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Even before the Covid-19 pandemic upended higher education, colleges were focusing more resources on supporting students. Demographic changes in the United States meant that more first-generation, low-income, and minority students were enrolling—populations that usually graduate at lower rates than the national average. To help retain them and keep them on a path toward a degree, colleges have been spending more on technologies, academic programs, training, and staff members.

Now, with the novel coronavirus, student needs are quickly changing as issues of health and safety become paramount. The public-health emergency and how it will play out across the country remains very uncertain, but to examine what’s needed to serve students, how much money it will require, and how it will affect budgets to come, The Chronicle brought together a community-college president, college financial and business officers, and other experts. Hosted by Sarah Brown, a Chronicle senior reporter, the panel discussed the inevitability of furloughs and layoffs, the possible investments today in technology that may serve colleges tomorrow, and the importance of building a resilient institution, financially and operationally, in response to the crisis.
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Ronald L. Rhames is president of Midlands Technical College, in South Carolina. Since becoming president, in 2015, he has made changes that include a comprehensive strategic-planning process focusing on engagement and execution; service-excellence training for all employees; measures for student placement; centralized academic and career advising; and locating a major industrial tenant on the college’s Enterprise Campus. Rhames began his career with the college in 1990, serving as senior vice president and chief operating officer. He has also served as board chair of the National Association of College and University Business Officers; president of the Southern Association of College and University Business Officers; and president of the Community College Business Officers of the United States and Canada. He has published papers in several academic journals and professional publications.
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Sarah Brown joined The Chronicle of Higher Education, where she is a senior reporter, in 2015. She reports on campus life, including students’ mental health, issues of sexual assault and harassment, diversity, activism, and the Greek system. Recently she has written about how turnover and burnout are roiling campus Title IX efforts, how colleges are balancing students’ demands for free speech and inclusion, and how the lack of a college education has become a public-health crisis. She is the author of The Chronicle’s recent deep-dive report, “Overwhelmed: The Real Campus Mental-Health Crisis and New Models for Well-Being.”
New Student Needs

Remote education. Plastic shields. Socially distanced classrooms. The changes that colleges have to make to prepare for the fall are complicated. Managing the costs and preparing for emergency spending is an enormous challenge, especially at a time when tuition revenue, state budgets, and investment income may be suffering.

But in addition to those tangible expenses, our panel’s participants are focused on an intangible one: The cost if students decide that they can’t trust an institution to protect their safety.

As Amelia Parnell, vice president for research and policy at Naspa – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, put it: “The individual costs are expensive. What’s hard to measure is the cost of the relationship between the campus and the students.”

Sarah Brown: In higher education, budget plans are made years in advance — and obviously, in pandemic times, the immediate term has been upended. What will it take to meet student needs this fall, and what will it cost?

Ellizabeth A. Hardin: What it will take is very situational. If you’re a public institution in a state that requires its public institutions to be open in physical form with students on campus, then what it takes is a focus on safety. And that safety costs a lot.

What does that safety look like in terms of where students live? What does it look
“My point is that now is a time when we can use those reserves to help smooth the curve of demand.”

—Lynn V. Valente
like in terms of how they learn? And what does it look like in terms of their out-of-classroom experience?

On our campus, about 22 percent of students live on campus. How do they interact with each other? How do we change cleaning methods?

With the safety of the educational experience itself, the big issues for us have been around how many people attend classes face to face, and what the alternative is. We have spent a tremendous amount of energy to determine what the classroom experience looks like. What does a six-foot distance really look like? Do you shield or not? How does the cleaning method change?

And then you've got the out-of-classroom experience. We have nearly 500 student organizations. How do they interact with students? We have virtualized all of the orientation programs.

So what does it cost? Tens of millions of dollars. We can parse the particulars, if you will, but it is extremely expensive.

Brown: Lynn, what will it take to meet student needs on your campus this fall, and what will it cost?

Lynn V. Valenter: Speaking from a perspective of a nonresidential college, the core of what we do is deliver academic programming. That’s where we have made huge and significant investments. The good news is they will probably serve us post-Covid. Data generally suggest that student learning is most effective when you can do part distance and part face-to-face, part group and part individualized.

The good news is we had already invested in how to effectively deliver remotely. Whether that’s synchronous or asynchronous depends on faculty preferences and subject matter. So we’ve been investing in the technology to effectively deliver remote learning and in the infrastructure that’s necessary to help the faculty pivot. Some faculty members are leading the charge, some are partway there, and some haven’t embraced it. So helping instructors be successful is key; the heart of our institutions are the faculty who deliver the student learning.

