don’t dilute the institution’s core mission and that are economically sustainable. Careful cost-benefit analysis and customer surveying needs to take place to make sure programs will have users and earn back more than they cost.

At the same time, colleges and universities need to put in place policies and practices that improve affordability for students:

- **Lock in tuition prices.** Guaranteeing tuition rates for four years allows students to better plan their total costs.

- **Reduce time-to-graduation.** Getting students out of school faster by providing accelerated classes, offering a comprehensive summer schedule, ensuring required courses are available, and streamlining requirements allows students to maximize their investment in higher education and start their careers sooner.

- **Ease the transfer process.** Students move between institutions for multiple reasons, including financial ones. Spending even a single year at a low-tuition, in-state college or university can significantly reduce costs, but right now this process is fraught with anxiety, since schools have varying degree requirements, often require repetition of completed courses, and limit the number of transferable credits. Making transfers less painful could increase accessibility for many students.

**Questions for institutional dialogue:**

- How do we define affordability for our institution?
- How sustainable is the institution’s financial model? What is our level of debt? Of discounting? If the model isn’t sustainable, what needs to change?
- What programs are in place to retain existing students? How well are they working? What needs to be improved? Who is responsible for this task, and do they have the authority to be effective?
- What is our current rate of discounting? Do we need to adjust our stated tuition to better reflect the real price of a degree?
- How do we identify and evaluate new funding sources?

**Data Point:**

*High tuition, high discounts*

**The untenable discounting situation**

“Schools wanted a high tuition on the assumption that families would say that if they’re charging that high tuition, they must be right up there with the Ivys. So schools would set a high tuition, then discount it. But when the schools in your peer group all have discounts, it becomes an untenable competition for students, with everyone having to increase their discounts.”

3. **Focus on the mission of the institution.**

The issue: Many colleges and universities have tried to be all things to all people. They lack a core identity and mission that distinguishes them from other institutions. Narrowing the focus of the institution on a clearly defined and agreed-upon mission allows the college or university to start eliminating programs and staff that don’t support that mission. The result is not only reduced costs by prioritizing facility investments, but also a strong identity and driving sense of purpose.

**Strategies for success:**

- **Identify and increase distinctiveness.** Institutions that can point to a key strength and then build on that strength are like consumer brands that can point to a unique benefit; they can differentiate themselves from the rest of the pack. Distinctiveness attracts new students, draws donors, motivates faculty and staff, and creates a sense of camaraderie on campus.

- **Reduce administrative staff.** CFOs surveyed by *Inside Higher Ed* identified this strategy as one of the most important to reduce costs for the following year, but cutting staff can do more than simply balance the budget. Administrative bureaucracies also bog down the institution, reduce efficiency, and limit interaction between students and senior administrators.

- **Eliminate unnecessary academic programs.** Underperforming, unnecessary academic programs distract from the goals of the institution and suck money away from essential operations. As painful as the program prioritization process might be, the step was the second-most agreed-upon strategy for reducing costs identified by higher education CFOs in the *Inside Higher Ed* survey.

- **Share programs with other institutions.** Colleges and universities like the idea of their faculty teaching their students, but it doesn’t always have to be that way. Institutions can share faculty and programs resources when they are too much for one campus to manage alone or fall outside of one institution’s mission. This strategy is particularly appropriate for state institutions within systems; the use of the assets of the whole system to serve students on each campus is an underutilized strategy.

- **Outsource business functions.** The college campus is expected to operate top-notch dining, residential, sports, and IT units even though these are not the institution’s core functions. Businesses and nonprofits moved away from this model years ago—outsourcing is a mainstay of most modern businesses. Higher education needs to consider handing operations such as food service, housing, recreation, healthcare, IT, and custodial services to firms that can deliver better services at lower prices.

**Questions for institutional dialogue:**

- What type of institution are we? What do we do best? What programs are in the highest demand? Where do we deliver the most value?

- Does our stated mission really reflect who we are?

- Who are our students? What kinds of students constitute the market available to us? What kind of students are we best equipped to serve? Does our vision of our ideal student line up with reality?

**Data Point: Reducing administrative staff**

*The case for cutting staff positions*

“Administrative staff at colleges has grown in both absolute number and relative to student enrollments...Expenditures on education and related expenses are increasingly allocated to administrative and support services and less so to instruction, with expenditures on the former already outnumbering that of the latter in some sectors and approaching parity in the remainder.

“Administrative and support staffs in higher education should be reduced in order to lower the costs of providing a college education, to improve employee productivity, and to refocus the mission of colleges to the production and dissemination of knowledge.”

What is the current level of administrative staffing? Do these staff serve the mission of the institution? How do we determine which staff positions can be eliminated?

How do we evaluate programs/offerings to ensure they align with our mission? How do we create a process to shutter programs that offer little value?

What is our institution's attitude toward outsourcing? What do we outsource now, and how well does that process work? What other operations could be outsourced? What would be required to make outsourcing an accepted alternative at our institution?

How do we ensure new programs align with our mission?

