

Contents

Foreword	1
<i>Richard Ekman, President, Council of Independent Colleges</i> <i>William Graves, Senior Vice President, SunGard Higher Education,</i> <i>Professor Emeritus, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</i>	
Preface	5
<i>Jacqueline Powers Doud, President, Mount St. Mary's College</i> <i>Marylouise Fennell, Senior Counsel, Council of Independent Colleges</i> <i>Scott D. Miller, President, Bethany College</i>	
Chapter 1	8
Beyond the Board Book: Internet Communication with Trustees <i>Theodore E. Long, President, Elizabethtown College</i>	
Chapter 2	14
To Improve Institutional Performance, Aim High and Go "BI" <i>Larry Goodwin, President, The College of St. Scholastica</i>	
Chapter 3	18
Technology and Students: "Call my cell." <i>Richard Artman, President, Viterbo University</i>	
Chapter 4	23
Advancement: Connecting to Constituencies Inside and Out <i>Christopher R.L. Blake, President, Mount Mercy College</i>	
Chapter 5	28
Leveraging Technology to Increase Enrollment, Capacity and Revenues <i>Arthur F. Kirk, President, Saint Leo University</i>	

Chapter 6	33
Standing Out in a Crowd of Peer Institutions: Leveraging Your IT Investments and People for Routine Innovation <i>Kevin M. Ross, President, Lynn University</i>	
Chapter 7	37
Retaining Learners...An Institutional Initiative <i>Ruth A. Knox, President, Wesleyan College</i>	
Chapter 8	42
Doing More with Less: Transforming a Program through Technology <i>Kevin J. Manning, President, Stevenson University</i>	
Chapter 9	49
The Role of Portals in Higher Education <i>Michael T. Victor, President, Lake Erie College</i>	
Chapter 10	54
Using Technology to Further a Culture of Innovation <i>Esther L. Barazzone, President, Chatham University</i>	

Foreword

By Richard Ekman and William Graves

In recent years, the uses of technology in higher education have increased in ways that were not anticipated even a few years earlier. For presidents of smaller, independent institutions, the challenges have been several: 1) to learn about possibilities for new uses of technology on campus; 2) to obtain disinterested advice about which of many options to pursue, especially insofar as most purchases of technology are significant expenditures; and 3) to stay informed about even newer possibilities for using technology to improve academic and administrative outcomes while decisions made just a few years earlier are still being implemented.

The Council of Independent Colleges recognizes that most presidents cannot immerse themselves in the changing roles, capabilities, and cost structures of the latest technologies. CIC accordingly tries to help presidents understand enough about technology-related matters to act prudently on technology purchasing and deployment decisions in the short timeframes associated with technology advances. CIC has arranged for sessions on specific technology-related topics at the annual CIC Presidents Institutes, the participation of many technology experts in the Institute, and the publication in 2005 of two publications for presidents (*Information Technology Benchmarks: A Practical Guide for College and University Presidents* and *President to President: Views on Technology in Higher Education*). Among the many technology companies that serve independent colleges and universities, SunGard Higher Education, the largest devoted exclusively to higher education, deserves our thanks for supporting the latter 2005 publication and conceiving of the current collection of essays as a way to help CIC presidents address rapidly evolving technology issues and opportunities.

With the encouragement and continuing gratitude of CIC and SunGard Higher Education, CIC's Senior Counsel Marylouise Fennell and two college presidents, Jacqueline Doud of Mount St. Mary's College (CA) and Scott Miller of Bethany College (WV), have shepherded and edited a fresh set of essays on how technology is being used to help independent institutions operate more effectively, all written by presidents from the perspective of their direct experiences. Several of the essays focus on functional areas of the campus that correspond more or less to units of the typical campus organization—board relations, advancement, and enrollment, for example. Several others focus on subjects that are often sources of major time-consuming problems for presidents including cost efficiencies, retention, and making the institution more distinctive. And still other essays introduce presidents to aspects of technology that are likely to be of greater importance in the coming years—portals, social networks, cloud computing, collecting and analyzing data, and the emerging role of technology in “institutional productivity.”

What drives most of this inquiry is, indeed, a growing concern about the productivity of smaller colleges and universities. With pressure from families and public officials to control prices, most colleges are reexamining their cost structures and looking to utilize technology not only in back office functions, but also in highly visible aspects of a college's operations that include enrollment, instruction, and assessment of learning outcomes. The rhetoric of international competition and American workforce development has given immediacy to these discussions in recent years.

Technology and academic culture may sometimes collide, especially within the rhetoric of "productivity." In the sense of McLuhan's "medium-is-the-message" insight, however, technology is changing the larger environment in which students learn. The dilemma for smaller independent institutions is that small scale, plentiful student-faculty and student-student live interaction, and substantial co-curricular activity have been the hallmarks of these institutions for many years. There is good evidence that a college education that utilizes these (admittedly, expensive) features is very effective—indeed, often more effective than other formats of education. The challenge today, therefore, is to utilize more cost-effective means, while preserving what has been so successful in the past by adapting it to the evolving cognitive modalities of this and subsequent generations. Happily—within these essays—there are examples of innovative uses of technology that honor traditional philosophies of education, while also improving efficiency and increasing learning and institutional effectiveness. (An additional "thought piece" is available from SunGard Higher Education for those who want to dig deeper into the broad policy context for today's "learning productivity" challenge in education.¹)

CIC and SunGard Higher Education are grateful to presidents Richard Artman of Viterbo University, Esther Barazzone of Chatham University, Christopher Blake of Mount Mercy College, Larry Goodwin of the College of St. Scholastica, Arthur Kirk of Saint Leo University, Ruth Knox of Wesleyan College, Theodore Long of Elizabethtown College, Kevin Manning of Stevenson University, Kevin Ross of Lynn University, and Michael Victor of Lake Erie College for contributing essays to this effort to advance our collective understanding of the role of technology in the independent institution. We encourage you to read their timely and insightful essays, which we believe will stimulate fresh thinking among all college and university presidents about better ways to conduct and assure both the efficiency and the quality of the "business" of learning—even at the most intimate scale of intellectual interaction.

¹ Waste Not the Learning Productivity Crisis, William H. Graves, first version posted to the Web in June, 2009.
http://institutionalperformance.typepad.com/WHG/Waste_Not_the_Learning_Productivity_Crisis.pdf

About the Authors



Richard Ekman
President, Council of Independent Colleges

Richard Ekman has been president of the Council of Independent Colleges since 2000. He previously served as vice president for programs of Atlantic Philanthropies and, from 1991 to 1999, as secretary of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. From 1982 until 1991, he was a member of the staff of the National Endowment for the Humanities, first as director of the Division of Education Programs, and subsequently as director of the Division of Research Programs. He currently serves as a member of many boards, including those of the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, the National Humanities Alliance, Project Pericles, LSU Press, the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, and the Overseers' Committee to Visit the Harvard University Library. Additionally, at Harvard he has been a member of the Villa I Tatti Council and the Graduate School Alumni Council.

His previous experience includes service as vice president and dean of Hiram College, where he was also a tenured member of the history faculty. Earlier, he served as assistant to the provost at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, and as associate director of the Department of Expository Writing at Harvard University. Ekman holds a Ph.D. from Harvard in the history of American civilization, the institution from which he also received his A.M. and A.B. (*magna cum laude*) degrees. He is co-author, with Richard E. Quandt, of *Technology and Scholarly Communication* (University of California Press, 1999).

Ekman has previously been active as a member of a variety of advisory and governing boards, serving the American Association for Higher Education, the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, the Council of American Overseas Research Centers, the Rackham Advancement Council of the University of Michigan, the Society for Values in Higher Education, the Washington Higher Education Secretariat, Georgetown Day School (Washington, DC) and Collegiate School (New York), and the Ohio Board of Regents.



William Graves
Senior Vice President, SunGard Higher Education

Bill Graves, senior vice president, academic strategy, provides guidance for SunGard Higher Education's ongoing initiatives to support teaching and learning. Working closely with other members of the executive team, Graves's unique perspective and experience help position SunGard Higher Education as an education partner able to contribute to the realization of institutional goals and initiatives.

Graves is a professor emeritus of mathematics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). He writes a periodic academic technology column for *Campus Technology* and publishes papers in the *EDUCAUSE Review* and other periodicals. He serves as a co-founding board member on the boards of both the National Center for Academic Transformation and the Alliance for Higher Education Competitiveness. He also has served on the boards of a number of other higher education associations.

Graves earned a mathematics Ph.D. from Indiana University before joining the faculty at UNC, where he also served as dean for general education, interim vice chancellor for academic affairs, senior information technology officer under various titles, and founder and director of the Institute for Academic Technology (a UNC/IBM alliance). At SunGard Higher Education, he continues to advocate for the transformative role of technology in systemically and measurably improving and accounting for institutional performance in higher education. You can learn more about his ideas at Graves's blog <http://institutionalperformance.typepad.com/>.

Preface

By Jacqueline Powers Doud, Marylouise Fennell, Scott D. Miller

The story is told of the 19th century Micronesian islanders who had never before seen a sailboat. When early colonists excitedly pointed to ships just offshore, the islanders could not see them—the experience was just too far outside their perception. Likewise, many of us in higher education could not envision the ways in which technology would transform our operations and marketing for better or worse, helping to level the playing field for small and mid-sized colleges with limited endowments, while challenging us in ways that we could not even imagine a decade ago.

As one technology builds upon another, we continue to be inspired by the immense promise and infinite possibilities.

As one technology builds upon another, we continue to be inspired by the immense promise and infinite possibilities. The conversation first began in 2004. John McAllister of SunGard Higher Education—a loyal friend and strong supporter of the Council of Independent Colleges New Presidents Program—began to encourage us to do this work before we even understood the need. The result: the first volume of *President to President: Views on Technology*

in *Higher Education* the following year. The response was overwhelmingly positive and soon a Spanish version was printed and distributed throughout Central and South America.

This book is designed as a follow up to volume I and addresses the new technological awareness. We dedicate this project to our many friends and colleagues in independent higher education who provide outstanding leadership while making critical decisions concerning technology that will impact services provided to current and future generations.

We are especially indebted to:

Dr. Richard Ekman, president of the Council of Independent Colleges, a dear friend and colleague to the three of us, who continues to advocate for independent higher education, encourage dialogue, engage in reform, and stimulate progressive national programs and initiatives, while providing stellar support to member presidents in every aspect of their professional lives.

We are grateful to all the people at SunGard Higher Education, especially to Laura Kvinge, Sandra DeCastro, and William Graves. Together with The Council of Independent Colleges, they have provided support to this needed and worthwhile project.

Our gratitude also goes to Martha Gaffney, Stephanie Kappel, and Lucille Villegas, our indefatigable editors, who daily read our minds.

And we thank Annie Miller, Scott's wife of 26 years, a dedicated supporter of education, who has loyally served as "First Lady" of three colleges.

About the Authors



Jacqueline Powers Doud
President, Mount St. Mary's College

Jacqueline Powers Doud became the 11th president of Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles in 2000. The first lay president of the College, she served as provost and vice president for academic affairs before becoming president. She has more than 35 years of experience in senior administration, following nine years of teaching experience in French, humanities, and education. She earned a Bachelor of Arts in French from Mundelein College in Chicago; a Master of Arts in French literature from the University of California, Berkeley; and a Ph.D. in higher education from Claremont Graduate University.

President Doud has been a consultant for several colleges and universities, chaired numerous accreditation teams, and serves on several professional association boards. She holds an honorary doctorate from Hebrew Union College.



Marylouise Fennell, RSM

Marylouise Fennell is senior counsel for the Washington, D.C.-based Council of Independent Colleges (CIC), for which she also coordinates the New Presidents Program. She served as president of Carlow University, and her background includes both teaching and administrative positions at Saint Joseph College (CT), the University of Hartford and Boston University.

President Fennell holds a Bachelor of Arts from Diocesan Sisters College, a Master of Education and a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study from the University of Hartford, and a doctoral degree from Boston University. She has also published widely.

An internationally recognized management consultant, she has worked in more than 20 countries, including a post as chief consultant for the Association for Private Universities of Central America (APRICA). Her awards include more than 40 honorary doctoral degrees, and she is presently a member and/or chair of three college boards of directors. In addition, Fennell serves as executive director of the Inter-American Consortium, a partnership of six American and 11 foreign higher educational institutions.

President Fennell also serves as a consultant to college and university presidents and boards and has written widely on higher education.



Scott D. Miller
President, Bethany College

Scott D. Miller is the president and M.M. Cochran Professor of Leadership Studies at Bethany College in West Virginia. President Miller earned his Bachelor of Arts from West Virginia Wesleyan College, Master of Arts from the University of Dayton, Ed.S. from Vanderbilt University and Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from The Union Institute & University.

Now in his 19th year as a college chief executive officer, President Miller served for 10 ½ years (1997-2007) as president of the College and DuPont Professor of Leadership Studies at Wesley College in Delaware. He has also served as president of Lincoln Memorial University (1991-97). Before being named president there, he served as executive vice president (1988-91) and vice president for development (1984-88). A native of Pennsylvania, President Miller is a former director of university relations and alumni affairs at the University of Rio Grande in Ohio and a former journalist. Well known nationally for his contributions to higher education, he was one of 17 presidents nationwide featured in a Kaufman Foundation-funded book entitled *The Entrepreneurial College President* (American Council on Education / Praeger Series on Higher Education, 2004). President Miller and the Wesley story were one of four “amazing transformational stories” featured in the book *The Small College Guide to Financial Health* (National Association of College & University Business Officers, 2002) and one of six featured in *The Small College Guide to Financial Health: Weathering Turbulent Times* (NACUBO, 2009). He was extensively interviewed in *The First 120 Days: What A New President Must Do* (Jerold Panas, 2008). He is a regular columnist for *College Planning and Management* and is the author of a widely distributed e-newsletter *The President’s Letter*, which addresses a wide variety of higher education issues.

