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About the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

The Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy is dedicated to improving philanthropy by educating and empowering students, professionals and volunteers to be innovators and leaders who create positive and lasting change in the world. The first of its kind in the world, the School offers a comprehensive approach to philanthropy – voluntary action for the public good – through its academic, research and international programs and through The Fund Raising School, Women’s Philanthropy Institute, Mays Family Institute on Diverse Philanthropy and Lake Institute on Faith & Giving. Learn more at [www.philanthropy.iupui.edu](http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu).
FOREWORD

I hope this summary conveys some of the promise of a new beginning that animated our gathering. Philanthropy has long engaged the frontiers of education and discovery, and the community we have begun to form with the workshop draws on many scholarly and pragmatic accomplishments. We welcome and encourage all who find this topic of interest to engage with us. As you will see, we seek innovations to realize all the possibilities for philanthropy and higher education to advance the public good.

Amir Pasic
Eugene R. Tempel Dean
Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy

INTRODUCTION

This is a rapporteur’s summary of the proceedings conducted under the Chatham House Rule, where the information exchanged is freely shared, but the identity of the speaker(s) is not revealed. Similarly, none of the participants have endorsed this as an authoritative summary but agree that it is a useful opportunity to share the main themes with those who are interested.

The workshop’s purpose: to help inform philanthropy and higher education as they seek to serve the public good. Can we produce knowledge that will enhance what we do at the intersection of philanthropy and higher education, and reduce whatever harm we may be producing? Do we have the core of a community that could be usefully extended and nurtured to create a useful body of research connected to innovative and impactful practice? What do good practices look like when they elevate the good that is being done? In pursuing these questions, we gathered practitioners, funders, and scholars to pursue ways of thinking and doing that can better respond to current and emerging challenges.

Day One
1 Opening Dialogue with Jamie Merisotis
2 Philanthropy’s Contributions to Higher Education
3 The Major Factors Impacting Higher Education and Philanthropy
4 The Societal Role of Philanthropy in Higher Education

Day Two
5 Implications – Synthesis, Discussion, and Proposed Next Steps
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• Patricia Snell Herzog, Melvin Simon Chair and Associate Professor of Philanthropic Studies, Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
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• Leslie Lenkowsky, Professor Emeritus, Paul H. O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University Bloomington
• Arthur Levine, Distinguished Scholar of Higher Education, New York University Steinhardt Institute for Higher Education Policy
• Jamie Merisotis, President and CEO, Lumina Foundation
• Jacqueline Pfeffer Merrill, Director, Campus Free Expression Project, Bipartisan Policy Center
• William F. L. Moses, Managing Director, Education, Kresge Foundation
• Donna Nicol, Professor and Department Chair, Africana Studies, California State University Dominguez Hills
• Amir Pasic, Eugene R. Tempel Dean, Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
• William Plater, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties Emeritus, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
• Michal Poliakoff, President and Chief Executive Officer, American Council of Trustees and Alumni
• Carol Schuler, Editor-in-Chief of Trusteeship Magazine, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges
• Genevieve Shaker, Donald A. Campbell Chair in Fundraising Leadership and Associate Professor of Philanthropic Studies, Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
• Andrea Walton, Associate Professor, Indiana University School of Education
• Ruth Watkins, President, Postsecondary Education, Strada Education Foundation
• Meredith Woo, President, Sweet Briar College
Jamie Merisotis, President and CEO of Lumina Foundation, opened the workshop by discussing Lumina’s role in focusing higher education on the topics of access and equity. Lumina brings thought leadership to the challenges of higher education to help promote greater access, affordability, accountability, and racial equity—issues that have been driving philanthropy in recent years. Society needs both sectors, higher education and philanthropy, to evolve to meet its needs.

Lumina has set a time-limited, quantitative goal: for 60% of Americans to have a high-quality degree, certificate, or credential by 2025. When Lumina began pursuing this goal in 2008, the U.S. had 38% attainment. Today, 54% of Americans have a post-secondary credential.

Lumina seeks to shift thinking towards the idea that attainment is good for both individuals and society. Philanthropy by its very nature is designed to create social change; it’s not just about helping, but also changing the conditions under which help is needed. And higher education is an engine of social and economic progress for the country. If we do not take a deliberate, proactive, organized approach to how we invest in philanthropy in higher education, we’re simply doing some good for some people. Though not every foundation will set such timely and quantitative goals, Merisotis emphasized that it is important for organized philanthropy to be deliberate about outcomes—irrespective of vantage point—in pursuit of tangible change. From Lumina’s perspective, philanthropy should be taking the risks that others cannot in service of greater social good.

