Digital transformation continues to evolve quickly, and no emerging technology has the potential to influence the future of higher education more than AI.

Huron and *Inside Higher Ed* surveyed higher education leaders across the country for insights to better understand the current and future states of AI at colleges and universities.

In this report, you will learn more about how institutions are considering AI opportunities, which areas they expect AI to impact the most, and current AI investment targets. Their responses highlight the uncertainty and caution that persist in light of the immaturity of emerging technologies such as AI — as well as the need for a strategic, collaborative approach to successful adoption.

**Putting Possible Into Practice**

Huron is at the forefront of digital transformation and partners with higher education institutions to use data and technology to enable innovation, growth, and stability.

Engage with a member of the Huron team to continue this dialogue and get insights on how your institution can best prepare and execute an AI strategy that puts the possibilities of AI into practice.

huronconsultinggroup.com
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Introduction and Methodology

*Inside Higher Ed* has partnered with Hanover Research, with sponsorship from Huron, to understand stakeholders’ current attitudes and thoughts about how artificial intelligence (AI) will impact higher education in this country. This survey was administered online in April and May of 2023 using the Qualtrics platform. Results include 224 respondents following data cleaning which removed 9 low-quality respondents. Written analysis about the results for the entire sample is found throughout the report, along with some analysis based on sector, AI utilization, and role.

- Hanover sent invitations via email to 2,639 stakeholders at different institutions. Hanover collected 213 fully or partially completed surveys, yielding an 8 percent response rate.
- After data collection, Hanover identified and removed low-quality respondents.
- Specialty colleges - namely, Bible colleges and seminaries with a Carnegie Classification of 24 - and institutions with an enrollment of fewer than 500 students were excluded from the sample.
- Sample sizes vary across questions as some questions only pertain to a subset of respondents.
- Conclusions drawn from a small sample size (n<20) should be interpreted with caution.
- “Don’t Know or Not Applicable” responses, and equivalent, are often excluded from the figures and analysis in order to focus on respondents who did express an opinion.
- Due to small sample sizes, some sectors have been excluded. The 2018 Carnegie Classification was used to determine sector classifications. Some schools lacked a classification and were excluded from those segmentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Institutions, by Sector</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private Nonprofit</th>
<th>For-profit*</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Master’s/ Bacc.</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Doctoral/ Master’s</th>
<th>Bacc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample size</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that data is not reported for these groups due to small sample size.
Key Findings

- Respondents from public schools are more likely than those at private nonprofit schools to indicate that their institution is currently using AI. In fact, more than half of those from public schools report that their institution is currently utilizing any AI technology or software (55 percent), compared to just 36 percent of those from private nonprofit schools. Overall, respondents are generally split on whether their institution is currently using AI. Nearly half of respondents indicate that their institution is currently using AI technology or software (48 percent) and 41 percent indicate that their institution is not.

- Regarding steps taken to manage AI usage on campus, about half of respondents report that their institution has encouraged AI-related training among faculty/staff. Additionally, more than a third have provided workshops to teach university stakeholders how to best utilize AI (37 percent). However, a quarter of respondents report that their institution has not taken any steps to manage AI usage on campus (25 percent).

- Most respondents think future AI advances will be very helpful at making learning support (e.g., self-service chat bots, flagging at risk students) more efficient. Additionally, more than two-thirds of respondents think future AI advances will be very or extremely helpful at making administrative support (e.g., analyzing data on operational effectiveness, admission trends, student retention, financial management) more efficient (69 percent). However, respondents are slightly less likely to think that future AI advances will be at least very helpful at making research support more efficient (54 percent).

- Respondents believe that AI technology will be most impactful in answering student questions with chatbots and with analyzing data related to student retention. Further, more than a quarter of respondents think AI will be impactful in analyzing data related to student recruitment (28 percent). However, fewer believe that AI technology will help with assisting faculty with teaching (16 percent) and general administration support (15 percent).

- Respondents are split on whether the Office of Teaching and Learning or the Office of Information Technology should lead their institution’s AI planning and implementation initiatives. Few believe that the President’s Office should lead the AI planning and implementation initiatives (11 percent).