President Miller serves as a consultant to college and university presidents and boards and has written widely on higher education and leadership.

Beyond the Board Book: Internet Communication with Trustees

By President Theodore E. Long, Elizabethtown College

It was a new trustee who first suggested it. "Let's post all this material electronically so I can work off my laptop instead of lugging this big book of paper around to every meeting. It should be pretty simple to do," she said, "and it will be a lot easier to do board work." Six years later, what began as a matter of trustee convenience and saving paper has become a new center for board communication. Our conversion from paper to electronic communication did save trees and made things easier. But what we discovered – and are still learning to exploit – is that internet communication enables our board to work differently, not just more conveniently. It has changed the way we do business at Elizabethtown. Using our experience as background, this chapter describes those new possibilities, reviews their advantages, and lays out some principles for exploiting this tool successfully.

What we discovered – and are still learning to exploit – is that internet communication enables our board to work differently, not just more conveniently.

Web-Based Communications

Accessed via the College's web site, our board communications center is housed on our Blackboard utility, with password secure access for trustees and the College's senior leadership. That site contains a variety of documents, information and functions:

- ❑ A roster of members,
- ❑ Basic board documents (by-laws, policies, trustee expectations, strategic plan, etc.),
- ❑ College dashboard indicators,
- ❑ College and board calendars,
- ❑ Communication functions (announcements, email, discussion room, etc.),
- ❑ Committee document sites,
- ❑ Meeting materials, and
- ❑ Archives.

There are additional options and other platforms, and you don't have to do it yourself anymore, as we did. For example, as a trustee at Capital University, I use a system built on SharePoint, which also includes a survey function, workspaces, and pictorial libraries. And there are now several commercial vendors who will set this up for your board (see, for example, www.boardbooks.com). From these sites, virtually all board functions can be conducted, during or between meetings, and all board activities are driven through the site.

Initially, we used the web site primarily for meeting materials, and regular board meetings still lie at the heart of our communication system. Materials are posted continuously in the weeks preceding each board meeting, and members are notified when new items appear. The documents are organized in sets corresponding to the organization of the board meeting, just as a board book would be, so that members can navigate to pertinent documents quickly and easily. Until recently, we still supplied paper copies of key documents on site for late adopters, but as the system has caught on, we now only need to print very late-breaking documents.

As our system has evolved, we learned to capitalize on its possibilities between board meetings. We provide updates to committees on works in progress, we seek approval of changes in plans or new developments on matters that require board or committee action, we post new documents that follow up on board conversations or requests, and we consult with committees or board leaders on breaking issues. We can conduct self assessment and board assessment surveys, review the president's performance, and conduct virtual committee conferences via the web site. Timely and full communication in both directions between board and staff has increased substantially.

One possibility taking longer to exploit is the discussion function for trustee deliberation. Some board members tried it out initially, but it remains an underutilized resource. Members who have issues to raise usually do so directly with other individuals. Because much of the material about substantive board issues is generated through the senior staff, the flow of collective communication naturally focuses on exchanges between board and staff. Intra-board conversation using the discussion function needs to be prompted with a specific question that opens up an issue without seeking a conclusion, at least until boards develop the habit of initiating their own conversation between meetings.

The Internet Advantage

The operational advantages of web-based board communication are considerable, and they fall into two main categories: a) savings and b) process improvements. Primary savings include:

- Staff time once devoted to the production and distribution of the board book can be redirected more productively.
- The costs of duplication and mailing are eliminated.
- No paper is used, enhancing sustainability initiatives.

The major process improvements are as follows:

- ❑ The board is connected to board work at all times and from any place, so the board can function continuously.
- ❑ All board members have a common, readily accessible database of materials and documents.
- ❑ Decisions are made according to the readiness of the issue, not the fixed schedule of board meetings.

These operational advantages would justify the move to internet communication by themselves. But even more significant benefits can be realized from a web-based board operation, those that enhance the capacity of the board to govern. Properly deployed, an internet communication system can support a different way of doing board business. Here are five ways in which internet communication can nourish higher order governance capacities.

- ❑ **Deeper Engagement** – An ongoing flow of communications with the board engages them more often with college issues. Boards that are more engaged on a day-to-day basis can contribute much more to effective governance of the institution, not by micro managing but by supplying their expert counsel.
- ❑ **Responsiveness to Changing Circumstances** – With internet communication systems, boards now have the capacity to respond to changing circumstances as they develop, seizing opportunities in timely fashion or changing directions promptly.
- ❑ **Integrative Partnership with the President** – AGB (*The Leadership Imperative*) has called for “integral” leadership, in which the board and president forge a partnership on behalf of common institutional goals. Ongoing board communication via board web sites supports such a partnership.
- ❑ **Intraboard Dialogue** – Board members often talk to each other only at meetings, unless there is a major crisis. Internet communication creates the capacity to conduct ongoing conversations about major issues without a crisis or a board meeting, which establishes a much stronger foundation for decision-making than once and done reviews of policy issues.
- ❑ **Generative Thinking** – Working with limited time and limited dialogue, most boards stick to managing their fiduciary responsibilities. Some boards are able to govern more strategically. Rare is a board that has mastered “generative thinking” (Chait, Ryan and Taylor, *Governance as Leadership*), about the meaning and significance of things. Open-ended internet communication enables trustees to explore meaning and basic assumptions more easily in support of this important governance function.

Principles for Effective Web-Based Communication

My trustee was right about the benefits of electronic communication but wrong about how easy it would be. Even after five years, we are still not completely satisfied with our system. The process of implementation takes some time to build effectiveness and integrate this new tool with the board's work. There are several obvious obstacles to effectiveness: 1) some members don't have the appropriate technology; 2) members feel secure with the books and insecure with the web; 3) they forget, and we have to generate paper anyway; 4) members feel its too much work to learn a new system; and 5) they just print it themselves instead of saving paper. There are more, but those are some of the major ones.

Those headaches are real and can create frustrations in the transition to web-based communication, but their eventual resolution is mostly a matter of persistence and patience. I have not seen dramatic resistance to such change, and once the board decides to go this direction, the transition is usually readily accomplished as members become comfortable with new ways. The larger challenges arise from dilemmas that need thoughtful solutions for the board in question. We have found five main areas where good decisions, not just patience, are critical in making web-based communication effective: culture, architecture, coherence, coaching, and dialogue. For each, I offer a few comments framed around a central principle of effectiveness.

- ❑ The culture of the board always trumps concepts of the perfect system. It does not matter how elegant the conception of your system is; it only works if it fits with board culture. Consistent with our religious heritage (Church of the Brethren), Elizabethtown's board has a "culture of simplicity." A complex system will not work for us, even though it looks brilliant in design. Our board does not want immense amounts of information, so we have to give them only what is necessary and manageable for the work at hand. Other boards, like Capital's, expect to see more complexities, so Elizabethtown's system would frustrate them even though it works for us.
- ❑ The architecture of board work is more important than the architecture of the technology. It is comforting to suppose that the right software will ensure effectiveness, but the real key, whatever the software, is to design a system to fit the way your board works. For example, we changed the structure of our website when our board altered the structure of its meeting agenda so that the design matched our new pattern of work. Even if an outside vendor is engaged, it is critical that the institution itself design the site for maximum effectiveness, even if some of the features offered by the platform are not heavily used.
- ❑ Coherence is necessary to make convenience real. Just because board members can get speedy results does not make the system convenient for them. Securing fast access to the wrong documents or having to hunt for documents that are out

of order just frustrates board members and makes the system less convenient for them. Likewise, a haphazard posting of documents over time, which is quite convenient for the senior leadership team, is not convenient for board members because there is no consistent rhythm and timetable for using the web site. There has to be an orderly pattern to the arrangement of the documents that is effectively linked to the pattern of their use for board members to experience a real convenience.

- ❑ Coaching is vital to initial success and essential to sustained success. Even the first clause in this proposition is not always self-evident, as we discovered the hard way. Figuring that people would have little trouble, we just gave them passwords and invited them in. After dozens of calls about how to access the site and use it, we quickly created a coaching system to help people utilize the system most effectively. Then we discovered that board members often forget what they once knew after weeks between uses. We also learned that it is necessary to prompt members when it is time to review documents so that they can do so in synch with document postings. And coaching is especially necessary to capitalize on unfamiliar functions, like discussion boards. In short, coaching must be continuous.
- ❑ Dialogue is more powerful for good governance than delivery. The operational benefits of board internet communication are realized primarily by delivering material and messages in a new way. However useful, though, shifting to a new mode of delivery will not improve board governance itself. The power of internet communication to extend board effectiveness arises from its capacity to host board dialogue. For boards that are not used to the dialogue and debate inherent in higher board functions, this medium provides a way to open up discussion. For boards that are already functioning at higher levels, this new capacity can multiply their effectiveness. But the dialogue function must be intentionally nurtured; even good boards will not automatically exploit it without prompting.

Old habits don't die easily, and moving a board to full web-based communication always takes some time. But the time it takes to do so is a worthwhile investment for the board and the institution itself. It remains only a tool, but it is a tool that can change the conditions of board work in such a way that the boards will not only become more efficient, but also more effective.

About the Author



Theodore E. Long
President, Elizabethtown College

Theodore E. Long became the 13th president of Elizabethtown College in 1996. Previously he served as provost and vice president for academic affairs at Merrimack College in North Andover, Massachusetts, and earlier he taught sociology at George Washington University, Hollins University and Washington and Jefferson College. A 1965 graduate of Capital University, President Long earned a master's degree in sociology from Duke University (1968) and a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Virginia (1979).

During his tenure, Elizabethtown has grown significantly in size, academic stature and financial strength as it implemented a comprehensive strategic plan and master facilities plan. The college has built distinctive programs of study around four signature emphases: global education, purposeful life work, experiential education, and relationship-centered learning, which will highlight its strong position among comprehensive liberal arts colleges across the country.

As a scholar, President Long has studied and written on religious movements, religion and politics, religion and the economy, religious conversion, social change, socialization, and the training of physicians. He served as president of the Association for the Sociology of Religion in 1990-91, and has been active in many other scholarly and higher education associations. He is a trustee of Capital University, his alma mater, the largest Lutheran university in the country, has conducted numerous accrediting reviews as a visiting team leader, and is frequently engaged by colleges and other non-profits to lead strategic planning and board development processes.

To Improve Institutional Performance, Aim High and Go “BI”

By President Larry Goodwin, The College of St. Scholastica

Several years ago, The College of St. Scholastica—a Catholic Benedictine school in Duluth, Minnesota—purchased a business intelligence (BI) system to improve our ability to make data driven decisions. Along the way we have learned some important lessons that have made us stronger, and that may be of use to other institutions.

A bit of background might be helpful. The College of St. Scholastica was founded in 1912 by the Benedictine Sisters in Duluth. We were a women’s college until 1970, when we became coeducational and independent, although still sponsored by the Sisters. The school has a modest endowment and is tuition-driven. We offer programs in the liberal arts and several pre-professional areas; more than half of our students major in health care fields.

As we tightened the connection between action plans and budgets, we began to realize the importance of data-driven assessment of results.

Over the past decade St. Scholastica has changed considerably. We entered the education market for working adults, opened three new campuses, added Division III football, expanded our master’s programs, added two clinical doctorates, and entered the online market. Enrollment has grown from 2,000 to 3,600; faculty and staff have increased by 65 percent; we have more than doubled the number of

traditional undergraduates living on the mother campus; the budget has grown from \$28M to \$60M. We anticipate more growth as we expand online programming.

These changes are a result of ongoing strategic planning, and they have caused us to improve our planning process. We have been clear all along that mission and vision should shape strategic priorities, and these priorities should inform annual college goals and departmental action plans. We operate on the belief that the budget is the price tag for the plan, and we have gotten better at connecting everything in the plan with a budget number, and vice versa. If there is something in the plan that has no corresponding budget number, we take it out.

As we tightened the connection between action plans and budgets, we began to realize the importance of data-driven assessment of results. If we committed a hundred thousand dollars to a retention initiative, did we achieve the anticipated results? If we increased our marketing budget by a half-million dollars, can we tell what difference it made? Looking at our set of aspirant

institutions, what benchmarks can we establish from them and how should we strive to realize them? Where are the most effective returns on our investments? Getting answers to these kinds of questions is essential in an environment where there is increasing competition for limited dollars.

A few years ago we began reporting important dashboard indicators to our trustees on an annual basis. The effort to refine and expand these measurements has now led us to establish key performance indicators (KPIs) for every goal in our strategic plan. KPIs are three dimensional: they give a snapshot of where we are, a trend line showing the direction we are moving, and a benchmark we are trying to achieve. For example, we want to realize a four-year graduation rate of 60 percent; we are currently at 55 percent; we have been moving slowly but steadily in the right direction for the past five years.

