

PRESIDENTIAL PERSPECTIVES

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY
OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

INSIDE
HIGHER ED

insidehighered.com

KENNETH C. GREEN
SENIOR RESEARCH CONSULTANT

with

SCOTT JASCHIK
&
DOUG LEDERMAN

FOUNDING EDITORS, INSIDE HIGHER ED

SUPPORT FOR THIS PROJECT PROVIDED BY
KAPLAN GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, PEARSON, AND SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION



Student
Retention
Solutions

Looking to improve student retention?

At Pearson, we understand that every program is unique.

We partner with education institutions to create client-driven solutions tailored to meet program needs. Our proven education solutions can help:

- ▶ Achieve Institutional Outcomes
- ▶ Increase Value and Affordability
- ▶ Deliver Workforce Education
- ▶ Support Growing Enrollments

Let Pearson be your partner.

Visit <http://www.pearsoncustom.com/institutional> to learn more.

PRESIDENTIAL PERSPECTIVES

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS



Presidential Perspectives - 4

What Matters Most? - 6
Strategies for Challenging Times - 8
Absent Political Concerns - 11
Acting Responsibly: Allies, Accomplices & Adversaries - 13
Does Technology Make a Difference? - 14
What They Do Well - 17
<i>Plus Ça Change</i> : Does Washington Make a Difference? - 21
Presidents Have Opinions - 21

Data Tables - 22

Appendix A: Methodology - 27

Appendix B: About the Authors - 28

Introduction

The ebb and flow of the American economy have direct consequences for the economic and psychological health of American higher education. In the decades following World War II, higher education did well (and felt good about itself) when the nation was doing well economically. Concurrently, the inevitable economic downturns, particularly those since the early 1970s, have had dire effects on both the budgets and the cultures of many American colleges and universities. ¶ College leaders do not lack for hyperbole in their efforts to capture the impact of economic downturns on the academic enterprise. The title used for a widely cited 1971 Carnegie Commission Report, *The New Depression in Higher Education* (Earl Cheit,

McGraw-Hill, 1971), marked an important transition—indeed an escalation—in the language used to link the economic experience of the nation with the economic conditions affecting higher education.

The current recession has been widely described as the nation’s worst economic upheaval since the Great Depression of the 1930s. What also differentiates this downturn from the past three – in the early 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s – is that it is the second in a single decade. The American economy and higher education were in many ways still recovering from the financial chaos brought on by the dot-com bust and 9/11 when the economic world seemed to implode, again, in fall 2008. Campus leaders had hoped that the economic recovery under way in the middle years of the last decade would

provide some stability and security for their institutions. But the nation and higher ed were again roiled by financial upheaval in 2008.

This Presidential Perspectives survey addresses key concerns that confront presidents across all sectors of American higher education as they and their institutions seek to emerge from the downturn. The eight categories of questions, listed below, address an array of current challenges presidents face:

- What are the most important problems confronting your institution in the next two-three years?
- What strategies have you deployed during the current economic downturn to address the financial and other challenges confronting your campus? Which

strategies are really effective?

- What strategies would you like to employ if the political costs of doing so were not significant?
- Which groups within your campus community have fulfilled their respective responsibilities helping your institution maneuver through the financial challenges of the past two years?
- How would you rate the effectiveness of your institution’s investments in information technology?
- How effective is your institution in the context of various “performance” metrics, such as the quality of undergraduate education and the use of data to inform campus decision making?

- Given the new Congress that convened in Washington in January 2011, how likely it is that Congress will take action on various issues important to higher education in the coming months?

- What is your perspective on various issues important to higher education?

The survey data offer new insights about presidential priorities during (yet another) period marked by significant financial challenges. Although politicians and the public might prefer that campus presidents speak with one voice about policy matters that affect the post-secondary enterprise, the survey reveals consensus on some issues but areas of significant difference among campus leaders across sectors.

The *Inside Higher Ed* Presidential Perspectives survey was conducted in January and February 2011. An e-mail invitation with a hotlink to an online questionnaire was first sent on January 21st to the presidents of some 3,100 public, private, and for-profit colleges and universities. Discounting some 200 undeliverable e-mails, the actual survey sample included some 2,900 two- and four-year colleges and universities that enroll 500 or more students. A total of 956 campus and system presidents, chancellors, and CEOs, about 33 percent of those invited to participate, completed the questionnaire, making the 2011 Presidential Perspectives survey one of the largest surveys of American college and university presidents in recent decades. (Additional information about the survey methodology is presented in Appendix A.)

WHAT MATTERS MOST

Presidents confront many challenges. One goal of the Presidential Perspectives survey was to get presidents to identify the “two most important issues” confronting their institutions over the next two to three years. Rather than forcing survey respondents to rank a long list of items, the questionnaire asked presidents to select two issues -- from a list of 12 -- that they felt posed the most pressing challenges for their institutions.

As shown in **Table 1**, budget shortfalls rank first among the full sample of 956 presidents, chancellors, and campus CEOs participating in the survey, followed by rising tuition/affordability, changes in state support, increased competition for students, and remediation/college readiness. The lowest-ranked items for the full population of survey respondents were impending faculty retire-

ments, unfunded retirement liabilities, financial support from corporations, and potential cuts in federal research support.

But here as elsewhere in the Presidential Perspectives survey data, a single number for the full survey sample masks major differences in and across key segments of American higher education. As shown in Table 1, presidents of public institutions identify budget

Table 1
The Two Most Important Issues Confronting My Institution Over the Next Two to Three years
(top five items by sector; percentages, winter 2011)

All Institutions (n=956)	Public Institutions (n=561)	Private Institutions (n=356)	For-Profit Institutions (n=39)
Budget shortfalls (48.8)	Budget shortfalls (62.0)	Rising tuition / affordability (42.2)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (48.7)
Rising tuition / affordability (26.9)	Changes in state support (42.6)	Increased competition for students (35.3)	Increased competition for students (28.2)
Changes in state support (26.5)	Remediation and student readiness for college (19.6)	Budget shortfalls (32.2)	TIE: Rising Tuition & Remediation and student readiness for college (25.6)
Increased competition for students (17.5)	Rising tuition / affordability (17.2)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (16.5)	Student assessment and institutional outcomes (17.9)
Remediation and student readiness for college (14.0)	Maintaining the quality of academic programs (15.2)	Financial support from alumni (15.1)	

Table 2
The Two Most Important Issues Confronting My Institution Over the Next Two to Three Years Among Public Institutions
 (top five items by sector; percentages, winter 2011)

Doctoral Universities (n=61)	Master's Institutions (n=105)	Baccalaureate Institutions (n=51)	Community Colleges (n=344)
Budget shortfalls (57.6)	Budget shortfalls (58.7)	Budget shortfalls (56.9)	Budget shortfalls (64.5)
Changes in state support (52.5)	Changes in state support (54.8)	Changes in state support (39.2)	Changes in state support (37.9)
Maintaining the quality of academic programs (28.8)	TIE: Maintaining the quality of academic programs and Rising tuition / affordability (24.0)	TIE: Rising tuition/affordability and Maintaining the quality of academic programs (17.6)	Remediation and student readiness for college (27.2)
Rising tuition / affordability (16.9)	TIE: Increased competition for students and Student assessment / institutional outcomes (13.7)	TIE: Increased competition for students and Student assessment / institutional outcomes (13.7)	Limits on our ability to respond to rising enrollments/increased demand (20.4)
Potential cuts in federal research support (16.3)			Rising tuition / affordability (15.1)

shortfalls as their most pressing challenge, followed by changes in state support and remediation/student readiness. In contrast, rising tuition/affordability ranks as the top challenge for presidents of private nonprofit institutions, followed by competition for students and then budget shortfalls. And the small sample of CEOs/campus executives who represent the for-profit sector have a somewhat different set of priorities, led by potential cuts in federal financial aid programs, followed by increased competition for students and then a tie for third place between rising tuition and student remediation/readiness.

The variation in priorities across the public, private nonprofit, and for-profit institutions should come as no surprise. As state funding for core academic operations as a proportion of total operating revenues has declined sharply for public institutions in many states over the past three decades, budget shortfalls

linked to current cuts in state support clearly present a challenge for presidents of public colleges and universities. In contrast, presidents of private nonprofit institutions cite rising tuition and affordability concerns as their top priority, followed by competition for students -- particularly the highly talented and the affluent who can afford to pay full tuition. For private colleges, budget shortfalls are linked to enrollment or endowment issues as opposed to operating support from the states. And among for-profits, which receive a huge proportion of tuition revenue via federal student aid programs, cuts in federal aid (which could also include restrictions on federal aid for students enrolled at for-profit colleges) would pose major problems.

A single number for a sector such as public or private nonprofit institutions masks important differences within that segment. **Table 2** reveals both consonance and dissonance about the most pressing in-

stitutional issues among the presidents of public colleges and universities. The points of consensus among the presidents of public institutions are budget shortfalls and changes in state support. These two items emerge as the top concerns across public institutions -- doctoral universities, master's and baccalaureate institutions, and community colleges.

However, the consensus on institutional priorities among public sector presidents begins to fragment beyond the two top ranked issues. Beyond the shared concern about budget shortfalls and changes in state support, community college presidents place remediation/college readiness and limits on institutional capacity to respond to rising enrollments among the most pressing issues affecting their institutions. In contrast, their counterparts in four-year public colleges and universities cite maintaining program quality, competition for students, and assessment/institutional

tutional outcomes as their top concerns.

The survey data also document a general consensus about pressing priorities among the presidents of private nonprofit colleges and universities. As shown in **Table 3**, rising tuition/affordability is the top issue for presidents across all segments, from large doctoral universities to small, private two-year institutions. And across all four segments of private nonprofit higher education, the presidents' top five priorities are fairly consistent, even as the percentages and rankings vary a bit. For example, presidents in all four institutional segments cite rising tuition/affordability and budget shortfalls as pressing concerns. Presidents in three of the four segments also cite rising competition for students, and cuts in state student aid programs.

The presidents of private doctoral

universities (like their public sector counterparts) identify potential cuts in federal research funding in their list of most pressing issues. Only the presi-

dents of private baccalaureate institutions cite financial support from alumni as one of their top institutional concerns for the next two to three years.