- Recent AI advancements have generally caused institutions to re-assess its instructional plans and goals more than its administrative plans and goals. Nearly two-thirds of respondents agree that AI advancements have caused their institution to re-assess its long-term instructional plans and goals (64 percent). Comparatively, fewer than half agree that AI advancements have caused their institution to re-assess its long-term administrative plans and goals (46 percent).
Key Findings (cont.)

- In regard to AI software and technology implementation, institutions are more focused on long-term goals (3 years or more in the future) than they are short-term goals (in the next 12 months). Respondents are more likely to agree that recent AI advancements have caused their institution to re-assess its long-term administrative (46 percent) and instructional (64 percent) plans and goals (3 years or more in the future) than their short-term administrative (25 percent) and instructional (52 percent) plans and goals.

- Most respondents believe that AI software will be a core skill institutions will need to teach, yet fewer believe that faculty will be able to successfully teach students how to use AI. Further, almost all respondents agree that working with AI software will become a core skill needed in the workforce (90 percent). However, fewer than half agree that faculty at their institution will be receptive to adjusting their curricula to include teaching students how to use AI (43 percent). Additionally, just 36 percent agree that their institution will have adequate resources to support faculty as they learn how to use new AI technology.

- Very few respondents agree that their institution has a good sense of how much it will cost to implement and deploy new AI technology in administrative and instructional areas. Although, more than three-quarters of respondents believe that investing in AI in administrative (77 percent) and instructional (76 percent) areas will ultimately lead to a positive return on investment at their institution. Most respondents anticipate their institution will spend less than 250,000 dollars on AI in the next two years (70 percent). Respondents from private nonprofit institutions (80 percent) are more likely than those from public institutions (64 percent) to anticipate their institution spending less than 250,000 dollars on AI in the next two years.

- Respondent’s main concern about utilizing AI at their institution is students using it to cheat or plagiarize. Additionally, more than one third of respondents are very or extremely concerned about AI-ingrained biases that could negatively affect marginalized groups at their institution (40 percent) and prospective students using AI to write their application essays (38 percent). To combat AI-ingrained biases, more than half of respondents believe that implementing internal guidelines or procedures will be at least very important for their institution (58 percent).
Key Findings (cont.)

- More than a third of respondents are very or extremely concerned about their institution’s ability to keep up with rapidly developing AI technology. Further, 38 percent are moderately concerned. Those who are not currently utilizing AI at their institution (49 percent) are more concerned about their institution’s ability to keep up than those who are utilizing AI at their institution (33 percent). Very few respondents feel very or extremely knowledgeable about the rapidly changing developments in AI (11 percent). Although, nearly half indicate that they feel moderately knowledgeable (46 percent).

- Fewer than a quarter of senior officers report that their institution has room in the budget for new AI software. Further, fewer than one third agree that their institution is prepared to efficiently make decisions to implement new AI software when it comes out (29 percent).

- More than half of respondents indicate that utilizing data analytics has been very or extremely important to their institution, yet few report that their institution highly effectively uses data to inform decisions. In fact, just 24 percent report that their institution is very or extremely effective at using data to aid and inform campus decision-making.
Artificial Intelligence Utilization

Respondents are split on whether their institution is currently utilizing any AI technology or software. Nearly half of respondents indicate that their institution is currently using AI technology or software (48 percent) and 41 percent indicate that their institution is not.

Respondents at public schools (55 percent) are more likely than those at private nonprofit schools (36 percent) to indicate that their institution is currently using AI.

Is your institution currently utilizing any Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology or software? (n=213)

- Yes: 48%
- No: 41%
- I don’t know: 11%
Nearly a third of respondents indicate that their institution is not currently using AI to assist with administrative functions. However, about a quarter report that their institution uses AI to streamline administrative tasks (24 percent), for general administration support (23 percent), and for analyzing data related to student retention (23 percent).

Does your institution currently use AI in any of the following administrative capacities? Please select all that apply. (n=102)

- Streamlining administrative tasks: 24%
- General administration support: 23%
- Analyzing data related to student retention: 23%
- Flagging at-risk students at the institutional level: 22%
- Analyzing data related to student recruitment: 13%
- Scheduling for classrooms or facilities: 8%
- Assessing administrative productivity and performance: 4%
- Analyzing institutional financial data: 3%
- Analyzing development office data: 3%
- Other: 28%
- None of the above - my institution is not currently using AI to assist with administrative functions: 29%

Note: This question was displayed to respondents whose institution is currently utilizing AI technology or software.
Al-Generative Tools

The top AI-generative tools that institutions currently provide students with are access to virtual assistants that can answer questions at the institutional level and within certain offices or departments. However, 43 percent of respondents indicate that their institution is not currently providing students with any AI-generative tools.