Overall, then, the past decade has been for us an exercise in trying to refine our answer to the question: How do we best link planning, budgeting, and assessment in a dynamic environment? We believe that our competitive advantage lies in our ability to answer that question effectively.

The ongoing attempt to establish meaningful KPIs caused us to look at purchasing a BI system. We had the right insight—use data to measure the effectiveness of planning and budgeting—but we struggled to get clean and consistent data. Until very recently, we faced the following challenges:

- ❑ Departments tweaked and manipulated data on our administrative computing system to best serve their own departmental interests. Finance might define “full time student” in one way to meet its needs; the registrar’s office might define the term slightly differently to meet its needs.
- ❑ Dozens of homegrown “datamarts” emerged, each very good for local tactical purposes, but increasingly unable to converse with one another at the all-college and strategic level.
- ❑ A general mess resulted: Differing definitions of basic terms (“full-time student,” “campus,” “term”), inability to report historical trends, increasing use of IT time to reconcile reports and data, lengthening lag time between senior administrators’ requests for and receipt of important data for strategic decisions.

It was in this context that we purchased a BI system. The first lesson we learned was that selecting the right tool required us to be clear about our needs. What are the criteria for “right”? We needed data that was reliable and accurate, dynamic, serving constituents across the institution, conveniently accessible online, and scalable. We chose a tool that allowed us to create a Data Store to collect discrete information (Jane Doe’s year in school, major, financial aid package), a Data Warehouse to collect aggregate information (how many sophomore English majors on the Duluth campus receiving Benedictine scholarships?), and the reporting tools that allow any budget manager or administrator to access the store and the warehouse to create reports.

Sounds wonderful! And it is wonderful, but putting the BI system into operation was not easy. The difficulty was not technological or quantitative; it was political: Who controls the fundamental data definitions? In the push and pull of meetings of a large committee established to implement BI, it gradually became obvious that people whose primary interests were tactical and departmental simply could not agree on common definitions. Senior administration had to take hands-on control of the process. This was our second lesson learned.

Accordingly, we formed an Institutional Reporting Committee (IRC) consisting of the vice presidents of academic affairs, of finance, of enrollment management, the chief information officer, and the institutional researcher. While seeking input from the larger committee, the IRC moved “top down” to establish data definitions to meet the broadest set of organizational needs, to establish reporting standards, and to guide process improvement. It was not the democratic process that campuses often prefer, but it worked. Overall, people are pleased with the results. When the registrar’s office, admissions office, financial aid office, and student accounts office access the data warehouse, they draw from exactly the same data. The result is that reports are timely, accurate and consistent—and they provide the data we need to move forward, confident in our mutual understanding.

In the end, arriving at common data definitions requires attention to college strategy. Data should serve strategy, not just discrete tactical purposes. This was our third lesson. As already noted, our former set of data definitions had evolved in a way that served the day-to-day needs of operating departments, but limited our access to strategic information. One key priority for the College is to increase enrollment in our non-traditional offerings; with this in mind, the IRC retooled our data definitions to accommodate this strategy. We can now view and analyze unlimited combinations for headcount or student FTEs or credits taken by program, by campus, by term. The tactical need for efficiency in operations yielded to the need for strategic information.

A BI system can be costly (our upfront investment was \$250K) and require a lot of staff training (intensive for key users for three to eight weeks; ongoing, but more moderate, for about a year). But the payback is generous and quick. Data reporting at St. Scholastica has increased ten-fold. Time spent retrieving information has been reduced by 50-75 percent. Collections work that took a half-day each month now takes less than a minute. The Controller saves over eight hours each semester on reconciling numbers. And so forth. Best of all, data is reliable and consistent, allowing for accurate and integrated planning, budgeting, and assessment. That’s the whole point.

About the Author



Larry Goodwin
President, The College of St. Scholastica

Larry Goodwin has served since 1998 as the 11th president of The College of St. Scholastica in Duluth, MN. He was also the College's vice president for academic affairs and dean of faculty.

During his tenure as president, enrollment has grown from 2,000 to 3,600. The College has opened three new campuses offering accelerated learning for adult students and has put several of its graduate programs online.

President Goodwin earned his doctorate at The University of Chicago, and he taught philosophy and theology at the College of St. Catherine for twelve years. He has particular interest in conceptions of deity and the problem of evil, reflecting his experience as a soldier in Vietnam. He is author of *The Ontological Argument of Charles Hartshorne*, and co-editor (with Philip Devenish) of *Witness and Existence: Essays in Honor of Schubert Ogden*.

President Goodwin is active in the Duluth community as a Rotarian and board member of the United Way. He is past chair of Minnesota's Campus Compact and has served as a consultant/evaluator for The Higher Learning Commission. President Goodwin currently serves as a board member of the Minnesota Private College Council as well as the Council of Independent Colleges.

Technology and Students: “Call my cell.”

By President Richard Artman, Viterbo University

My nine-year-old granddaughter, Jordan, wanted a cell phone. She carefully prepared her case to be made to her parents. She produced a PowerPoint presentation with the top ten reasons she needed a cell phone; she outlined the benefits for her and her parents; she researched the costs and had a payment plan recommendation. She burned the PowerPoint onto a disc so she could project her presentation onto the large screen TV in their family media center. She made her pitch. Unfortunately for Jordan, my son and daughter-in-law were not persuaded. Impressed, but not persuaded.

When Jordan enrolls in one of our colleges or universities in another eight to nine years, or perhaps sooner through online options for gifted students, will we be ready?

In April 2009 I invited a group of freshmen honors students to a session on technology. I wanted to know how the University was responding to their needs and what we should be planning for the future. Their responses were in some ways surprising and in other ways predictable. Do you know the song “I Want it All” by Queen? I expected I would hear the refrain from the song, “I want it all, and I want it now!” That was pretty much their take on technology, but that would be too simple and would be an injustice to their feedback.

These students are frequent and competent users of technology. Their expectations are high for ubiquitous access to the internet. They want speed, and they do want it now. Their sympathy for prehistoric tales of dial-up access is similar to mine for my parents’ stories of walking to school, 20 miles, uphill, both ways. Every student they know owns a cell phone and they expect that there will be ever-increasing applications available for computing on the fly and in the clouds. “We have an app for that” is more than an advertising slogan. In other words, they’ll download customized applications to fit their needs. And they want to be sure that wherever they go on campus they can connect and stay connected.

Students expect the faculty to be well-versed in technology. While they don’t expect 24/7 responses, they think nothing of sending an email or posting a thread on Blackboard in the wee hours of the morning. A professor’s or administrator’s response in the morning will do just fine, but before noon, thank you.

**Instant communication
is here to stay;
there’s no turning back.
So our policies and
practices need to adapt.**

Faculty will need to wrestle with classroom policies on the active use of laptops, iPods, smart phones and emerging technologies. Our students seem willing to defer to the professor's classroom policy, but the students noted perceptively that technology applications in the classroom encourage active learning, accommodate various learning styles, and transform the role of faculty to learning facilitators. A smart phone will be able to serve as a clicker for quick assessments and classroom votes, an instant internet search might clarify or resolve a question, and a text to one's friend will confirm plans for dinner. After all, this is the multitasking generation. Attempts to stifle or control their use of technology will be fruitless or, at best, frustrating for students who believe the only way to find a phone number is to search whitepages.com.

Instant communication is here to stay; there's no turning back. So our policies and practices need to adapt. If a crime takes place on campus, trust that it will be on Facebook or Twitter in seconds. Administrators who wait for a complete investigation before communicating to students will allow the students to control the message, which will be inaccurate and distorted as happened after a recent robbery on our campus. Emergency contact systems must be as fast as the students' social networks.

This generation of students has been on camera since dad captured their birth – so they do not see cameras for security purposes as an invasion of privacy. Have you seen the smart cameras with video analytics that can intelligently monitor parking lots and entryways? Don't bother students with excuses for not having all administrative processes online and don't expect them to wait in line for anything. Our students admitted they are an impatient lot.

We can go green and go paperless — the students will respect the effort. This is certainly one area where sustainability can be advanced. Debit cards or debit accounts for campus printers are no brainers, and while we are at it, network those printers for printing anytime, from anywhere. If I could put their eloquent comments into plain commands, a partial list would look something like this:

- Stop wasting time and money by mailing stuff – put grade reports online.
- Take out the phones in my room; I shouldn't have to pay for something I never use. Remove the pay phones too and save a few dollars.
- Put my electronic signature on file and allow me to sign electronically my financial aid papers and housing documents.
- Stop the posting of all those flyers around campus. No one reads them.
- Put the student newspaper online.
- Make my student ID card do everything I need to do – access buildings, pay bills, buy books or a candy bar from the vending machine.

- ❑ Keep the computer labs up to date and spread them throughout campus. They are still necessary for robust computing, data base searches and research papers.

Picture this recent cartoon. A baseball catcher walks to the pitcher's mound for a conference and the pitcher says, "Why didn't you just text me?" While technology makes certain aspects of our life more pleasant or convenient, there can be downsides. Some experts say we should gear up for more cases of student depression and lessened ability to resolve conflict via face-to-face communication. The effect of social networks may indeed be an increased sense of isolation. Watch students leaving class, hands appear attached to an ear, earphone cords dangle on the shoulders, they walk with and pass each other but in a private zone of attention. Our students text a lot. But they still crave personal contact with their friends and faculty.

Presidential skin needs to get thicker. YouTube photos of residence hall rooms, of parties off campus, or of a faculty lecture could cause embarrassment and we have no control to stop it or retract it. Better to harness the technology and use it for recruitment and retention. Find creative ways to encourage or facilitate positive image postings, and have enough good clips on YouTube to counter any that will induce a call from your board chair. Students and the new media are close friends who are growing up together.

I was pleasantly surprised that our honors students didn't want technology for technology's sake. They expect high tech equipment in the science labs, simulation laboratories in their nursing training, state of the art graphic tools for theatre and set design, and smart classrooms in which technology boosts teaching and learning. But they especially want personal contact with their faculty; they want high tech and high touch.

In my session, students emphasized that the personal relationships with faculty distinguish our type of college from the large publics. The students realize there are more online databases in the libraries at the state institutions attended by their friends. Yet, they welcome the trade-off: smaller classes and connections with full-time faculty. They said they wouldn't hide behind "rate my professor" websites but would speak directly to a faculty member or department chair if they had issues with teaching or advising. They expect faculty to state clearly their policies and penalties on plagiarism and to be held accountable for misusing resources and references. They believed professors at Viterbo would know if a research paper or essay came from the internet. (A Google search for "buy a research paper" lists 26,300,000 sources.)

In a CIC-sponsored project, especially one between presidents, we're accustomed to some "take-aways." I offer these:

1. Ubiquitous access to the internet and speed outrank students' historical desire for more parking and better food. Being a "wired" campus no longer deserves bragging rights. Being wireless is expected.

2. Put it online. It's the first place this generation of students seeks information.
3. We live in a digital universe. Make sure your policies, practices and codes of conduct reflect this. In the past, it wasn't necessary to prohibit cameras in locker rooms – but do you have a policy about photos secretly taken via a cell phone?
4. Begin weaning your institution from costly view books, printed catalogs and handbooks that are outdated the day of printing, fancy president's annual reports, and printed letters, forms and documents.
5. Communication modalities that were successful in our career paths to the presidency are no longer sufficient. Presidents must be conversant in the use of new media in order to communicate effectively with our students and constituents. Students need not be our friends on Facebook, but senior management should know how to advertise on Facebook, send a Tweet, or interview an international student or faculty candidate over Skype.
6. When designing new facilities, involve students as well as the technology experts. Think of "learning spaces" rather than classrooms. Put wireless ports and power outlets everywhere. Make space and furnishings as flexible as possible.
7. Allocate resources for faculty development to help faculty incorporate new media and emerging technologies into their teaching and communication with students.
8. Be familiar with the technology and its evolution. Two subscriptions I find helpful: *Campus Technology* – www.campustechnology.com and *EDUCAUSE Review* – www.educause.edu.
9. Engage current students and younger generations in website design and evaluation, in student recruitment and in technology operations. Build a connection with a middle school and some elementary school teachers. Get a head start on who's coming to our campuses.
10. Stop investing resources into large, general-purpose computer labs. There is a need for curricular labs linked to specific disciplines and the pedagogic needs of the faculty. But, in an era of cloud computing, students can access the specialized software that now sits on desktops in computer labs from their residence halls, off-campus residences and even while studying abroad.

Before investing in catching up, stop and assess where your students are. The laptop campus is now the cell phone campus and we don't even have to provide the phones. Ninety-nine percent of students have a mobile communications device (*Campus Technology* June 2009). Palm pilots and other PDAs are morphing into smart phones whose minor function will be to make or receive a phone call. Let your imagination leapfrog and prepare for smart phone technology and its thousands of applications. If you're not sure why, I have a PowerPoint from a nine-year-old that might persuade you!

About the Author



Richard Artman
President, Viterbo University

Richard Artman was appointed the eighth president at Viterbo University in La Crosse, Wisconsin in July, 2006. Prior to this appointment, President Artman served as president of Siena Heights University in Adrian, Michigan for twelve years. His administrative career path to the presidencies has been a progression of various positions in student affairs. From 1982–1994 President Artman served as vice president for student affairs at Nebraska Wesleyan University. Prior to that, he held various student affairs positions at the University of Miami, Florida where he received his Ph.D. in administration of higher education and his Master of Education in student personnel administration. President Artman is a 1990 graduate of the Harvard University Institute for Educational Management.