STRATEGIES FOR CHALLENGING TIMES

Table 4 reveals that campus leaders have pursued multiple strategies to address the financial difficulties facing their institutions. Some strategies, such as budget cuts, might generate significant savings; others, such as launching new programs or expanding online education programs, offer the hope of new enrollments and revenues.

In aggregate, the survey data reveal that colleges' budget cuts were generally targeted, rather than across the board, and focused on administrative rather than academic savings. Across all sectors, in-

creased tuition was also an important part of institutional strategies to address the financial issues: almost half (48.8 percent) the presidents of public institutions and a quarter (25.3 percent) of the presidents

Table 3
The Two Most Important Issues Confronting My Institution Over the Next Two to Three Years Among Private Nonprofit Institutions
(top five items by sector; percentages, winter 2011)

Doctoral Universities (n=29)	Master's Institutions (n=111)	Baccalaureate Institutions (n=197)	Associate Institutions (n=19)
Rising tuition / affordability (41.4)	Rising tuition / affordability (45.4)	Rising tuition / affordability (40.5)	Rising tuition / affordability (42.1)
Budget shortfalls (34.5)	Increased competition for students (38.9)	Increased competition for students (36.9)	TIE: Budget shortfalls and Increased competition for students (31.6)
Potential cuts in federal research support (20.7)	Budget shortfalls (29.6)	Budget shortfalls (33.3)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (21.1)
Maintaining the quality of academic programs (17.2)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (18.5)	Potential cuts in state student aid programs (26.2)	Limits on our ability to respond to rising enrollments/increased demand (15.8)
Potential cuts in state financial aid programs (16.7)	Potential cuts in state student aid programs (12.3)	Financial support from alumni (17.9)	

Table 4
Strategies Used to Address the Financial Consequences of the Economic Downturn
 (percentage that reported deploying the strategy, winter 2011)

Strategy Deployed to Address Financial Issues	All Institutions	Public	Private/ Non-Profit	For-Profit
Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations and services	57.8	63.6	51.7	30.8
Increased tuition by 5 percent or more for 2010-11	38.8	48.8	25.3	23.1
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs and activities	36.3	44.2	27.0	7.7
Hiring freeze for administrative positions	34.8	37.7	30.7	30.8
Launching/expanding online education programs	33.9	38.6	27.0	30.8
Increased proportion of part-time (vs. full-time) faculty	29.9	43.3	9.9	20.5
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs	29.2	27.0	33.0	25.5
Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions	28.4	35.1	20.5	5.1
Raised student fees for campus resources and services	27.7	38.0	13.4	10.3
Changes in benefit levels (health ins., retirement, etc.)	25.6	24.6	29.3	5.1
Hiring freeze for academic programs/departments	24.1	27.5	19.3	17.9
Layoffs of administrative employees	21.8	24.8	18.8	7.7
Budget cuts targeting selected student services	21.8	26.8	16.2	2.6
Across the board budget cuts	21.2	24.5	17.0	12.8
Allowed the discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid	20.1	2.9	48.9	5.1
Layoffs of clerical or custodial/support staff	19.2	22.5	16.2	--
New alliances with corporate partners	16.8	22.8	7.1	17.9
Layoffs of instructors/academic staff members	13.3	16.8	9.4	2.6
Budget cuts targeting varsity athletic programs	11.8	15.4	7.4	--
Increases in endowment payout rates	3.9	2.2	7.1	--

of private nonprofit institutions report tuition increases of more than 5 percent during the economic downturn.

Public institutions were more likely to deploy the strategies identified in Table 4 than were private nonprofit and for-profit institutions. Public institutions had the highest rates of deployment for 16 of the 20 strategies listed above. In some instances, the contrasts in the percentage of public vs. private nonprofit institutions deploying a particular strategy are striking. For example, more than four times as many presidents of public

institutions report the increased use of part-time faculty (43.3 percent public vs. 9.9 percent private). Almost twice as many publics increased tuition by 5 percent or more (48.8 percent public vs. 25.3 percent private). And public institutions were almost three times likelier to increase student fees for campus resources and services than were private colleges and universities (38.0 percent public vs. 13.4 percent private).

In contrast, private institutions lead their public counterparts on just four strategies: creation of new, self-sustain-

ing programs (33.0 percent private vs. 27.0 percent public); changes in benefits levels such as health insurances and retirement (29.3 percent vs. 24.6 percent); allowing the discount rate to rise (48.9 percent vs. 2.9 percent), and increases in the payout from the endowment (7.1 percent vs. 2.1 percent).

In aggregate, these data suggest that the downturn hit public institutions harder than their private counterparts: a larger number of public than private institutions were engaged in both cutting budgets (to save money) and launching or expanding selected initiatives (e.g., online programs, alliances with corporate partners) to generate new revenue.

The survey data also highlight key strategy differences within institutional segments. Just as public institutions were more likely than privates to deploy more of the strategies, public doctoral universities were more likely than other public sector campuses institutions to deploy various tactics to reduce expenses and increase revenues. Public doctoral institutions lead on 15 of the 20 strategies listed on Table 5. Moreover, compared to other public sector institutions, the presidents of doctoral institutions report their campuses were more likely to use budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations (81.4 percent) and academic programs (71.2 percent); to lay off administrative personnel (50.8 percent), clerical and custodial/support staff (39.0 percent), and instructors/academic personnel (32.2 percent); to cut the budget for varsity athletic programs (33.9 percent); and to allow the discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid (11.9 percent). On

the revenue side, doctoral universities were also more likely than other public campuses to create new, self-sustaining programs (45.8 percent), to launch/expand partnerships with other institutions (45.8 percent), and to increase the payout from the endowment (6.8 percent),

Community colleges lead their public sector peers in increasing the proportion of part-time faculty as a way to contain costs (53.0 percent). Interestingly, public baccalaureate colleges were slightly more likely than their peers to deploy across-the-board

budget cuts (29.4 percent), while master's institutions were more likely to utilize a hiring freeze for both administrative positions (48.1 percent) and for academic departments (37.5 percent).

The survey data reveal somewhat different deployment patterns among private colleges and universities. Doctoral universities lead on eight strategies, including budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations (69.0 percent), layoffs for administrative employees (37.9 percent), budget cuts target-

ing selected academic programs (34.5 percent), budget cuts targeting student services (27.6 percent), layoffs of clerical and custodial/support staff (24.1 percent), and budget cuts targeting varsity athletic programs (17.2 percent). Private baccalaureate colleges lead the private sector on allowing the discount rate to rise (50.8 percent), as well as changes in benefits levels (30.8 percent), launching/expanding online programs (28.7 percent), and across-the-board budget cuts (18.5 percent). Master's institutions lead their private sector counterparts in creating new, self-sustaining programs (37.6 percent), imposing a hiring freeze on administrative positions (34.9 percent), raising tuition by 5 percent or more (28.4 percent), and raising student fees for campus resources and services (20.2 percent).

The Presidential Perspectives survey also asked presidents to rate the effectiveness of the various strategies deployed by their institutions. As shown in **Table 7**, the survey data reveal that presidents are not overwhelmingly sanguine about the effectiveness of most strategies, and express more confidence in tactics that produce revenue than those that cut costs. In aggregate, four of the top six strategies that get the highest ratings involve new revenue opportunities: creating new, self-sustaining programs (45.2 percent), launching/expanding online education programs (36.1 percent), launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions (35.5 percent), and increasing tuition by 5 percent or more (33.1 percent). Additionally, presidents rate targeted cuts in administrative operations as more effective than academic cuts.

Table 5
Strategies Deployed by Public Institutions to Address the Financial Consequences of the Economic Downturn
 (percentage that reported deploying the strategy, winter 2011)

Strategy Deployed to Address Financial Issues	Doctoral	Master's	Baccalaureate	Comm. Colleges
Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations and services	57.8	76.9	62.7	56.5
Increased tuition by 5 percent or more for 2010-11	59.3	49.0	37.3	48.2
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs and activities	71.2	49.0	35.3	39.3
Hiring freeze for administrative positions	45.8	48.1	29.4	34.3
Launching/expanding online education programs	45.8	40.4	39.2	36.7
Increased proportion of part-time (vs. full-time) faculty	27.1	28.2	27.5	53.0
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs	45.8	29.8	23.5	23.4
Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions	45.8	25.0	33.3	36.7
Raised student fees for campus resources and services	47.5	47.1	25.5	35.5
Changes in benefit levels (health ins., retirement, etc.)	30.5	14.4	19.6	27.5
Hiring freeze for academic programs/departments	33.9	37.5	19.6	24.6
Layoffs of administrative employees	50.8	26.9	15.7	21.3
Budget cuts targeting selected student services	32.2	30.8	19.6	25.7
Across the board budget cuts	22.0	23.1	29.4	24.6
Allowed the discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid	11.9	2.9	3.9	1.2
Layoffs of clerical or custodial/support staff	39.0	22.1	17.6	20.4
New alliances with corporate partners	39.0	19.2	5.9	23.7
Layoffs of instructors/academic staff members	32.2	19.2	11.8	14.2
Budget cuts targeting varsity athletic programs	33.9	25.0	9.8	10.1
Increases in endowment payout rates	6.8	1.0	2.0	1.8

Table 6
Strategies Deployed by Private Institutions to Address the Financial Consequences of the Economic Downturn
 (percentage that reported deploying the strategy, winter 2011)

Strategy Deployed to Address Financial Issues	Doctoral	Master's	Baccalaureate	Associate
Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations and services	69.0	54.1	49.7	31.6
Increased tuition by 5 percent or more for 2010-11	17.2	28.4	24.1	31.6
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs and activities	34.5	33.0	23.6	15.8
Hiring freeze for administrative positions	34.5	34.9	28.2	26.3
Launching/expanding online education programs	20.7	25.7	28.7	26.3
Increased proportion of part-time (vs. full-time) faculty	6.9	14.7	6.7	21.1
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs	34.5	37.6	28.7	47.4
Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions	6.9	20.2	21.5	31.6
Raised student fees for campus resources and services	6.9	20.2	10.8	10.5
Changes in benefit levels (health ins., retirement, etc.)	20.7	29.4	30.8	26.3
Hiring freeze for academic programs/departments	10.3	20.2	21.0	10.5
Layoffs of administrative employees	37.9	14.7	17.9	21.1
Budget cuts targeting selected student services	27.6	15.6	14.9	15.8
Across the board budget cuts	6.9	15.8	18.5	26.3
Allowed the discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid	41.4	46.8	50.8	52.8
Layoffs of clerical or custodial/support staff	24.1	14.7	16.4	10.5
New alliances with corporate partners	10.3	9.2	6.2	--
Layoffs of instructors/academic staff members	3.4	8.3	10.3	15.8
Budget cuts targeting varsity athletic programs	17.2	7.3	6.7	--
Increases in endowment payout rates	13.8	4.6	8.2	--

ABSENT POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

Presidents often lament that political issues and campus pressures tie their hands and limit their options when their institutions confront serious financial challenges. To address this issue, the Presidential Perspectives survey offered presidents a list of eight “politically difficult” strategies and asked respondents to rate the likelihood that they would deploy these strategies absent pushback or fallout at their institutions.

