



---

## The Value of Campus in Contemporary Higher Education

Dr Sarah French and Professor Gregor Kennedy  
Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education  
October 2015

The idea of ‘going to university’ is integrally tied to the concept of the university campus as a physical place. The campus is both the location in which learning occurs and a place that gives meaning to the learning experience. It is a setting that provides the opportunity for social and intellectual engagement with a scholarly community as well as a place with the capacity to engender knowledge, self-discovery and personal transformation. Higher education institutions have produced some of the world’s most famous physical settings, many of which have served as the source of inspiration for art, poetry, literature and film. Narratives about university life impart a strong sense of the places in which they are set, creating memorable depictions of student experiences on campus. Paul Temple suggests that the powerful images of university campuses evoked by certain novels stem from an understanding that ‘in universities, the interactions between people and their material world are more than usually significant’ (xxvi). Universities have a unique sense of place that is made meaningful by the actions and interactions that occur within them; they are illustrative of Henri Lefebvre’s notion that space is a complex social construction that is not merely built but *produced*, and made productive through social practices (1991).

Despite the centrality of the campus to university life, with the exception of the area of educational architecture and design, scholarly literature in the field of higher education gives surprisingly little consideration to the role that space and place play in campus-based learning. This paper aims to in some way address this gap by examining the benefits of the campus experience. It begins with a brief overview of the history of the university campus and then outlines the key changes to the educational environment, the nature of student participation and modes of delivery, highlighting the impact of these changes on the role of the physical campus. The next section of the paper examines arguments for the value of the campus and identifies six key benefits of campus-based learning. The concluding remarks highlight some of the implications for the University of Melbourne with the aim to generate further discussion on the future role that campuses will play in the Melbourne experience.

### The history of the campus

The term ‘campus’ was first used in relation to a university in the late eighteenth-century to describe the grounds at the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University). However, the emergence of the campus can be traced back to the universities of medieval Europe where scholarly exchanges occurred in intimate cloistered settings (Chapman, 2006: 7). From their beginnings, universities created a strong relationship

between learning and physical place. Chapman explains that the designs of the early American campuses drew upon European universities and were especially influenced by 'the English notion of how a scholarly community can be shaped by the character of its setting' (2006:7). Similarly, when the first Australian university campuses were established in the 1850s they drew inspiration from European architectural history, from the gothic character of the University of Sydney, influenced by the designs of Oxford and Cambridge, to the 'sombre Scottish ecclesiastical stonework' of the University of Melbourne (Davis, 2012). These designs reflected a desire to create physical environments that would evoke a sense of grandeur and wonder, places with the capacity to stimulate and inspire students and staff in their quest for knowledge.

Over the course of the twentieth century the role of the campus underwent a series of transitions. Universities gradually became less elite and more inclusive as student populations expanded beyond the demographic of the white upper-class male. To accommodate expanding student numbers, they became increasingly larger in scale and frequently spread across multiple campuses. In Australia, the need to offer higher education to a population scattered across rural and remote areas prompted the development of correspondence education in the 1920s. Initially a service funded by the government, distance education soon evolved into an 'educational enterprise led by economic imperatives' (Reiach et al, 2012: 248). As modern technologies developed, access to distance education increased; Australian institutions that had previously relied upon radio transmissions pioneered the use of video and audiocassettes. The settings in which higher education took place expanded further with the emergence of night schools and community colleges. Once it became possible for students to study and obtain a tertiary qualification without physically attending a campus, the historical notion of the campus was displaced and the physical campus became less intrinsic to higher education. At the same time, university campuses continued to increase in size, attract higher student numbers and expand their social functions. During the 1960s and 70s university campuses became places of radicalism, irreverence, politics and protest as well as hubs of artistic and cultural activity. More university campuses were established across Australia to accommodate the growing and varied student population. In the 1990s the advent of online learning extended the possibilities of distance education and students began to take advantage of new modes of off-campus study. By the turn of the century, the role of the university campus had simultaneously expanded and given way to non-campus based forms of learning.

