A successful 21st century university is a student-centered institution, unconstrained by time and place, that operates simultaneously in a local and global context, constantly measuring and communicating its progress, and continually renewing its commitment to students, community and the economic competitiveness of the country.
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PROLOGUE

LAST SPRING, WE EMBARKED ON A LIVELY SURVEY IN WHICH WE MET WITH AND INTERVIEWED 50 HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS (A COMBINATION OF CHANCELLORS, PRESIDENTS, VICE PRESIDENTS, PROVOSTS AND CIOS) IN THE U.S. AND CANADA, HOPING TO LEARN ABOUT THEIR GREATEST CHALLENGES—THE ONES THAT KEPT THEM UP AT NIGHT. WE ALSO ASKED THEM ABOUT THEIR DREAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

The interviews were warm and candid; the leaders were open and accessible. We put no boundaries on the discussions. Our talks were broadly focused on strategic concerns, not narrowly focused on technology or product issues.

We were surprised by the consistency of the answers and the changes they spelled out for higher education. It became clear to us that higher education is operating in a new environment, perhaps for the first time since the immediate post-World War II era. The ground is shifting. Colleges and universities are confronting new types of students—younger and more technology-driven, as well as older and more career-driven. They are confronting unprecedented competition, aggressive accountability demands and a view of operating in a global context. And they are doing all of this with less direct funding.

We analyzed and synthesized the results into a coherent vision for the future of higher education. As we put together this forward view, we also drew information from some of the larger studies reporting on the same subjects, e.g. the Spellings Commission and the National Survey of Student Engagement; as well as reports and data from EDUCAUSE, Eduventures, the American Council on Education, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (see Bibliography).

Conducting this engaging dialogue and composing this report are part of Blackboard’s commitment to address the changing needs of higher education. Blackboard has historically been a strong partner in creating innovative and useful educational technologies that enhance higher education academic study and campus life. Like our counterparts in higher education, we must rise to address the larger challenges, as well as the traditional ones.

In this report we reveal what we learned through the words of the education leaders we interviewed. It is our hope that this document will be useful for stimulating discussion and confronting the challenges faced by higher education.

We are grateful to those who took the time to share their concerns with us.

Peter Segall, President North America Higher Education and Operations
Gordon Freedman, Vice President, Education Strategy
I. View from the Top

The Four Greatest Challenges Facing Higher Education Today:

- Student Engagement
- Institutional Accountability
- Revenue Generation
- Globalization

Higher education is facing the demands of a world with new and quickly changing student demographics, an increasingly flat global environment, and tighter funding and accountability constraints. All of the education leaders we interviewed understand the importance of more market-oriented, student-centered and businesslike management and accountability strategies, while preserving their academic mission, focus and values.
Higher education is facing the demands of a world with new and quickly changing student demographics, an increasingly flat global environment, and tighter funding and accountability constraints. All of the education leaders we interviewed understand the importance of more market-oriented, student-centered and businesslike management and accountability strategies, while preserving their academic mission, focus and values.

For example, David Eisler, President of Ferris State University in Michigan, works diligently on strategic planning and involving the whole campus and the greater community in order to bring together the elements of a successful 21st century university. His student-centered dream for higher education includes providing more flexibility for students to learn, while servicing a wide variety of new student needs and wants. Ferris State University is working at creating a seamless experience for every student, no matter where they are, no matter who they are, by combining virtual, hybrid, physical settings and multiple options for learning, Eisler told us. The institution’s strategic plans are centered on the development of a learning core with uniform quality and content for whatever and however a student is studying and learning.

Arizona State University (ASU) President Michael Crow, formerly Executive Vice Provost at Columbia University, sees “A New American University” as the centerpiece of a transformational effort aimed squarely at re-focusing ASU’s goals and strategies. Part of the transformation means that, while still offering courses and programs in traditional disciplines, ASU is morphing into an institution balanced by modern programs aimed at solving real-world research issues that meet the current needs of Arizona, as well as providing the best education to the broadest population globally.