During his tenure at Siena Heights, the University was rated one of the most wired campuses in the United States. President Artman is a member of the boards of directors of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities and the NAIA Council of Presidents, for which he served as chair from 2006 to 2008. President Artman served as a consultant evaluator for The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association for 17 years and is a frequent presenter at the CIC New Presidents Program on the topic of fundraising.

Advancement: Connecting to Constituencies Inside and Out

By President Christopher R.L. Blake, Mount Mercy College

There is a statue at Iceland’s Keflavik International Airport that commemorates Leif Ericson, the 10th century Icelandic Norse explorer, who is generally accepted as the first European to land in North America. History now credits Ericson and his Viking pioneers with establishing “Vinland” and other early European colonies in modern-day Newfoundland and Labrador. The statue is a powerful reminder of Iceland as the “gateway” nation between Old and New Worlds, and the extraordinary power of pioneering campaigns.

Effective campaigns connect advancement operations with educational purpose.

The Ericson story is interesting in several ways. The Viking desire for land and riches inspired daring and grueling expeditions in a cold, menacing ocean wilderness. Their goal was land and colonization, and the abundance of seafood was a key resource to that end. Having achieved their goal, the Vikings then forgot their mission. Colonization meant adoption of new ways of living, not simply expansion. Within three centuries the Viking campaign in the New World was finished

because Ericson’s successors dogmatically held to their old ways of living, and failed to recognize that the Icelandic or Nordic ways of doing things – agrarian and fishing – would not support thriving communities in a different environment.

There are some valuable lessons for life in this haunting Viking saga for college and university advancement campaigns. Losing sight of their mission was the death knell to their story. The Vikings mission of colonization meant using what they found in new ways, rather than repeating what had worked back home. Even more so, the Viking failure to adapt to their environment left them figuratively adrift in the North Atlantic. They had the information – the data – from trying to live for two centuries alongside Native Americans who clearly had succeeded there. But sadly for them, they failed to learn from that information or data, and in so doing, they opened the doorway for Christopher Columbus to take over the story and make it his own in later centuries.

This short chapter explores how mission, connections, purpose and data are crucial in our advancement endeavors, be they less bold or daring than earlier Viking ones. Particularly crucial is the intriguing connection between facts and relationships, head and heart, intuition and information. The best campaigns are those which never lose sight of either ends of this continuum, and make sure they connect them at all stages.

Our first point must be that of mission: Effective campaigns connect advancement operations with educational purpose. The common ground of mission is one that needs to prevail in university campaigns at all levels, connecting the distinctive educational mission with campaign purpose and philanthropic instinct. Mission drives the campaign and unites the community, enabling internal and external constituents to find agreement and excitement around campaign goals. This is crucial since the nature of a campaign includes a range of factors that lend themselves to complications, including planning and implementation, diversity of stakeholders, strategic decisions, multiple voices, donor fatigue, ego and emotion, and community expectations. That connection between campaign design and campaign action can test the best of relationships within the campus and the larger community to a breaking point. Equally, it can cement the deepest loyalty, harness the most altruistic impulses and unite the strongest creative energies of a campus community. Yet the paradox remains that although academia is an environment that is accustomed to slow change, when dollars and fundraising programs are concerned, patience tends to be shorter. Navigating these choppy waters calls for staying the course, trusting the compass and remembering the purpose of the mission.

Data serves as the compass to guide the ship across the ocean. The availability of sophisticated data tools like Wealth Engine which, for example, provides a range of prospect management techniques for tracking fundraising progress and informing decisions. In an unprecedented age of web information and public data, this use of data-informed campaigning is as essential to fundraising as segmentation is to marketing. This is culturally challenging for many small colleges and universities where historically a small pool of long-term donors and loyal alumni have galvanized major giving and annual fund support. Why is it helpful to use complex data analysis and operations, when the relationship is more akin to an extended family? This is where the world of fundraising has recently surprised many of us, whether we are a modestly sized and endowed Midwestern college, or a fabulously wealthy East Coast Ivy giant. For data mining shows us that even when using the Midwest family style approach to fundraising, relationships and instinctive judgment alone will not suffice. We need to evaluate how far we can apply reliable data-informed processes to help create a sustainable donor base that truly gives to capacity and inclination. Indeed, since our donors are themselves stakeholders in a culture where data-informed decision-making is the norm, we need to make sure that we can speak the same language of analysis and accountability. As Dove (2000) notes, this cultural shift is necessary in fundraising long before any dollar gifts are actually obtained:

The concept of prospect management is a relatively recent trend in development, made possible by the widespread use of technology in fundraising. Data-processing technology, which has revolutionized gift processing, acknowledgment, and record keeping, will play now an important role in shaping development activities on the front end – long before solicitation occurs (p.110).

Historically this is a bigger and more comprehensive cultural shift for using fundraising data. The continued use of prospect management data throughout the implementation stages of a campaign is going to be a litmus test of success or failure, even when we think we know our donors well. The interplay between technology and human operations is critical, and data will be meaningless unless the organizational structure and personnel roles are defined, understood and managed. A fundraising campaign with clear steps and clear dollar goals illuminates the effectiveness of the human factor and its interplay with technology. It depends on a dynamic interplay of team members who have assigned functions and who constantly monitor the campaign in order to make tactical and strategic decisions – almost like a classic data feedback loop. In short, using our Viking analogy, build a crew that will row together or your campaign longboat will not even get out of the harbor.

One way of reducing this risk is through careful use of communications, and here technology can be an essential ally. The availability of multiple sources of communication tools can be critical in maintaining information, focusing on mission and target, and ensuring broad support. Indeed, the most ‘savvy’ fundraisers are aware that technology is essential to heightening awareness and disseminating information on fundraising. By showing the case, eliciting support, and explaining multiple ways of support, the technology interfaces the communication and solicitation aspects of fundraising. When it works well, the effect is powerful. When it works badly, the effect is chaos. Campaigns are faced with this stark reality.

Like many others focused on capital needs and annual fund support for scholarships, Mount Mercy has begun to bring these contemporary realities together in a new multi-million dollar campaign. And like many others, we are doing so in the worst recession since the Great Depression and with a history of less than robust fundraising aspirations. The point of this campaign is that it is as much internal transformation as in any transformation of our landscape or financial aid system. Worth (2005) observes this opportunity in campaigning:

Campaigns have become communication and marketing vehicles as well as fund-raising efforts, and their public goals may be intended to help position the institution among peers and competitors, mobilize volunteers, and raise the sights of donors (p.84-85).

The development of our campaign has pushed us to reframe our sense of vision, our approach, our outcomes and our practices in several areas:

- ❑ Annual phone solicitations, with increased use of advanced demographic segmentation.
- ❑ Mailing solicitations, with increased use of demographic segmentation and differentiated frequency for those segments.

- ❑ Data mining, searching large databases for specific attributes and patterns that increase likelihood of donor matching, rather than focusing on specific individuals and their attributes.

These data-informed practices are also influencing our solicitation of smaller donors and those who might become donors. By sifting through databases for specific factors and key patterns, a prospect management exercise becomes an operation in data mining, enabling the advancement staff to aggregate prospects more effectively. Mount Mercy has made real progress in:

- ❑ Data screening and using vendor services, particularly in developing major gifts. The rise of electronic databases has made it possible to compile, from a variety of sources, public data that is useful for flagging prospects with significant wealth indicators, such as real estate records, public stock holdings, top executive compensation, and aircraft or boat ownership. Data screening companies now offer to compare a school's entire database against those sets of public records, allowing fundraising staff to identify prospects for whom certain levels of wealth can be definitively established, as well as others who fit the profile of major donors.
- ❑ Alumni and donor surveys. While not necessarily new, surveys of a college's constituents have become much easier to coordinate with the use of email and internet surveys, and the data can be used to create new strategies and directions for the advancement office as a whole.

In a real sense this panoply of traditional relationship building, technological advances and data-informed operations mirrors the broader trends of higher education itself. Advancement and philanthropy should never operate in isolation from the rest of academia. Now fundraising speaks the same language and requires the same skill-sets that infuse the university as a whole. Fundraising is a key component of mission-based education, arguing the point that philanthropy and learning are absolutely entwined. It shows that data track, as much as data assessment of students, provides evidence of learning outcomes for the institution. The parallel holds powerfully between fundraising campaign and academic programming, and that parallel is helpful to an understanding of both. Fundraising requires relationships, and so do classrooms, both real and virtual. Fundraising requires a complex interaction between people and technology, and so does the 21st century learning experience. Fundraising relies on data and its usage in the same way that educational outcomes need to be measured by student assessment. We are truly working now in the same academy and embarking on the same journey.

The Vikings were good at realizing something essential about a voyage of discovery. When people with imaginations use devices and tools that work powerfully, and rely on essential information, they can reach to the ends of the earth. The Vikings actually did that, and so changed Western history. There is something in their saga that can help us keep sight of our own advancement dreams and ambitions, but unlike them, not lose sight of how to live once we have achieved those ambitions.

About the Author



Christopher R.L. Blake
President, Mount Mercy College

Christopher R.L. Blake ushered in a new era at Mount Mercy College when he began his duties as president on July 1, 2006. He is the College's eighth president in its 80-year history.

President Blake received his Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees in theology from the University of Oxford, Keble College. He received his Ph.D. in education from the University of London, King's College. Before coming to Mount Mercy, President Blake served as provost of Mount Saint Mary's University in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

Upon his arrival at Mount Mercy, President Blake formed a campus-wide committee to review the institution's mission, vision and values, which were adopted by the board of trustees in April, 2007. The highlight of the visioning process was the goal of transitioning the college to Mount Mercy University by 2015, and further transforming Mount Mercy to a distinguished regional institution in the Catholic intellectual tradition, recognized nationally for its academic life, student experiences, institutional resources and community outreach.

Under President Blake's leadership Mount Mercy has also implemented graduate programs, including a Master of Business Administration as well as two Master of Arts in Education programs. In addition to the new graduate programs, new majors have been added to meet the needs of transfer students, offering degrees with extensive application possibilities in outdoor conservation, applied management and human resource management.

President Blake has also overseen the addition of athletic scholarships in all 13 varsity sports, giving the athletic department a new and vital edge in recruiting talented and committed student-athletes. The president has also appointed a director of international programs, opening the door for international educational partnerships and immersion experiences for Mount Mercy students.

Currently, President Blake is leading the institution's strategic planning process, which focuses on five themes central to the Mount Mercy experience.

Works Cited:

- Dove, Kent E. (2000). *Conducting a Successful Capital Campaign*. Second Ed. Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco.
- Worth, Michael J. (2005). *Securing the Future: A Fund-Raising Guide for Boards of Independent Colleges and Universities*. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington.

Leveraging Technology to Increase Enrollment, Capacity and Revenues

By President Arthur F. Kirk, Saint Leo University

Are you watching all the for-profit universities' stocks soar as their online programs grow by double-digit percentages? Have you been reading about private equity firms buying failed private colleges and "preserving the mission," but developing online programs? Do you wonder how the University of Phoenix grew to more than 400,000 students? Do you believe that you could develop online programs, market them nationally, capture a small share of those online students, and add millions to your bottom line? In today's economy – such thoughts are understandable. Colleges need more students and cash and lucrative online programs to grow. Why not go for it?

Forget it! You are far too late and likely much too small, to think big now. But, you do have opportunities, just probably not big ones. You also have imperatives. Big may be out, but online is in.

Saint Leo University, my school, enrolls more than 3,000 undergraduate students exclusively online. Another 5,800 of our undergraduate students (mostly adult students) take from one course to 50% of their courses

online. We also have 1,000 graduate students fully or partially online. Our online tuition and fees generated \$56,000,000 last year and will grow again this year. But it is highly unlikely you can ever match even our modest (compared to the for-profits) totals. According to the Babson Survey Research Group and The Sloan Consortium, "[t]he majority of recent growth in online enrollments has come from schools most engaged in online education...These institutions are larger and more established [online], so they are in a better position to "scale up" their online offerings." Sloan found that most of these schools started such programs prior to 1999 (Allen and Seaman, 2008).

But, you need online courses and online programs. Your traditional and non-traditional students increasingly demand – and often require them. The time may have passed for the "big growth" strategy, but if you want to protect what you have and hopefully grow it, you need to be online, now!

Since 2002 online education grew by a compounded annual rate of 19.7%. It grew 12.9% in 2007 (Sloan). During that same period overall collegiate enrollments grew at a 1.6% annual rate. Sloan reports that students taking at least one online course went from 1,602,970 students in 2002 to

**If you want to protect
what you have
and hopefully grow it,
you need to be online, now!**

3,938,111 in 2007. In 2007, 21.9% of all students took at least one online course, up from 9.6% in 2002. More than 80% were undergraduates.

Sloan's and Babson's research confirms that adult students favor online courses. American Intercontinental University's research revealed that 75% of mothers with children under 17 wanted to earn a bachelor's or master's degree (Trends in Online Education for 2009; All Online Schools). According to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics, by 2016 traditional age (18-22) student enrollments will grow a total of 7% while students aged 22-29 will increase 20% and those over the age of 30 will increase 14%. This growing "adult" aged student population will drive growth online.