The survey data in **Table 8** indicate that presidents would like more options on personnel policies. In aggregate, the top four “politically difficult”

strategies all involve personnel issues: outsourcing services, retirement policies, tenure policy, and increased teaching loads. These items are closely

clustered, separated by just two percentage points; the fifth ranked politically difficult strategy—significantly increasing tuition—resides 15 points behind the first four.

The support for increasing tuition among public campus presidents suggests growing receptivity for a “high tuition-high aid” approach. Given the declining state support for the core operating budgets of public institutions in most states, rising tuition increasingly seems inevitable – and the tuition increases will continue to be significant. The move to a “higher tuition-more aid” policy may allow states to address access issues for low- and middle-income families while accruing additional tuition revenue from upper-income families who send their children to public colleges and universities.

Interestingly, the top “politically difficult” strategy for presidents in public institutions is outsourcing services, suggesting some presidential frustration with HR practices, civil service policies, and union contracts. In contrast, a larger proportion of presidents in private institutions would move on retirement policies than would their public sector counterparts.

Table 9 suggests significant consensus among the presidents of public institutions about which “politically difficult” strategies they might like to deploy. Less than a tenth (8.5 percent) of the presidents of large public doctoral universities indicate that they would make significant cuts to their athletics budget absent political pushback at their institutions; more than a

Table 7
Rating the Effectiveness* of Institutional Strategies to Address Financial Challenges
 (percentage reporting "very effective" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not effective, 7=very effective, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs (45.2)	Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations/activities (44.5)	Creation of new, self-sustaining programs (52.0)	Creation of new, self-sustaining programs (48.3)
Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations/ activities (43.3)	Creation of new, self-sustaining programs (41.1)	Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations/activities (44.5)	Launching/expanding online education programs (43.8)
Launching/expanding online education programs (36.1)	Launching/expanding online education programs (38.3)	Hiring freeze for admin. positions (38.3)	TIE: New alliances with corporate partners and Budget cuts targeting selected administrative operations (34.5)
Launching/expanding partnership with other institutions (35.5)	Launching/expanding partnership with other institutions (37.9)	Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs/activities (33.5)	TIE: Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs and Launching/expanding partnership with other institutions (27.6)
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs/activities (35.1)	Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs/activities (36.4)	Launching/expanding partnership with other institutions (31.8)	
Increased tuition by 5 percent or more for 2010-11 (33.1)	New alliances with corporate partners (34.0)	Launching/expanding online education programs (31.0)	

Table 8
Absent Political Consequences, What Strategies Would Presidents Use to Address the Financial Challenges Confronting Their Institutions?
 (percentage reporting "very likely" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not likely, 7=very likely, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
Outsourcing various campus services (36.0)	Outsourcing various campus services (44.0)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (43.3)
Mandating the retirement of older faculty (35.8)	Increasing teaching loads (38.0)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (30.5)
Altering the institutional policy on tenure (34.5)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (37.0)	Increasing teaching loads (26.7)
Increasing teaching loads (34.0)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (31.9)	Outsourcing various campus services (23.1)
Significantly increasing tuition (19.2)	Significantly increasing tuition (23.6)	Significantly increasing tuition (12.8)
Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (15.7)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (19.8)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (7.7)
Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (8.1)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (9.4)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (5.4)
Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (1.7)	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (1.7)	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (2.3)

Table 9
Absent Political Consequences, What Strategies Would Public Sector Presidents Use to Address the Financial Challenges Confronting Their Institutions?

(percentage reporting "very likely" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not likely, 7=very likely, winter 2011)

Doctoral Universities	Master's Institutions	Baccalaureate Institutions	Community Colleges
Outsourcing various campus services (50.8)	Outsourcing various campus services (37.5)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (41.2)	Outsourcing various campus services (46.9)
Mandating the retirement of older faculty (37.3)	Significantly increasing tuition (36.5)	TIE: Outsourcing various services and Altering the tenure policy (39.2)	Increasing teaching loads (42.3)
Significantly increasing tuition (30.5)	Increasing teaching loads (32.7)	Increasing teaching loads (33.3)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (42.0)
Increasing teaching loads (27.1)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (31.7)	Significantly increasing tuition (21.6)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (29.6)
Altering the institutional policy on tenure (22.0)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (27.9)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (13.7)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (26.6)
Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (8.5)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (9.6)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (9.8)	Significantly increasing tuition (18.6)
Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (6.5)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (8.7)	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (0.0)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (9.6)
Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (0.0)	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (1.9)		Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (0.9)

quarter of community college leaders would, though.

Absent political consequences, the presidents of private colleges would like to mandate the retirement of older faculty, alter tenure policies, outsource various campus services, and increase teaching loads (Table 10). None of the

presidents of private doctoral universities indicates any interest in cutting the budget for athletic programs absent any political consequences for doing so. As with several other results in the survey, these data suggest a sizable and perhaps growing divide between presidents and faculty leaders over fundamental matters.

The Presidential Perspectives survey asked college presidents how effectively various groups have fulfilled their respective responsibilities in helping the institution maneuver through the financial challenges of the past two years, and how effective they thought these groups would be in the coming two years.

Across most sectors, presidents report that senior administrators, followed by trustees and deans, were generally very effective during the downturn (Table 11). A smaller proportion of presidents report that elected faculty leaders, general faculty, and students provided very effective support and assistance as the

IN TIMES OF ADVERSITY: ALLIES, ACCOMPLICES, AND ADVERSARIES

Effective and successful presidents rely on the goodwill and cooperation of many groups and constituencies: trustees, other administrators, deans and department chairs, faculty, students, alumni, and individuals in the local community. This is particularly true during times of financial stress.

Table 10
Absent Political Consequences, What Strategies Would Private Nonprofit Sector Presidents Use to Address the Financial Challenges Confronting Their Institutions?

(percentage reporting “very likely” scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not likely, 7=very likely, winter 2011)

Doctoral Universities	Master’s Institutions	Baccalaureate Institutions	Associate Colleges
Mandating the retirement of older faculty (51.7)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (47.7)	Mandating the retirement of older faculty (41.0)	Increasing teaching loads (42.3)
Altering the institutional policy on tenure (20.7)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (34.9)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (30.3)	TIE: Mandating the retirement of older faculty and Outsourcing various campus services (27.8)
Outsourcing various campus services (17.2)	Increasing teaching loads (33.0)	Increasing teaching loads (23.6)	Significantly increasing tuition (26.3)
Increasing teaching loads (13.8)	Outsourcing various campus services (25.7)	Outsourcing various campus services (22.1)	Altering the institutional policy on tenure (22.2)
TIE: Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission and Significantly increasing tuition (10.3)	Significantly increasing tuition (13.8)	Significantly increasing tuition (11.3)	TIE: Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards and Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (5.6)
Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (0.0)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (8.3)	Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs (8.7)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (0.0)
Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (0.0)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (2.8)	Narrowing or shifting the institutional mission (7.2)	
	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (1.8)	Increasing enrollment by lowering admissions standards (2.1)	

institution sought to deal with financial challenges of the past two years. Comparatively few presidents report that civic leaders and alumni proved to be “very effective.”

Looking forward, presidents are slightly more optimistic that the key constituencies will help their institution navigate continuing financial challenges in the next two years. The high numbers for senior administrators shown in Table 11 drop slightly, but the numbers for most other groups – faculty leaders, general faculty, students, community leaders, and alumni – rise (Table 12).

DOES TECHNOLOGY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Today’s college presidents should not be strangers to many of the technologies that are (or should be) transforming American higher education. Consider the demographic profile of the 956 men and women who participated in the Presidential Perspectives survey: mean age: 57; median age: 60. Many were just out of graduate school or had assumed their initial academic positions when the first IBM PCs and Macintosh computers began migrating onto campuses in the mid-1980s. Some in this group have been using word processing software, spreadsheets, and e-mail for more than two decades; many have probably owned more computers than cars during their academic careers.

Table 11
How Effective Were Various Groups in Helping Your Institution Maneuver Through the Financial Challenges of the Past Two Years?
 (percentage reporting "very effective" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not effective, 7=very effective, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Senior administrators (80.5)	Senior administrators (80.8)	Senior administrators (80.7)	Senior administrators (74.4)
Trustees/regents (56.3)	Deans and dept. chairs (53.6)	Trustees/regents (63.6)	Deans and dept. chairs (64.1)
Deans and dept. chairs (52.3)	Trustees/regents (53.1)	Deans and dept. chairs (48.9)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (38.5)
Elected/appointed faculty leaders (34.3)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (34.2)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (33.8)	Trustees/regents (35.9)
TIE: General faculty and Student gov't/student leaders (26.5)	Student gov't/student leaders (29.9)	General faculty (25.3)	General faculty (33.3)
Community members/civic leaders (20.5)	General faculty (26.8)	Student gov't/student leaders (22.4)	TIE: Student gov't/student leaders and Alumni (15.4)
Alumni (14.7)	Community members/civic leaders (25.2)	Alumni (17.0)	Community members/civic leaders (17.9)
	Alumni (13.2)	Community members/civic leaders (13.4)	

Table 12
How Effective Do You Expect Various Groups to be in Helping Your Institution Maneuver Through Financial Challenges in the Next Two Years?
 (percentage reporting "very effective" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not effective, 7=very effective, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Senior administrators (78.4)	Senior administrators (78.8)	Senior administrators (77.6)	Deans and dept. chairs (84.6)
Deans and dept. chairs (63.7)	Deans and dept. chairs (65.9)	Trustees/regents (68.8)	Senior administrators (79.5)
Trustees/regents (59.9)	Trustees/regents (57.1)	Deans and dept. chairs (58.0)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (46.2)
Elected/appointed faculty leaders (40.9)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (41.3)	Elected/appointed faculty leaders (39.8)	General faculty (43.6)
General faculty (33.6)	General faculty (34.2)	General faculty (31.5)	TIE: Trustees/regents and leaders and Community/civic leaders (20.5)
Community members/civic leaders (27.9)	Community members/civic leaders (32.8)	Alumni (30.1)	TIE: Student gov't/student leaders and Alumni (15.4)
Student gov't/student leaders (26.5)	Student gov't/student leaders (28.1)	Student gov't/student leaders (25.3)	
Alumni (22.5)	Alumni (18.1)	Community members/civic leaders (21.0)	

And as seasoned campus administrators, they have become familiar with (if not dependent on) the campus information systems that generate reports about students, finances, and donors. Consequently, it is fair to say that the current cohort of academic leaders has come of professional age as computers and information technology have become ubiquitous across the campus and fully embedded in the college experience and

campus operations and management.