That’s not cheap. All of that is very expensive if we want to do it well. When you’re doing a face-to-face component, a distance component, and maybe synchronous, it adds complexity, which adds costs. And so it helps qualitatively, but not necessarily from a cost-reduction view.

One of our campuses is looking to deliver lab classes by having one lab partner be at home and one in the lab wearing a GoPro [camera]. That’s the kind of creativity that’s needed. It may not be scalable, but as long as we keep the focus on student learning, we have to figure out a way to pay for it.

And if I can just wrap up with a comment about how we are going to pay for it. I don’t know about your budgeting habits, but I know we all believe this: that when you budget, you budget reserves. And we often get pushback: “What do you need reserves for? You’re just Scrooge McDuck trying to hold all the gold.”

My point is that now is a time when we can use those reserves to help smooth the curve of demand. The scale is not such that reserves alone will do it. We will have to change how we are spending. But this is a time when having reserves can help us help our faculty serve our students well.

Brown: Ron, from your standpoint at a community college, what will it take?

Ronald L. Rhames: What we’re planning to do in the fall is to have approximately 50 percent of our students on campus and 50 percent online. This situation changes almost hourly, and so we’re prepared to change that.

The costs that we’ve incurred include all the things that’ve been discussed already. But by having smaller classes, it becomes a challenge in terms of managing section size for faculty. You have to work with faculty and faculty leadership to help them understand that just because a faculty member has got one section, it may have a section A and section B. It’s a split classroom. We can’t afford to teach eight
“You want students on campus so they can get their experience. A nursing student needs to be in the hospital so they can touch and feel the patient; we want the welding student to do that in terms of welding. Trying to manage that through this process is a real challenge.”

—Ronald L. Rhames

Robert G. Moore: We are a small residential campus. Over 80 percent of our students live on campus. The yield rate on our incoming class far exceeded our projections. So we have had to rent housing off-campus to accommodate some of our juniors.

We have international students who were never able to safely go home, so we had to feed them all summer. We were losing money every day, because feeding about 50 students a day you cannot do economically.

We teach only one class at a time. So for 18 days you take one class, and there is a classroom devoted just to that class. We’ve had to mark off the classrooms, and then there’s the question, How do you clean the classroom so you can use a different group?

We’ve decided to open with only our first-year students being physically on
campus during the first block — that is, our first four weeks. Normally the students go through a full-week program and spend three days camping and doing a service project. We had to totally change that program and will not bring students here and send them off campus.

But we want to focus on their experience first. They are at the greatest risk for not becoming a part of the college in the normal way.

It’s getting close to $10 million in what we had to commit to these changes.

Brown: Amelia, finally to you. How do you think about student needs and the costs to meet them?

Amelia Parnell: One thing that could come up, unfortunately, is if campuses are in-person to any degree and, six weeks or a month into the year, there’s an outbreak. They may need to clear the campus and send students home or somewhere safer. I anticipate that will come up because of student needs. The individual costs are expensive. What’s hard to measure is the cost of the relationship between the college and the students.

We are very much and rightly so talking about this in a transactional way. How do we make this work? How do we start this and stop that and put students here and move them there?

There’s still an underlying expectation that there should be a relationship between the college, the student, and the people that work there. The cost of the relationship is hard to measure, but if we handle it well, it is invaluable.

Brown: You all talked about these investments — money, resources, staff, time. Typically the chief financial officers are thinking about returns. How do you think about return on investment at a time like this? Is it a measure of success like retention and tuition dollars? Or is there another way to measure effectiveness? How are you thinking about returns on these unprecedented investments?

“And for a small liberal-arts college to talk about furloughs or layoffs, that’s going to be hard for the community. But the reality of that is coming.”

—Robert G. Moore
Valenter: At this moment in time, even maybe especially as a finance officer, I am not leading with a return on investment. I’m leading with, What is the right thing to do? Honoring the commitment to students. Doing everything we can to hold on to our mission. Long term, there will be an opportunity to evaluate our practices. And there are potentially long-term savings that would be welcomed. Right now I’m scrambling to figure out how to pay for it, but I’m not running an ROI on the things we are doing. Do we care greatly about retention? Absolutely. Is that something we are tracking? Yes. Is that driving much of what we are doing after safety? Absolutely. It is a time when we are tracking and paying attention. But that is not driving our expenditures at this point.

