2019 CMED BENCHMARK SURVEY - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Survey Working Group: Tania Xerri, York University, Canada; Ross Morriss, University of South Australia; Jenifer Renshaw, Kennesaw State University; Raveen Sanghera, Simon Fraser University, Canada

N = 84 Responses. Survey is in its 9th year – collected annually since 2010.

Purpose of the Survey:

- Provides trends across a wide range of University Executive and Continuing Education locations, that is not available elsewhere
- Use the data to shape appropriate strategy for your operation
- Use results for building a case for resource needs
- Valuable in communicating with Deans and Executives about the industry, and cross-walking the data to your unit
- Data captures a cross section of the industry from the smallest units to the largest

Survey Results:

Demographics

- Survey responses decreased from 113 last year to 84 this year; the sample is about half the size of 2017
- Location of centers responding are predominately US & Canada (91%) with no representation from Caribbean and Central & South America this year
- Half of the centers are traditional Exec Ed with 44 % Continuing and Extended Ed and the remaining falling in professional and graduate education colleges
- Respondents continue to be middle/upper managers

Marketing & Social Media

- Increase to having a dedicated marketing person or getting support from other parts of school
- Budget is still determined mostly by a flat dollar amount, but this percentage decreased this year while the percentage of using projected revenue as a determining factor increased by 11%.
- Diverse Marketing Mix – website, SEO, SEM, email marketing
- Social Media – , LinkedIn and Instagram saw the largest increase, while Twitter and YouTube saw the largest decrease. There was an increase in those who covered the basics but with no plan, but also an 8% increase in those finding it critical and having a plan.

Sales & CRM

- The varied ways to engage a sales team (or not), changed between 2018 to 2019. More units/centres have dedicated staff to perform sales activities, increasing from 34% to 45.8. In the previous 4 surveys, these proportions had not changed very much year over year.
- The salary only proportion has dropped from 60% in 2018 to 51% in 2019
- At least a quarter of respondents continue to report annually that they have no sales staff
- Centre's report selling mostly custom and open enrolment programs.
- Most report having CRM systems
- Centres continue to report using no CRM and having no sales staff which asks the question what other centre models are in use in the industry?

Revenue & Financial Model

- Survey responses are again down this year compared to past years, with the greatest drops in the 0-500k and 3-6 million segments.
- Per past years, the majority completing the survey have revenue between 1-3 million, but there is still a broad spread from start-up through to the larger 10+ million operations. This year there was a significant reduction of survey respondents in the 0-500k segment and the 3 million to 6 million range, and an increase in the 6+ million segments.
- Most revenue continues to be generated by non-credit, face to face delivery, but blended programs are on the rise as is custom work and other undefined sources of revenue. There has also been an increase in the national and international audience as a percentage of revenue, but the latter is still to return to the high of 2016.
- FTE's per revenue segment follows past trends, with larger centers generating more revenue per person, highlighting efficiencies of scale.
- Net profit for the majority is between 0-39%, with the largest segment in the 0-9%, per the past 3 years. This year we had a higher proportion (30%) of survey participants who did not know their net margin.
- Consistent with past years, 71% of survey respondents must make enough money to pay for all direct and indirect expenses and pay a tax to the university. The majority (20%) pay via an agreed % of revenue which is a change from past years where all net profit sent to faculty/university.

Business Performance/Programming

- Growth is the strong with 76% of centers reporting growth and of that, 28% reporting significant growth
- Growth is reflected in both custom and open enrolment offerings.
- Overall, total number of centers reporting fully online and hybrid programs decreased slightly from last year
- Drop off in the launch of new open enrolment programs with 22% of centers reporting 0 new programs, up from 16% last year. Only 3% of centers launched 6 or more open enrolment programs, down from 17% last year.
- Innovation, data analytics and personal development programs have moved into the top 7 in types of programs offered
- New questions added for 2019 around the duration of open enrolment and contract training

Instructors

- Percentage of centers using between 0-19 or 20-49 instructors increased.
- Hourly rate of pay for faculty increased.
- Majority of centers pay instructors for course development in $500 – $1499/day range.
- Instructor ownership of IP increased while center ownership decreased.

In Summary, we continue to find this survey a valuable source of information and trends, for the reasons outlined above. Considering this is a global study, performance and trends in the industry seem quite consistent regardless of where you are in the world, with few outliers. Perhaps that is due to consistency in governance and leadership in higher education. This suggests that we can continue to learn and benefit from networking with each other. Your feedback on future surveys is most welcome and you can contact us through the conference organizers. Thank you! The Benchmarking Survey Working Group