More respondents from public schools (40 percent) than those from private nonprofit schools (15 percent) report that their institution provides their students with access to virtual assistants that can answer questions at the institutional level.

**Does your institution currently provide students with any of the following types of AI-generative tools? Please select all that apply.** (n=102)

- Access to virtual assistants that can answer questions at the institutional level: 32%
- Access to virtual assistants that can answer questions within certain offices or departments: 27%
- Adaptive tutoring support: 17%
- Adaptive degree and course planning: 7%
- Access to virtual teaching assistant that can answer questions at the course level: 5%
- Other: 5%
- None of the above - my institution is not currently providing students with any AI-generative tools: 43%

Note: This question was displayed to respondents whose institution is currently utilizing AI technology or software.
Approximately half of respondents have encouraged AI-related training among faculty/staff. Additionally, more than a third have provided workshops to teach university stakeholders how to best utilize AI (37 percent). However, a quarter of respondents report that their institution has not taken any steps to manage AI usage on campus (25 percent).

Interestingly, respondents from private nonprofit institutions (57 percent, 39 percent) are more likely than those from public institutions (40 percent, 24 percent) to report that their institution has encouraged AI-related training among faculty and staff and conducted research on how other institutions are managing AI usage.

Has your institution taken any of the following steps to manage AI usage on campus? Please select all that apply. (n=213)
Helpfulness of Future AI Advances

Most respondents think future AI advances will be at least very helpful at making learning support (e.g., self-service chat bots, flagging at risk students) more efficient (76 percent). Additionally, more than two-thirds of respondents think future AI advances will be very or extremely helpful at making administrative support (e.g., analyzing data on operational effectiveness, admission trends, student retention, financial management) more efficient (69 percent). However, respondents are less likely to think that future AI advances will be at least very helpful at making research support more efficient (54 percent).

How helpful do you think future AI advances will be at making the following areas of your institution more efficient?

- Learning support (e.g., self-service chat bots, flagging at risk students) (n=202)
  - Not at all helpful: 2%
  - Slightly helpful: 4%
  - Moderately helpful: 17%
  - Very helpful: 37%
  - Extremely helpful: 39%

- Administrative support (e.g., analyzing data on operational effectiveness, admission trends, student retention, financial management) (n=195)
  - Not at all helpful: 1%
  - Slightly helpful: 6%
  - Moderately helpful: 25%
  - Very helpful: 30%
  - Extremely helpful: 39%

- Teaching support (e.g., providing adaptive and automated assessments) (n=198)
  - Not at all helpful: 3%
  - Slightly helpful: 9%
  - Moderately helpful: 27%
  - Very helpful: 37%
  - Extremely helpful: 24%

- Research support (e.g., assisting faculty with their research) (n=178)
  - Not at all helpful: 4%
  - Slightly helpful: 12%
  - Moderately helpful: 30%
  - Very helpful: 24%
  - Extremely helpful: 30%
Respondents believe that AI technology will be most impactful in answering student questions with chatbots and with analyzing data related to student retention. Further, more than a quarter of respondents think AI will be impactful in analyzing data related to student recruitment (28 percent).

However, fewer believe that AI technology will help with assisting faculty with teaching (16 percent).

In which of the following areas do you believe that AI technology will be most impactful at your institution? Please select up to five options. (n=200)

- Answering student questions with chatbots: 38%
- Analyzing data related to student retention: 36%
- Analyzing data related to student recruitment: 28%
- Streamlining administrative tasks: 28%
- Flagging at-risk students at the institutional level: 28%
- Detecting plagiarism: 26%
- Adaptive tutoring support: 25%
- Flagging at-risk students in their classes: 24%
- Access to virtual assistants that can answer questions within certain offices or departments: 23%
- Access to virtual assistants that can answer questions at the institutional level: 23%
- Sifting through large research datasets: 20%
- Access to virtual teaching assistant that can answer questions at the course level: 17%
- Assisting faculty with teaching: 16%
- General administration support: 15%
- Creating adaptive course materials: 15%
Respondents believe that the Office of Teaching and Learning or the Office of Information Technology should lead their institution’s AI planning and implementation initiatives. Few believe that the President’s Office should lead the AI planning and implementation initiatives (11 percent).