The Presidential Perspectives survey provides a rare look at how campus leaders across all sectors assess the significant investments their institutions continue to make in a wide array of information technology resources and services that support recruitment, instruction, campus services, institutional management, and alumni engagement. The questionnaire asked presidents to “rate the effective-

ness of [their] institution’s investment” in an array of technology resources and services. The survey data suggest that many presidents may be “ambivalent captives” to the personnel and financial resources their campuses invest in IT: although their institutions clearly have to continue to invest in information technology to support recruitment, instruction, and administrative operations, a significant proportion of presidents across all sec-

Table 13
Presidential Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Campus Investments in Information Technology
(technologies deemed “very effective,” winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Library resources and services (51.0)	Online/distance ed courses and programs (55.4)	Library resources and services (46.9)	Library resources and services (59.0)
Administrative info systems and operations (48.0)	On-campus teaching and instruction (54.0)	Student recruitment (45.2)	Online/distance ed courses and programs (56.4)
On-campus teaching and instruction (45.5)	Library resources and services (53.1)	Administrative info systems and operations (41.5)	Student recruitment (48.7)
Online/distance ed courses and programs (45.3)	Administrative info systems and operations (52.7)	Data analysis and managerial analytics (37.5)	Student resources and services (43.6)
Data analysis and managerial analytics (41.8)	Data analysis and managerial analytics (44.7)	On-campus teaching and instruction (32.7)	TIE: On-campus teaching and academic support services and Admin. information systems (41.0)
Student recruitment (38.3)	Academic support services (39.7)	Academic support services (31.3)	Data analysis and managerial analytics (38.5)
Academic support services (36.6)	Student resources and services (38.8)	Development efforts (29.5)	TIE: Research and scholarship and alumni activities/engagement (10.3)
Student resources and services (33.7)	Student recruitment (33.2)	Online/distance ed courses and programs (28.1)	
Development efforts (23.5)	TIE: Research and scholarship and Development efforts (20.3)	Alumni activities/engagement (25.1)	
Research and scholarship (21.4)	Alumni activities/engagement (13.6)	Student resources and services (24.7)	
Alumni activities/engagement (17.7)		Research and scholarship (24.5)	

tors and segments wish their institutions received a better return on the continued and significant investments they make in IT resources and services.

Table 13 reveals that, in aggregate, presidents across all sectors rank libraries, administrative information systems, data analysis/managerial analytics, online education, and on-campus instruction among their institutions' more effective investments in information technology. But even these investments are not ranked all that high: in many instances barely half the presidents rate these top-ranked investments as "very effective." Research/scholarship and alumni engagement receive lower rankings, although direct comparisons should be made with caution given the differential deployment of technology resources to support research/scholarship and alumni engagement across institutional segments (e.g., doctoral universities vs. community colleges).

The data presented in **Table 14** suggest that institutional segment (e.g., university vs. two-year institution) often matters more than sector (e.g., public vs. private nonprofit vs. for-profit) in presidential assessments of information technology. For example, over half the presidents in both public and private doctoral universities rate their institutions' investment in information technology to support research and scholarship "very effective" compared to roughly one-fourth of the presidents in other segments, both public and private. Two-thirds (68.0 percent) of community college presidents view the investment in IT to support online education as "very effective," compared to just over one-third (36.5 percent) in public master's institutions, just over two-fifths (43.1 percent) in pub-

Table 14
Presidential Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Campus Investments in Information Technology
 (percentage reporting "very effective" scores of 6 or 7; scale of 1=not effective, 7=very effective, winter 2011)

	Public Univ.	Public Master	Private Bacc.	Public Assoc.	Private Univ.	Private Master	Private Bacc.
Library resources	50.8	45.2	60.8	54.7	48.3	47.7	46.2
On-campus teaching and instruction	32.2	36.5	49.0	63.9	13.8	42.2	29.7
Online/distance education programs	27.1	36.5	43.1	68.0	34.5	38.5	22.1
Academic support services	27.1	34.6	37.3	43.8	34.5	30.3	31.3
Student resources and services	42.4	29.8	33.3	41.7	31.0	23.9	23.1
Research and scholarship	50.8	24.0	23.5	13.3	55.2	26.6	20.0
Student recruitment	39.0	38.5	47.1	28.4	37.9	54.1	40.5
Administrative information systems and operations	39.0	46.2	47.1	58.0	51.7	41.3	42.1
Data analysis and managerial analytics	42.4	37.5	49.0	46.7	37.9	39.4	37.9
Development efforts	25.4	23.1	23.5	18.0	37.9	29.4	29.2
Alumni activities/engagement	18.6	20.2	27.5	8.6	27.6	26.6	24.1

lic baccalaureate institutions and less than one-fourth (22.1 percent) in private baccalaureate colleges. Similarly, more than three-fifths (63.9 percent) of community

college presidents assess the investment in IT to support instruction as "very effective" compared to one-seventh (13.8) of presidents of private doctoral universities.

WHAT THEY DO WELL

Five years after the Spellings Commission's report (*A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education*, 2006), the Presidential Perspectives survey provides timely information about how presidents assess the effectiveness of their institutions on a number of key academic and operational metrics. Although presidents typically present their institutions in a very positive light, the survey data reveal that campus leaders are aware that their colleges and universities must improve in many areas.

As shown in **Table 15**, the majority of presidents in all sectors give their institutions high marks on managing financial resources, the quality of their

undergraduate programs, town-gown relationships, and preparing students for future employment. In contrast, more than half of the presidents of for-profit

institutions report that their colleges are “very effective” on just three issues: preparing students for employment, the quality of undergraduate programs, and managing financial resources.

But how do presidents know with confidence that they are doing well in those areas? What metrics do they use?

The Presidential Perspectives survey reveals that more than two-thirds of the survey respondents acknowledge that their institutions are not “very effective” in using data to aid and inform campus decisions (**Tables 15 and 16**).

Indeed, most metrics referenced in Tables 15 and 16 fall below the 50-per-

cent mark (some far below), suggesting that presidents across all sectors are, at least in private, well aware of the ways in which their institutions must improve. This is particularly true in areas such as student support services, recruiting/retaining talented faculty, and ensuring the development of junior faculty.

Table 15
Presidential Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Their Institutions
 (percentage reporting “very effective” scores of 6 or 7; scale 1=not effective; 7=very effective, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Managing financial resources in times of budget problems (76.5)	Managing financial resources in times of budget problems (80.4)	Managing financial resources in times of budget problems (72.2)	Preparing students for future employment (66.7)
Providing quality undergraduate education (69.7)	Providing quality undergraduate education (69.7)	Providing quality undergraduate education (70.7)	TIE: Providing quality undergraduate education and Managing financial resources in times of budget problems (59.0)
Developing strong town-gown relationships (57.6)	Developing strong town-gown relationships (63.9)	Preparing students for future employment (53.1)	Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making (48.7)
Preparing students for future employment (56.5)	Preparing students for future employment (58.0)	Developing strong town-gown relationships (51.4)	Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.) (41.0)
Recruiting/retaining talented faculty (45.4)	Building and maintaining political support (48.7)	Recruiting/retaining talented faculty (46.9)	Recruiting/retaining talented faculty (35.9)
Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.) (40.8)	Recruiting/retaining talented faculty (45.1)	Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.) (46.0)	TIE: Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty and Developing strong town-gown relationships (25.6)
Building and maintaining political support (40.4)	Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.) (37.5)	Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making (37.2)	Building and maintaining political support (23.1)
Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making (35.9)	Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making (34.2)	Building and maintaining political support (29.3)	TIE: Securing financial support from alumni and Securing financial support from corporations and foundations (5.1)
Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty (24.3)	Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty (24.1)	Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty (24.4)	
Securing financial support from corporations and foundations (14.2)	Securing financial support from corporations and foundations (14.2)	Securing financial support from alumni (16.2)	
Securing financial support from alumni (11.8)	Securing financial support from alumni (9.4)	Securing financial support from corporations and foundations (15.3)	

Table 16
Presidential Perspectives on the Effectiveness of Their Institutions
 (percentage reporting “very effective” scores of 6 or 7; scale 1=not effective; 7=very effective, winter 2011)

	Public Univ.	Public Master	Public Bacc.	Public Assoc.	Private Univ.	Private Master	Private Bacc.
Managing financial resources in times of budget problems	79.7	76.9	78.4	82.0	82.8	74.3	69.7
Providing quality undergraduate education	64.4	73.1	64.7	70.4	75.9	61.5	75.4
Developing strong town-gown relationships	71.2	64.4	56.9	63.5	55.2	52.3	51.8
Preparing students for future employment	50.8	58.7	62.7	58.3	55.2	53.2	52.8
Recruiting/retaining talented faculty	44.1	45.2	51.0	44.4	58.6	37.6	50.8
Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.)	27.1	40.4	37.3	38.5	41.4	44.0	47.2
Building and maintaining political support	45.8	43.3	51.0	50.6	44.8	33.0	26.8
Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making	30.5	30.8	33.3	36.1	55.2	35.8	36.4
Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty	16.9	21.2	21.6	26.6	31.0	22.9	25.6
Securing financial support from corporations and foundations	15.3	12.6	11.8	14.8	31.0	17.4	11.8
Securing financial support from alumni	15.3	12.6	11.8	14.8	31.0	17.4	11.8