But don't discount your traditional aged students' desire for online options. Sloan also reports more than 1,000,000 public school students took online courses in 2007-2008, a 47% increase over a period of time. Many were for Advanced Placement. According to the Chronicle Research Services Report: The College of 2020: Students, "[t]he ideal of four years away from home – spent living and learning and growing into adulthood – will continue to wane." Of those who responded to the Chronicle survey, "two-thirds said that almost all of their students were full-time and aged 18-25," but predicted that by 2020 "students will be taking up to 60% of their courses online. Now almost no students at these colleges take courses online."

Online as an aggressive enrollment growth strategy (Saint Leo enrollment went from 7,100 to 14,100 in our first ten years online) may be obsolete. But online as a defensive enrollment strategy may be a necessity.

I made the commitment to put Saint Leo University online in January 1997 when I began my presidency. I set up two separate "skunk works." One, located 20 miles from campus, developed full online, asynchronous undergraduate degree programs through what we named the "Center for Online Learning" (COL). We developed highly-structured courses by teaming faculty with instructional designers and adult learning experts. Much of the content developed was "fixed," restricting the teaching faculty's autonomy to teach what and how they saw fit, but assuring consistency and quality.

We partnered with a firm that provided the instructional designers and the studio and technicians for audio video presentations of every week's lesson. They also provided the learning management system, bought all the online student leads, marketed to these prospects, recruited, billed, collected the tuition and provided the books. The program was marketed nationally and globally. Lead generation, marketing and recruiting costs were and are substantial. Content development, when expertly done, is as well. Our partner bore most of the upfront costs, we shared revenues. COL grew rapidly. In 1998 when we offered our first courses, there was little competition beyond the University of Phoenix. In fewer than 10 years, we approached 35,000 annual enrollments.

Our skunk works developed online courses to augment our offerings at our continuing education locations. Saint Leo University has taught on military bases since 1973 and on Florida Community College campuses since 1993. In 1997, we had 15 centers in five states, more than 25 teaching locations and about 6,000 adult (military and civilian) students taking courses in classrooms. We labeled the online courses Distance Learning (DL) courses. Faculty developed and taught these courses in a standard, unstructured autonomous model. These online courses gave our students flexibility and options, and allowed the University to reduce the number of small classes and independent studies offered by gathering students from multiple locations in online courses averaging 17 students with, in most cases, superior teachers as well. DL course enrollments also grew rapidly.

In FY 1997-98, Saint Leo invested just over \$600,000 out of a budget of \$26 million to develop online courses and capacity. We produced \$88,000 in tuition revenue that year. In 2007 we estimated a \$9,000,000 upfront investment was required to start a COL program from scratch. I doubt the return would be as good. Going national requires a lot of money – and no amount of money assures success. (Look at the University of Illinois Online which had 121 students in September of 2008 after spending \$8.9 million [Mercer, 2008]. In June of 2009 the University of Illinois shut it down after spending nearly \$15 million). Brand names and big money don't guarantee success. They help, but it may be true that at this point in the market's maturity, it is just too late for anyone to "go national, go big."

What opportunities remain? Plenty, but they are much smaller. But, so too are our Council of Independent College schools. We are smaller, more agile, and excellent at serving our students. Many have niche programs not yet available online. Opportunity exists.

All good marketing opportunities start with a niche. It may be programmatic. It might be geographic. Be realistic. Develop your strategies based on your strengths.

Today's online reality is that most online students select a local college – if they can. Do you offer an evening or weekend program? Do you offer accelerated degree programs? Do you have an executive MBA program? All of these students may prefer some online options. If you don't provide them, the University of Phoenix or Saint Leo University will. (Saint Leo has online students in all 50 states.)

George Otte, Ph.D., director of instrumental technology for the City University of New York delivered a paper at the GUIDE International Conference on Online Education entitled "The Collapse of Distance: Online Learning as Local Education" (2007). Otte posited that online courses' "most important utility may now be local outreach, done to address the growing problem of degree completion." Sloan found that more than 50% of online students are local (within 50 miles of campus). Another 35% are from the region (Allen and Seaman, 2008).

Culver-Stockton College, a very successful participant in the Online Consortium of Independent Colleges and Universities (OCICU), used online Saint Leo courses to help students who dropped out go on to complete their degrees. Their strategy has been very effective. They leverage their brand identity with those who know them best and already demonstrated a desire to earn a Culver-Stockton degree. Since six out of every ten college students do not complete a bachelor's degree within six years, this market is sizable for any school (Carey, 2005). OCICU schools access online courses to meet a variety of different student needs without having to invest in course development or expensive new marketing campaigns.

What is required?

The first component of success is institutional commitment. Far too many schools falter because of vocal pockets of faculty resistance and lack of strong leadership. Smaller private not-for-profit colleges remain the least likely to offer online classes or programs. Yet a majority of them embrace a mission to educate working adults and/or depends upon those students to balance budgets.

While chief academic officers generally believe that faculty accept the value and legitimacy of online courses, fewer than half of private college CAOs believe their faculty do so. Those opinions ignore mountains of data that demonstrate no differences in learning outcomes between online and classroom courses. They also ignore the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data that found that "distance education" students reported being more engaged than traditional students. Negative faculty opinions run counter to those of business leaders. According to Excelsior College/Zogby Internationals' nationwide online survey of business executives, among those familiar with online programs, "83% strongly believe that degrees earned via online programs are viewed favorably compared with those earned in a more traditional way."

The Chronicle Research Services study warned, "[w]hen it is common for private colleges to give away their product at about a 40% discount, it might be time to question whether the business model can continue." That comment in the context of the study's conclusion that the elite schools will be fine and "the model for for-profit and community colleges is also strong. They cater to older students who . . . want and need courses at times and in formats that fit their schedules" sounds an alarm – or should. Robert Sevier, senior vice president of strategy at Stamats, Inc., commenting on the Chronicle study, identified leadership as the key issue. He wrote, "[i]t is the quality of leadership – not external market forces – that will spell the difference between an institution that thrives and one that is marginalized or even fails." He calls on presidents, their cabinets and boards to "squarely face the issues, develop a compelling vision, outline a clear strategy, work together and execute."

I could not agree more – and for most, online courses and programs need to be part of the strategy.

About the Author



*Arthur F. Kirk, Jr.
President, Saint Leo University*

Arthur F. Kirk, Jr. assumed the presidency of Saint Leo University in January 1997. He earned his bachelor's and master's degrees from Kean University and his doctorate from Rutgers University, having written his dissertation on small college survival strategies. President Kirk became director of alumni affairs at Kean University in 1971 and later served as the university's assistant director of college development. In 1975, he was appointed director of development and planning for Raritan Valley Community College. In 1979 he became executive vice president and CFO of College Misericordia and in 1984 President Kirk was named president of Keuka College, where he served until 1997.

President Kirk has received honors and awards from Rutgers University, Kean College of New Jersey, and Keuka College. He currently is a member of the board of the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL), World Presidents Association, the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) President's Advisory Council, and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities' (NAICU) Public Policy Committee. He is the immediate past chair of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF), current vice president of the Florida Association of Colleges and Universities Board of Directors, and serves on several corporate and community boards.

Standing Out in a Crowd of Peer Institutions: Leveraging Your IT Investments and People for Routine Innovation

By President Kevin M. Ross, Lynn University

We have been informed for decades now about the transformative powers of technology and how the development and deployment of software and hardware will allow our institutions to become more efficient and effective. In the mainstream media and on our own campuses, we can cite numerous examples of how the utilization of technology allowed us to perform critical tasks faster or even better than in the past (i.e., the development of course management systems; administrative office suites; and more recently, a dizzying array of social networking applications that seem to have rendered our students' campus email addresses useless). In many cases, technology has allowed achievements to occur that quite simply would never have been possible before. There is no doubt that ongoing IT expenditures in people, hardware and software are here to stay. The key is getting the most out of these investments on a routine basis.

Some [IT] costs can be confusing at times and often don't receive the same scrutiny as other institutional expenditures.

The investments made in IT over the last 30 years have been unprecedented and oftentimes have produced great dividends for our students, faculty and institutions as a whole. It would be difficult to imagine a president, board or campus community that didn't have significant expectations, both now and in the future, about the percentage of an overall budget that should be devoted to IT. However, some of these

costs can be confusing at times and often don't receive the same scrutiny as other institutional expenditures because of the near ubiquitous opinion that if some IT is good, more IT is better. However, like other areas of the campus enterprise, IT must also be managed for efficiency and effectiveness and through the primary lens of your institutional mission.

Lynn University is a relatively young institution (we will be celebrating our 50th anniversary in 2012). We have experienced significant development programmatically and through the growth of our physical campus since our founding as Marymount College, a two-year, women's Catholic college. Today, as Lynn University, we are no longer religiously affiliated and have 2,400 students from more than 80 countries and 40 states attending our primarily residential institution.

Because we are a relatively young school with a history of strong entrepreneurial leadership, we tend to look at structure and solutions in terms of sustainable progress, instead of quick fixes.

We simply can't afford to spend time or money advancing toward our strategic plans in fits and starts. We try to do our homework, survey the independent higher education landscape, look at the available data (which admittedly is a new discipline for us, but catching on like wildfire) and put structures and systems in place that permit our divisional leaders to have concrete goals that stem directly from our strategic plan. It also allows our leaders to define for themselves how they are going to reach those goals. In short, we are at a pivotal point in our history where we must be more intentional about how we plan to move our institution forward. Crucially important to that work is our use of technology.

Like most other institutions, we have made investments in IT for years based upon the expectation that they would make us more efficient and overall better. However, we quickly came to realize that we had to find ways in which to truly leverage our investments in IT to serve the entire campus community. If we are going to stand out among our peers, we wanted to do so not just in a few instances, but consistently. Being relatively new when compared with peer institutions that have many more years and significant endowed funds behind them, we knew we couldn't compete in a technology arms race, nor did we want to.

Because we recognize the value of IT and encourage tinkering in the hopes of finding new and better solutions across campus, we have thought long and hard (and continue to) about how to proceed with IT investments and how those investments would support our institutional mission. We studied and talked with other institutions that seemed to be having success in the areas of teaching and learning through the use of IT, as well as looked at their trends in spending. We chose the components we admired most and sought to emulate those practices that were aspirational, but only if they resonated with our institutional culture and strategic planning goals. Then we got to work on how to make the IT arm of the university consistently engaged in supporting teaching and learning across campus on a more sustainable basis. This required a rather significant structural change for a small institution like ours, which does not even offer an information technology degree.

Previously, IT served under the vice president of business and finance and concentrated its efforts in supporting technical commodities and business services (a technical mechanic). This structure worked fine for that time, but prior to 2006, more than 75 percent of our IT budget was geared toward business systems. Most initiatives were non-academic in nature and were designed to assist business processes or student experience outside of the classroom.

In order to ensure that strategic planning goals and ongoing university objectives had the best chance of being successful and contained all the resources of those significant investments we made in IT, we no longer wanted to rely on informal information networks or personal connections between department leaders to be successful. So, in addition to creating a formal chief information officer (CIO) position, we had to reposition IT from an administrative branch committed to serving business operations to a strategic partner with all branches of the university. This included adding

the senior-most IT member (the CIO) to the president's cabinet, where the CIO reports to the president. This structural shift was a big change for us, and it has made a world of difference.

Once the CIO position was created and filled, IT was able to play more of a strategic role and become a partner with academics and all other institutional divisions. The CIO, through the direction of the president, also refocused IT goals and strategies to concentrate efforts, resources and knowledge in academics. Through this repositioning of IT, new initiatives were created to utilize technology in and out of the classroom to support teaching and learning.

- ❑ Efforts such as the Academic Spaces Task force, a task force co-chaired between the CIO and the academic dean, were created to evaluate and recreate more effective and technically equipped learning environments (whether that meant hanging smart boards or applying a new, more vibrant coat of paint to the classroom walls).
- ❑ The creation of our Center for Instructional Innovation provided a lab-like environment and academic/technical staff to assist faculty in the development of technical skills and competencies.
- ❑ During our new core curriculum development, the IT department became responsible for the creation of the student learning outcomes embedded in our new core. The IT department and academics collaborated in the creation of the Student Technological Literacy program.

The number one priority in the IT strategic plan is now “to promote teaching and learning through the use of technology.” Most new initiatives are prioritized by how we are improving or promoting teaching and learning. This is a significant cultural change for IT and our institution — one that took several years but began with the creation and empowerment of our CIO role. Today IT spends more than 50% of its overall budget on academics or academic-related initiatives.

The one caveat I would offer is that the temperament of our CIO has been key to our success. Sustained adoption and use of information technology goes well beyond hardware and software purchases. An effective CIO under this model is someone who has patience and takes the time to listen and explore what individuals across campus are trying to accomplish through the use of technology. This individual must have the capacity to be technical when necessary, but also possess great people skills as he or she seeks to understand, explore and explain new ways of enhancing teaching and learning, as well as other campus operations. We are fortunate to have an individual with these talents and skills as our CIO.

Our structure is only a few years old and we already have seen great dividends in cost savings, efficiency and the accomplishment of many of our strategic planning goals related to teaching and learning. In fact, both our CIO and some of the programs created under this new structure have begun to gain recognition for the early adoption of emerging technologies. I realize this

is a significant shift for some institutions and politics abound. However, in my experience, it has absolutely been worth having another direct report in the CIO. With the right person in the job for your institution, you can leverage the significant investments you have made in IT and set yourself apart from your peers in a consistent, sustainable way.