On the current regulatory environment for higher education and philanthropy, Merisotis maintained that both sectors are at risk from the growing idea that you don’t need higher education to be successful. We must therefore better define what people mean when they say “higher education”—while the public typically thinks of bachelor’s degrees, we should expand that thinking to include things like certificates, high-quality industry certifications, and associates degrees. The affordability of higher education is another public policy topic to be addressed, in light of an increasing narrative that everyone in America is facing the exorbitant prices that only about 40-50 institutions actually charge. In order for philanthropy to enlighten or move policy into a better, more imaginative future, Merisotis suggested that foundations return to fostering new big ideas that will influence higher education for the better, like the Carnegie Commission did with the Pell Grant.

Philanthropy is a largely unregulated industry, resulting in complicated, conflated conversation. To combat this, the industry must embrace transparency and commit to greater introspection.
As society’s risk capital, it is critical that philanthropic institutions both take risks and announce failures, and then address what can be learned and applied from those failures. When it comes to the emergence of impact investing and its role in higher education, Lumina invested in its first-mission related investment fund manager in 2011 and helped anchor the creation of New Market Ventures. The mission-related investment managers that Lumina has in its portfolio have post-secondary learning as a primary part of their focus and share Lumina’s view that education is about creating greater equity in some form. Merisotis further argued that philanthropy must more effectively invest in public actors the way Lumina invests in the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, which doesn’t have political power but can connect actors and develop novel strategies for the sector.

Merisotis challenged the notion that there is a tradeoff between the number of degrees attained nationally and their quality, arguing that you cannot have equity without quality. You cannot have equity if the available opportunities are not offering high-quality learning; nor can you have quality without equity, because providing quality for only a very narrow band of people is a false promise. Merisotis acknowledged that the definition of “quality” is getting more complicated because of the proliferation of new kinds of credentials, and Lumina has been working to help the traditional system of accrediting reform itself to keep pace with this development.

In conclusion, Merisotis recommended that the workshop keep non-baccalaureate opportunities in mind (as historically the conversation tends to skew toward the four-year sector) and that conversations remain rooted in consideration of equity. Higher education must more effectively serve more people in order to effect large-scale societal change, and the only way to do that is to broaden our view and ask, “who are we serving now, and how do we serve the people who are behind?”

PHILANTHROPY’S CONTRIBUTIONS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Facilitator: Richard Ekman

Guiding Questions: In what unique ways does current philanthropy, on balance, positively or adversely affect higher education’s duty to advance the common good? What is the proper relation between philanthropy and higher education?
The session began, after posing a handful of big questions, with a review of the choices that funders make in selecting the recipients of their philanthropy. Is it more effective to support individuals or institutions? Weak institutions with noble aspirations or already strong institutions? Institutions that promise to follow a blueprint provided by the funder or those that are open to unspecified new ideas or experimentation and have not yet settled upon an approach? Some of the pros and cons of each type of grant recipient were noted.

The session then discussed the varying theories of change that underlie the guidelines of grant applications. Should the funder focus on research, on pilot projects, on planning, on implementation, on facilities, on people? Again, the pros and cons of concentrating support on a range of activities in the change process were discussed.

Finally, the session reviewed a number of well-known foundations and highlighted the choices these funders had made when pursuing their goals about the best kinds of grant recipients and the best activities to fund in order to achieve the greatest impact. Examples included the Teagle Foundation’s “Cornerstone” program, fellowships for teachers supported by the Danforth Foundation and by the Woodrow Wilson International Fellowship Foundation, The Andrew W Mellon Foundation’s support of graduate education in the humanities, general institutional support of HBCUs provided by the MacKenzie Scott Foundation, interinstitutional arrangements for transfer from two-year to four-year institutions supported by the ECMC Foundation and the Teagle Foundation, prizes supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and others.

While it was noted that no single formula has proven to be universally more effective, it was also noted that there has been a recent shift at many foundations to support of social justice initiatives and a shift to greater prescription in what foundations are interested to fund.

