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Executive Summary

Higher education is grappling with multiple disruptions, including a shift toward more online and hybrid modalities, diminishing budgets and enrollments, increased demand for wrap-around supports, and the wide-scale introduction of generative AI technologies. Admin are situated at the center of these shifting demands, making the types of campus-wide decisions that will determine the institution’s direction into the future. Often, these decisions are based on varying levels of data, pressures from faculty and students, financial constraints, and long-standing financial and political agreements that contribute to innovation inertia. Any misstep can have a ripple effect on the rest of the institution, detracting from the teaching and learning experiences of faculty and students.

To gain insights into how administrators perceive and experience these challenges — and complement the insights obtained from our student and faculty surveys — the College Innovation Network (CIN) at WGU Labs launched the CIN Administrator EdTech Survey. The survey, which included 214 administrators from diverse colleges and universities across the country, explores how administrators perceive and make decisions about educational technology, how they view the future of higher education, and how their institutions are approaching new generative AI technologies. The goal of the survey is to identify challenges in administrators’ experiences and opportunities to streamline the integration of technology into instruction moving forward.
TAKEAWAY 1: FEWER THAN HALF OF ADMINISTRATORS ARE CONFIDENT IN THEIR ABILITY TO CHOOSE EFFECTIVE EDTECH PRODUCTS — AND THEY AREN’T MAKING DATA-INFORMED DECISIONS.

Sixteen percent of administrators said they were not at all or slightly confident in their ability to choose effective EdTech products for their departments or institutions. Thirty-seven percent were moderately confident and 47% were very or extremely confident. Many aren’t gaining the insights and perspectives that would help increase their confidence. For example, nearly half (48%) of admins said their institution conducts technology audits less than once a year. Thirty percent said their institution seeks feedback from faculty members on their experiences with EdTech less than once a year, and 38% said their institution seeks feedback from students less than once a year.

TAKEAWAY 2: ADMINISTRATORS PRIORITIZE TECHNOLOGY THAT INTEGRATES WITH THEIR LMS AND IMPROVES THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE.

When asked about which factors are most important when choosing new EdTech products, administrators prioritized integration with the LMS (58%), followed by seeing evidence of successful implementations at other institutions (46%), and evaluation research (28%). When asked what problems they most want to see EdTech solve, administrators prioritized making courses more engaging, improving the quality of online learning, and increasing access to student support services. To summarize, administrators are seeking EdTech that aims to improve the student experience, provided that tech integrates with existing systems and is backed by evidence. Taken together, these findings suggest that uncertainty is leading administrators to choose inaction, resist adopting novel solutions, and err on the side of caution. Rather than choosing products that disrupt the EdTech market, administrators seem to be deferring to the status quo — they prefer products that integrate with the LMS and they’re choosing products that have been used by their peers and have been around long enough to have evidence-backing. Ultimately, this may limit innovation in the EdTech market and prevent institutions from staying up-to-date with students’ evolving needs.
TAKEAWAY 3: ADMINISTRATORS ARE POSITIVE ABOUT OFFERING STUDENTS MORE OPTIONS FOR LEARNING MODALITIES AND CREDENTIALS, BUT UNCERTAIN OF HOW THIS WILL IMPACT TEACHING.

Administrators were largely enthusiastic about offering more learning modalities and credential options in the future. Seventy-nine percent of administrators felt positively about institutions offering more hybrid courses in the future, and 78% felt positively about institutions offering more micro-credential and certificate programs. Fifty-seven percent of administrators felt positively about institutions offering more online programs and courses in the future. However, administrators were split on how a shift toward more learning modalities might affect the learning environment. Fifty-four percent of administrators agreed that instruction would become more personalized in the future, but 52% thought it would become more standardized. These findings stand in contrast to the most recent CIN Faculty Edtech Survey Report, in which over 60% of faculty expected instruction to become more standardized and only 41% thought it would become more personalized. These findings suggest that there is a mismatch in perception around how technology will impact instruction, with faculty appearing to be more concerned that their autonomy over course instruction will be curtailed. If administrators are not attuned to faculty concerns, their decisions and communications about tech-enabled learning may fail to resonate with faculty members — and faculty members may be less likely to adopt and champion new technologies as a result.