About the Author



Kevin M. Ross
President, Lynn University

Kevin Ross was named the fifth president of Lynn University, succeeding his father, Dr. Donald E. Ross, who was Lynn's president for the previous 35 years. He took office July 1, 2006.

President Ross has held numerous administrative positions in educational institutions, including Lynn. In his role as chief operating officer (COO) immediately preceding his presidency, President Ross initiated and oversaw completion of Lynn's long-range strategic plan.

President Ross came to Lynn in 1999 as associate dean of the Eugene M. and Christine E. Lynn College of International Communication, where he facilitated installation of its state-of-the-art broadcast journalism curriculum, studios and equipment.

President Ross also served as director of special projects, director of development, and vice president of institutional advancement before assuming the COO position in 2004.

President Ross earned his A.B. degree in English in 1994 from Colgate University and his Master of Arts in Liberal Arts in 1997 at St. John's College in Annapolis, Md. He recently received his doctorate in higher education leadership and policy from Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. His dissertation topic was "Bridging the Gap: A Multi-Case Study of the Adoption and Implementation of Instructional Technology in Higher Education."

Retaining Learners...An Institutional Initiative

By President Ruth A. Knox, Wesleyan College

While enrollment plans must include a variety of strategies for admitting new first-year students and transfers, a solid institutional effort to retain those students is equally important. Both require significant human and financial resources, including creativity and cooperation from virtually every aspect of the campus community. A strong partnership between the leaders of academic affairs and student affairs is crucial, and both areas can use technology to accomplish the goal of helping all students persist toward completion of their degrees.

At Wesleyan, we measure the success of our first-year experience in terms of persistence and academic success.

Technology Infrastructure

The Wesleyan College technology infrastructure begins with and has an institution-wide approach. From the college portal, students complete online applications, make appointments for advising, register for courses, learn about ordering textbooks, access grades, track their curriculum progress, and participate in social and academic e-groups. Faculty post assignments, facilitate electronic discussions, and track attendance. Thus, students, faculty, and staff combine the latest technology tools with the individual attention that is so important to a small college campus—all under one electronic umbrella. Such reliance on technology for day-to-day operations demands high levels of student preparation and support. Each student is expected to have a computer, and the college appoints a Computer Resident Advisor (CRA) for each residence hall (in addition to the more traditional Resident Advisor). During the first week of each semester, the CRA administers a Computer Proficiency Survey for each new student in her hall, working with the student to ensure she is fully connected and has the ability to access and use all available technology.

Data-driven Decisions

As we all know, collecting and analyzing data are keys to understanding the students we serve, and reliable data can provide direction for new initiatives to enhance student learning outcomes and success. In 2004, for example, Wesleyan College began to analyze characteristics of our students who did not persist beyond the first year. The findings indicated, among other factors, that students who entered college with a predictive GPA of 2.5 or less were more likely to withdraw than those whose predictive GPAs exceeded that benchmark. While not entirely surprising, this

pattern continued for four years, even for students who actually achieved a higher GPA than expected. In addition, our analysis of conditionally accepted students (those who did not meet the SAT or high school GPA requirement) showed that only 50 percent met the terms of their acceptance in the first semester. With this red flag, our Enrollment Management Team, Student Progress Committee, and Student Support Team developed a plan of action to help these “at risk” students achieve success in their first year.

The Path Program

One exciting component of our plan was the idea of a “pre-entrance” experience. Rather than providing remedial courses, we wanted to give these students a simulated week of real college experience, challenging them to anticipate problems that could arise during the year and develop basic skills to handle them. Using the name PATH: Pioneering Approaches to THinking, we invited conditionally accepted students and those with predictive GPAs of less than 2.5 as the first participants.

PATH, a one-week course offered immediately prior to the fall semester, aims to model the college experience in a condensed period, helping students develop academic success skills, discover and understand how to use a variety of resources (including campus technology), and increase self-confidence both intellectually and socially. The course includes interactive sessions in which students learn and/or enhance academic and social skills, practice those skills in a supportive environment, and reflect on their experiences.

Feedback and evaluations from students have been overwhelmingly positive. Assessment of the program is ongoing and includes monthly meetings with the PATH students, at their request, to evaluate their ongoing needs and monitor their academic and social progress. We anticipate that these students will be more successful academically than predictive scores would indicate, leading to higher retention levels for the PATH students than for others who fall in the “high risk” categories but did not join the program.

Strong First-Year Experience

Higher education experts tout the importance of a comprehensive and collaborative first-year experience as part of an institution’s overall retention plans (Goodman and Pascarella, 2006; Hunter, 2006; Evenbeck and Hamilton, 2006). At Wesleyan, we measure the success of our first-year experience in terms of persistence and academic success. Important elements of our program include interdisciplinary seminars taught by faculty who serve as first-year advisors, lab sessions that focus on skills for academic success taught by Student Affairs staff, an Academic Center, the Writing Center, a library orientation, tutoring, a fall retreat, and careful attention to class attendance and grades. Students encounter campus technology throughout this process, with assignments tailored to help them develop confidence in their ability to use technology and

transfer those skills to other course requirements. We know, however, that students can become overwhelmed by the avalanche of information that comes their way in the first year of college. For that reason, we recently developed an interactive electronic orientation module, giving students ready access to questions and answers about many of the campus resources they encounter—however briefly—during their first year. While still new, the module is receiving good reports.

Student Support Team

The Student Support Team (SST), comprised of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs faculty and staff, meets weekly to monitor class attendance and grades. Faculty are required to report after the first four weeks of each semester and again at midterm any student whose grades are below average, providing an early warning to the student and information to the SST that is critical to student success (Kuh 2007). The SST pays special attention to first-year students, new transfer students, and students on academic probation, but team members monitor attendance and grades for all students.

Career Development and the Career Map

Another aspect of our retention analysis showed that many students who were leaving Wesleyan after the first year had not yet declared a major or otherwise indicated their academic interest. This evidence led us to develop a number of new initiatives in the area of Career Development, including the Career Map. Designed to help each student navigate most aspects of the college experience, the Career Map begins with easing the transition to a new community and also encourages early planning to reach goals throughout the college years.

Effective use of the Career Map requires a student to think about and make decisions that will help her achieve specific outcomes — academically, personally, and professionally — that she sets for herself. The Map contains general guides for fostering learning, personal growth, and professional development as well as specific content areas that the student plans to study during the first year and beyond. Introduced at New Student Orientation, the Career Map is emphasized throughout the First Year Experience, especially by members of the Student Affairs staff during their lab sessions.

The use of technology is an integral part of developing career plans, beginning during a student's first year. The online assessment tool that profiles possible career directions and alternatives is introduced and used. During the second semester of the first year, faculty and staff advisors emphasize career exploration through review and discussion of available majors at Wesleyan. Ideas and timelines for making decisions become part of the Career Map. By the end of the first year, following the Career Map should lead each student to declare her major academic interest. This early engagement in developing a four-year plan also makes persistence at the college more likely.

Co-curricular Transcript

Wesleyan follows the belief that college students learn best by being involved (Astin 1993). Documenting involvement in the classroom through an academic transcript is standard practice. Since learning also occurs outside the classroom, and that process is not so easily recorded or tracked, we have developed an electronic co-curricular transcript.

With a focus on graduate school and career preparation, first-year students use the co-curricular transcript to document their involvement and make better and more informed decisions about how they would like to participate in the life of the campus. Additionally, active use of the co-curricular transcript allows a student to look more easily at the breadth of her involvement. Whatever she sees will enable her to make the right choice. Whether she narrows her focus, if she has become overly committed, or expands her activities to include an internship, sports, or community service, creating this online co-curricular transcript helps her enjoy a more complete experience outside the classroom.

At Wesleyan, the electronic co-curricular transcript allows each student to create a permanent record of her entire college experience as it occurs, becoming fully prepared to design a complete resume for that first job or graduate school application. By combining the academic and co-curricular transcripts, she can readily show all the ways she has learned both in and out of the classroom. Thoughtful attention to these activities also results in better choices and an increased likelihood of satisfaction and success.

Retaining learners requires a variety of carefully designed plans based on knowledge about the students we serve. Collaboration among faculty and student affairs professionals is essential. Even on a small campus, where individual attention and person-to-person connections are both promised and real, technology improves our programs, strengthens our lines of communication, and enhances our management and analysis of data. Creative ideas that engage students in setting the course for their college experience, including the resourceful use of technology, lead to superior learning and teaching, involved and happy students, and graduates who are well prepared to achieve their goals.

About the Author



Ruth Austin Knox
President, Wesleyan College

Ruth Austin Knox is president of Wesleyan College, in Macon, Georgia. She is the first alumna to hold that position, having graduated magna cum laude from Wesleyan in 1975 with a degree in English. She also graduated magna cum laude from The University of Georgia School of Law in 1978, where she was selected to Phi Beta Kappa and the Georgia Law Review. She built her legal career in Atlanta, specializing first in commercial real estate and public finance transactions and later in estate planning. Throughout her years of practicing law, President Knox was an active volunteer for Wesleyan, serving as president of the college's Alumnae Association and as chair of the Board of Trustees before assuming her current position in 2003.

President Knox's tenure as president has been characterized by the development of several new programs, including centers of excellence in the sciences, arts, and education, and by a renewed commitment to service and faith initiatives throughout the campus. The college's fundraising efforts have resulted in significant additions to its endowment for scholarships, salaries, programs, and campus improvements. In 2007, Wesleyan celebrated the opening of a state-of-the-art science facility, the institution's first new academic building in more than 40 years, which also is endowed for future maintenance.

In addition to her life-long engagement with Wesleyan and the education of women, President Knox has been and remains involved in a wide variety of civic and volunteer organizations. She currently chairs the board of Girl Scouts of Historic Georgia. Other board service includes Central Georgia Health Systems, the Tubman African American Museum, Georgia Women of Achievement, the Higher Education Foundation of the United Methodist Church, and the Georgia Humanities Council. She is consistently recognized for outstanding leadership and has been named to Georgia Trend's "100 Most Influential Georgians" list.

Works Cited:

- Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evenbeck, S. & Hamilton, S. (2006). From "my course" to "our program": Collective responsibility for first-year student success. *Peer Review* 8(3), 17-19.
- Goodman, K. & Pascarella, E. T. (2006). First-year seminars increase persistence and retention: A summary of the evidence from *How College Affects Students*. *Peer Review* 8(3), 26-28.
- Hudson, W. E. (2006). Can an early alert excessive absenteeism warning system be effective in retaining freshman students? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* 7(3), 217-226.
- Kuh, G. D. (2007). What student engagement data tell us about college readiness. *Peer Review* 9(1), 4-8.

Doing More with Less: Transforming a Program through Technology

By President Kevin J. Manning, Stevenson University

Founded in 1947 as Villa Julie College, Stevenson University has a long tradition of educating women and preparing students for healthcare professions such as nursing and medical technology. As a national leader in career education with 2,600 full-time undergraduate students, Stevenson is now in the position to make a significant positive impact on Maryland's and the nation's nursing shortage. The creative use of technology is the key to reversing this national trend.

In early 2000, it became clear that critical shortages in nursing, if not reversed, would rapidly affect the quality and level of health care that Americans have long experienced. One of the primary reasons for this anticipated problem would be the profound shortage of nursing faculty across the country, reducing the ability of colleges and universities to train enough nurses at the undergraduate level. With an established nursing program, including a RN-to-BS degree program, Stevenson knew it could play a vital role in tackling this national challenge.

Stevenson is now in the position to make a significant positive impact on Maryland's and the nation's nursing shortage.

Initially, the University eliminated the use of internet instruction for nursing education because of limitations related to the average class size. Stevenson developed an innovative live video distance learning program in 2004

to address the interconnected problems of limited nursing faculty and the need to increase the number of students in the nursing pipeline. With the assistance of Maryland's U.S. Senator Barbara A. Mikulski and the Verizon Corporation, Stevenson was able to bring its RN-to-BS program to a greater number of working nurses across Maryland. Collaboration with the state's community colleges and the use of the latest in distance learning technology enabled us to successfully expand the reach of our existing nursing faculty.

The following chapter addresses the opportunities and challenges involved with this collaborative project and briefly reviews the use of technology in higher education.

Technology in Higher Education

In many ways, higher education has been slow to take advantage of technology to increase efficiency and enhance instruction, especially in the classroom. Of course, higher education as a research enterprise has been the primary driver of basic, applied, and computer research and technology, primarily in the latter half of the 20th century. The development of mainframe computers, the explosion of communications technology, and the steady advancement of the nation's defense technology have all been fostered by higher education's research mission.

But if one looked in the classroom, there was little use of these advances in information technology until the mid- to late-1990s. The basic exchange in higher education on the undergraduate level was direct verbal and visual classroom communication between faculty and students through textbooks and blackboards. Except for the use of traditional audio-visual tools such as overheads or projectors, higher education used the lecture format to accomplish its essential tasks. Little had changed over centuries.

Internet Revolution Paves the Way

Despite the extensive use of computers in higher education, the ability to decentralize their overall use had been slow in coming. In 1982, for example, I had to analyze data for a doctoral dissertation using a batch-mode punch card system. All of this changed with the development of the internet and its linkage to the personal computer (PC). With the onset of broadband networks and more powerful PC hardware and applications in the late 1990s, the internet's true ability to enhance the classroom experience for faculty and students alike became abundantly clear.