Lesley University President Margaret McKenna explains that Lesley University’s success can be attributed to its focus on continuously improving its core educational competencies, along with getting constant feedback from students on issues relative to program offerings, schedules and services. For the near future, McKenna sees growth in hybrid learning and international programs, with students spending increased time abroad and enhanced exposure to international issues. In addition, she sees potential dramatic growth in online offerings, along with Lesley University providing more flexible and meaningful educational opportunities for adults who are changing careers.

And Ron D. Wright, President of Cincinnati State, a two-year public institution that is heavily career- and technology-oriented, talks about how enhancing student services is vitally important. “We need to provide the best services we can at the best prices through programs with the greatest integrity,” Wright asserts. “This leads to more online programs for students who can handle them. We are finding ways electronically to provide access for more people to do more training.”
WHAT KEEPS EDUCATION LEADERS A WAKE AT NIGHT?

In addition to hearing many similar visionary goals and statements, our interviews with education leaders brought to light their biggest concerns (what keeps them awake at night), giving us the wherewithal to set down the four greatest challenges facing higher education today: Student Engagement, Institutional Accountability, Revenue Generation and Globalization.

Here are the short definitions of these challenges:

**Student Engagement** is all about enabling academic achievement and providing high quality student services. It also includes the student lifecycle, from choosing and preparing for higher education to student life services, remediation, retention, time to graduation and alumni relations.

**Institutional Accountability** means being accountable to trustees, state funding entities, legislatures, accrediting bodies, etc., who ultimately represent students, parents and taxpayers. It involves effectively gathering evidence and measuring student learning outcomes, evaluating financial performance, and gauging progress toward meeting institutional strategic goals and objectives.

**Revenue Generation** entails increasing non-tuition, tuition and state funding sources, primarily through better management of student services, increased development and marketing of distance education courses, and entrepreneurial activities that leverage research and community-development activities. Revenue generation also includes seeking increased research funding and philanthropic support.

**Globalization** involves developing and enhancing an institution’s international efforts through initiatives that establish new global partnerships, helping institutions compete more effectively in the global arena, improving international student recruitment, increasing students’ knowledge of global issues and boosting study-abroad programs.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

The challenges concerning student engagement involve much more than academics—it’s about the overall higher education experience students encounter on a day-to-day basis, from the moment they set foot on campus to commencement (if they get that far). Facing the challenges concerning student engagement requires a keen understanding about remediation issues, retention rates and the expectations of a diverse student population (adults, Millenials, NetGeners and everyone in between); providing timely and efficient student services; getting faculty to modernize from a technology perspective; and making meaningful lifelong learning connections.

When considering some of the amalgamated data and calls-to-action doled out by professional organizations that conduct serious research about higher education, the world of student engagement is an environment with many notable characteristics.

**•** The U.S. Department of Education reveals that 34 percent of one million first-time-in-college, bachelor-degree-seeking students who enrolled in Fall 1996 graduated from the same college or university in four years or less; 51 percent graduated in five years of less; and 56 percent graduated in six years or less.¹

**•** 34 percent of undergraduate students are over the age of 25.²

“I want to change the California State University system to be more student centered, to be student driven, to be student focused. My perspective is that the current culture is faculty first — not what is best for the student.”

Charles Reed, Chancellor
California State University System
Higher education enrollments are expected to increase by 20 percent from 2000 to 2015, and the large majority of these students will be low-income minorities, from Latino, Asian/Pacific-Islander and African-American families. Yet this new generation of students is arriving at college at a time of budget retrenchment and cutbacks for higher education.³

The best indicator of college student satisfaction is their perception of how the environment supports both their academic and social needs.⁴

Three out of 10 first-year students say that they do only just enough academic work “to get by.”⁵

“Most colleges and universities don’t accept responsibility for making sure that those they admit actually succeed . . . Over the past decade, literacy among college graduates has actually declined . . . compounding these difficulties is a lack of clear, reliable information about the cost and quality of post secondary institutions, along with a remarkable absence of accountability mechanisms to ensure that colleges succeed in educating students.”⁶

“Institutional Accountability

All of the education leaders we talked with are very intent on providing accrediting agencies with more valid and meaningful data representative of their successful programs. Additionally, it was noted that funding bodies, trustees and accrediting bodies are more deeply concerned than ever about the quality of, and access to, instruction that improves graduation rates and provides students with the necessary skills to compete in today’s workforce on a global scale. Education leaders are also following the development of their institution’s human capital, or lack thereof, to help power state economies.