TAKEAWAY 4: ADMINISTRATORS ARE SPLIT ON AI AND CHOOSING INACTION IN THE FACE OF UNCERTAINTY.

Fifty-two percent of administrators reported positive attitudes toward AI. Thirty percent were neutral, and 19% reported negative attitudes. Few administrators reported that their institutions had formal policies toward use of these tools. Seventy-six percent said their institution does not have a policy on faculty use of these tools in instruction, and 67% said their institution does not have a policy on student use of the tools. This may indicate that administrators are struggling to navigate the uncertainty around AI and to apply strategic thinking about how their institution may benefit from it.
In the past several years, higher education has experienced significant disruptions that have changed the way we teach and learn. Institutions are increasingly moving to flexible, online models of learning that cater to a more diverse group of learners and require a broader range of wrap-around support to aid these learners in their journey through higher education. Universities are grappling with declining budgets and enrollments, prompting a need for innovative strategies to sustain institutional viability. And the introduction of new artificial intelligence (AI) tools has been met with both excitement about the potential of these tools, but little concrete evidence about how they might impact learning.

These disruptions pose a range of challenges and pressures, particularly for higher education administrators who are tasked with making decisions that benefit students, faculty, and the bottom line. To be successful in their role, administrators must not only make effective decisions for their institutions, but they must also garner support and buy-in for these decisions from key user groups. When administrators make poor decisions, students and faculty often suffer the consequences — and this can impact administrators’ ability to implement future initiatives due to lack of utilization by key stakeholders. Understanding how administrators are navigating these challenges is critical for ensuring that students and faculty have effective technology-enabled learning experiences.

To keep a pulse on the role of technology and its impact on these user groups, the College Innovation Network (CIN) launched its annual EdTech survey series in 2020. The series has previously focused on how students and faculty are experiencing EdTech and has offered a range of insights to improve their experiences with tech-enabled learning. To complement these perspectives and to gain insights into how administrators are navigating the evolving landscape of higher education, we launched our CIN Administrator EdTech Survey in August of 2022.

The goal of the survey was to examine three key questions:

1. How are administrators approaching making decisions about EdTech in their institutions/departments and who are they including in the process?
2. How do administrators view the future of higher education?
3. How do administrators view new AI technologies and what are their institutional policies toward these tools?

Ultimately, we hope to pinpoint areas of friction in administrators’ experiences that may impact students and faculty and identify areas to improve tech-enabled learning moving forward.

SURVEY APPROACH/METHODOLOGY

In August 2023, the CIN research team emailed surveys to more than 30,000 administrators across the United States. Participants were recruited from three sources: 1) an email list of administrators purchased from University Business; 2) a list of approximately 2,250 administrators who were employed at a representative sample of institutions across the U.S. and whose email addresses were publicly available online, 3) a list of administrators at each of the participating CIN network institutions. The survey contained 24 questions to better understand administrators’ experiences with EdTech. The final sample included 214 respondents. A detailed breakdown of this sample by demographics is available in the appendix.
Takeaway 1: Fewer than half of administrators are confident in their ability to choose effective EdTech products — and they aren’t making data-informed decisions.

To ensure that students and faculty have positive experiences, it is critical that administrators make informed, effective decisions about which EdTech products are available for teaching and learning. Yet, our survey revealed that only 47% of administrators are very or extremely confident in their ability to choose effective EdTech products for their department or institution. Thirty-seven percent of administrators were moderately confident, and 16% were not at all or slightly confident (Figure 1).

Regularly conducting technology audits and seeking feedback from key technology user groups is critical for making informed decisions that benefit the institution. However, many institutions aren’t doing this. Indeed, 48% of administrators in our sample reported that their institution conducts technology audits less than once a year. Among these, 14% said their institution never conducts technology audits. Thirty percent of administrators reported that their institution seeks feedback from faculty members on their experiences with EdTech less than once a year and 38% said that their institution seeks feedback from students less than once a year.