Chief information officers (60 percent) are more likely than chief financial officers (45 percent) and those in academic leadership (24 percent) to indicate that the Office of Information Technology should lead their institution’s AI planning and implementation initiatives.

Which department or unit at your institution do you believe should lead your institution’s AI planning and implementation initiatives? (n=200)

- Office of Teaching and Learning: 37%
- Office of Information Technology: 37%
- President’s Office: 11%
- Office of Budget and Finance: 2%
- Other: 15%
Impact of Recent AI Advancements

Generally, recent AI advancements have caused institutions to re-assess their instructional plans and goals more than their administrative plans and goals. Nearly two-thirds of respondents agree that AI advancements have caused their institution to re-assess its long-term instructional plans and goals (64 percent). However, fewer than half agree that AI advancements have caused their institution to re-assess its long-term administrative plans and goals (46 percent).

Additionally, institutions are more focused on long-term goals (3 years or more in the future) (64 percent, 46 percent) than they are short-term goals (in the next 12 months) (52 percent, 25 percent).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
Recent AI advancements have caused my institution to re-assess its...

...long-term instructional plans and goals (3 years or more in the future). (n=181)
- Agree: 32%
- Disagree: 9%

...medium term instructional plans and goals (in the next 1-2 years). (n=181)
- Agree: 32%
- Disagree: 9%

...short term instructional plans and goals (in the next 12 months). (n=181)
- Agree: 27%
- Disagree: 14%

...long-term administrative plans and goals (3 years or more in the future). (n=183)
- Agree: 29%
- Disagree: 18%

...medium term administrative plans and goals (in the next 1-2 years). (n=185)
- Agree: 28%
- Disagree: 23%

...short term administrative plans and goals (in the next 12 months). (n=185)
- Agree: 19%
- Disagree: 25%
AI Effect on Higher Education Instruction

Most respondents believe that AI software will be a core skill institutions will need to teach, yet fewer believe that faculty will be able to successfully teach students how to use AI. Further, almost all respondents agree that working with AI software will become a core skill needed in the workforce (90 percent). However, fewer than half agree that faculty at their institution will be receptive to adjusting their curricula to include teaching students how to use AI (43 percent). Additionally, just 36 percent agree that their institution will have adequate resources to support faculty as they learn how to use new AI technology.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding how AI may affect higher education instruction?

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

1. Working with AI software will become a core skill needed in the workforce. (n=185)
   - Somewhat agree: 34%
   - Strongly agree: 56%

2. Working with AI software will become a core skill institutions will need to teach. (n=184)
   - Neither agree nor disagree: 38%
   - Strongly agree: 51%

3. In the next five years, the implementation of AI software will dramatically change higher education instructional practices. (n=183)
   - Neither agree nor disagree: 38%
   - Strongly agree: 45%

4. In the next five years, the implementation of AI software will dramatically change the type of material taught in the classroom. (n=185)
   - Neither agree nor disagree: 41%
   - Strongly agree: 32%

5. Faculty at my institution will be receptive to adjusting their curricula to include teaching students how to use AI. (n=184)
   - Neither agree nor disagree: 36%
   - Strongly agree: 7%

6. My institution will have adequate resources to support faculty as they learn how to use new AI technology. (n=186)
   - Neither agree nor disagree: 19%
   - Strongly agree: 7%
Funding of AI Technology

Very few respondents agree that their institution has a good sense of how much it will cost to implement and deploy new AI technology in administrative (10 percent) and instructional (9 percent) areas. However, more than three-quarters of respondents believe that investing in AI in administrative (77 percent) and instructional (76 percent) areas will ultimately lead to a positive return on investment at their institution.

More respondents from public institutions (83 percent, 81 percent) than those from private nonprofit institutions (69 percent, 68 percent) believe that investing in AI in administrative and instructional areas will ultimately lead to a positive return on investment at their institution.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding the funding of AI technology at your institution?