Table 17
Prospects for Congressional Action on Key Issues Affecting Higher Education
 (percentage reporting “very likely” scores of 6 or 7; scale 1=not likely; 7=very likely, winter 2011)

All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions	For-Profit Institutions
Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education (39.5)	Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges (36.4)	Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education (42.7)	Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education (61.5)
Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges (36.8)	Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education (35.9)	Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges (36.8)	Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges (43.6)
Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant in 2012 (28.2)	Terminate Congressional earmarks (29.9)	Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant in 2012 (28.8)	Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant in 2012 (30.8)
Terminate Congressional earmarks (28.0)	Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant in 2012 (27.7)	Terminate Congressional earmarks (26.8)	Protect/increase federal funding for academic science (25.6)
Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges (19.2)	Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges (17.6)	Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges (21.7)	Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges (20.5)
Protect/increase federal funding for academic science (8.1)	Protect/increase federal funding for academic science (8.7)	Protect/increase federal funding for academic science (7.4)	Terminate Congressional earmarks (12.8)
Protect/increase federal student aid spending (6.9)	Protect/increase federal student aid spending (6.3)	Protect/increase federal student aid spending (5.7)	Protect/increase federal funding for academic science (5.1)

Table 18
Prospects for Congressional Action on Key Issues Affecting Higher Education
 (percentage reporting “very likely” scores of 6 or 7; scale 1=not likely; 7=very likely, winter 2011)

	Public Univ.	Public Master	Public Bacc.	Public Assoc.	Private Univ.	Private Master	Private Bacc.
Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education	28.8	42.2	33.3	35.5	35.7	44.0	32.1
Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges	20.3	32.7	37.3	40.2	32.1	28.4	41.5
Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant in 2012	25.4	23.1	35.3	28.4	14.3	32.1	28.7
Terminate Congressional earmarks	28.8	33.7	31.4	28.7	21.4	32.1	24.6
Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges	20.3	26.0	23.5	13.6	14.3	22.0	23.6
Protect/increase federal funding for academic science	6.8	7.7	11.8	8.9	3.6	7.3	8.7
Protect/increase federal student aid spending	3.4	3.8	2.0	8.3	3.6	5.5	6.2

Table 19
College Presidents Have Opinions
 (percentages who agree/strongly agree, by sector and segment, winter 2011)

	All Institutions	Public Univ.	Public Master	Public Bacc.	Public Assoc.	Private Univ.	Private Master	Private Bacc.
Faculty are realistic about the financial challenges confronting my institution	47.8	57.6	50.0	41.2	44.7	58.3	44.1	53.9
Faculty have been supportive of efforts to address the budget problems confronting my institution.	72.0	80.4	75.9	68.7	56.5	82.7	72.5	79.0
The adoption of nationally comparable measures of student learning has improved undergraduate education.	40.2	37.3	37.5	33.4	48.4	28.6	34.0	33.8
The tuition discount at my institution is dangerously high.	18.8	13.6	16.5	7.8	10.7	27.6	32.1	32.3
The investment/business savvy of my board helped us manage the downturn.	65.9	46.0	51.0	70.6	58.0	96.5	78.9	75.4
Launching/expanding online education courses and programs provide a way for my institution to serve more learners.	78.1	83.1	83.7	70.0	89.4	62.0	76.2	57.0
Launching/expanding online education courses and programs provide a way for my institution to increase our (net) tuition revenue.	69.4	66.1	76.0	62.8	75.5	58.7	69.7	56.4
Board members pushed the institution into overly aggressive investments that exacerbated our financial problems.	3.8	5.1	2.9	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.1
Greater transparency in decision-making by colleges will result in better decisions.	76.9	72.5	77.0	78.5	78.7	79.3	66.1	79.5
Doctoral programs now enroll too many students who aspire to academic careers.	40.0	40.7	32.7	37.3	34.4	62.1	47.7	47.2
The recent elimination/reduction of humanities programs at many colleges will create major problems for higher education.	60.3	56.0	65.4	58.8	55.7	65.5	67.9	68.2
The end of Congressional earmarks would cause major financial problems for my institution.	31.8	62.8	38.4	54.9	32.5	24.1	23.8	19.5

PLUS ÇA CHANGE: DOES WASHINGTON REALLY MATTER?

A new and in many ways very different Congress arrived in Washington in January 2011, just as *Inside Higher Ed* was developing this survey. We sought to gauge presidents' views on how the new Congress would deal with issues important to their institutions. (Congress has since begun acting on some of these matters, including taking steps to cut Pell Grant spending.)

Tables 17 and 18 reveal that, in general, presidents do not expect Congress to take dramatic action on many issues that affect higher education. Roughly two-fifths of the survey par-

ticipants expect Congress to act on new regulations affecting for-profit institutions and to mandate new regulations governing accrediting agencies. And presidents believe that law-

makers are likelier to cut student aid spending than to increase the maximum Pell Grant (28.2 percent vs. 6.9 percent).

In many respects, leaders in college sectors are most pessimistic about the issues that affect them directly. For instance, community college chief executives are less likely than their peers to believe that Congress will provide new programs or funds for two-year institutions. And for-profit college presidents are likelier than other leaders to expect greater regulation of career colleges in the current Congress.

PRESIDENTS HAVE OPINIONS

The 2011 Presidential Perspectives Survey provided a unique opportunity to poll presidents on a range of current topics: the activities of their boards during the downturn, if faculty members are realistic about their institutions' situations, if online education will increase revenues and serve more learners, and the like. Given the small number of survey participants among private two-year colleges and for-profit colleges, data for these institutions are excluded from **Table 19**.

Across sectors and segments, the survey data reveal interesting areas of consensus among presidents on issues such as whether faculty are realistic about the financial challenges confronting their institutions (about half of presidents say yes); the impact of eliminating humanities programs (not good for higher ed); and the consequences of greater transparency for institutional decision-making (very good for higher ed).

The data also offer interesting ex-

amples of dissonance within sectors and segments. Some examples:

- The presidents of community colleges are less likely than their peers to agree that "faculty have been supportive of efforts to address the budget problems confronting my institution" and more likely to agree that "adoption of nationally comparable measures of student learning has improved undergraduate education."

- Within the private nonprofit sector, university presidents are less likely than their peers in master's and baccalaureate institutions to agree that discount rates have gotten "dangerously high."

- Presidents of private institutions are more likely to agree that the "investment/business savvy of their boards" helped the institution through the downturn.

- A much larger proportion of private university presidents than public ones agree that "doctoral programs now enroll too many students who aspire to academic careers."

- The presidents of public doctoral universities and community colleges are more likely than their peers in other sectors to agree that "the end of Congressional earmarks will create problems for higher education."

P R E S I D E N T I A L P E R S P E C T I V E S : D A T A T A B L E S

	ALL INSTITUTIONS BY SECTOR				PUBLIC				PRIVATE NONPROFIT			
	All Institutions	Public	Private Nonprofit	Private For-Profit	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc
Number of institutions	956	561	356	39	61	105	51	344	29	111	197	19
As you think about the future of your institution, which of the following are the TWO most important issues/challenges confronting your college or university over the next two-three years? (Please select two items from the list below.)												
Budget shortfalls.	48.8	62.0	32.2	12.8	57.6	58.7	56.9	64.5	34.5	29.6	33.3	31.6
Rising tuition/affordability.	26.9	17.2	42.2	25.6	16.9	24.0	17.6	15.1	41.4	45.4	40.5	42.1
Unfunded retirement liabilities.	1.7	1.8	1.7	-	1.7	-	3.9	2.1	10.3	0.9	1.0	-
Impending faculty retirements.	0.7	0.4	1.4	-	-	1.0	-	0.3	-	0.9	1.0	10.5
Clarifying the institutional mission.	3.4	2.7	4.6	2.6	6.8	2.9	5.9	1.5	3.4	5.6	4.6	-
Maintaining quality of academic programs.	12.5	15.2	8.8	7.7	28.8	24.0	17.6	9.8	17.2	10.2	7.7	-
Increased competition for students.	17.5	5.4	35.3	28.2	1.7	8.7	13.7	3.8	13.8	38.9	36.9	31.6
Changes in state support.	26.5	42.8	3.4	5.1	52.5	54.8	39.2	37.9	-	3.7	4.1	-
Limits on our ability to respond to rising enrollments/increased demand.	10.5	14.5	5.1	2.6	5.1	2.9	9.8	20.4	6.9	5.6	3.6	15.8
Potential cuts in federal research support.	2.4	2.7	2.3	-	15.3	-	7.8	0.6	20.7	-	1.0	-
Potential cuts in federal student aid programs.	9.1	1.6	16.5	48.7	-	2.9	-	1.8	13.8	18.5	15.4	21.1
Potential cuts in state-funded student aid programs.	7.1	2.4	14.0	-	3.4	1.9	2.7	6.9	16.7	12.3	26.3	12.8
Student assessment and institutional outcomes.	9.2	8.5	9.4	17.9	3.4	4.8	13.7	9.8	13.8	9.3	9.2	5.3
Remediation and student readiness for college.	14.0	19.6	4.0	25.6	3.4	8.7	9.8	27.2	-	0.9	6.2	5.3
Financial support from alumni.	6.4	1.3	15.1	-	1.7	4.8	2.0	-	13.8	12.0	17.9	5.3
Financial support from corporations & foundations.	2.0	1.3	3.4	-	1.7	-	-	1.8	3.4	1.9	4.1	5.3
The current economic downturn has wreaked havoc with institutional budgets. What strategies has your institution deployed to address the financial consequences of the downturn? How would you rate the effectiveness of these strategies?												
Across-the-board budget cuts	21.2	24.5	17.0	12.8	22.0	23.1	29.4	24.6	6.9	15.6	18.5	26.3
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs/activities	36.3	44.2	27.0	7.7	71.2	49.0	35.3	39.3	34.5	33.0	23.6	15.8
Budget cuts targeting selected admin. operations/activities	57.8	63.6	51.7	30.8	81.4	76.9	62.7	56.5	69.0	54.1	49.7	31.6
Budget cuts targeting selected student services	21.8	26.8	16.2	2.6	32.2	30.8	19.6	25.7	27.6	15.6	14.9	15.8
Budget cuts targeting varsity athletics programs	11.8	15.4	7.4	-	33.9	25.0	9.8	10.1	17.2	7.3	6.7	-
Hiring freeze for academic programs/departments	24.1	27.5	19.3	17.9	33.9	37.5	19.6	24.6	10.3	20.2	21.0	10.5
Hiring freeze for administrative positions	34.8	37.7	30.7	30.8	45.8	48.1	29.4	34.3	34.5	34.9	28.2	26.3
Layoffs of instructors/academic staff members	13.5	16.8	9.4	2.6	32.2	19.2	11.8	14.2	3.4	8.3	10.3	15.8
Layoffs of administrative employees	21.8	24.8	18.8	7.7	50.8	26.0	15.7	21.3	37.9	14.7	17.9	21.1
Layoffs of clerical or custodial/support staff	19.2	22.5	16.2	-	39.0	22.1	17.6	20.4	24.1	14.7	16.4	10.5
Changes in benefit levels (health insurance, retirement, etc.)	25.6	24.6	29.3	5.1	30.5	14.4	19.6	27.5	20.7	29.4	30.8	26.3
Increases in endowment payout rates	3.9	2.2	7.1	-	6.8	1.0	2.0	1.8	13.8	4.6	8.2	-
Increased proportion of part-time (vs. full-time) faculty	29.9	43.3	9.9	20.5	27.1	28.8	27.5	53.0	6.9	14.7	6.7	21.1
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs	29.2	27.0	33.0	25.6	45.8	29.8	23.5	23.4	34.5	37.6	28.7	47.4
Launching/expanding online education programs	33.9	38.6	27.0	30.8	45.8	40.4	39.2	36.7	20.7	25.7	28.7	26.3
Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions	28.4	35.1	20.5	5.1	45.8	25.0	33.3	36.7	6.9	20.2	21.5	31.6
New alliances with corporate partners	16.8	22.8	7.1	17.9	39.0	19.2	5.9	23.7	10.3	9.2	6.2	-
Increased tuition by 5% or more for 2010-11	38.8	48.6	25.3	23.1	59.3	49.0	37.3	48.2	17.2	28.4	24.1	31.6
Allowed discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid	20.1	2.9	48.9	5.1	11.9	2.9	3.9	1.2	41.4	46.8	50.8	52.6
Raised student fees for campus resources and services	27.7	38.0	13.4	10.3	47.5	47.1	25.5	35.5	6.9	20.2	10.8	10.5