### CONFIDENCE IN CHOOSING EFFECTIVE EDTech PRODUCTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How confident are you in your ability to choose effective EdTech products for your department or institution?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% not confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37% moderately confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Figure 1_

**WHY THIS MATTERS**

The decisions that administrators make have an outsized impact on students and faculty. Without up-to-date information about their current tech stack and how these tools are impacting students and faculty, it is challenging for administrators to make informed decisions that benefit their institutions. Our data show that many institutions are not seeking this information — and their administrators are not confident in their ability to make effective decisions about EdTech. To increase administrators’ confidence and to give students and faculty greater voice in the decision-making processes, institutions should establish procedures and best practices for regularly auditing and gaining feedback on the technology tools available for teaching and learning.
Takeaway 2: Administrators prioritize technology that integrates with their LMS and improves the quality of the student experience.

With so many technology companies now serving the higher education sector, prioritizing technology that best serves the needs of their institutions is a challenging task for administrators. How are administrators deciding among the many options available to them?

**ADMINISTRATORS PRIORITIZE EDTECH THAT INTEGRATES WITH THEIR LMS AND IS BACKED BY EVIDENCE.**

To gain insights into how they make these decisions, we asked administrators to choose the top three most important factors when considering new EdTech products for their department or institution. Integration with the university LMS was the highest chosen factor, with fifty-eight percent of administrators selecting it as one of their top three factors (Figure 2).

Beyond integration with existing systems, administrators want products that are backed by evidence. Seeing evidence of successful implementations of the product at other institutions was the second highest response (chosen by 46% of administrators), and seeing evaluation research that shows that the product is effective was the third highest response (chosen by 28%). These findings are particularly noteworthy given that less than 10% of EdTech products currently on the market are backed by rigorous evidence of their efficacy. These preferences also may have the impact of prioritizing larger institutional players in EdTech over more innovative start-ups that operate outside the LMS and may not have the resources or customer base to conduct research studies, which could limit an institution's ability to be innovative, nimble, and provide what students are looking for.
ADMINISTRATORS WANT TECHNOLOGY THAT IMPROVES THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE.

We also asked administrators what problems they most wanted to see EdTech solve. Our findings revealed that, by and large, administrators want EdTech that improves students’ learning experiences. The top four problems administrators wanted to see EdTech solve were making courses more engaging (48%), improving the quality of online learning (37%), providing greater access to student support services (32%), and providing a more personalized learning experience for students (32%) (Figure 3).

Interestingly, these results align with the results of our most recent student survey, in which students were also enthusiastic about the potential for EdTech to make courses more engaging and facilitate their access to student support services.

PROBLEMS POTENTIALLY SOLVED BY EDTECH

There are 1.82K funded EdTech companies currently serving higher education. But if these companies are not meeting the needs of institutions, their products are unlikely to succeed in the marketplace. Administrators in our sample most want to see technology that improves the student experience, but that technology must also integrate seamlessly with existing systems and be supported by evidence. Currently, only 7% of EdTech companies are providing evidence of their efficacy. EdTech vendors should invest additional resources into conducting quasi-experimental and randomized-controlled trials to evaluate the impact of their products on student outcomes. This evidence will not only increase administrators’ confidence in the product, but it will also help vendors improve their product over time. On the flip side, administrators’ preference for LMS-integrated and mature tech makes it harder for startup EdTech companies to enter the market, lowering the ability to innovate within higher education as a sector. In an industry already well-known for favoring established hierarchies and solutions — but seeing marked decreases in perception of confidence and value — the failure among administrators to embrace new or disruptive technologies could compound existing enrollment and funding challenges.
Takeaway 3: Administrators are positive about offering students more options for learning modalities and credentials, but uncertain of how this will impact teaching.

The disruptions to higher education have created uncertainty about what the future of teaching and learning will look like. To gain administrators’ perspectives on these issues, we asked several questions about their attitudes toward a more tech-centric future of higher education, as well as their perceptions of how this future might impact the teaching and learning experience.

**Administrators are excited about more diverse learning modalities and credential options.**

The results showed that administrators are largely excited about offering students more learning modalities and credential options in the future. Seventy-nine percent of administrators had positive attitudes about institutions offering more hybrid courses in the future, and 78% were positive about institutions offering more micro-credentials and certificate programs.

The majority of administrators also had positive attitudes toward institutions offering more fully online courses and programs in the future, but a sizable percentage viewed these possibilities negatively. Fifty-seven percent of administrators held positive attitudes about institutions offering more online courses in the future, but 20% held negative attitudes toward this possibility. Similarly, 57% of administrators were positive about institutions offering more online programs in the future — 23% were negative about this possibility (Figure 4).