Hardin: I haven’t thought about ROI for a minute since February 15th — when we started our journey toward a field hospital. Not that some elements of how we pay for this do not matter — they do. The way we are thinking about it is, What type of institution are we now, and who do we serve? Thirty-seven percent first-generation college students. Twenty-five percent students with zero expected family contribution. A vibrant, lively campus with a live-in component. A curriculum and pedagogy that include technology, that have various class sizes, etc.

We are thinking through, What do we need to be one year from now, two years from now? And how do we optimize our resources to get there? What do we spend less of? More of?

Brown: I want to talk about data you are using. Enrollment is on your minds, right? What data should be looked at as fall planning takes shape, in addition to the enrollment piece?

Rhames: Enrollment certainly is a big one. Not only just enrollment, but are they wanting to be on campus? Do they want to be in a virtual situation? How many credit hours are they taking? What is the load for the students? What are the programs and sections and classes that they are interested in, or, more important, that they need to take? Because if you need to take 10 classes with labs, that is different from a general-education course in English.

We also know that it is dynamic. Community-college students in general will wait till the last moment to make decisions anyway. So we are finding this decision-making is being put further into the future.

Parnell: I have a short list of things that would need to be a part of comprehensive data strategy. Sometimes we can get into the habit of collecting data for the sake of having it, versus in this crisis, you have to know the answer of how you would use it if you have it. I think of several useful things: We know there will be disparities across the student population about access, level of access to technology, specifically being able to connect. That’s hard to capture, but you can still gather a little more detail about the hardships students might have, which would be relevant to the quality of the education experience.

The extent to which students can engage with each other between classes or still have some level of sense of community — we need something showing us it’s happening so they feel they are not out there on an island.

In terms of leading indicators, things like accessing the learning-management system, logging in, how much time they spend there, and are they using it the way they should. Fafsa completion. The amount of time it takes to reach a live person to get information. Time spent on the website. A lot of campuses are trying a one-stop page. Is it working? Are people finding what they need from that single location?

Don’t take this as an exhaustive list, but it’s important to start with the end in mind. It starts with: What can you reasonably expect to change, and what data can you use to get there?
Tough Decisions:
What Stays and What Goes

In a time of intensely difficult decision-making, campus leaders must determine where to focus resources. Colleges across the country were already grappling with growing costs and decreasing revenue — and that was before the pandemic changed everything. In the midst of this unprecedented crisis, college financial leaders are confronting a whirling array of challenges, all carrying implications for expenses and revenue.

Our panelists discussed the reality of furloughs and layoffs, the complexity of different revenue streams, the emotional process that occurs before business-oriented and student-oriented decisions can be made, the possibility of housing refunds, and the challenges of advising campus cabinets.

Sarah Brown: Where are you redirecting resources? Where are you making difficult decisions about cuts? Virtually all of these decisions have an impact on students. Can you offer examples of difficult decisions and what stays and what goes?

Robert G. Moore: We have promised to continue paying all our employees through August 1. We have made a big effort to re-direct those who cannot do their jobs. Our fund-raising people have manned the call lines trying to answer parents’ questions. Child-care-center workers have come in to scan documents. We’ve tried to repurpose, but we are about to end that phase. And for a small liberal-arts college to talk about furloughs or layoffs, that’s going to be hard for the community. But the reality of that is coming.

We operate a fine-arts center, and the theater will be dark for a long time. How long can you continue to pay theater workers when they have no hope of a production? There’s the rapidly changing student need. Because we are so small, they are almost one-offs — a student who needed...
“It is hard for everybody to come to terms with. I think it’s a very emotional process. But we cannot get business-oriented, student-oriented decisions made until you work through that emotional cycle that allows you to get to a place where you can look at data and make good decisions.”

—Elizabeth A. Hardin
to get home in March and was afraid to fly. We ended up renting a car to get that student across the country. For some it was not safe to send them home in March, April, and May, and we had to keep them.

So if they come, and we have to close, how do we serve those students?

Ronald L. Rhames: The reality of it is you are not going to solve this massive problem with the one-offs, and you will not solve it by cutting travel. When 75 or 80 percent of your budget is personnel and personnel-related, you have to deal with that question eventually. We will be able to make it here at Midlands through the fiscal year that just started. But the reality is, I do expect we are going to have to make some really tough decisions for the next fiscal year, and those tough decisions will involve people’s employment with the college. That is just reality.

Faculty and others have a difficult time seeing that, especially when you have multiple sources of revenue and some of those revenues are for specific purposes. So if you make a decision to renovate or build a building because somebody gave you that resource, it is difficult to explain that at the same time you are reducing personnel costs. We’re going to have to make some tough decisions.