P R E S I D E N T I A L P E R S P E C T I V E S : D A T A T A B L E S

	ALL INSTITUTIONS BY SECTOR				PUBLIC				PRIVATE NONPROFIT			
	All Institutions	Public	Private Nonprofit	Private For-Profit	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc
percentage who rate these strategies as "very effective" (6/7; scale: 1=not effective; 7=very effective)												
Across-the-board budget cuts	12.8	12.7	12.7	15.6	10.9	12.0	13.3	13.1	8.7	7.2	15.8	20.0
Budget cuts targeting selected academic programs/activities	35.1	36.4	33.5	27.6	45.5	36.5	34.1	35.0	52.4	34.5	28.9	41.2
Budget cuts targeting selected admin. operations/activities	43.3	44.5	42.2	34.5	53.6	49.0	46.7	41.1	57.7	40.4	41.3	35.3
Budget cuts targeting selected student services	21.9	23.6	19.5	14.8	26.5	24.1	22.5	23.0	22.7	21.7	19.0	6.7
Budget cuts targeting varsity athletics programs	20.4	22.2	14.2	48.0	13.5	15.2	12.8	28.0	20.0	10.3	16.1	12.5
Hiring freeze for academic programs/departments	21.1	20.2	23.6	13.3	14.8	28.9	19.0	18.8	18.2	22.1	26.9	11.8
Hiring freeze for administrative positions	32.7	30.4	38.3	20.0	22.2	31.0	41.5	30.1	56.5	39.5	36.2	23.5
Layoffs of instructors/academic staff members	10.4	8.9	12.6	14.8	4.1	15.0	10.0	7.8	4.8	13.9	11.5	25.0
Layoffs of administrative employees	17.8	15.4	22.0	18.5	17.3	20.2	17.9	13.2	27.3	16.5	22.8	35.3
Layoffs of clerical or custodial/support staff	13.3	11.2	16.9	16.0	10.0	12.8	12.5	10.8	23.8	14.1	17.4	17.6
Changes in benefit levels (health insurance, retirement, etc.)	23.4	23.9	23.9	10.7	19.6	22.1	25.6	24.9	23.8	21.6	26.1	17.6
Increases in endowment payout rates	6.5	5.8	7.3	8.3	8.5	2.7	7.7	5.9	13.0	1.3	11.3	-
Increased proportion of part-time (vs. full-time) faculty	24.8	30.1	14.8	22.6	7.7	24.7	19.5	37.3	4.8	15.7	15.5	18.8
Creation of new, self-sustaining programs	45.2	41.1	52.0	48.3	40.4	40.5	39.0	41.8	40.9	54.7	52.0	52.9
Launching/expanding online education programs	36.1	38.3	31.0	43.8	28.8	40.0	27.9	41.1	14.3	43.0	26.0	27.8
Launching/expanding partnerships with other institutions	35.5	37.9	31.8	27.6	29.6	32.5	27.3	42.7	10.0	31.7	37.1	18.8
New alliances with corporate partners	29.8	34.0	21.1	34.5	30.4	25.3	15.0	40.2	-	22.2	22.1	37.5
Increased tuition by 5% or more for 2010-11	33.1	41.8	17.5	26.7	56.6	50.0	28.9	38.7	9.1	21.8	14.3	31.3
Allowed discount rate to rise to provide more financial aid	11.9	5.2	21.5	10.7	8.3	8.1	8.1	3.1	22.7	20.5	20.3	35.3
Raised student fees for campus resources and services	21.8	29.1	8.6	14.3	27.8	41.4	20.0	26.8	-	9.8	6.1	31.3
During periods of financial difficulty, presidents sometimes lament that there are strategies they would employ if the political costs of doing so were not so great. Which of the following practices would you want to use if you did not have to worry about the pushback or fallout at your institution? percentage likely to use (6/7; scale score: 1= not likely; 7=very likely)												
Altering your institution's tenure policy	34.5	37.0	30.5	35.9	22.0	27.9	39.2	42.0	20.7	34.9	30.3	22.2
Mandating the retirement of older faculty	35.8	31.9	43.3	23.1	37.3	31.7	41.2	29.6	51.7	47.7	41.0	27.8
Increasing teaching loads	34.0	38.0	26.7	43.6	27.1	32.7	33.3	42.3	13.8	33.0	23.6	42.1
Outsourcing various campus services	36.0	44.8	23.1	28.2	50.8	37.5	39.2	46.9	17.2	25.7	22.1	27.8
Increasing enrollment by lowering admission standards	1.7	0.9	2.3	7.7	-	1.9	-	0.9	-	2.8	2.1	5.6
Narrowing or shifting the college's mission	8.1	9.4	5.4	12.8	6.8	9.6	13.7	9.2	10.3	1.8	7.2	-
Significantly increasing tuition	19.2	23.6	12.8	15.8	30.5	36.5	21.6	18.6	10.3	13.8	11.3	26.3
Significant cuts to the budget for athletic programs	15.7	19.8	7.7	30.8	8.5	8.7	9.8	26.6	-	8.3	8.7	5.6
How effectively have the following groups fulfilled their respective responsibilities in helping your institution maneuver through the financial difficulties of the last two years? How confident are you in their ability to do so in the next two years? Percent strongly effective (6/7)												
In the PAST two years:												
Elected/appointed faculty leaders	34.3	34.2	33.8	38.5	45.8	39.4	29.4	31.4	41.4	23.9	37.9	36.8
General faculty	26.5	26.8	25.3	33.3	22.0	27.9	21.6	28.1	31.0	18.3	28.2	26.3
Deans and department chairs	52.3	53.6	48.9	64.1	59.3	60.6	52.9	50.6	58.6	43.1	50.3	52.6
Trustees/regents	56.3	53.1	63.6	35.9	50.8	43.3	52.9	56.5	62.1	62.4	65.6	52.6
Senior administrators	80.5	80.8	80.7	74.4	86.4	76.0	80.4	81.4	62.1	78.0	87.2	57.9
Student government/student leaders	26.5	29.9	22.4	15.4	40.7	45.2	25.5	24.0	27.6	20.2	23.6	15.8
Alumni	14.7	13.2	17.0	15.4	30.5	15.4	15.7	9.2	31.0	11.0	19.5	5.3
Community members/civic leaders	20.5	25.2	13.4	17.9	30.5	22.1	17.6	26.3	17.2	14.7	13.3	-