THE MAJOR FACTORS IMPACTING HIGHER EDUCATION AND PHILANTHROPY

Facilitator: Genevieve Shaker

Guiding Questions: What are the major “factors” (principles, ideals, ideologies, economic/market forces, laws, regulations, existential changes, etc.) that have had the greatest impact on shaping philanthropy to and by higher education in the past twenty years? What changes in the most impactful factors should be made for the future, and for what purpose(s)? Which current institutional forms should philanthropy support?
In the United States, education follows religion as the most common destination of donations, with higher education accounting for a majority of that. A review of more than 500 studies about factors influencing donor behavior distilled the factors into eight mechanisms driving philanthropy: altruism, values, reputation, awareness of need, psychological benefits, solicitation, efficacy, and cost and benefits.

But what else might motivate giving to higher education in particular? Donors, alumni, and non-alumni alike likely feel a personal connection with some aspect of the institution’s identity that motivates them to give. Alumni often identify deeply with their alma maters, and the sense of belonging, trust, and satisfaction they felt during their experience as a student influences their desire to give in the future. Some research shows that LGBTQ alumni and alumni of color may have donation motivations related to their own negative sense of belonging and satisfaction at an institution; they do not want future generations to have the same experiences, and as a result will help institutions that commit to change.

GIVING TO HIGHER EDUCATION: BY THE NUMBERS

Voluntary Support of Education, 2021

Voluntary Support by Source 1991-2021
Another piece of research—the 2021 Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) study—described patterns of giving to higher education based on a longitudinal analysis of 400 institutions. **In the latest cycle, $52.9 billion was given to higher education.** Of note is the distribution of donated dollars across institutions: $30 billion went to the 100 biggest institutions, nearly equally divided between public and private institutions. (Unfortunately, there is not currently enough research about community colleges, HBCUs, or HSIs regarding how money is being raised and being used to present national data on those types of campuses.)

Using VSE data from 1988-2018 representing 450 of the 800 some institutions that complete the VSE today, this study shows a significant decline in the portion of giving designated as unrestricted at the institutional level. Why the decline in unrestricted support?

In exploring this question, one participant remarked that institutions realized that they could motivate both more and larger gifts if they could define impact, which could be part of why more gifts are restricted. Another participant said, fundraisers certainly add to the ranks of administrative staff relative to academics, and administrative compensation in general accounts for some of the inflation in higher education. Could the shift toward restricted giving be in response to this trend?

**FINANCIAL AID**

The VSE captures information about giving for financial aid in both the “current operations” and “endowment” categories of giving. 2021 VSE shows that 10.3% of current restricted dollars went for student financial aid, spanning from 3% at public specialized institutions to 50% at associates and in between for others (low around 10% at research and multicampus publics). This means that about $2.7B went for student financial aid in expendable, current dollars. The 2021 VSE shows that the largest percentage of the restricted endowment goes to student financial aid (35.3% with a range up to around 60% of the funding at all but the research universities). Looking at the 2021 figures, $5.1 Billion restricted endowment went for student financial aid. All together about $7.8 B for student financial aid or 14.7% of the total dollars given. The NACUBO – TIAA Study of Endowments also shows that endowments fund 11% of institutional budgets on average and that 47% of endowment spending is directed toward student financial aid.

Of course, campuses could be spending unrestricted dollars (at the institution or unit level) for student financial aid while also crafting programs in other ways that aid with student retention and completion. St. John’s College was raised as an example. The college launched an ambitious endowment campaign, doubling down on student financial aid while also focusing on degree completion. They set a clear strategic goal and have been very successful, as many alumni who had never given a major gift before contributed to the campaign. Some thought, however, that an initiative like this might be easier at a smaller college and not necessarily replicable on a larger scale.

The session ended with a discussion of the status of research on higher education philanthropy, during which the presenter thanked the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE),
TIAA-NACUBO, and others for their work in providing data and reports on philanthropy to higher education. However, a larger body of research is still needed as much of the data regarding alumni giving and giving designations relies on self-reporting or only focuses on one institution. It was agreed that philanthropy is often left out of considerations of higher education on both an institutional level and in discussions on the broader landscape. One possible solution is to make research more relatable and accessible to higher education practitioners, donors, and the greater public. Finally, several gaps still exist—although good progress has been made in recent years—in research around HBCUs, HSIs, community colleges, and other non-traditional higher education institutions. Additionally, more scholarship is needed to better understand foundation and corporate giving to higher education, the giving motivations of minoritized communities, and the effects of identity-based philanthropy on higher education.