**Possible Futures**

Below are some possible futures that higher education may soon experience. How positively or negatively do you view each of these potential scenarios for student learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutions offering increasing number of hybrid courses.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5% Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutions offering increasing number of micro-credential and certificate programs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9% Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutions offering increasing number of fully online courses.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Institutions offering increasing number of fully online programs.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23% Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4*
ADMINISTRATORS AGREE THAT HIGHER EDUCATION WILL BECOME MORE TECH-CENTRIC IN THE FUTURE.

When asked about what teaching and learning might look like in the future, administrators overwhelmingly agreed that the future would be increasingly tech-enabled. Seventy-eight percent agreed that instructors will spend more time delivering course content online, 86% agreed that instructors would spend more time supporting students online (e.g., holding online office hours), and 92% agreed that instructors would spend more time using educational technology tools in class (Figure 5). These findings make it clear that institutions are increasingly moving away from the traditional, brick-and-mortar, lecture model and moving toward models of learning that are more flexible, innovative, and online.

BUT THEY ARE UNCLEAR WHAT THE TECH-CENTRIC FUTURE WILL LOOK LIKE.

Administrators were split on whether the tech-enabled future would be more personalized or standardized for students — 54% agreed that instruction would become more personalized in the future, but 52% agreed that it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations for the Future of Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I expect instructors will use more education technology tools in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%  6%  92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect instructors will spend more time supporting students online (e.g., online office hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%  7%  86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect that instructors will spend more time delivering course content online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% 12% 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect instruction to become more personalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% 27% 54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5
would become more standardized (Figure 6). Although personalization and standardization of instruction may seem incompatible, it is possible that administrators do not see these concepts as mutually exclusive and instead see ways to standardize learning content, while personalizing the ways that students can engage with that content.

These results provide an interesting contrast to our most recent faculty survey, in which 41% of faculty agreed that instruction would become more personalized in the future and 61% agreed that it would become more standardized.

Administrators who believed that courses would become more personalized in the future held more positive attitudes toward institutions offering increasing numbers of online courses and programs in the future. This suggests that administrators who see the potential of online learning to personalize learning for students are more likely to endorse these options.

Thirty-nine percent of administrators agreed that instructors will have less autonomy over their course design in the future, and 28% agreed that instructors will spend less time interacting with students. These results also stand in contrast to the CIN Faculty Edtech Survey Report, in which 53% predicted that they would have less autonomy over their course design, and 49% predicted that they would spend less time interacting with students. Overall, administrators in our sample were more optimistic about the future of higher education than were our most recent sample of faculty respondents.

**EXPECTATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF STUDENT LEARNING**

Below are some possible futures that higher education may soon experience. Rate your agreement with each of these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I expect courses will become more standardized.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect that instructors will have less autonomy over their course design.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect instructors will spend less time interacting with students.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6

**WHY THIS MATTERS**

To garner enthusiasm for the tech-enabled future, administrators must effectively communicate the benefits of tech-enabled learning to key stakeholders including students and faculty. While administrators are enthusiastic about the expansion of diverse modalities and credential paths, they are divided on how these options will benefit students and faculty. Institutions should prioritize balancing concerns about standardization by encouraging faculty collaboration to develop personalized learning experiences while also providing frameworks for standardization where necessary. Moreover, institutions should address the clear gaps between administrator and faculty perceptions by regularly gathering faculty perspectives and bringing them in as partners in the decision-making process. Doing so will not only give administrators additional insights into faculty experiences, but it will also help garner faculty enthusiasm and buy-in for the adoption of tech-enabled learning.
Takeaway 4: Administrators are split on AI and choosing inaction in the face of uncertainty.

One of the biggest disruptions to higher education has been the wide-scale introduction of generative AI technologies. While generative AI is not new, the technology has only recently become publicly available through platforms like ChatGPT, and the impact of these tools on the teaching and learning experience remains unclear. Moreover, our data suggest that the uncertainty around AI, and perhaps administrators’ lack of confidence around their ability to effectively choose EdTech products, may be leading to administrator inaction to develop policies or action plans on the utilization of AI at their respective institutions.

ADMINISTRATORS ARE SPLIT ON THE POTENTIAL OF AI TO IMPROVE THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE.