- I believe that investing in AI in administrative areas will ultimately lead to a positive return on investment at my institution. (n=182)
- I believe that investing in AI in instructional areas will ultimately lead to a positive return on investment at my institution. (n=180)
- In general, I am concerned about my institution being able to afford the costs of implementing and deploying new AI technology. (n=184)
- My institution has a good sense of how much it will cost to implement and deploy new AI technology in administrative areas. (n=183)
- My institution has a good sense of how much it will cost to implement and deploy new AI technology in instructional areas. (n=181)
Money Anticipated to be Spent on AI in Next Two Years

Most respondents anticipate their institution will spend less than 250,000 dollars on AI in the next two years. About 9 percent of respondents anticipate their institution will spend between 250,000 and 499,999 or between 1 and 2 million dollars.

Respondents from private nonprofit institutions (80 percent) are more likely than those from public institutions (64 percent) to anticipate their institution spending less than 250,000 dollars on AI in the next two years.

How much money do you anticipate your institution spending on AI in the next two years? (n=187)

- Less than 250,000 dollars: 70%
- Between 250,000 and 499,999 dollars: 9%
- Between 500,000 and 749,999 dollars: 4%
- Between 750,000 and 999,999 dollars: 3%
- Between 1 and 2 million dollars: 9%
- Between 2 and 3 million dollars: 2%
- More than 3 million dollars: 4%
Concerns About AI

Respondents’ main concern about utilizing AI at their institution is students using it to cheat or plagiarize (65 percent). Additionally, more than one third of respondents are very or extremely concerned about AI-ingrained biases that could negatively affect marginalized groups at their institution (40 percent) and prospective students using AI to write their application essays (38 percent).

How concerned is your institution about the following?

- **Students using AI software to cheat or plagiarize. (n=182)**
  - Not at all concerned: 2%
  - Slightly concerned: 10%
  - Moderately concerned: 24%
  - Very concerned: 35%
  - Extremely concerned: 28%

- **AI-ingrained biases that could negatively affect marginalized groups at my institution. (n=170)**
  - Not at all concerned: 10%
  - Slightly concerned: 20%
  - Moderately concerned: 30%
  - Very concerned: 26%
  - Extremely concerned: 14%

- **Prospective students using AI to write their application essays. (n=158)**
  - Not at all concerned: 16%
  - Slightly concerned: 23%
  - Moderately concerned: 22%
  - Very concerned: 18%
  - Extremely concerned: 20%

- **Faculty and staff using AI-generative tools to inflate their experiences or accomplishments when applying for positions. (n=172)**
  - Not at all concerned: 26%
  - Slightly concerned: 33%
  - Moderately concerned: 28%
  - Very concerned: 8%
  - Extremely concerned: 5%

- **Faculty using AI to write grant applications. (n=166)**
  - Not at all concerned: 37%
  - Slightly concerned: 35%
  - Moderately concerned: 20%
  - Very concerned: 6%
  - Extremely concerned: 1%

- **Faculty using AI tools to evaluate student work. (n=172)**
  - Not at all concerned: 27%
  - Slightly concerned: 40%
  - Moderately concerned: 28%
  - Very concerned: 4%
  - Extremely concerned: 1%
Guidelines to Combat AI-Ingrained Biases

More than half of respondents believe that implementing internal guidelines or procedures to combat AI-ingrained biases will be at least very important for their institution (58 percent).

No significant differences were found between respondents at the sector or role level.

How important do you believe it will be for your institution to implement internal guidelines or procedures to combat AI-ingrained biases? (n=185)

- Not at all important: 2%
- Slightly important: 11%
- Somewhat important: 28%
- Very important: 37%
- Extremely important: 21%

Knowledge in Rapidly Changing Developments in AI

Few respondents feel very or extremely knowledgeable about the rapidly changing developments in AI (11 percent). However, nearly half indicate that they feel moderately knowledgeable (46 percent). Additionally, almost half of respondents report that their immediate colleagues (48 percent) and campus leaders (49 percent) are just slightly knowledgeable about the rapidly changing developments in AI.

More respondents who are currently utilizing AI at their institution (19 percent) than those who are not currently utilizing AI at their institution (3 percent) feel at least very knowledgeable about the rapidly changing developments in AI.