THE SOCIETAL ROLE OF PHILANTHROPY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Facilitator: Erin Hoffmann Harding

Guiding Questions: What does society (in its private and public, individual and collective forms) need to know about the role of philanthropy in higher education as it evolves in the future to enable individual institutions to achieve their respective missions, to enable governments to regulate philanthropy to and by higher education, and to enable donors to achieve their respective intents?

9 Societal Trends Impacting Post-Secondary Education

1. The Demographic Cliff
   The year 2026 will bring a peak in high school graduates then an aggressive decline, marked also by a decline in international student demand.

2. The Diversity and Inclusion Imperative
   Universities struggle to close a double digit achievement gap while the next 10 years will bring increasingly diverse students.

3. Increasing Mental Health Needs
   Mental and emotional health issues such as anxiety and depression have been on the rise and increased even more sharply in the Covid-19 period.
A Debate About Affordability and Value
Cost-to-attend is slightly higher, but debt levels have risen more. While return on investment for a degree is still high, ROI is inequitable, and value is increasingly questioned.

The Future of Work is Now
Automation is expected to impact ~30% of tasks in ~%60 of roles. While STEM enrollment is increasing, more technical skills are needed now.

Higher Education Went Remote with Long-Term Implications
COVID-19 forced rapid remote learning adoption within weeks. Acceptance of online and hybrid learning appears to be accelerating.

Non-degree Offerings are Growing Rapidly
As employers look more for skills than degrees, non-degree offerings are proliferating.

Interdisciplinary Research is the Norm in an Increasing Battle for Funding
Federal govt. R&D investments lessen on a relative basis, while research landscape is reorganizing to focus on interdisciplinary and new capabilities.

Financial Instability Brings Consolidation and Stressors
Financial pressures are increasing amidst state funding declines (pre-COVID-19) and industry consolidation and closures, largely of for-profit institutions.
Society is ever-evolving, and trends affect both philanthropy and higher education in myriad and sometimes unexpected ways. A few of the trends discussed in the session are explored below.

MENTAL HEALTH
Mental health issues have been on the rise in recent years, and students both need and expect their institutions to provide relevant resources. Current college students are reporting that they’re more likely than ever before to leave school because of stress. As a result, universities have moved to increase offerings: some have launched online counseling and therapy options and engaged with outsourced entities to triage mental health crises, all in an effort to direct students to the proper provider or resource for their situation.

AFFORDABILITY AND STUDENT DEBT
The net cost of higher education over a decade has increased by about 4%, but the median debt rose by 45% while repayments also fell. While previously 54% of institutions and colleges saw students with relatively low debt on a per capita basis and high repayment lengths, over a decade that number has fallen to an astounding 6%.

Though there’s a reality to the fact that the ROI for higher education has fallen a bit, it’s still extremely favorable for a degree. But higher education is losing the public narrative with a view that it’s becoming unreasonably expensive. Despite the overall trend in terms of the positive ROI, there are inequities in terms of earnings on that return by type of degree, race and ethnicity, and program of study.

AUTOMATION
When it comes to automation, the headline is that 60% of occupations could have 30% of their tasks automated. As a result, graduates are going to need different sets of skills going forward. Though the market is still looking for technical skills, social and emotional skills are also vital to graduate success (though these skills are, admittedly, more difficult to measure).

EXPANSION OF NON-DEGREE OFFERINGS
In this changing landscape, where digital options driven by the pandemic are seeing a great uptick, there could be an opening for exploration of the non-degree market. Employers have demonstrated a clear willingness to consider alternatives to traditional degrees when it comes to hiring. However, it is possible that the growth of non-degree opportunities is coming from those who already have degrees and are seeking to add credentials or experiences to their resumes.

One participant introduced an online Google certification as an example, which has over 300,000 people enrolled in it at any given time. Although only a small percent will complete the certification, this option is a lot less expensive than getting the same certification from a two-year
college. It also comes with Google’s brand association versus that of a lesser-known community college. Though the vast majority in this program do not have bachelor’s degrees, it might not matter—whatever programs these and similar students are taking, they could have taken them through higher education instead. The end result is that tuition revenue decreases.

HOW CAN PHILANTHROPY ADDRESS THESE TRENDS?

In response to the many factors and societal trends impacting higher education, workshop participants had a number of thoughts about how philanthropy can help institutions to adapt.