To gain insights into administrators’ perspectives on AI, we asked them how positively or negatively they feel about the use of these tools in higher education. Fifty-two percent of administrators reported that they were somewhat or extremely positive about AI tools. Thirty percent were neutral, and 19% were somewhat or extremely negative. These data suggest that while many administrators are optimistic about the potential of AI in higher education, many are undecided or have reservations.

Moreover, a small minority of administrators had either extremely positive (12%) or extremely negative (4%) sentiments about the prospect of AI in education, but the vast majority of people were somewhat positive (40%), neutral (30%) (Figure 7), or somewhat negative (15%). Overall, this pattern of responses suggests a general sense of uncertainty or ambivalence about AI, possibly because of how new these technologies are and how little data there is about how it may affect students.

FEELINGS ABOUT AI

How positively or negatively do you feel about the use of AI tools in higher education?

- Extremely negative
- Somewhat negative
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat positive
- Extremely positive

(Figure 7)
We next asked administrators which area of the student experience they expect AI to bring the most value. Their responses were largely mixed. The top four responses were connecting students with student support and resources, providing a more personalized learning experience for students, using data to identify students in need of academic support, and providing self-service chatbots, with roughly 20% of the sample selecting each of these four options (Figure 8).

**MOST INSTITUTIONS HAVE NOT YET ESTABLISHED CLEAR POLICIES ON THE USE OF THESE TOOLS.**

Most administrators reported that their institutions do not yet have clear policies on acceptable uses for students and faculty.

Sixty-seven percent of administrators reported that their institution does not have a policy on student use of ChatGPT or other AI tools. Twenty percent reported that their institution allows students to use AI in specific ways, and 10% reported that their institution encourages students to use AI in ways that enhance their learning. Four percent reported that their institution had banned students from using AI (Figure 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE OF AI IN STUDENT EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In which of the following areas do you think AI will bring the most value to the student experience?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect students with student support and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a more personalized learning experience for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use data to identify students in need of academic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide self-service chatbots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve testing and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF GENERATIVE AI**

Which of the following best describes your institution’s current policy on student use of ChatGPT or other generative AI tools in their courses?

- My institution has encouraged students to use ChatGPT and other generative AI tools in ways that enhance their learning | 10.0% |
- My institution has banned students from using ChatGPT and other generative AI tools | 4.0% |
- My institution does not have a policy on ChatGPT and other generative AI tools | 66.5% |
- My institution allows students to use ChatGPT and other generative AI tools in specific ways | 19.5% |
When we asked administrators about their institutions’ policies toward faculty use of AI in instruction, we saw a similar pattern of results. Seventy-six percent reported that their institution neither encourages nor prohibits faculty from using AI tools in instruction, 22% said their institution encourages faculty to incorporate AI tools into their instruction, and 3% said their institution discourages or prohibits faculty from using AI tools in their instruction (Figure 10).

### AI TOOLS IN INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My institution discourages or prohibits faculty from using AI tools in their instruction.</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My institution neither encourages nor prohibits faculty from using AI tools in their instruction.</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My institution encourages faculty to incorporate AI tools into their instruction.</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10*

### WHY THIS MATTERS

The wide-scale introduction of AI has been arguably the biggest disruption to higher education in recent years, and it is imperative that administrators think about how they can use AI to streamline institutional practices and improve the teaching and learning experience. Although administrators largely see the potential of AI to improve the student experience, most institutions have not yet developed formal policies toward the use of these tools. It is possible that administrators have been slow to develop policies because they lack the time and resources needed to engage deeply with the questions facing their institutions, which we have consistently observed as a challenge for administrators through the College Innovation Network. It could also be a demonstration of the uncertainty with which administrators are engaging with new and innovative technologies. But without defined guidelines, students and faculty may lack a structured framework for responsible and ethical use of AI. Students may also miss out on an opportunity to learn and practice AI-based skills that will quickly be required in the workforce, a challenge that could exacerbate existing inequalities for first-generation student populations, many of whom are less aware of AI solutions than their continuing-generation peers. A failure to utilize cutting-edge technologies like AI is also a lost opportunity to capitalize on the organizational improvements and efficiencies that could be made through such innovation.
As higher education faces unprecedented disruptions, staying attuned to how key decision-makers are navigating these changes is critical for maintaining a streamlined teaching and learning experience for students and faculty. In this report, we examined how higher education administrators are perceiving and experiencing these challenges.