In general, how knowledgeable do you feel about the rapidly changing developments in AI? (n=184)

- Not at all knowledgeable: 3%
- Slightly knowledgeable: 40%
- Moderately knowledgeable: 46%
- Very knowledgeable: 10%
- Extremely knowledgeable: 1%

In general, how knowledgeable do you feel each of the following groups are about the rapidly changing developments in AI?

My immediate colleagues (n=181)

- Not at all knowledgeable: 6%
- Slightly knowledgeable: 48%
- Moderately knowledgeable: 39%
- Very knowledgeable: 6%
- Extremely knowledgeable: 1%

Campus leaders (n=180)

- Not at all knowledgeable: 11%
- Slightly knowledgeable: 49%
- Moderately knowledgeable: 35%
- Very knowledgeable: 4%
- Extremely knowledgeable: 1%
Respondents mainly learn about AI advancements through news outlets (e.g., newspapers, radio, TV news) and professional organizations they are apart of. Additionally, about half of respondents learn about AI advancements through faculty/staff at their institution (54 percent) and e-mail newsletters (49 percent).

**From which of the following sources do you learn about AI advancements? Please select all that apply. (n=177)**

- News outlets (e.g., newspapers, radio, TV news) 77%
- Professional organizations I am apart of 68%
- Faculty/staff at my institution 54%
- E-mail newsletters 49%
- Faculty/staff at other institutions 38%
- My institution's current technology vendors 32%
- Social media 32%
- Other 15%
Frequency of Hearing about AI Advancements

Few report that they often hear about AI advances from their institution’s technology providers for administrative or operational applications (e.g., ERP applications) or instructional applications (e.g., LMS platforms). In fact, fewer than one third indicate that they hear about AI advancement relevant to their institution through their institution’s technology providers for instructional applications (e.g., LMS platforms) often or very often (27 percent).

How frequently do you hear about AI advancements relevant to your institution through the following sources? (n=55)

- My institution’s technology providers for administrative or operational applications (e.g., ERP applications)
  - Never: 5%
  - Rarely: 25%
  - Sometimes: 33%
  - Often: 27%
  - Very Often: 9%

- My institution’s technology providers for instructional applications (e.g., LMS platforms)
  - Never: 5%
  - Rarely: 22%
  - Sometimes: 45%
  - Often: 22%
  - Very Often: 5%

Note: Respondents who learn about AI advancements through their institution’s current technology vendors saw this question.

Concern about Ability to Keep Up with AI Technology

More than a third of respondents are very or extremely concerned about their institution’s ability to keep up with rapidly developing AI technology (41 percent). Further, 38 percent are moderately concerned.

Those who are not currently utilizing AI at their institution (49 percent) are more concerned about their institution’s ability to keep up than those who are utilizing AI at their institution (33 percent).
More than two-thirds of senior officers report that their institution relies on an equal combination of recommendations from IT vendors as well as their own internal research to stay informed about advances in technology in the higher education space, specifically around administrative applications and providers.

Senior officers from public institutions (79 percent) are more likely than those from private nonprofit institutions (50 percent) to rely on an equal combination of recommendations from their IT vendors and their own internal research to understand what new technology they should be implementing.

Which of the following best describes how your institution stays informed about advances in technology in the higher education space, specifically around administrative applications and providers? (n=47)

- Mostly relies on our current IT vendors to recommend what new technology and software we should be implementing, rather than relying on our own internal research.
- Relies on an equal combination of recommendations from our IT vendors as well as our own internal research to understand what new technology and software we should be implementing.
- Mostly relies on our own internal research to understand what new technology and software we should be implementing, rather than on recommendations from our current IT vendors.

Note: Chief technology officers, chief information officers, chief digital officers, and other senior or informational officers saw this question.
Most senior officers report that their institution relies on an equal combination of recommendations from IT vendors as well as their own internal research to stay informed about advances in technology in the higher education space, specifically around instructional applications and providers. Nearly a quarter indicate that they mostly rely on their own internal research, rather than recommendations from their current IT vendors (23 percent).