Every leader interviewed agreed that technology will play a key role in acquiring, and developing an understanding of, data necessary for reporting to state governments, funding agencies, advisory boards, employers, politicians, accrediting agencies and the general public. In short, managing the nature and quality of student learning outcomes, maintaining continuous improvement and providing a consistent flow of evidence are all vitally important when developing successful institutional strategies.

Concerns about accountability are frequently discussed topics among education leaders and reported in the contemporary literature.
Accrediting agencies create clear expectations for institutions and programs to “define, collect, interpret and use evidence of student learning outcomes.”

Higher education needs to be more transparent about cost, price and student success outcomes. Additionally, such information needs to be shared with students and families.

“Despite increased attention to student learning results by colleges and universities and accreditation agencies, parents and students have no solid evidence, comparable across institutions, of how much students learn in colleges or whether they learn more at one college than another.”

The top overall strategic objective identified in a survey of higher education presidents, chief academic officers and chief financial officers (464 respondents) was “improving student learning outcomes.” However, as noted by Derek Bok, President Emeritus and Research Professor at Harvard University, less than one-third of higher education institutions in the U.S. conduct comprehensive evaluations that reveal whether or not the purposes of the institution’s general education program are achieved. Furthermore, Bok asserts that, while faculty typically keep the content of courses up to date, they rarely obtain clear evidence of how much their students are learning, especially in large lecture hall classes typically taught to passive audiences.

“The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that jobs requiring higher education will grow by 22 percent between 2002 and 2012—nearly double the rate of non-college jobs. In addition, the highly educated baby-boom generation is nearing retirement age, and shortages in the scientific- and engineering-related fields will be particularly acute.”

Government data on higher education does not include adequate numbers on nontraditional students, “and rarely focus on outcomes.”

“Economic impact studies are part of our public positioning for both local and state economies. We publicize results. Outreach programs into the community through our academic programs are integral parts of the curriculum. We also have regular executive-level contact with local elected officials. We anticipate Blackboard will help further enhance our local relationships.”

Dan Burkey, CFO
Creighton University

“We want to be the school that trains the employees for the manager trained at MIT. Our students can take a concept and make it happen.”
Ron D. Wright, President
Cincinnati State College

“The most acted upon finding across our interviews with education leaders was the use of, or intention to use, online technologies and programs to extend the campus footprint and relieve the physical campus. Additionally, the ability to provide a wider range of services on campus has become a universal need.”

Harvey Perlman, Chancellor
University of Nebraska Lincoln

Revenue generation is another great challenge for education leaders. Developing new revenue sources looms large as funding from both state and federal governments flattens, and competition for new students increases. Some revenue-generating solutions include creating new online programs and courses that can both increase enrollments and help facilitate the use of physical space more efficiently. Plus, well-managed student services can both increase the attractiveness of a campus and be a source of additional revenue. Automating services, along with increasing self-service options for students, ultimately prevents costs from growing.

“We simply need a more stable and secure level of resources. It is a fact in our state, like most, that Medicare, K-12 and prisons are going to take increasingly larger percentages of the budget, while higher education is seen as being more part of the discretionary budget.”

Harvey Perlman, Chancellor
University of Nebraska Lincoln
Overall, institutions are always looking for ways to develop innovative, business-oriented, student and community-spirited activities to generate new revenue. This is no surprise, especially when considering much of the data and information reported in relation to funding trends.

- A 2004 State Higher Education Finance (SHEF) study documented a four-year period (2001-04) when state funding did not keep pace with enrollment growth, “leaving per-student state and local funding near their lowest levels nationally in 25 years.”

- Between 2001 and 2004, state and local appropriations for higher education remained flat, while enrollment increased 11 percent and cost increased 13 percent.