Moore: We’re building a hockey arena on campus at the same time we are talking about laying off and furloughing, so there’s your point.

Rhames: We have a million-dollar project going through the approval process now and it’s 100 percent funded, with dedicated funding. If we did not do it, we would have to return the money. As a former business officer, that is not in my blood.

Elizabeth A. Hardin: This reminds me of what I refer to as the death-and-dying communication cycle, which as leaders we encounter a lot in this environment. The first conversation: Denial. Anger. Bargaining. And eventually acceptance, when you can actually have a conversation about what needs to happen and begin a decision-making process.

We have seen this repeatedly. Some people catch on really quickly. For other people, we are still cycling back to the denial. We have to restart the whole process again. This goes back to communication, largely to get people to a place where they are emotionally prepared to make a decision.

Brown: Talking about denial, people on a college campus are a tight-knit community. It is impossible for emotion to not be tied up in the conversation.

Hardin: And the speed of the transition is so confusing: Wait, how can this be happening when we have a record freshman class? How does this happen? It is hard for everybody to come to terms with. I think it’s a very emotional process. But we cannot get business-oriented, student-oriented decisions made until you work through that emotional cycle that allows you to get to a place where you can look at data and make good decisions.

Lynn V. Valenter: Anytime we have to reduce expenses, there is the camp that says it should be strategic, and there is the camp that says across-the-board. Everyone agrees that across-the-board has its flaws. But everybody who advocates for strategic-only will argue if they think they get less than their fair share.

Everything we do has people who care deeply about it. It is extraordinarily difficult to stop doing things. Because of the speed at which this event and the financial challenges came on, we are keeping open positions vacant. We are freezing travel, although no one is traveling. We have equipment freezes. At this point we are doing what we would typically do. But as my fellow panelists called out, with most of our expenses being people and related costs, at some point it will impact people.

Brown: I want to ask about housing and dining refunds if the campus has to close. Are you planning on that? How is that affecting campus planning for the fall?

Hardin: We sent our students home on March 16. We made the decision to pro-rata
refund dining and housing. We did have the reserves to do that. We also made the decision to pro-rata refund parking, because the parking charges are fairly expensive. Although the refunds were modest, like $60 or $70, parking is a point of great contention, so we wanted to recognize that our students were in significant distress.

What we have done for the fall is we have communicated clearly that we will not be able to sustain refunds should we come back to campus and subsequently have to depart.

Is it possible that some people will sue us over that? It is possible — but we have communicated clearly about that. Going back to the framework of, What type of institution are we for our students now? And what do we want to be a year from now?

We are essentially asking our students to contribute, through this process, to sustaining what we are for them.

So we’ve communicated, and that is where we are. The most expensive scenario is actually the one we are on, which is coming back to a physical campus, opening housing with the potential of having to send students back home at a certain point.

Now, we’ve got a plan for it. We are not terribly concerned on the academic side, actually. We’ve all noted the risk is on the auxiliary side.

Brown: I want to talk about advising on decision-making. You are in the room with the cabinet, and you are trying to tell vice presidents or vice chancellors that you’ve got to make some tough decisions on things that affect students — programs, initiatives, and services. How do you advise institutions or institutional leaders to go about that?

Rhames: As a president you are sitting literally at the head of the table, and everybody is ultimately looking at you. What I try to do is encourage conversation. If we cannot build a consensus on what it is we are going to do, I think folks understand that the president will have to make that final decision. But before that, you really want to make sure you hear as many people as possible. Sometimes I will ask folks to talk to other folks in the college — we might have neglected to ask someone, What do you think about this? How will this impact not just today but tomorrow?

Sometimes you just have to cut off the debate and say, This is what we are going to do. And sometimes you are right, and sometimes you are wrong. That is just the way it is. Especially in this dynamic environment — you don’t have the luxury to study things like we normally do in higher education. One thing with my team is when we leave the room after a decision, I think we are all on board at that moment. So that is the kind of environment you want to create.

Valenter: We think about our mission and our values, and as business officers, I think, where it is helpful, we can point out unintended consequences. Also, when we are advocating to spend money for refunds or whatever else, our voice has an outsized value, because we are more often advocating for less expenditures rather than more, and so when Beth says this is the right thing to do and we need to do that, it tends to carry the day in terms of institutional outcomes. That is where we can be powerful contributing members of the cabinet, to note what the consequences of courses of actions are, but then to support the right ones, guided by the mission and values.

Parnell: When it comes to decision-making, among those who are around the table, there are blind spots. Once you get those out there, then it comes down to discussion of the level of risk people are comfortable with.