One recommended addressing the quality of learning and teaching. The struggle to find effective online teaching methods is still ongoing; and with the rise of online instruction, PhD students are not learning how to teach in classrooms as effectively as before. Perhaps philanthropists can play a role in retraining and preparing future faculty where universities are struggling.

Demographic trends may also impact the roles philanthropy can play. The national decline in family size, population, and the number of college-age students reflects the financial pressures of raising children, and has led to institutional closures and a depletion of federal support (especially coupled with pandemic effects). If philanthropy wants to help higher education, it may have to operate in areas that have nothing to do with higher education in the near term, like supporting children and families.

With respect to college closures, there is an opportunity for philanthropists to support students being forced to change institutions as a result. A report from Clearing House found that if students can re-enroll within six months, they’re likely to be successful; but students in this situation—especially students of color—are too often left behind when their schools close.

In some states, institutions cannot create programs designed to help a particular demographic because of anti-affirmative action legislation. Are there opportunities, therefore, for private entities to fill the gaps where schools cannot use affirmative action as a mechanism for creating targeted support programs?

One participant reinforced an earlier point that philanthropy can do a better job of addressing problems that represent existential threats to human existence, such as the gaps between economic classes, looming authoritarianism, climate change, declining trust in institutions, the future of work, loss of community, and the demographic cliff.

At the end of the day, institutional leaders must have the courage to approach philanthropists with well-configured initiatives. The ability of philanthropy to pivot and be responsive is often far greater than most institutions of higher education, but philanthropists need to hear ideas and data in order to get excited and dive in alongside institutional leaders.
The Future of Higher Education and Philanthropy Dinner & Keynote Panel Discussion

At the conclusion of day one, workshop participants were joined by the Indiana Commissioner for Higher Education and higher education leaders from the Indiana University system and surrounding colleges and universities for a dinner discussing the future of higher education and philanthropy. Amir Pasic, Eugene R. Tempel Dean, moderated a keynote panel discussion featuring Arthur Levine, Ruth Watkins, and Meredith Woo which examined the current landscape of higher education and philanthropy, and how the two historical allies should prepare to serve a shared vision of the common good in the future.
Throughout the historical intersection of higher education and philanthropy, capital projects have been a common approach for growing an institution through giving. But donors, philanthropists, and philanthropic organizations have increasingly sought to have an impact that gets to the heart of a school’s mission—to serve students in more diverse and meaningful ways.

Alison Bernstein of the Ford Foundation, in urging higher education to focus on new endeavors, put a spotlight on different kinds of students and of institutions—an inclusivity that is critical for the future of the United States to flourish and to be a more equitable society. A number of foundations joined the “access and success” movement, advocating for measures to promote universal accessibility to higher education as a way to empower successful graduates. Though different foundations have different focuses in terms of their own priorities and missions, there is collaboration in pursuit of this guiding principle.

As discussed on day one of the workshop, there are major existential threats facing society that higher education and philanthropy, together, can work to address. As higher education has become increasingly specialized, ever more so with new kinds of certifications and micro-credentials, the notion of common learning is at risk. To many, higher education seems like a luxury good as prices continue to rise. And this issue does not just impact applicants to traditional four-year colleges; the cost of living and transportation in some urban areas makes it difficult to access community colleges as well.

The operation of higher education is also not often informed by research. For example, institutional researchers often don’t know the data held in advancement offices, and advancement offices may not know that they have an institutional research arm. But there are ways to collect usable data.

Philanthropic organizations might think about how to work with higher education institutions to pull de-identified, aggregate data together to try to understand how school-specific data might be applied more broadly. There is an embarrassment of riches of data in this sector—often held by associations, councils, or accreditation agencies—that could be better shared. CASE, for instance, is helping institutions collect data from their own alumni to inform their thinking about philanthropy and their performance.
Very few schools assess what they are actually delivering to students in terms of value added. The U.S. spends more per pupil in higher education than any other nation in the world, but international testing of core collegiate skills show that the U.S. is a bit below average. So while access and completion are important, we must examine more broadly—using better assessment tools—where the U.S. system of higher education is failing to train students once they enroll.

**DRIVING TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE**

In most institutions, we see fundraising methods that perpetuate, and maybe interfere with, some of the transformation higher education seeks to make on a national and even global scale. Institutions have established fundraising projects and targets; but the dollars that will help move them toward transformative opportunities are often what philanthropists are looking to contribute. Achieving better collaboration between the two sectors on identifying these funding opportunities is a major priority for gatherings like this one. Too much fundraising, one participant argued, supports *inertia instead of problem-solving.* To the extent that institutions of higher education define the problems of their institutions and the world, they can in tandem attract interest from philanthropy.