Alliance agreements to develop projects in which institutions partner with, jointly invest resources with, and jointly retain ownership with, another organization (including institution-vendor partnerships), increased from 14 percent in 2004, to 30 percent in 2005 (in dollar terms). “Increasing prevalence of such contracts indicates that institutions are entering into shared-risk contracts with well-trusted service providers.”

The share of per-capita personal income going to public higher education has dropped 20 percent since 1977.

Public institution tuition has risen 54 percent in the last 10 years in response to increasing costs, without increasing appropriation.

---

**GLOBALIZATION**

Some of the primary globalization issues discussed by education leaders today include finding international partners, developing programs that can be offered internationally and that are enhanced through the creative use of educational technologies, competing globally for international student enrollments, and educating students to be competitive in a growing global economy and multi-national workforce environment.

It’s no secret that institutions that forge deeper international partnerships present a more competitive profile for attracting and retaining both faculty and students. Building institutional capacity that has global implications is a matter of pride, as well as practicality, for U.S. institutions to remain competitive worldwide.

Most of the institutions we surveyed have international departments that are expanding through the development of new courses and programs, and by forging new partnerships. In many cases, institutions are moving ahead of student demand out of an understanding that having a global perspective is an essential element for future success and relevancy.

---

“We have an ambitious campus master plan to build more dormitories and colleges. Our goal is to integrate and enrich the student living and learning experience to improve the overall quality of the undergraduate experience. We are moving to reduce the student-to-faculty ratio and to create environments in which students and faculty will socialize and spend more time together.”

Reagan Ramsower,
VP for Finance and Administration,
Baylor University

---

“The balance between capital needs and enrollment is a challenge. The campus is spending a high percentage of available capital on creating better and more up-to-date residential facilities. The ROI is not the major factor in this effort; the value to the college in terms of attracting and retaining students is our primary stimulus.”

Kenneth Levison, Vice President for Administration and Finance
State University of New York at Geneseo

---

“As we focus on the demand for career education, we are also moving towards internationalizing our students’ experience and boosting our reputation internationally.”

Michael Roy, CFO
Northern Michigan University
There is “no more valuable asset to our country than the friendship of world leaders who have been educated here,” noted Colin Powell.  

Our colleges and universities can, and do, contribute to affecting a more positive image of America on the global stage by fostering open debate about global issues and by educating students in ways that “reflect both the nature of contemporary policy problems and the changing global market for public service.”

While U.S. higher education has long been admired internationally, our continued pre-eminence is no longer something we can take for granted. The rest of the world is catching up, and by some measures has already overtaken us. We have slipped to 12th in higher education attainment and 16th in high school graduation rates.

Methods & Solutions for Meeting the Four Challenges

In their day-to-day work at meeting the four challenges, all of the education leaders interviewed were clear about encouraging an overriding framework for driving their institutions to be more market-oriented and businesslike, while preserving their academic integrity and focus on student learning.

Their methods and solutions for accomplishing such a goal tended to fall within three organizational structures: Transformational/Comprehensive, Transitional and Incremental. Depending on factors concerning an institution’s current state of affairs and its levels of mission achievement to date and beyond, many institutions move through all of these organizational structures at different rates and times.

Transformational/Comprehensive: Entails solutions that require the entire campus to come together in a reinvention process guided by a clear vision and strategic planning. ASU’s New American University initiative is a perfect example of how a very large institution can reinvent itself. In addition to proclaiming that it does not measure itself by the academic credentials of its incoming freshmen, the New American University is one “whose researchers, while pursuing their scholarly interests, also consider the public good; one whose students, faculty and staff transcend the concept of community service to accept responsibility for the economic, social, cultural and environmental vitality of the communities they serve.”

Ferris State University (FSU) is another example. In recent years FSU has developed a vision for creating a learning-centered university in which students, faculty, staff and administrators work together to become an engaged campus. “We must continue to work toward greater campus engagement,” says FSU President David Eisler. “Most of a student’s day is not spent in class, but rather outside it. To maximize the university experience we must continually work to extend the learning experience beyond the classroom. The world our students will work and live in is increasingly global and more diverse. We must prepare our students for this rapidly changing and evolving society.”