Do we have opportunities for either expanding markets or reducing costs that can be explored if the institution embraces new delivery models (online, competency-based, etc.)?

4. Allocate resources based on institutional priorities.

The issue: Higher education frequently allocates resources without making a case for the expense. Budgets and space assignments are a matter of standard operating procedure even when that procedure no longer makes educational or financial sense. Institutions need processes for determining the optimal allocation of resources, including space, capital funding, faculty, staff, and money. These processes should be driven by the college or university’s mission and priorities and incorporate analysis of return on investment.
Colleges and universities can start improvements by looking seriously at the utilization of existing resources and assets, including facilities (how many classrooms are empty how often?); faculty (how many credit hours are taught by faculty members in different departments?); and programs (how many students have graduated in each of the last five years?). Understanding the current state of affairs can point the institution toward areas where resources can be used more effectively.

**Strategies for success:**
The single-most important strategy for colleges and universities is to adopt the principle that resources are allocated to achieve the institution’s mission. From that principle flows specific steps that colleges and universities can take to align resource use and campus goals.

- **Adopt a budgeting strategy that ties resources to mission.** Colleges and universities employ a wide variety of budget models, some of which do a better job than others of aligning resources and goals. Simply adjusting budgets up or down by percentage increments, for example, has no connection to institutional planning. Budgets need to be strategic, integrated across the institution, and aligned with agreed-upon priorities. For example, the Resource Allocation Mapping model requires projects and departments to prioritize expenses based on an assessment that encompasses the mission and strategic plan, the financial performance of the project/department, internal competencies (can the institution accomplish this task and do it well?), and market trends (are others doing it?). Programs are ranked from most important (Drives the Enterprise) to least (Drains Resources) and funded accordingly.

- **Allocate space as carefully and strategically as any other resource.** Institutions have a track record of treating space like an entitlement, a free possession of departments and programs, rather than a limited, expense-generating resource. Colleges and universities should understand and communicate both the value and the cost of space.

- **Use return-on-investment (ROI) to drive resource deployment.** Measuring ROI in higher education is complicated—it’s not a simple matter of how much money was made in a new factory. At some research institutions, ROI can be relatively straightforward for lab spaces; universities can calculate the amount of grant money per square foot of lab space. For classrooms, teaching labs, offices, and libraries, the equation is more complicated. Can the institution tie improved student learning to upgraded classrooms? Can administrative productivity gains be linked to an integrated, easy-to-use financial software system? Despite the difficulties, colleges and universities see a benefit to analyzing the return on institutional investments, even if they are more qualitative than quantitative.

**Questions for institutional dialogue:**
- What is the current budgeting model at the institution? Does it explicitly tie the college or university’s mission to budget line items? How do departments or programs make the case that their expenditures support broader priorities?
- Do individual departments or programs “own” their space, or is it controlled at the college or institutional level?
- Is space allocation explicitly tied to the university’s mission and goals? If not, how would the space allocation process need to change to align space use with institutional priorities?
- Are the users of space aware of the costs of that space? If awareness is low, how can the institution communicate the expenses associated with space?

**Data Point: Space allocation**

**Changing the culture of space**

“We need to make it clear that space is not owned by a department; it is allocated to a need or an activity, to contribute to that activity’s success. We need to set the expectation that as activities shift in priority, space reallocation will be necessary.”

—Phil Rouble, associate director of facilities planning & sustainability at Algonquin Colleges, quoted in “Changing the Culture of Space Allocation,” Higher Ed Impact, Academic Impressions, December 8, 2011.
What sort of qualitative or quantitative measures can be used to measure the ROIs in facilities, operations, and administration? Can these measures be linked to the institutional mission and strategic plan?

5. Increase reliance on data and business analytics to support decisions and improve teaching and learning.

The issue: Colleges and universities should take advantage of every tool available to improve the performance of the institution, yet many have hesitated when it comes to business analytics and data-driven decision making. Other campuses have found success employing analytics to allocate resources, manage finances, and serve students. Institutions should make strategic investments in analytics and promote a culture of data-driven decision making.

At the same time, colleges and universities need to build on their investment in course management software by digging deeper into their data for insights on students and faculty. Programs can already alert faculty if a student’s engagement with a course suddenly declines (as measured by a marked decrease in online participation, for example). As systems develop they will be able to customize learning modules to best fit students’ learning styles, identify gaps in the mastery of material, and provide feedback on how to better present material.