In its abandonment of traditional capital campaigns, Stanford University for instance received its biggest gift for something new—a sustainability school. This **attention to a problem to solve is powerful motivation for philanthropists to get involved,** and speaks to the universal impact that philanthropists and institutions are striving toward together. By engaging with a more diverse donor base—such as donors of color, minorities, and women, who are more likely to be ignored when it comes to traditional fundraising—instiutions can further broaden their spheres of impact.

In order to continue serving students, the nation, and the world at large, institutions of higher education must evolve to meet changing needs. Philanthropy can be so transformative in this landscape by incentivizing reform and new ways of thinking, and by providing the resources and innovation necessary to fight stasis.
CONCURRENT SESSIONS: ASSESSING THE DEPTH AND DURABILITY OF OUTCOMES

Facilitators: Courtney Brown, Phillip Harper, Patricia Snell Herzog, David King, Donna Nicol, and Carol Schuler

Guiding Questions: What do you imagine could be the most impactful outcomes of this workshop (up to three)? What are the next steps in getting to those outcomes? What are the next topics of conversation should we reconvene? What other information or data do participants need? Who else should be at the table?

In the workshop’s concurrent sessions, participants broke out into table groups to consider the main questions that emerged from the workshop’s first day. Major themes and thoughts from these discussions are aggregated below, and these indicate a way forward for both higher education and philanthropy to continue striving to provide opportunities for students in pursuit of the common good. There are so many questions still to be asked and answered, and this workshop represents only the start of the conversation.

IDENTIFYING IMPACTFUL OUTCOMES

One major goal identified for sessions like this one was for philanthropists and institutions to develop better metrics and data-sharing mechanisms, which could help everyone craft more informed strategies. The workshop revealed a lag between what is happening at foundations and philanthropic organizations versus what academic researchers understand to be happening. So periodic meetings such as these might be helpful to facilitate more frequent exchanges between academic researchers and philanthropists. **Stronger and more consistent partnerships among researchers, foundations, and institutions might in fact help drive the kind of transformational change that they are all pursuing.**

ENGAGING NEW VOICES IN THE CONVERSATION

Government organizations and policymakers, other types of philanthropic organizations (such as corporate philanthropists), institutional leaders (such as presidents and provosts), diverse funders, community
college representatives, school trustees, and members of the media were all suggested as potential future partners. These and other entities can add so many layers and perspectives to the conversation surrounding higher education and philanthropy. But these participants, it was emphasized, should be selected based on the topic being discussed so that tangible progress can be made in specific areas.

LOOKING AHEAD

Addressing one or more of the existential threats discussed throughout the workshop was a major goal identified for future sessions, and the selection of a particular challenge or threat was suggested as a sole focus of a future session. The ideal result of such directed sessions would be more specific action items and a better understanding of the data and research required to really enact change.

A stronger focus on community colleges was also suggested. Donors are uniquely motivated to give to these institutions that often have a latent impact on their local communities. They also fill an important role in forging connections with K-12 institutions in their immediate area—a sphere that philanthropists and foundations are looking to focus more attention on to achieve longer-term impact.

Finally, participants called for a concrete vision and action plan for transformational philanthropy in higher education. In order to make change, we must discover how to turn research into action. Could foundations incentivize pilot programs for scholars, for example, to help translate scholarship into practice? Philanthropists and institutions must bridge the gap between big ideas and the people doing the work in order to make those ideas a reality.

NEXT STEPS

Facilitator: Amir Pasic

The movement toward equity and access indicates that there is great value to people getting credentials and degrees; but we must keep asking what it is that people are acquiring through those degrees. Compare higher education to literacy: 100 years ago, literacy might’ve been discussed as such an important piece of what it means to be successful and fully formed and have all the possibilities in front of you. Is higher education the new literacy? Throughout the workshop, no one talked about the notion that higher education is only for certain people in society.

Lumina’s stated goal—for 60% of Americans to have a high-quality degree, certificate, or credential by 2025—is not a final goal. Everybody should have the opportunity to engage in the transformational notion of higher education on some level, which is part of what higher education and philanthropy can together hopefully achieve. When we next convene, we will consider innovations in higher education philanthropy as they engage individual institutions, the higher education ecosystem, and public policy.