### **The changing campus environment**

In the twenty first century advances in online learning along with changing patterns in student participation have prompted universities to look at the role of the physical campus afresh and to redefine the campus experience in a changing educational environment. In his provocative report on the issues facing Canadian universities today, Stephen J. Toope suggests that universities need to change the way in which education is structured and delivered to meet the needs of a changing educational environment. He argues that students will only continue to attend campus if two conditions are met: first, the university must have a superior reputation or 'brand,' and second, the university must create an on-campus experience that is 'so rich and unique that students feel drawn to participate actively' (2014:5). This can only be achieved, Toope argues, if universities are 'highly differentiated, specific places with distinctive personalities' (2014:6).

The need for universities to offer distinctive campus-based experiences is the focus of numerous recent studies on learning space design and campus planning. In the past decade, there has been extensive interest in the physical spaces of universities within the fields of architecture and design (Coulson et al, 2015; Harrison and Hutton, 2014; Temple, 2014; Fraser 2014; Edwards, 2014; Oblinger, 2006). Studies highlight the

importance of a well-designed campus to effective teaching and learning and also suggest that campus design plays a key role in reflecting the values and identity of an institution. Many argue that a well-designed campus can give institutions a major competitive edge. In *University Trends: Contemporary Campus Design*, Coulson, Roberts and Taylor suggest that ‘the appearance of a campus can play a critical role in tipping the balance in the increasing competition universities face in attracting students and staff’ (2015: 10).

The university campus can also potentially facilitate learning by encouraging interaction and the advancement of new ideas. Recent developments in educational and learning theory postulate that social settings influence learning. Similarly, design scholars argue that the ways in which a space is designed influences the learning that takes place within that space. Brian Edwards notes that ‘universities have the almost unique challenge of relating the built fabric to academic discourse’ (2000: vii). Similarly, Torin Monaghan uses the term ‘built pedagogy’ to refer to the ‘architectural embodiments of educational philosophies’ (2002: 5). She suggests that ‘a well trained eye can read these spaces for the pedagogies they facilitate’ (2002:5). Nancy Van Note Chism too argues that ‘a campus should proclaim that it is a location designed to support a community of scholars. It should say this physically’ (2006: 2.11). Such ideas constitute a major shift in thinking about the role of the university campus. While for much of the twentieth century the development of the campus centred upon the provision of discrete facilities such as stand-alone lecture theatres, the 21st century will be the time for visions of campuses as unique places with interactive and interconnected spaces.

The advantages to be gained from an aesthetically appealing, accessible, and well-designed campus are well known to university planners. Over the past two decades institutions have made significant investments in campus infrastructure, especially in the US and the UK, and more recently in Australia (Coulson et al, 2015: 10). Newly designed university buildings and campus spaces reflect key shifts in thinking around learning space design, which in turn reflect recent changes in approaches to teaching and learning. For example, as lecture-based teaching methods have become less dominant and peer-based collaborative learning more prominent, new campus designs include fewer lecture theatres and more spaces designed for conversation and interaction. While historically, campus planning and design reflected a didactic approach to learning, contemporary thinking is that university campuses should facilitate more explorative and flexible styles of learning by providing spaces that are comfortable, flexible, multi-layered, collaborative, interactive, sensory, and imbued with technology (Chism, 2006; Cox, 2011).

In addition to creating new buildings and re-designing learning spaces, institutions are also becoming cognisant of the need to think more holistically about the campus experience and to more clearly identify the role that the physical campus can play in improving the quality of teaching and learning. For example, Stanford University’s ‘Stanford 2025’ project explores undergraduate experiences of the future, suggesting various possibilities for paradigm shifts in the relationship between students and institutions. The project emphasises that learning needs to take place within ‘a complex and special setting’ and explores future possibilities for ‘living and learning *on campus*’ (<http://www.stanford2025.com/>). Such innovative thinking about the future of the campus mirrors the innovation currently invested in the development of online learning spaces. Indeed, a key premise of the Stanford project is that the complex ideas emerging in the area of digital learning must be matched by equally complex planning in the design of physical learning spaces.

To better support learning and to create a more student-centred approach, Peter Jamieson argues that ‘universities need to reclaim the concept of “place” as a framework for rethinking our understanding of how the campus could be developed’ (2009: 24). The sense of community generated by a university campus has

the capacity to transform locational *space* into social *place*. Places are produced through the relationships that people establish with their surroundings and through the ways in which people appropriate their physical settings. It is therefore essential that students are able to feel a sense of ownership of campus spaces so that those spaces may become places invested with personal meaning. Universities face a key challenge to transform their campus spaces into places that students see as relevant, valuable and meaningful (Kennedy, 2014).