“We are expanding student exchange programs and formal partnerships with international institutions. Our target countries include China, Germany, India, Japan and Mexico. We hope to expand credit transferability and increase the number of students who study abroad to 10 percent.”

Carl Amrhein, Provost
University of Alberta
Transitional: Requires actions that reorient elements of the institution but stop short of being large-scale reorganization processes. Transitional solutions are common and typically involve one or more aspects of the campus operation attempting to change organizationally and/or procedurally. At Capella University, for instance, President Michael Offerman explains the institution’s economic mindset as one that focuses on making investments as opposed to reducing costs. “For us, technology is not a cost,” he says, “it’s an investment, and we expect a solid return from that investment.” In addition, Capella’s economic models revolve around cost per learner, as opposed to unit operating costs.

Incremental: These are singular solutions designed to address a specific issue or set of challenges in one or more aspects of campus life. A good example can be found at Quinnipiac University, where a Q-CARD program has resulted in generating new revenues. In short, Quinnipiac, like many institutions today, realized that moving its Q-CARD cashless transaction system to include more off-campus businesses results in a dramatic increase in overall transactions. “Quinnipiac can generate significant revenue incurring little expense while adding a great service to students, and requiring minimal staff resources,” says Jonathan Terry, Quinnipiac’s Facilities Administrative Coordinator.

LEADERSHIP & PROGRESS

Of course, none of these methods and solutions could have been accomplished without innovative and competent leadership. Our research and interviews also reveal that there are tough barriers to consider when moving an institution from discussion, to agreement, and to action. As one community college vice president of administrative services notes, “at our campus we are always five years behind. This needs to be changed, but it will take a major cultural shift in attitudes to make it happen.”

Many of the education leaders we interviewed say that they have some percentage of faculty and staff who oppose, and are threatened by, change. Others are disconnected with the mindset and behaviors of students. Our survey reveals that, to prevail under such circumstances, many leaders tend to follow a three-stage pattern of progress: rethink, engage and adapt.

Rethink
In almost every case where top-down change occurs, a rethinking or study process is implemented in which old methodologies are catalogued, new problems are defined, a re-conceptualization of issues is created and a change-implementation process is initiated. Such processes may be led by the president or provost and typically involve the appropriate campus constituencies, driven by a committee or group appointed to survey the issues at hand.

Engage
Change will not happen without engaging faculty, staff, administrators, and outside assistance in a process driven by campus constituencies and not dictated by campus leadership. To engage people at this level requires the development of an environment where faculty, staff and administrators see change as an absolute necessity. Education leaders who have implemented such a process report campus-wide ownership of change.

“Faculty must become more comfortable rethinking their teaching methods and embracing technology. The successful faculty of the future will be very comfortable teaching in a blended environment, with much done online, and with continuous improvement of the teaching process enabled through technology.”

James Rosser, President
California State University-Los Angeles

“The campus is facing some significant challenges in the future based on the demographics in the region. We are excited about our new President and the impact she will have on funding, retention and overall awareness of BHSU.”

Kathy Johnson, Vice President of Finance and Administration, Black Hills State University
Adapt
Institutions need to be flexible, nimble, adaptive to the ongoing process of organizational change, and capable of refocusing efforts to achieve qualitative and quantitative results. Without these capabilities, change is only tactical and difficult to achieve. With an adaptive capability and process to support it, change is part of the mission of the institution and is an expected part of improving campus life.

"We have to grow 2.5 percent each year; that’s 10,000 students over five years. In order to do this, we must be more efficient and productive, and we must watch quality. How do we increase quality and efficiency? The only way we can do this is through technology. This is critical to our future.”
Charles Reed, Chancellor
California State University System

EMBRACING CHANGE WITH TECHNOLOGY

It became very clear that education leaders fully embrace the notion that change must occur along the lines of financial, organizational, service, and education improvement and accountability. To enact change requires bold action and a clear vision that entails using technology and organizational change wisely. All of the education leaders expect to increasingly rely on technology solutions to help solve problems, create greater levels of engagement, and to become more efficient, as well as more performance- and evidence-oriented.
Follow-Up Study of Higher Education Leaders Echoes Findings from In-Person Interviews