P R E S I D E N T I A L P E R S P E C T I V E S : D A T A T A B L E S

	ALL INSTITUTIONS BY SECTOR				PUBLIC				PRIVATE NONPROFIT			
	All Institutions	Public	Private Nonprofit	Private For-Profit	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc
In the NEXT two years:												
Elected/appointed faculty leaders	40.9	41.3	39.8	46.2	45.8	52.9	31.4	38.5	41.4	27.5	47.7	26.3
General faculty	33.6	34.2	31.5	43.6	32.2	38.5	21.6	35.2	31.0	22.9	36.9	26.3
Deans and department chairs	63.7	65.9	58.0	84.6	79.7	74.0	64.7	61.2	65.5	58.7	56.4	57.9
Trustees/regents	59.9	57.1	68.8	20.5	55.9	51.0	47.1	60.7	58.6	67.9	70.3	73.7
Senior administrators	78.4	78.8	77.6	79.5	84.7	78.8	80.4	77.5	58.6	77.1	82.1	63.2
Student government/student leaders	26.5	28.1	25.3	15.4	42.4	40.4	19.6	23.1	27.6	25.7	25.1	21.1
Alumni	22.5	18.1	30.1	15.4	42.4	22.1	17.6	12.7	31.0	21.1	34.9	31.6
Community members/civic leaders	27.9	32.8	21.0	20.5	40.7	30.8	25.5	33.1	17.2	21.1	21.0	26.3
Over the past two decades, colleges and universities have made significant investments in information technology to enhance instruction and scholarship and to improve services and administrative operations. How would you rate the effectiveness of your institution's investment in technology resources and services on the following issues? Percent strongly effective (6/7)												
Student recruitment	38.3	33.2	45.2	48.7	39.0	38.5	47.1	28.4	37.9	54.1	40.5	52.6
On-campus teaching and instruction	45.5	54.0	32.7	41.0	32.2	36.5	49.0	63.9	13.8	42.2	29.7	36.8
Online/distance courses and programs	45.3	55.4	28.1	56.4	27.1	36.5	43.1	68.0	34.5	38.5	22.1	21.1
Library resources and services	51.0	53.1	46.9	59.0	50.8	45.2	60.8	54.7	48.3	47.7	46.2	47.4
Academic support services	36.6	39.7	31.3	41.0	27.1	34.6	37.3	43.8	34.5	30.3	31.3	31.6
Student resources and services	33.7	38.8	24.7	43.6	42.4	29.8	33.3	41.7	31.0	23.9	23.1	36.8
Research and scholarship	21.4	20.3	24.5	10.3	50.8	24.0	23.5	13.3	55.2	26.6	20.0	11.1
Data analysis and managerial analytics	41.8	44.7	37.5	38.5	42.4	37.5	49.0	46.7	37.9	39.4	37.9	21.1
Development efforts	23.5	20.3	29.5	15.4	25.4	23.1	23.5	18.0	37.9	29.4	29.2	21.1
Alumni activities/engagement	17.7	13.6	25.1	10.3	18.6	20.2	27.5	8.6	27.6	26.6	24.1	22.2
Administrative information systems and operations	48.0	52.7	41.5	41.0	39.0	46.2	47.1	58.0	51.7	41.3	42.1	21.1
How effective (or ineffective) is your institution in the following areas? Percent strongly effective (6/7)												
Providing quality undergraduate education	69.7	69.7	70.7	59.0	64.4	73.1	64.7	70.4	75.9	61.5	75.4	68.4
Offering support services for undergraduates (advising, etc.)	40.8	37.5	46.0	41.0	27.1	40.4	37.3	38.5	41.4	44.0	47.2	52.6
Preparing students for future employment	56.5	58.0	53.1	66.7	50.8	58.7	62.7	58.3	55.2	53.2	52.8	52.6
Using data to aid and inform campus decision-making	35.9	34.2	37.2	48.7	30.5	30.8	33.3	36.1	55.2	35.8	36.4	26.3
Recruiting/retaining talented faculty	45.4	45.1	46.9	35.9	44.1	45.2	51.0	44.4	58.6	37.6	50.8	42.1
Ensuring the professional development of junior faculty	24.3	24.1	24.4	25.6	16.9	21.2	21.6	26.6	31.0	22.9	25.6	10.5
Building and maintaining political support	40.4	48.7	29.3	23.1	45.8	43.3	51.0	50.6	44.8	33.0	26.2	15.8
Managing financial resources in times of budget problems	76.5	80.4	72.2	59.0	79.7	76.9	78.4	82.0	82.8	74.3	69.7	68.4
Developing strong town/gown relationships	57.6	63.9	51.4	25.6	71.2	64.4	56.9	63.5	55.2	52.3	51.8	36.8
Securing financial support from alumni	11.8	9.4	16.2	5.1	30.5	14.4	11.8	3.8	34.5	12.8	16.9	-
Securing financial support from corporations & foundations	14.2	14.2	15.3	5.1	15.3	12.6	11.8	14.8	31.0	17.4	11.8	15.8
A new (and in many ways very different) Congress will convene in Washington beginning in January 2011. How likely do you think the new Congress will be to take the following actions? Percent likely (6/7)												
Protect and/or increase federal student aid spending	6.9	6.3	5.7	25.6	3.4	3.8	2.0	8.3	3.6	5.5	6.2	5.3
Cut the size of the maximum Pell Grant for 2012	28.2	27.7	28.8	30.8	25.4	23.1	35.3	28.4	14.3	32.1	28.7	31.6
Terminate Congressional earmarks	28.0	29.9	26.8	12.8	28.8	33.7	31.4	28.7	21.4	32.1	24.6	26.3
Protect/increase federal funding for academic science	8.1	8.7	7.4	5.1	6.8	7.7	11.8	8.9	3.6	7.3	8.7	-
Dictate new requirements for accrediting agencies and colleges	36.8	36.4	36.8	43.6	20.3	32.7	37.3	40.2	32.1	28.4	41.5	42.1
Create new programs/sources of funds for community colleges	19.2	17.6	21.7	20.5	20.3	26.0	23.5	13.6	14.3	22.0	23.6	10.5
Increase the regulation of for-profit higher education	39.5	35.9	42.7	61.5	28.8	42.3	33.3	35.5	35.7	44.0	42.1	52.6

P R E S I D E N T I A L P E R S P E C T I V E S : D A T A T A B L E S

	ALL INSTITUTIONS BY SECTOR				PUBLIC				PRIVATE NONPROFIT			
	All Institutions	Public	Private Nonprofit	Private For-Profit	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:												
Faculty are realistic about the financial challenges confronting my institution.												
Strongly disagree	14.2	15.0	12.2	20.5	6.8	19.2	11.8	15.7	3.5	20.2	9.2	10.5
Disagree	38.0	38.2	37.8	35.9	35.6	30.8	47.1	39.6	37.9	35.8	36.9	57.9
Agree	42.3	41.3	44.9	33.3	54.2	45.2	37.3	38.5	48.3	41.3	47.7	31.6
Strongly agree	5.5	5.4	5.1	10.3	3.4	4.8	3.9	6.2	10.3	2.8	6.2	-
Faculty have been supportive of efforts to address the budget problems confronting my institution.												
Strongly disagree	6.7	6.5	6.5	10.3	1.7	3.9	2.0	8.9	3.5	10.1	4.6	10.5
Disagree	21.3	23.4	16.5	35.9	17.0	20.2	29.4	24.6	13.8	17.4	16.4	15.8
Agree	59.6	58.2	63.9	41.0	69.5	61.5	62.8	54.4	58.6	66.1	63.1	68.4
Strongly agree	12.4	12.0	13.1	12.8	11.9	14.4	5.9	12.1	24.1	6.4	15.9	5.3
The adoption of nationally comparable measures of student learning has improved the quality of undergraduate education.												
Strongly disagree	12.6	10.1	16.2	15.4	22.0	14.4	11.8	6.5	20.7	16.5	14.9	21.1
Disagree	47.3	45.8	50.0	43.6	40.7	48.1	54.9	44.7	51.7	49.5	51.3	36.8
Agree	36.3	40.2	29.8	38.5	33.9	34.6	31.4	44.4	24.1	30.3	29.7	36.8
Strongly agree	3.8	3.8	4.0	2.6	3.4	2.9	2.0	4.4	3.5	3.7	4.1	5.3
The tuition discount rate at my institution is dangerously high.												
Strongly disagree	34.3	40.5	22.8	51.3	28.8	48.5	33.3	41.1	31.0	22.0	23.1	11.1
Disagree	46.9	47.7	45.9	43.6	57.6	35.0	58.8	48.2	41.4	45.9	44.6	66.7
Agree	15.0	10.7	22.8	5.1	13.6	14.6	7.8	9.5	24.1	22.9	23.6	11.1
Strongly agree	3.8	1.1	8.6	-	-	1.9	-	1.2	3.5	9.2	8.7	11.1
The investment/business savvy of my board helped us manage the downturn.												
Strongly disagree	8.7	12.3	3.7	2.6	13.6	20.2	9.8	10.1	-	4.6	3.6	5.3
Disagree	25.5	30.1	18.2	25.6	30.5	28.9	19.6	32.0	3.5	16.5	21.0	21.1
Agree	48.8	46.6	51.1	59.0	39.0	40.4	62.8	47.3	51.7	52.3	49.2	63.2
Strongly agree	17.1	11.1	27.0	12.8	17.0	10.6	7.8	10.7	44.8	26.6	26.2	10.5
Launching/expanding online education courses and programs provide a way for my institution to serve more learners.												
Strongly disagree	8.2	3.1	16.5	5.1	5.1	1.9	10.0	2.1	-	9.2	24.1	5.3
Disagree	13.7	11.1	18.8	5.1	11.9	14.4	20.0	8.6	37.9	14.7	16.9	31.6
Agree	51.9	55.9	46.3	46.2	72.9	57.7	52.0	53.0	51.7	52.3	42.6	42.1
Strongly agree	26.2	30.0	18.5	43.6	10.2	26.0	18.0	36.4	10.3	23.9	16.4	21.1
Launching/expanding online education courses and programs provide a way for my institution to increase our (net) tuition revenues.												
Strongly disagree	10.0	6.0	16.8	5.1	8.5	3.9	11.8	5.3	6.9	6.4	25.1	5.3
Disagree	20.7	20.7	21.9	10.3	25.4	20.2	25.5	19.2	34.5	23.9	18.5	26.3
Agree	47.5	50.2	44.3	38.5	54.2	45.2	47.1	51.5	55.2	46.8	41.0	47.4
Strongly agree	21.9	23.2	17.1	46.2	11.9	30.8	15.7	24.0	3.5	22.9	15.4	21.1
Board members pushed the institution into overly aggressive investments that exacerbated our financial problems.												
Strongly disagree	72.1	74.1	70.2	61.5	62.7	76.0	56.9	78.1	69.0	67.9	72.3	63.2
Disagree	24.2	22.5	25.9	33.3	32.2	21.2	39.2	18.6	27.6	28.4	24.6	21.1
Agree	2.8	2.5	3.1	2.6	5.1	2.9	3.9	1.8	3.5	2.8	2.1	15.8
Strongly agree	1.0	0.9	0.9	2.6	-	-	-	1.5	-	0.9	1.0	-