### **The changing nature of student participation**

Since the 1990s a series of social, cultural and economic drivers have contributed to major shifts in student approaches to university education. Changes in higher education policy since the Dawkins Reforms of the late 1980s have resulted in increased costs of higher education to students, a more vocationally-oriented education system, greater student numbers and an increasingly competitive global higher education market (Kennedy, 2014). At the same time, rapid technological changes have radically altered the higher education landscape. In the 2000s and 2010s the impact of educational technology increased as online learning evolved, social networks developed into informal learning communities and online programs such as MOOCs were established. Such developments have changed the traditional relationship between students and universities and disrupted assumptions about the role of the physical university campus (Kennedy, 2012).

Unsurprisingly, recent studies indicate that university students are attending campus less and choosing online modes of learning more, often due to work and family commitments (James, Krause & Jennings, 2010; Baik, Naylor & Arkoudis, 2015). Factors such as the costs and travel distance to campus also impact upon student attendance. Students are increasingly viewing physical attendance at campus more as an option than a necessity. Studies conducted by the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education on the first year experience in Australian Universities in 2009 and 2014 found that first year students are spending fewer days and less time on campus than in the previous decade (James, et al 2010; Baik et al 2015). These reports identify two key factors for the reduction in time spent on campus: the availability of online resources such as lecture recordings and class notes, and the increased number of hours students spend in paid employment. However, they also emphasise that these factors do not appear to have negatively affected student satisfaction or commitment to learning. Students surveyed were highly positive about the benefits of online technology available for study purposes, and despite the growing proportion of students undertaking part-time work and working longer hours, 'significantly fewer students reported that their work interfered significantly with their study' (James, et al. 2010). While student engagement measured through time spent on campus may appear to have declined, Baik et al observe that 'the indicators of academic engagement show a significant rise in the proportion of students feeling satisfied with their subject choices, their course design, and with their interactions with teaching staff' (2015: 92). There is evidence in the report to suggest that student enjoyment of the campus experience is not necessarily marked by the number of hours spent on campus.

On the other hand, the authors of the 2015 study do express concern regarding students' *social* engagement with the university. They note that 'over a quarter of students report never studying with other students, and approximately a third have not made one or two close friends at university' (2015:92). This is a cause for some concern to institutions, they suggest, 'as students' social engagement with peers is a strong predictor of student retention' (2015: 44). Facilitating more opportunities for social engagement on campus may be a key factor in enhancing the student experience and improving student retention. However, the findings of the report appear somewhat paradoxical for while students come to campus less, keep to themselves more

and fewer say that they have made close friends at university, a higher percentage of students say they like coming to campus and are excited to be at university than in previous studies. It is far less common today for students to attend campus five days per week, and the findings of the report suggest that students are increasingly balancing their time learning on campus with time learning and living off-campus as well as time spent in paid employment.

The changing patterns of student participation are also a result of shifts in student demographics and a reflection of the differing needs of different student groups. For first year school leavers, such as those surveyed in the above studies, being on campus is an important part of the university experience. In addition to the potential benefits of face-to-face teaching and learning, being on campus facilitates participation in orientation programs, social events and co-curricular activities. However, attending the campus to study may be less essential for students who are mature professionals, often undertaking further study to upgrade their qualifications, and mostly studying on a part-time basis. For such students, it is often difficult and impractical to attend campus due to the time commitments of work and family. As higher education becomes increasingly more diversified it is important that institutions offer different pathways for students to engage with learning, as well as flexibility for students to move between on-campus and online modes of study. The greater uses of online learning does not necessarily result in a reduction of students undertaking campus-based study since students are not only more varied but also more numerous. Thus while there are an increasing number of students taking advantage of online learning, it is also likely that there are also more students coming to campus.