Blackboard commissioned a follow-up study to accompany the in-depth interviews of higher education leaders that have been synthesized in “View from the Top: Building the 21st Century Campus.” The follow-up study employed online surveys conducted by an independent research organization, the DRC GROUP, in October/November 2006. The study participants consisted of more than 500 leaders from a wide cross-section of institutions, both in size and educational profile. These leaders comprised a balanced group of presidents, chancellors, provosts, academic vice presidents, deans, directors of institutional research, student services leaders and selected faculty chairpersons. This larger sample echoed the key findings from the in-depth interview study described in this “View from the Top” report.

Complementary highlights are referenced below. A full executive summary of the follow-up study, including a more detailed review of student service leadership issues, is also available.

On Core Missions
One of every three leaders stated that improving academic quality, revamping curriculum or adding new academic programs was a top priority.

Important Point of Agreement
Enhancing the quality of student life was high on everyone's list, regardless of role.

The Most Complex Issue
Student engagement has the broadest ownership and deepest layers of composition of any theme.

“Ivory Tower” No Longer
From a base of over 1,200 top issues volunteered by campus and system leaders, fully one-in-four reflected external forces with which they were confronted.

Top Challenges
The fifth and sixth most mentioned top priorities out of 1,200 offered were Enrollment and Student Retention.

Administrative View
Presidents and chancellors are particularly concerned with funding issues, capital project needs and community partnering.

Progress Report
The vast majority of leaders say they are well along in their planning or already implementing plans when it comes to strengthening assessment processes across the institution.

Faculty First?
Faculty issues, from development to succession, and technology adoption to workload, represented one out of every five key priorities for leadership. This was more evident with provosts and deans.

Technology
Twelve percent of all issues raised specifically focused on technology, generated by campus and academic leaders, not technologists.

ROI Means Performance Budgeting
Establishing a culture of measurement to support performance-based budgeting is one area in which many institutions have yet to take formal steps.

Strategic Asset
Half of senior leadership described e-Learning systems as a strategic asset that benefits their students and faculty.
II. The 21st Century Campus

An Emerging Vision:

- Institutional Flexibility
- Student Mobility
- Pervasive Technology
- Return on Investment

Listening carefully to the leaders, and analyzing what they and others are saying, led us to four variables that we think help define the shift in higher education thinking: Institutional Flexibility, Student Mobility, Pervasive Technology and Return on Investment. These four variables are part of the 21st century higher education mindset for the entire campus culture, not just for leaders, but for faculty, staff, alumni and students.
II. THE 21ST CENTURY CAMPUS

AN EMERGING VISION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY CAMPUS

As expressed throughout this synthesis of the interactions we had with 50 educational leaders and the reviewed literature, a new vision to match the new realities of our times is emerging and moving forward.

A successful 21st century university is a student-centered institution, unconstrained by time and place, that operates simultaneously, in a local and global context, constantly measuring and communicating its progress, and continually renewing its commitment to students, community, and the economic competitiveness of the country.

A NEW INSTITUTIONAL MINDSET ACROSS THE CULTURE

Listening carefully to the leaders, and analyzing what they and others are saying, led us to four variables that we think help define the shift in higher education thinking: Institutional Flexibility, Student Mobility, Pervasive Technology and Return on Investment. These four variables are part of the 21st century higher education mindset for the entire campus culture, not just for leaders, but for faculty, staff, alumni and students:

**Institutional Flexibility:** Higher education is less fixed in time, place, and offerings than it was in the past, and it is more opportunistic, positive about measurement and confident. While this is laudable, it is also necessary for surviving in a world with less funding and more demands.

*What’s Changed:* An institution is no longer simply a set of buildings, a rigid organizational hierarchy and physical property. Institutions can be thought of as less tangible now but more focused on creating value for communities, engaging students and building intellectual property.

**Student Mobility:** The era of students attending one institution, being loyal to the brand and learning through a single set of offerings is over. Students surf life and options in the real world just as they do virtually.