**Which of the following best describes how your institution stays informed about advances in technology in the higher education space, specifically around instructional applications and providers?**

- **My institution...** (n=47)
  - ...mostly relies on our current IT vendors to recommend what new technology and software we should be implementing, rather than relying on our own internal research. 4%
  - ...relies on an equal combination of recommendations from our IT vendors as well as our own internal research to understand what new technology and software we should be implementing. 72%
  - ...mostly relies on our own internal research to understand what new technology and software we should be implementing, rather than on recommendations from our current IT vendors. 23%

*Note: Chief technology officers, chief information officers, chief digital officers, and other senior or informational officers saw this question.*
Relationship with Technology Vendors

Fewer than a quarter of senior officers report that their institution has room in the budget for new AI software (20 percent). Further, fewer than one third agree that their institution is prepared to efficiently make decisions to implement new AI software when it comes out (29 percent).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your institution’s relationships with technology vendors? My institution...

- ...has a strong infrastructure to effectively roll out new AI software to faculty and staff. (n=45)
- ...has a strong infrastructure to effectively roll out new AI software to students. (n=45)
- ...is currently receiving proposals from our key technology providers regarding the deployment of AI technology in their products and services. (n=45)
- ...is prepared to efficiently make decisions to implement new AI software when it comes out. (n=45)
- ...is reassessing our relationships with our technology vendors because of recent AI developments. (n=43)
- ...has room in the budget for new AI software. (n=45)

Note: Chief technology officers, chief information officers, chief digital officers, and other senior or informational officers saw this question.
Utilizing Data Analytics

More than half of respondents indicate that utilizing data analytics has been very or extremely important to their institution (59 percent), yet few report that their institution highly effectively uses data to inform decisions. In fact, just 24 percent report that their institution is very or extremely effective at using data to aid and inform campus decision-making.

In the past five years, how important has utilizing data analytics been to your institution? (n=178)

- Not at all important: 5%
- Slightly important: 10%
- Somewhat important: 26%
- Very important: 34%
- Extremely important: 25%

In general, how effectively does your institution use data to aid and inform campus decision-making? (n=178)

- Not at all effective: 2%
- Slightly effective: 21%
- Somewhat effective: 54%
- Very effective: 19%
- Extremely effective: 4%
Effectiveness at Utilizing Data Analytics

Respondents generally think their institution is at least moderately effective at using data analytics in most surveyed areas, with the exception of assessing faculty performance and productivity (33 percent). Approximately one third of respondents think their institution is very or extremely effective at projecting future enrollment numbers (35 percent) and identifying potential applicants (30 percent).

No significant differences were found at the sector or AI utilization level.

How effective is your institution currently at using data analytics to do the following?

- To project future enrollment numbers (n=165)
  - Not at all effective: 7%
  - Slightly effective: 21%
  - Somewhat effective: 36%
  - Very effective: 26%
  - Extremely effective: 9%

- To identify potential applicants (n=151)
  - Not at all effective: 12%
  - Slightly effective: 21%
  - Somewhat effective: 38%
  - Very effective: 23%
  - Extremely effective: 7%

- To analyze high school and admission data (n=145)
  - Not at all effective: 7%
  - Slightly effective: 20%
  - Somewhat effective: 45%
  - Very effective: 20%
  - Extremely effective: 8%

- To analyze institutional financial data (n=160)
  - Not at all effective: 17%
  - Slightly effective: 18%
  - Somewhat effective: 39%
  - Very effective: 21%
  - Extremely effective: 6%

- To support current at-risk students (e.g., flagging at risk students, developing support plans for students) (n=167)
  - Not at all effective: 8%
  - Slightly effective: 25%
  - Somewhat effective: 41%
  - Very effective: 20%
  - Extremely effective: 5%

- To understand how to retain enrolled students (n=163)
  - Not at all effective: 7%
  - Slightly effective: 24%
  - Somewhat effective: 47%
  - Very effective: 17%
  - Extremely effective: 6%

- To refine marketing strategies for a variety of stakeholder groups (n=156)
  - Not at all effective: 13%
  - Slightly effective: 26%
  - Somewhat effective: 41%
  - Very effective: 16%
  - Extremely effective: 3%

- To assist in development efforts (n=150)
  - Not at all effective: 18%
  - Slightly effective: 31%
  - Somewhat effective: 33%
  - Very effective: 16%
  - Extremely effective: 3%

- To assess faculty performance and productivity (n=159)
  - Not at all effective: 29%
  - Slightly effective: 38%
  - Somewhat effective: 24%
  - Very effective: 8%
  - Extremely effective: 1%
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