By the early 21st century, it was now a commonplace activity for faculty to bring to the classroom all of the world's information—video, audio, and text—to enhance the instructional experience. In addition, faculty and students were able to keep in touch 24/7 using standard classroom management applications. Beyond this, the actual use of technology expanded and full-motion video streaming became available, allowing the classroom experience to be transmitted real-time between distant sites. (The above material was adapted from an informative article on technology in higher education, *“Will Technology Really Change Education?”* Kent and McNergney, 1999, Corwin Press.)

A New Model Emerges

It was this real-time distance learning approach that Stevenson chose to develop in 2004 to help deal with the nursing shortage. Although an online program model would deal with some aspects of overall nursing enrollment, it still wouldn't address the faculty shortage. Stevenson's RN-to-BS program was popular. Although we had experienced and able faculty members, we could not see them serving as ongoing “road warriors,” driving from site to site across the state.

By the late 1990s, some institutions were experimenting with full-motion video instruction that offered the advantages of internet instruction with a high-speed interactive opportunity in the classroom. Most importantly, this new type of video classroom permitted one faculty member to teach in several classrooms simultaneously. Stevenson was initially connected to a proprietary video network which limited the number of classrooms with which our faculty could interact. By 2007, we expanded to internet transmission, which permitted worldwide transmission of instruction and would not limit the number of classrooms.

In the development of this new video classroom model, we had to confront three essential facts about nursing education: 1) the significant shortage of faculty in nursing; 2) the widespread availability of video classrooms in community colleges throughout Maryland; and 3) the ability of students with the RN degree to study at the community college in their third year and complete their fourth year at universities such as Stevenson (allowing community college students in nursing to earn up to three years of credit in the two-year setting). The synergies existed but a new model had to bring these forces together.

To gauge interest in this model, Stevenson officials approached a variety of organizations, including hospitals experiencing serious nursing shortages. From these discussions it became apparent that community colleges presented the best scenario for collaboration. One of the advantages of the community colleges was the fact that all of their students had to complete clinical internships, mitigating the disadvantage that distance learning had relative to actual clinical experiences. The second advantage offered by community colleges was that most of the Maryland colleges already had video distance learning classrooms in place.

In discussions with various community college officials around the state, we found that there was a real need for this model and a willingness to provide financial support. Our first partnership was with Chesapeake College and Memorial Hospital on Maryland's Eastern Shore, which has established articulation agreements with seven other Maryland community colleges as of fall 2009.

Verizon Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

As Stevenson formulated this model, we realized that we were breaking new ground. We were not yet experienced in the use of full-motion video distance learning classrooms. The start-up for the program would require substantial funds. To get started, we identified an under-utilized lecture hall on our campus and began approaching foundations and corporations with interests in financing nursing education. The cost of fully equipping two sophisticated technology classrooms was estimated to be \$500,000, which included significant renovation of the room, construction of special tables, projectors, hardware, and other digital equipment.

Together with our community college partner, we demonstrated this model's value to workforce development. Senator Mikulski showed an interest in the project early on and attended the first

public demonstration between Stevenson and Chesapeake College. With her help, we secured a federal grant of \$248,000 for the project. The Verizon Foundation provided \$100,000 in funds for equipment, in addition to significant design and technical support. University funds allotted for the project totaled \$218,000. This successful collaboration allowed us to open the Verizon Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in October 2004. We established two comprehensive video distance learning classrooms that permitted us to teach three additional offsite classrooms across a distance at the same time.

As noted earlier, over time we realized the limitations of the proprietary network and in 2007 moved to a University System of Maryland network that gave us unlimited ability to broadcast around the world using a Web-based technology. The age of the digital classroom had arrived for Stevenson.

Digital and Video Classrooms Are Not Enough

Of course, digital and distance learning classrooms bring their own sets of challenges and require a host of services to support students and instructors. In the case of video distance learning, instructors require extensive training to be effective in this setting.

For digital learning, students and instructors also need technical support. We found the use of outside vendors to be the most effective approach. We contracted with an online vendor to provide 24/7 “help desk” solutions and identified an around-the-clock library reference service through collaboration with the State of Maryland. In fact, our Stevenson libraries have helped to adapt all library services to technology-driven support.

We also developed online tutorial assistance that would be available at all times and even provided a software system to assist students in setting up their own computers. While digital and distance learning classrooms provide solutions, they require a host of support functions to optimize their value to students.

Benefits of the Evolved Stevenson Model

The result of our move into video distance learning for the RN-to-BS program has been the successful development of a complement of subsequent delivery modes essential to the operation of a modern university. Stevenson has taken a “hybrid” approach to instruction—online, video distance, and traditional classroom—with the ability to adapt curricula to modes that best meet the demands of specific student groups, adult or traditional students, and to provide the appropriate support necessary to ensure their success. In the case of online instruction, our approach is guided by “Quality Matters” (QM), a faculty-centered, peer-reviewed process to certify the quality and effectiveness of online courses and support materials.

The flexible approach that we utilize for this hybrid model also has the benefit of affordability. Community college nursing students are able to take as many as three years of credit at the local community college. They can finish their fourth year at Stevenson’s normal private institution tuition rate, still making the overall cost to these students comparable to attending a Maryland state university as a commuter student, a fairly low tuition rate.

Finally, there is the issue of accessibility. By going directly to community colleges and hospitals with our nursing program model—and keeping it affordable and convenient—we increased accessibility and put more students in the state’s pipeline to completing a baccalaureate degree in nursing career.

Outcomes of the Model

Enrollment growth in our RN-to-BS nursing program has been one of the most significant outcomes of our model. From 122 students in RN-to-BS nursing in 2004–2005, to 270 students in RN-to-BS nursing in 2008–2009, Stevenson has realized a 125 percent increase. Of course, this increase directly translates into more qualified nurses entering the profession.

Another important aspect of our distance video effort was what our institution learned about online instruction. The collaborative solution helped to provide quality education in nursing in a way that wasn’t possible through our traditional classroom model. We now have a blueprint that we are already using to develop similar programs in the future.

Since 1991, Stevenson has graduated more than 1,000 baccalaureate-prepared nurses in both our traditional and RN-to-BS programs, adding a significant number of professionals to our region. In addition, because of the use of the video distance learning model, we were able to offer quality instruction without adding more faculty, an important factor given the shortage of trained faculty in nursing education.

Lessons Learned

It is difficult to overestimate the role of technology and its efficiency in higher education. Mega-universities are quickly emerging, such as the Open University in England and University of Maryland University College. When critical mass is reached and an irreversible technology shift occurs, colleges and universities that are not adept in using technology will struggle to keep up, similar to the struggle of newspapers now losing readership and advertisers to online media. Only educational institutions that take the initiative to experiment with technology and develop effective strategies for its use will be able to compete.

It is important to be patient. Much of the confusion over technology in higher education is generational. New faculty will bring with them a considerable amount of computer experience and interest.

Yet, institutions need to focus their attention carefully. Remember, Stevenson University began its distance learning efforts with one program—nursing. This has developed into a distance learning division with extensive capabilities, flexibility, and quality-control measures. (Paul D. Lack, Ph.D., wrote an excellent article on some of these specific developments at Stevenson in *University Business*, “Distance Learning that Works,” October 2007.)

Be prepared for extensive investment and a considerable amount of lead-time for developing programs for online and distance learning. It can be very expensive to develop a single program of study, so return on investment scenarios should be analyzed. Because of careful research, we were able to develop a distance graduate program in forensic studies for less than a quarter of a million dollars. There was an obvious market need identified, and we have already experienced a successful payback. Advance research is valuable.

A Final Word

From Stevenson’s standpoint, we are glad we began the long journey into distance and hybrid learning when the opportunity arose. In my view, more and more learning at the higher education level will be via a hybrid technology model. New teaching and learning protocols are clearly escalating now after 25 years of relatively slow development. With the rising costs of higher education, gas, and the challenge of commuting by car, we all need to consider what benefits the hybrid technological educational model brings as we encounter the rapidly changing realities of higher education in the 21st century.

About the Author



Kevin J. Manning
President, Stevenson University

Kevin J. Manning assumed his role as the fourth president of Stevenson University on July 1, 2000. He was selected for the position after an extensive national search process that involved the Board, students, faculty and staff of Maryland's third-largest independent college.

President Manning's career in higher education spans more than four decades. Before coming to Stevenson University, he was vice president for development and college relations at Immaculata University in Pennsylvania. Previously, he held key administrative positions at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania, and at Washington University in Missouri.

Widely acknowledged as a visionary leader (he received the Ernst & Young Entrepreneur of the Year® Award in 2007), President Manning guided the development of the institution's second campus, thus transforming the University from a commuter school to a residential one. In addition, he oversaw the process through which a name change and move to university status were implemented. Under his tenure, full-time enrollment has grown from 1,648 to 2,596.

President Manning's commitment to Stevenson extends far beyond campus boundaries. He is on the board of directors of the United Way of Central Maryland and is the co-chair for the current campaign. He is also on the Board of Directors of the Greater Baltimore Committee, the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education, and the Maryland Chamber of Commerce.

President Manning earned a Bachelor of Arts in Theatre from Webster University, a Master of Science in Counseling and Student Personnel from Shippensburg University, and a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from The Ohio State University.

The Role of Portals in Higher Education

By President Michael T. Victor, Lake Erie College

Of all that has evolved within higher education over the past decade, the potential of technology is one of the most significant. We must be reminded that the cohort of students descending upon our campuses today are citizens of the information age. They are the most diverse group ever to inhabit the college campus and the most demanding in terms of technology. As educators, we must recognize that in this third decade of the technology revolution, our students demand mobility, convenience, and accessibility to media. They expect constant communication with friends, family and their learning environment.

So how do we provide that *instant access*? Not so long ago, the role of information portals on campus websites and intranets was one that provided access to operational information such as admissions forms, libraries, class registration and sports information. The focus has shifted from being organizationally centered to that of student-centered. In the age of

iTunes and Picasa, Facebook and MySpace, Webkinz and ClubPenguin, institutions must gain an understanding of this new era of social networking and its influence on how students communicate and learn. Schrand (2008) suggests the use of technologies that support social networking can facilitate more active student learning, will appeal to multiple intelligences, and will address different learning styles.

Although there are a number of ways to utilize technology on campus, the fundamentals of any technology initiative should support the academic or pedagogical framework of the organization. Chickering and Gamson (1987) remind us that good practices within higher education should:

- Encourage contact between students and faculty
- Encourage active learning
- Respect diverse talents and ways of learning

More recently, Bates (2005) tells us to identify the kinds of learning that different media facilitate best and under what circumstances, while Oblinger and Hawkins (2006) remind us the issue is not whether we use technology to do the same things but whether we take advantage of technology's unique capabilities to do things differently. In his book, *Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation*

The challenge is to find meaningful ways to incorporate tools students utilize in their personal lives into the classroom.

is *Changing Your World*, Tapscott (2008) states the obvious: “Focus on the change in pedagogy, not the technology. Learning 2.0 is about dramatically changing the relationship between teacher and students in the learning process. Get that right, and use technology for a student-focused, customized, collaborative learning environment” (p. 148).

In his blog entitled: “*Web 2.0 Is the Future of Education*,” Steve Hargadon outlines a number of trends within society that are germane to higher education. He speaks to the use of Web 2.0 technologies as he points out the following key components in the paradigm shift occurring in higher education, indicating that we are a society moving from:

- ❑ Consuming to producing
- ❑ Authority to transparency
- ❑ Expert to facilitator
- ❑ The lecture to the hallway
- ❑ “Access to information” to “access to people”
- ❑ “Learning about” to “learning to be”
- ❑ Passive to passionate learning
- ❑ Presentation to participation
- ❑ Publication to conversation
- ❑ Formal schooling to lifelong learning
- ❑ Supply-push to demand-pull

These key components address the mind-set of our digital students and are the foundation of the “World of Learning 2.0.”

To begin exploring the “World of Learning 2.0,” one might take a look at those areas of web development and design that facilitate interactive information sharing and collaboration. How many of us can create and post a blog, or upload class assignments to a course supported by Moodle or Twitter on a regular basis? All of these represent use of some form of social network software, a two-way platform that provides the beginnings of a virtual learning environment. The challenge is to find meaningful ways to incorporate tools students utilize in their personal lives into the classroom. Creating a collaborative environment is key to integrating social networking into curriculum. A variety of tools are available in the Web 2.0 toolbox, including blogs, wikis, podcasts, instant messaging, RSS feeds, digital storytelling, and social bookmarking (Parameswaran and Whinston, 2007).

Blogs are a method of extending the classroom experience through instructor postings that supplement curriculum by relating specific events, creating journaling opportunities for students, or even establishing an atmosphere for group projects.

Podcasts are another use of technology that are easily developed and provide students an opportunity to learn by doing rather than simply reading text or listening to a lecture.

Because collaboration is easily achieved, Wikis provide an environment that allows students to work together while also providing faculty the ability to track work in progress and determine how much each individual is contributing. Wikis also encourage students to produce work that can be placed in an electronic portfolio and utilized later in job interviews to demonstrate collaboration skills associated with teamwork and the sharing of ideas through the use of technology.

Social bookmarking is yet another way educators can collect and share resources, provide feeds to educational sites and blogs, and supplement online training. All of these are existing technologies that we are familiar with; perhaps we should take a look at how the fabric of the web environment can be intertwined with curriculum.