P R E S I D E N T I A L P E R S P E C T I V E S : D A T A T A B L E S

	ALL INSTITUTIONS BY SECTOR				PUBLIC				PRIVATE NONPROFIT			
	All Institutions	Public	Private Nonprofit	Private For-Profit	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc	Doctoral	Master	Bacc	Assoc
Greater transparency in decision making by colleges will result in better decisions.												
Strongly disagree	3.3	2.0	5.1	5.1	1.7	1.9	3.9	1.8	-	7.3	4.6	5.3
Disagree	19.8	20.1	19.6	18.0	23.7	21.2	17.7	19.5	20.7	26.6	15.9	15.8
Agree	49.7	50.5	48.6	48.7	52.5	48.1	56.9	50.0	48.3	42.2	51.8	52.6
Strongly agree	27.2	27.4	26.7	28.2	22.0	28.9	21.6	28.7	31.0	23.9	27.7	26.3
Doctoral programs now enroll too many students who aspire to academic careers.												
Strongly disagree	14.2	15.8	11.1	20.5	6.8	17.3	15.7	16.9	3.5	10.1	10.8	31.6
Disagree	45.8	49.2	41.8	33.3	52.5	50.0	47.1	48.7	34.5	42.2	42.1	47.4
Agree	29.4	24.9	35.5	38.5	30.5	23.1	27.5	24.0	41.4	34.9	36.4	21.1
Strongly agree	10.6	10.2	11.7	7.7	10.2	9.6	9.8	10.4	20.7	12.8	10.8	-
The recent elimination/reduction of humanities programs at many colleges and universities will create major problems for higher education.												
Strongly disagree	6.6	6.0	5.4	25.6	3.4	1.9	2.0	8.3	6.9	5.5	4.1	15.8
Disagree	33.1	35.9	27.6	43.6	40.7	30.8	39.2	36.1	27.6	26.6	27.7	31.6
Agree	46.2	46.0	49.2	23.1	49.2	51.0	41.2	44.7	37.9	52.3	49.2	47.4
Strongly agree	14.1	12.1	17.9	7.7	6.8	16.4	17.7	11.0	27.6	15.6	19.0	5.3
The end of Congressional earmarks would cause major financial problems for my institution.												
Strongly disagree	30.7	22.5	41.5	48.7	5.1	19.2	15.7	27.5	37.9	36.7	46.2	26.3
Disagree	37.5	38.6	36.9	28.2	32.2	42.3	29.4	39.9	37.9	39.5	34.4	47.4
Agree	21.7	25.2	16.5	20.5	45.8	24.0	39.2	19.8	17.2	17.4	15.4	21.1
Strongly agree	10.1	13.8	5.1	2.6	17.0	14.4	15.7	12.7	6.9	6.4	4.1	5.3
Please provide the following background information:												
Average Age	57.4	57.7	57.8	49.6	57.4	60.4	58.0	56.8	57.2	57.8	57.8	58.3
Median Age	60.0	60.0	60.0	55.0	62.0	62.0	61.0	60.0	59.0	60.0	60.0	61.0
Gender												
Female	25.6	26.3	24.4	25.6	18.6	20.2	27.5	29.3	20.7	22.0	24.1	47.4
Male	72.4	71.7	73.6	71.8	78.0	78.9	70.6	68.6	75.9	76.2	73.9	52.6
Unknown	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.6	3.4	1.0	2.0	2.1	3.5	1.8	2.1	-
How long have you served as president of this institution?												
Average years	6.9	6.5	7.6	5.2	4.9	5.9	6.3	7.1	6.7	7.6	7.8	6.7
Median years	5	5	6	3	3	5	5	5	5	6	6	5
Total years as a college president at any institution?												
Average years	8.9	8.7	9.2	9.8	6.5	8.3	6.9	9.4	9.5	9.3	9.2	8.2
Median years	7	6	7	7	5	6	5	7	10	9	7	7

Appendix A / Methodology

The *Inside Higher Ed* Survey of College and University Presidents was conducted in January and February 2011. An e-mail invitation with a hotlink to an online questionnaire was sent on January 21st to the presidents of some 3,100 public, private nonprofit, and for-profit colleges and universities. Discounting some 200 non-deliverable emails, the actual survey sample included some 2,900 two-and four-year colleges and universities that enroll 500 or more students.* A total of 956 campus and system presidents, chancellors, and CEOs completed the questionnaire, making the 2011 Presidential Perspectives survey one of the largest surveys of American college and university presidents in recent decades.

The number and types of colleges and universities that participated in the 2011 Presidential Perspectives survey are shown below.

Category	Number of 2011 Survey Participants
Public Universities	61
Public Master's Institutions	105
Public Baccalaureate Institutions	51
Public Two-Year/Associate Colleges	344
Private Nonprofit Universities	29
Private Nonprofit Master's Institutions	111
Private Nonprofit Baccalaureate College	197
Private Nonprofit Associate Colleges	19
For-Profit Institutions	39

* Fall 2007 enrollment data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education System Data (IPEDS) data files of the US Department of Education reveal that 27.1 percent (1,152) of the nation's 4,253 accredited, degree-granting two- and four-year colleges and universities enroll under 500 students (headcount enrollment). These institutions account for some 271,932 (1.5 pct.) of the nation's 18.052 million college students as of fall 2007. In contrast, the 505 colleges and universities that enroll 10,000 or more students represent just 11.4 percent of the total number of U.S. degree-granting institutions yet account for 53.1 percent of total headcount enrollment, some 9.8 million students. (source: special analysis of the 2007 IPEDS enrollment data by The Campus Computing Project; see also Digest of Education Statistics 2008. U.S. Department of Education, 2008, table. 224).

Appendix B / About the Authors

KENNETH C. GREEN, senior research consultant at *Inside Higher Ed*, is also the founding director of The Campus Computing Project, the largest continuing study of the role of computing, eLearning, and information technology in American higher education. Launched in 1990 as an IT benchmarking project for colleges and universities, Campus Computing is widely cited by both campus officials and corporate executives in the college publishing and technology industries as a definitive source for data, information, and insight about a wide range of online education and information technology issues that affect

U.S. colleges and universities.

Green is the author/co-author or editor of a dozen books and published research reports and more than 90 articles and commentaries that have appeared in academic journals and professional publications. He is often quoted on higher education, information technology, and labor market issues in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Ed*, and other print and broadcast media. His Digital Tweed blog is published by *Inside Higher Ed*.

In October 2002, Green received

the first EDUCAUSE Award for Leadership in Public Policy and Practice. The award cites his work in creating The Campus Computing Project and recognizes his “prominence in the arena of national and international technology agendas, and the linking of higher education to those agendas.”

A graduate of New College (FL), Green earned a Ph.D. in higher education and public policy at the University of California, Los Angeles.

SCOTT JASCHIK, is editor and one of the three founders of *Inside Higher Ed*. With Doug Lederman, he leads the

editorial operations of *Inside Higher Ed*, overseeing news content, opinion pieces, career advice, blogs and other features. Scott is a leading voice on higher education issues, quoted regularly in publications nationwide, and publishing articles on colleges in publications such as *The New York Times*, *The Boston Globe*, *The Washington Post*, *Salon*, and elsewhere. He has been a judge or screener for the National Magazine Awards, the Online Journalism Awards, the Folio Editorial Excellence Awards, and the Education Writers Association Awards. Scott is a mentor in the community college fellowship program of the Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media. From 1999-2003, Scott was editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Previously at *The Chronicle*, he held numerous other positions and his reporting work was honored by Investigative Reporters and Editors and *The Washington Monthly*. Scott grew up in Rochester, N.Y., and graduated from Cornell University in 1985. He lives in Washington.

DOUG LEDERMAN, is editor and one of the three founders of *Inside Higher Ed*. With Scott Jaschik, he leads the site's editorial operations, overseeing news content, opinion pieces, career advice, blogs and other features. Doug speaks widely about higher education, including on C-Span and National Public Radio and at meetings around the country, and his work has appeared in *The New*

York Times, *USA Today*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, and the *Princeton Alumni Weekly*. Doug was managing editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* from 1999 to 2003. Before that, Doug had worked at *The Chronicle* since 1986 in a variety of roles, including as athletics reporter and special projects editor. He has won three National Awards for Education Reporting from the Education Writers Association, including one in 2009 for a series of Inside Higher Ed articles on college rankings. He began his career as a news clerk at *The New York Times*. He grew up in Shaker Heights, Ohio, and graduated in 1984 from Princeton University. Doug lives with his wife, Sandy, and their two children in Bethesda, Md.

Founded in 2004, *Inside Higher Ed* (<http://insidehighered.com>) is the online source for news, opinion, jobs and blogs for all of higher education. *Inside Higher Ed* gives higher education professionals what they need to thrive in their jobs or find better ones: breaking news and feature stories, provocative daily commentary and blogs, practical career columns, and areas for comment on every article. The site also offers a powerful suite of tools to help academic professionals find job opportunities, and help colleges identify and hire talented personnel. ¶ The 2011 Presidential Perspectives survey was designed to provide timely data about key issues that confront presidents across all sectors of American higher education. The corporate sponsors of the 2011 Presidential Perspectives survey are Kaplan Global Solutions, Pearson, and SunGard Higher Education.

© Inside Higher Ed, 2011



booklet design - greenrhinodesign.com

Reach new international students.

Reach with custom programs.

Reach with your reputation and success.



Opportunity is always in reach with Kaplan Global Solutions.

Kaplan Global Solutions can help expand your reach – around the world. Our Global Pathways programs are providing successful pathways on campuses to help transition international students to university life. Our research, solutions and services from our Colloquy™ team of professionals are enabling institutions to take their educational programs online and to new levels of effectiveness. Our expanding array of solutions are unlocking the potential for lifelong learning – wherever and however learning occurs for institutions globally.

To discover more, please visit
KaplanGlobalSolutions.com

Or see us at Colloquy Booth #505 at ACE

KAPLAN
GLOBAL
SOLUTIONS

Everyone has a dream worth pursuing.

For millions of students around the world, education opens doors to new possibilities. At SunGard Higher Education, we are committed to helping institutions like yours discover new ways to teach, learn, manage, and connect. Together, we can help every student looking for a better future find it.

SunGard and the SunGard logo are registered trademarks of SunGard Data Systems Inc. © 2011 SunGard

SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

Shape the future of your institution today.

sungardhe.com