Just the word “risk” alone can have its own framing. I’ve heard it said that you don’t mitigate risk, you manage it. It’s important to be both aware and accepting of the possible losses, but to frame it in a way that you’re managing those associated risks with the expectation that you will rebound. To do so, what do we need to keep in mind? That’s not to throw roses on top of things and make it seem sunny — I don’t know that anyone, despite how bad it is, expects every single campus in the country will close. But how is every campus going to get through this? The framing is huge.
Looking Ahead

College leaders must, above all, be nimble as they confront the myriad trials of the pandemic and look to sustain their institutions. Higher ed has weathered world-shaking events before — the Great Depression, World War II, and the Great Recession. The empty campuses of the Covid-19 era have created a wholly different level of challenge and complexity. But campus leaders say they are heeding the imperative of their mission — to educate students — as they scramble for solutions and continue to plan for the future.

Our panelists discussed higher ed’s past struggles with managing change, as well as a silver lining to the coronavirus crisis — the reality that change is both unavoidable in this moment and also potentially a trigger for unforeseen opportunity.

Sarah Brown: I want to make sure I touch on planning for a sustainable student-centered institution a few years down the road, and on whether this is an opportunity to reimagine some of the economics and business of higher ed.

Robert G. Moore: It’s an ongoing discussion. We are in a very rare market. We are competing for students across the nation. We have 15 peer institutions, most of them in the East. They’re all liberal-arts, they all have sizable endowments. Every year we talk about, how can we sustain a 3- or 4-percent cost increase. Yet we’re competing for new faculty with those doing the same thing, so we are in a vicious cycle.

Ronald L. Rhames: I think a lot about the history of higher education. We are slow to change. I recognize that some institutions change faster than others. Somebody said earlier that we often try to be everything
“The conditions are so difficult, so unfamiliar and fast-paced, it is pushing a lot of campuses to try new things because they have to. There’s a small positive in that one of those new things may result in a different type of sustainability and a different way of giving students the evergreen skills they need.”

—Amelia Parnell
for everybody. We don’t really know how to say “no.” We have political pressures that cause us to do things that we don’t want to do. For instance, some programs we would like to eliminate, politically you cannot eliminate them. I hope we are truly providing for our students what they want and what they need to be competitive, either in the work force or, in our case, if they want to transfer to another institution.

Amelia Parnell: It is an optimal time to try a different model. I say that with a grain of salt, because I don’t want to reframe things to seem like it is just an open opportunity to do everything you’ve never tried before. But the conditions are so difficult, so unfamiliar and fast-paced, it is pushing a lot of campuses to try new things because they have to. There’s a small positive in that one of those new things may result in a different type of sustainability and a different way of giving students the evergreen skills they need. I don’t know what those will be, and I don’t have the secret sauce of what those moves could be, but this could be the time we find at least one of them.

Lynn V. Valenter: The value of higher education is well documented and well known. The moral imperative is retention. The biggest problem is when we have first-generation or low-income students come, take on debt, not graduate, and then be burdened by that level of debt without having the economic benefits that are typically imparted to a graduate. So this is a difficult time to figure out how to improve our retention. But there are also a lot fewer variables we have to take into account as we try some of the interventions — the intrusive advising, the dedicated freshman experience. So we are working to do that, to do it effectively and do it well. Time will tell. But I believe that the economic value of higher education is just extraordinary and accepted worldwide. We just need to find out how to deliver some of those same benefits without inflating the cost.

My final point is that the outcry against the economic model of higher education was probably most significantly inflamed by reduced state funding. And so it was not that our costs escalated. It was that the funding of those costs transitioned from a broad base of taxpayers — who typically do that because it helps economic development — to students and their families.

Elizabeth A. Hardin: The great revelation for us has been that place matters in terms of learning. We knew it, and it comes back to a point Amelia made — it’s because the relationship matters. And the relationship is fundamentally different when it is limited to technology. It is more different than we realized.

Oddly enough, technology will make us better. For us, you will see more tech. I think we will use it better. We will pay more attention to how well it is used by everybody, not just the eager folks who have been doing this for a while, but by everybody.

And then the business officer’s classic answer is that we have to have a far deeper understanding of the cost structure. Both deeper and broader. And it has to be something that is seen as a tool instead of a weapon. As a tool, it allows us to sustain programs that are in the liberal-arts tradition. A lot of times those perhaps do not see the love as much in times like this. But if you understand the cost structure as a tool instead of a weapon, a tool that can be used to make smart decisions that preserve things that really matter to you but which are not necessarily economic, I think you go a long way.
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