Strategies for success:

- Identify strategic questions that can be answered with data. Research by EDUCAUSE shows that business analytics systems work best when they are developed to answer specific questions. Institutions should start by identifying strategic business problems and developing questions for the system to answer.
- Start where you are, with the data you have. Institutions often believe that their data won’t support analytics; in fact, business intelligence requires neither perfect data nor the perfect data culture. Campuses can begin with what they have and improve their data going forward.
- Invest in people over tools. Analytics are as much about people as programs. Without staff who understand the data, the tools, the strategic problem, and the institution, analytics will simply be costly software systems.
- Employ analytics across the institution. The most common use of analytics today is in enrollment management, finance and budgeting, and student progress. However, analytics systems can be used to support any activity that generates large quantities of data, including human resources, facilities, procurement, and research administration.
- Incorporate analytics into student success efforts. Data analysis has particular promise in student performance, recruitment, and retention. Take advantage of the data already available from existing course management systems to track student success and look for patterns.
- Use student data to test the effectiveness of teaching and learning strategies. It’s sometimes hard to know what works in teaching—there are too many variables, especially in a single classroom. However, learning management systems allow for strategies to be tested across large numbers of learners and offer almost instant feedback. For example, course software systems can provide a different experience—such as different study materials, homework, or quizzes—to different students. For example, half the students in one section of an introductory science course could receive experience A and half experience B, allowing faculty to quickly see which approach is the most successful.

Questions for institutional dialogue:

- What are the highest priority strategic questions confronting the institution? How can data and analytics help provide an answer?
- What data is the institution already collecting? Who is responsible for this data? What is the quality of the data? What processes can be put in place to improve the quality of data going forward?
- What is the level of institutional commitment to analytics? Is the institution ready to invest in both systems and people? Who will be responsible for analytics systems? How will the systems be managed?
- What data is available in our existing course management software? How can we better take advantage of the insights hidden in that data?
6. Prioritize environmental sustainability.

The issue: Issues of affordability, budgeting, and student success can easily distract colleges and universities from the goal of sustainability. But the environment isn’t going to wait until the economy improves and institutions reform their financial operations. Sustainability must be tackled in the middle of everything else. A deep, lasting commitment to a green campus will have lasting benefits for the institution and the climate.

**Strategies for success:**
A model for the sustainable college or university was recently proposed by Mitchell Thomashow in his new book *The Nine Elements of a Sustainable Campus*. Mitchell divides his nine elements into three categories (infrastructure, community, and learning), and suggests strategies for each. These include the following:

- **Infrastructure**
  - Energy: Strive for zero-carbon energy use by adopting a mix of tactics, including renewable energy sources, rigorous conservation, and offsets. Track energy usage on a detailed level (by room, if possible) and make clear the connection between daily behaviors such as thermostat settings and institutional energy costs.
  - Materials: Employ sustainable materials with a minimal ecological footprint in both buildings and operations.
  - Food: Consider energy costs when sourcing foods and communicate these costs to students. Support local and organic farmers and look for opportunities to grow food on campus.

- **Community**
  - Governance: Incorporate sustainability into the mission, master plan, and strategic plan of the institution. Build alliances between all levels of administration and look for leaders with the passion and commitment to spearhead sustainability efforts.
  - Investment: Support green businesses within the local community. Evaluate the institution’s portfolio and consider focused investing in enterprises with a strong social and ecological commitment.
  - Wellness: Provide a healthy workplace. Incorporate health and wellness into the curriculum.

- **Learning**
  - Curriculum: Encourage faculty across the institution to incorporate sustainability into their teaching. Create more sustainability majors.
  - Interpretation: Communicate sustainability efforts to students, faculty, and visitors to the campus. Tell the story of environmental efforts in campus publications and marketing programs.
• **Aesthetics:** Encourage art students, faculty, and community members to treat the campus as a green canvas. Create architecture and landscape plans that are as sustainable as they are beautiful.

**Questions for institutional dialogue:**

- Where does sustainability rank among institutional goals? Has it lost momentum in recent years or remained a priority? How can your college or university keep up its commitment to environmental stewardship going forward?
- Among Thomashow’s nine elements, where has your institution made the most progress? Where should it turn its attention?
- Is sustainability part of the institution’s mission or vision? How does sustainability align with other elements of the mission? Does the mission need to be revised to incorporate sustainable elements?
- Are there untapped opportunities for developing curricula in a variety of academic areas that utilize the campus as a learning laboratory?

**Data Point:**

**Cutting academic programs**

**Hard choices at Pennsylvania colleges and universities**

Several public institutions in Pennsylvania have proposed eliminating academic programs to cut costs while focusing on the core of their academic mission. The move is upsetting students and faculty, who charge that the cuts will diminish institutions, according to an October 2013 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* titled “The Liberal Arts Confront Fiscal Reality at Edinboro U.”

Edinboro University faces the elimination of dozens of faculty members along with undergraduate programs in German, philosophy, and world languages and cultures. Julie E. Wollman, president of Edinboro, said the cuts are necessary in the face of declining state appropriations and shrinking enrollment; they will allow the university to remain on a sound financial footing. “In some areas, the number of majors is so low—typically, fewer than ten—that they are difficult to sustain,” said Wollman, who added that the university needs to “shift the focus to the needs of the region.”

Critics charge that the cuts will leave the institution “stunted.” They also argue that the role of the university is not to create well-trained employees but to provide a well-rounded education. “What worries me is that we’re not building citizens who know how to think, we’re training workers,” said Jean G. Jones, director of the Edinboro honors program and the faculty union’s representative at the school.

Look for Part 2 of this series in the November/December 2014 issue of *Facilities Manager*. Download the full report at [www.appa.org/bookstore](http://www.appa.org/bookstore)