Which leads us to the virtual world. Second Life (SL). Do you have an Avatar? Have you given any thought to the possibilities of creating your own campus in the world of SL? Institutional leaders are facing the challenge of integrating time-honored traditional pedagogy with the current technology environment. By creating a virtual campus, students are provided the opportunity to learn and experiment in ways that simply are not possible in the traditional classroom. Studies of educational work involving SL have identified where components of the SL experience can facilitate the paradigm shift in education. These include extended interactions, exposure to authentic content and culture, individual and collective identity play, simulation and community presence (Warburton and Perez-Garcia, 2009). Kay and Fitzgerald (2008) have developed a set of categories that represent the current educational activities of SL. They include:

- Self-paced tutorials
- Displays and exhibits
- Immersive exhibits
- Role plays and simulations
- Data visualizations and simulations
- Historical recreations and re-enactments
- Living and immersive archaeology
- Treasure hunts and quests

- ❑ Language and cultural immersion
- ❑ Creative writing

Our colleagues at the Kansas University Medical Center are currently utilizing a SL campus in their school of nursing and allied health programs. This environment allows students to learn, experiment, and experience in a safe environment. A virtual learning environment provides opportunity for students to feel “connected” to the learning process while gaining an understanding for situations they may never experience in real life. Institutions can establish learning kiosks to collaborate and exchange information with colleagues around the world without the hindrance of a language barrier. The development of Sloodle (which combines the learning management system of Moodle and the 3-D multi-user environment of a SL), has created endless possibilities for development of virtual learning environments.

Today’s student has been heavily influenced by technology, which presents both opportunity and challenge for institutions of higher education. We are called upon to address the paradigm shift from “sage on the stage” to “guide on the side” through meaningful technological applications and tools that have broad potential regardless of the discipline. These applications can be utilized to support experiential and active learning goals while at the same time aligning pedagogic goals with student preferences. Learning can be enhanced by encouraging students to think differently about the technology skills they have developed and apply them to educational and work-related tasks. It is imperative that institutional leaders take the lead in creating and supporting an atmosphere of change. This will include providing information to faculty to assist in understanding the need for the change in pedagogy. It will not come without strong debate among the faculty ranks, nor will it be applied consistently across all disciplines. Each content area will need to determine how best to approach the paradigm shift, as well as which technologies are most applicable to their course of study.

This shift in the manner in which technology is utilized in the classroom comes with a price tag. Your CIO will be able to help identify costs associated with upgrades to technology infrastructure necessary to support the various technologies presented. You might be surprised to find it is not as costly as you might think. In the meantime, consider having a conversation with your faculty regarding the creation of your own “University Island,” where the sun is always shining, the water always calm and the learning environment always exciting.

About the Author



Michael T. Victor
President, Lake Erie College

Lake Erie College's 11th president, Michael T. Victor has brought a new and contagious excitement and level of expectancy to Lake Erie College. An action president, and an accessible president, he has a bold vision for the future of the College.

Since his appointment, President Victor has overseen record enrollment and fundraising. He launched new football, tennis and lacrosse programs and is overseeing the College's transition to NCAA Division II athletics.

Before arriving in Painesville, he served as the dean of the Walker School of Business at Mercyhurst College beginning in 2002 and previously was an assistant professor of business and executive-in-residence at Gannon University. He gained much of his experience as the CEO of Pyramid Industries and subsidiaries and as an attorney in the Corporate Law Department of MacDonald, Illig, Jones & Britton.

Graduating summa cum laude from St. Vincent College, the Ridgway, Pa., native earned his J.D. from Duquesne University School of Law. President Victor serves on the board of directors of Junior Achievement of Greater Cleveland and Energy West.

Works Cited:

- Bates, A.W. (2005). *Technology, e-Learning and Distance Education*, 2nd edition. Routledge, New York
- Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1987, March). *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Higher Education*. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin.
- Hargadon, S. (2008). *Web 2.0 is the Future of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.stevehargadon.com>.
- Kay, J. & FitzGerald, S. (2008). *Educational Uses of Second Life*. Retrieved from <http://sleducation.wikispaces.com/educationaluses>.
- Oblinger, D. & Hawkins, B. (2006). The Myth About No Significant Difference: "Using Technology Produces No Significant Differences." *EDUCAUSE Review*, Vol 41, No 6 p 14-15.
- Parameswaran, M. & Whinston, A. (2007). Social computing: An overview. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 19, pp. 162-280.
- Schrand, T. (2008). Tapping into active learning and multiple intelligences with interactive multimedia: a low-threshold classroom approach. *College Teaching*, Vol 56, No 2, pp 78-84. Retrieved from <http://proquest.umi.com>.
- Tapscott, D. (2008). *Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing Your World*. McGraw-Hill: New York.
- Warburton, S. & Perez-Garcia, M. (2009). 3D design and collaboration in massively multi-use virtual environments. In D. Russell (Ed.), *Cases on collaboration in virtual learning environments: processes and interactions*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Using Technology to Further a Culture of Innovation

By President Esther L. Barazzone, Chatham University

Technology has long been thought of as a byproduct of innovation. But can technology help foster innovation? Recent events on our campus have shown that technology can be quite effective in speeding up the pace of change and encouraging creativity.

Chatham, like many small colleges and universities that survived and thrived in recent decades, did so by acting like the high tech start-ups of the 70's and 80's. Our campus could easily have been compared to a "skunk works" – that wonderful phrase coined for a small group of people (often in the computer or aerospace fields) working together with non-bureaucratically-impeded creativity. Because of the campus culture we created, we were able to approve and implement change rapidly, without the occasional excesses of process that plague many academic institutions, while preserving our historic commitment to quality. Faculty's mutual trust of their colleagues' academic integrity meant that we could move more rapidly than was customary in creating and implementing new academic programs. "Chatham Time" became a code for our commitment to action.

"Chatham Time" became a code for our commitment to action.

In large part because of this culture of innovation, Chatham changed remarkably between 1992 and 2007. We evolved from an historic women's liberal arts residential college of 500 undergraduate students to a coeducational

master's university with nearly 2,300 students in three colleges. We have an undergraduate women's college and nearly 20 coeducational graduate programs through the doctoral level. We continued to grow at double-digit rates almost every year. The faculty was equally committed to remaining an integrated institution and therefore only students, not faculty, were separated into the colleges, the new academic units.

In 2007, our new academic and organizational complexity was compounded when the Eden Hall Foundation gave us the extraordinary gift of 388 suburban acres – the "Eden Hall Campus." By spring of 2009 we began to teach on our new campus and we plan to have 150 students living there and attending a new School of Sustainability & the Environment within five years. Over the summer of 2009, we also moved a significant number of students and programs (mostly graduate) into a newly acquired urban property ("Chatham Eastside"), less than a mile from our original urban campus on Woodland Road.

Whereas in 2007 our campus had been concentrated on a small 37-acre arboretum within the City, by 2009 Chatham had become the largest landholding institution in Allegheny County, with three dispersed educational sites (not including our virtual campus) totaling nearly 450 acres. Our Woodland campus, once traversable in a three-minute walk, was now separated from the Eden Hall Campus by a 35 minute drive, and from Chatham Eastside by a distance that discourages many people from walking. The distances are especially challenging since, as the alma mater of Rachel Carson '29, we have dedicated ourselves to "walking the talk" in reducing our carbon footprint.

This growth, however, threatened to derail one engine of our change: the smallness, intimacy and lack of bureaucracy that had fostered our culture of innovation that we wanted to continue. We feared losing the communication – among faculty, between faculty and students (who frequently need comforting about change) and among the administration and faculty – that was so central to our change-oriented culture. Could we preserve our "skunk works" culture with so much separation among sites and people? Could the creativity that is ignited by the intellectual sparks that occur when people are in close proximity continue when they don't see each other as often?

Perhaps not surprisingly, some of the earliest steps we took to retain our campus commitment to being an integrated institution had little to do with technology. We worked to create physical presence at all sites of key people, as well as the presence of students from more than one program or degree level, so that the sense of the broader university community was preserved. Though no students yet live year-round at the Eden Hall Campus, a senior administrator was asked to reside there to establish a university presence. We thought it important that no site would come to be seen as the exclusive domain of any population. Eden Hall Campus has been used by undergraduates and graduate students, as well as alumni as part of orientation, reunion, retreats, and a new class in organic gardening. Meetings and events, including board meetings, were spread around the different venues. The vice president of academic affairs regularly goes to our new Chatham Eastside site to meet with faculty, rather than have the faculty always come to the Woodland campus.

However, it soon became apparent that these more traditional measures alone would not preserve the "skunk works" culture that had flourished on our smaller campus. They might serve to link dispersed populations better, or to personalize the non face-to-face learning experience, but they could not satisfy the need for a creative, intellectual community where innovation could thrive. We turned to the infrastructure already in place to create that community – online for those who were dispersed and even for those sitting in adjoining offices.

Chatham already had a comprehensive intranet capability with "myChatham," which is easily accessed through the internet and provided the customary central repository and clearing house of university information, holding such things as event calendars, directories, forms, student and faculty data, accounts and rosters. All three physical sites are wireless and all undergraduates

over the last five years have been issued tablet computers, a highly-portable computer which most faculty also use. While grant applications have been made to enhance the computing power through the addition of direct, high-speed fiber lines to provide better future networks, (and better linkages to outside infrastructure such as the Carnegie Mellon supercomputer) sufficient electronic capabilities were already in place. We also had experience in fostering a very good sense of community and personal connection through our online education programs, where we serve approximately 500 students.

A group of faculty members developed the first experiment that showed how technology could be used for new program development. They created “Farm 101” as a Moodle site where faculty, students and staff who wanted to be part of Eden Hall campus planning could share their thoughts and learning. It was also used as a clearinghouse where members of the campus community were asked to register their relevant life skills. Did anyone know how to keep bees or chickens, can produce, or create an organic garden? In relatively short order, Farm 101 became the equivalent of a “skunk works” from which emanated a number of innovative ideas – many of which have already been implemented or incorporated into future planning. Most importantly, Farm 101 created a community of collaborators to help develop this new campus and its programs. The Alumni Office and the College for Continuing & Professional Education further broadened the environmental planning community by creating an online book club to discuss Barbara Kingsolver’s *Animal, Vegetable, Miracle*.

We are looking now at ways to use technology to reduce the costs of making progress on disparate sites, by not replicating offerings. For example, when the Eden Hall Campus is built out as the home to the new School of Sustainability, it will offer master’s programs and collaborate with the College for Women to offer undergraduate degrees and experiences for students who want to take advantage of the courses offered at this new all “green” site, regardless of whether they are environmental studies majors.

We are also studying ways to expand online offerings as part of our existing traditional undergraduate program, along with imaginative rescheduling of coursework on the Woodland campus to make it possible for future students to pursue experiences on both campuses (for example, organic gardening at Eden Hall Campus) in an organized, concentrated schedule of offerings that will minimize commuting between sites and prevent the isolated development of the three sites as places that pursue different, unconnected activities.

We have already tried this “mixed metaphor” of academic offerings in our current undergraduate program as our faculty have begun to deliver part of our general education curriculum online. This summer, faculty who might never have taught online before did so in order to make good on our new policy of offering general education courses online by our regular faculty at competitive rates,

rather than permit students to take general education and disciplinary introductory courses at community colleges and transfer them back in (a practice which was costing us both in educational continuity for the students and in lost tuition revenue). At least one outstanding traditional faculty member found the experience so exhilarating that she has become a leader on behalf of this concept on educational, not economic, grounds — an important development.

Experimentation is also taking place in our graduate programs. Some of the most important graduate programs from our earlier growth period are attractive targets for expansion since they are proven quality winners with great appeal. However, they would be enormously expensive to expand by traditional means, in part because of the difficulty of finding field placement sites within our region where there are now many other programs seeking the same placements. In the case of one highly sought-after health science program, the standardization of academic experience which technology offers will be utilized in the future to perpetuate the strength of the core academic program through online classes, and the field opportunities expanded and dispersed through field experiences in supervised, distant, and even off-shore, locations.

The future challenge will be to strike the right balance between the “face” time necessary for continued trust that must undergird team-based innovation, and the use of more technology for communication and collaboration as we work to keep creativity, innovation and the sense of being one academic community, albeit in three disparate sites, alive.

About the Author



Esther L. Barazzone
President, Chatham University

Esther Barazzone, President of Chatham University since 1992, has been a leader in efforts to internationalize higher education. Chatham received the Institute for International Education's Heiskell Award in 2003. President Barazzone serves on the board of the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) and her work has been recognized by honorary doctorates from institutions in Pakistan, Korea, and Japan. She has also participated in several international delegations during her presidency, to Southeast Asia, Germany, and Egypt.

During President Barazzone's tenure, Chatham has developed programs in areas of the environment, international education, and women's leadership that have resulted in significant institutional growth and university status. President Barazzone also served as a faculty member and administrator at Hamilton and Kirkland Colleges, the University of Pennsylvania, Swarthmore College and Philadelphia University.

President Barazzone holds a Ph.D. and Master's of Art in European Intellectual History from Columbia University, where she was a Fellow of the Faculty. She was a Charter Scholar in the first graduating class of New College and received a Fulbright Student award to Spain in 1967. She has also studied at the Wharton School of Business Administration and at Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management.