Although administrators expressed enthusiasm for educational technology, they also harbor some degree of uncertainty. Their confidence in selecting effective EdTech products is limited, and they are not seeking out key information that would help increase their confidence. They are excited about offering students new learning modalities and credential options in the future, but they are divided about how these innovations will impact the learning experience. While some administrators are cautiously welcoming technologies like AI, many have reservations about these tools and there is a lack of clear policies to guide students and faculty. What becomes clear when viewing these data holistically is that despite many external pressures that could lead to innovation or disruption, many are reluctant to engage in new technologies like AI, or to challenge the status quo.

There are a few notable limitations of this work. First, our sample of administrators is relatively small, so we caution against broad conclusions from this work. Second, participants were recruited primarily through convenience sampling methods and, as such, they are not representative of the broader population. Despite these limitations, the administrators in our sample have an outsized impact on the experiences of students and faculty in their respective institutions, and their perceptions and experiences are valuable to study, even in small numbers.

As higher education continues to evolve, agile and timely research will be critical. Understanding how new technologies impact students and faculty is vital for administrators to make informed decisions that benefit students and faculty.
Appendix

**RACE/ETHNICITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 11*

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonbinary</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not provided</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12*
### ROLE IN ADMINISTRATION

- **Academic Management**: 45.79%
- **Alumni/fundraising**: 28.50%
- **Executive Management**: 28.50%
- **Facilities/infrastructure**: 1.87%
- **Finance/Business**: 4.21%
- **Not provided**: 0.00%
- **Other**: 10.75%
- **Technology Management**: 8.41%

![Figure 13](image)

### NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING

- **Less than 5**: 23.36%
- **6–10**: 15.42%
- **11–15**: 10.75%
- **16–20**: 10.75%
- **21–25**: 13.08%
- **26 and up**: 15.89%
- **Not provided**: 10.75%

![Figure 14](image)
NUMBER OF YEARS IN ADMINISTRATION

Figure 15

- Less than 5: 10.28%
- 6-10: 22.43%
- 11-15: 16.36%
- 16-20: 15.42%
- 21-25: 15.89%
- 26 and up: 12.62%
- Not provided: 7.01%
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WGU Labs is the nonprofit EdTech consulting, incubation, research, and design arm of Western Governors University (WGU), where our mission is to identify and support scalable solutions that address the biggest challenges in education today.

ABOUT THE COLLEGE INNOVATION NETWORK

The College Innovation Network (CIN) at WGU Labs is a network of higher education institutions committed to navigating uncertainty in an increasingly tech-enabled world. We leverage technology and community to promote belonging and engagement in the modern higher education environment, building highly engaged learning communities from enrollment through graduation - and beyond.

ABOUT THE CIN EDTECH SURVEY SERIES

CIN is in a unique position to learn about the student, faculty, and administrator experience with EdTech by leveraging the diversity of institutions within the Network. The CIN EdTech Survey Series is administered across the Network three times a year with the goal of generating valuable insights to help institutions understand how faculty and students experience EdTech. These insights can be applied to improve faculty and student experiences, and ultimately bolster the impact of EdTech across the sector.

Queries about CIN can be addressed to cin@wgulabs.org
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This survey project and associated report were made possible through the support of a grant from the Charles Koch Foundation, and through the cooperation of leadership at our CIN member institutions. The opinions expressed in this report are those of the author and CIN staff, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Charles Koch Foundation or CIN member institutions.

The support of generous donors who believe in the mission of CIN make this work possible. If you are interested in learning more, please contact us at cin@wgulabs.org.

REPORT CONTRIBUTIONS

This research was made possible through the collaboration of institutional leaders at Calbright College, Cuyahoga Community College (Tri-C), Loyola University New Orleans, Marshall University, Northern Virginia Community College, Pennsylvania Western University, Piedmont Community College, Rio Salado College, and Wayne Community College.

This report was designed, analyzed, and written by Stephanie Reeves, Betheny Gross, and Omid Fotuhi, with editing support from Holly Wallace, Natalie Berkey, and Erika Wandsneider, and visual design by CallyAnn Hamilton.