*What’s Changed:* Students vote with their minds, fingers and feet. They move around, assemble their own education solutions, follow their own leads or consult with peers, and rarely complain to authorities. Harnessing this, not ignoring it or missing the point, is critical.

**Pervasive Technology:** Technology is not optional at any level. It is here to stay and will grow and become more diverse as students continue to create their own communication, interaction and transaction modes. Faculty, staff and administration need to meet students where they are. New faculty have to come into the institution ready to engage as students do, and current faculty might need incentives to conform.

*What’s Changed:* Students have been relying on a variety of personal technologies, and campuses are always catching up. Administrations need to make it clear to faculty and staff that communicating, interacting with, and providing services to students are cultural variables critical to faculty success.
Return on Investment: The institution as a cost center will give way to the institution as an investment and ROI center. Institutions often look at the costs of technologies, reorganizations and planning, as opposed to perceiving such expenditures as investments whose returns (or losses) can be charted.

What’s Changed: Business models and business planning are becoming staples of campus redesign. By looking at investment strategies, return and loss can be monitored and used to guide later improvement, instead of simply appointing committees and hoping for the best.

WHAT IF?

What contributes to a successful 21st Century Campus? We compiled these “what if” propositions through a review of the literature and case studies related to how we educate, assess, house, service and retain today’s student body. Our interviews with higher education leaders also helped us formulate the “what-ifs”.

WHAT IF STUDENTS COULD . . .

• access engaging, interactive activities and assessments that support course and personal learning goals, anywhere, anytime?
• receive individualized instruction and attention, even in the largest of classes?
• access a variety of student life services on campus, off campus and online 24/7?
• complete self-directed remediation activities on a prerequisite or as-needed basis?
• be notified, and offered support, when they fall behind schedule or below expectations?
• participate in a strong network of peers, mentors, and instructors for learning and living?
• be offered a range of ways to engage in the life of the community based on their interests and expectations?
• easily demonstrate their accomplishments to peers, instructors and potential employers?
• be shown where they stand within their program and personal learning goals based on class benchmarks and professional standards?
• experience the team-based, global, virtual, 24/7 world they will work in while they are still in school?

WHAT IF FACULTY COULD . . .

• spend less time on administration and more time on research, teaching and community?
• easily transform their content and delivery to meet the new demands of students, institutional standards and employers?
• access a wealth of high-quality, interactive course content and assessments from inside and outside the university?
• more easily collaborate and share resources with local faculty, partner institutions and the global community of practice?
• demonstrate learning outcomes tied to professional requirements and institutional goals as a part of their normal workflow?
• be notified when students are performing below expectations and have a range of support options to offer them?
A VIEW FROM THE TOP: BUILDING THE 21ST CENTURY CAMPUS

WHAT IF ADMINISTRATORS COULD . . .

• continuously improve student engagement in learning and campus life?
• have confidence in the success and cost-containment of new and innovative programs and services?
• understand, track, and report on the complex factors and interactions that result in student success for use in institutional decision-making and resource allocation?
• demonstrate the attainment of learning outcomes tied to institutional goals and professional requirements?
• provide required remediation more economically?
• ensure business continuity for students in the face of natural disasters, terrorism, or quarantine resulting from pandemic disease or other catastrophes?
• build alumni loyalty and provide students with high-quality, branded, customized, service-oriented learning and living experiences that they will want to return to throughout their careers as learners?
SERVICING TOMORROW

Higher education is in more demand and plays a more significant role in society today than it has in any other period in history. As globalization brings communities of people around the world into the 21st century, the landscape for work, recreation, preservation and education is radically changing. Clearly, enterprise technology in the academic arena must evolve to meet the challenges present today.

Truly, a new student has emerged in both temperament and expectations. That student is operating in a new world. Higher education institutions, often slow to change, are confronting the realities of students who are technologically advanced, are likely to be in the workforce and who do not follow traditional educational paths. The same institutions that face this student, face a rapidly changing world. They do so in a funding climate that provides less direct funding than previously provided, and that demands that higher education do a better job of accounting for its successes and failures.

At this critical junction, Blackboard is committed to working closely with institutions to move from shared visions to the reality of building 21st century campuses.
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