### **The changing channels of delivery**

As noted above, the use of technology plays an important role in facilitating new forms of student participation and supporting learning through a range of online resources, including online lecture recordings, notes and readings. As some formal learning activities move online, the reasons that students attend campus are changing. Some of the primary reasons that students come to campus now might include opportunities to engage with academic staff directly, to participate in collaborative and interactive learning with peers and to be involved in social networks and activities. Educational designs are increasingly responding to these changes. The ‘flipped classroom’ approach in which the instructional component of lectures is delivered online and class-time is reserved for interactive learning, is one example of the ways in which teaching approaches are addressing the shifts in student participation. Institutions are also increasingly employing blended learning approaches that integrate online and face-to-face modes of learning.

The advent of online learning has initiated questions around the perceived efficacy and efficiency of the traditional lecture format and placed pressure on universities to improve their campus-based teaching and learning practices. However, many academics argue that the lecture continues to offer valuable learning opportunities, not all of which can easily be reproduced online. The common perception that the traditional lecture is a ‘boring’ instance of passive learning overlooks the potential for lectures to actively engage students in the learning process through their liveness, presence and interactive capability. While clearly poorly delivered lectures will fail to engage students, when designed and delivered expertly, lectures can be dynamic, inspiring and even transformative experiences that can play a central role in drawing students to campus.

Recent studies suggest that students continue to value face-to-face interactions in support of their learning. In their surveys of first year students, Baik et al found that ‘face-to-face discussion groups were used more

frequently, and regarded as more useful by users, than online discussion groups' (2015: 50). This finding supports arguments advanced by educational researchers and developers that campus spaces need to better accommodate interactive forms of learning, and suggests that students will continue to come to campus to participate in collaborative learning experiences.

In response to the changes to higher education brought about by technology, in 2014 *The Conversation* ran a series on 're-imagining the campus.' From different perspectives, all four contributors to the series emphasised the importance of engagement, interaction and community offered by the campus experience. Jason Lodge argued that the benefits of online and on-campus modes of study are vastly different and incomparable, and suggested that 'coming to campus provides an opportunity to be immersed in an intellectual culture.' For Tom Cochrane there is a 'mistaken perception [that] the university experience can be replicated online.' The experience of being at university, he argued, is 'engaging, personally challenging, and transformative of careers and lives.' Tom Kvan described the campus as 'the public face of the university' and argued that campus design needs to make universities more inclusive and accessible to better engage with the wider community. In the final article in the series, Robert Nelson argued that the role of the campus 'is to socialise one's developing knowledge, which is learning through conversation,' and suggested that campus designs need to be more conducive to socialised learning. Whereas the first two *Conversation* articles highlighted the continued benefits of on-campus learning in the face of technological change, the latter two suggested that universities are yet to fully capitalise on those benefits.

These discussions suggest that the increasing use of online learning does not decrease the value of the physical campus. However, they also suggest that universities need to improve the role of the campus experience and better integrate the advantages of technology with the benefits of on-campus learning. Digital technologies afford creative strategies for teaching and learning and can be employed to inform, enable and advance face-to-face learning creating a richer campus experience.

### **The value of campus-based learning**

Scholarly literature on campus-based learning suggests that the benefits of the campus experience have both cognitive and social dimensions that are equally important. They centre around six broad interrelated areas: involvement in a scholarly community, face-to-face interaction with academic staff, opportunities to engage with campus-based modes of teaching and learning, opportunities for collaborative, interactive and informal learning, opportunities for student engagement through participation in extra-curricular activities and opportunities for social contact and developing friendships.

#### **1. Involvement in a scholarly community**

Universities are places where learning and knowledge are developed and fostered. Coming to campus provides students with the opportunity to be immersed in an intellectual culture, to gain expert knowledge from scholars and to explore ideas with peers. A sense of community is produced not only by the staff and students that populate the university and produce its intellectual culture, but by the environment and campus features that motivate and inspire learning. Aspects such as an institution's architectural history, contemporary design features, landscaping, and the provision of accessible and appealing spaces in libraries, cafes and outdoor areas can all enhance the sense of involvement in a scholarly community.

## ***2. Face-to-face interaction with academic staff***

Being on campus allows students to gain exposure to scholars with expertise in specific disciplinary areas. The opportunity to interact directly with academic staff may enable students to further their knowledge through asking questions and engaging in face-to-face discussions. Face-to-face interactions facilitate an exploratory and investigative approach to learning that has the possibility to lead to new ideas and discoveries for both students and teachers. Students also greatly value quality feedback and advice from academic staff which can often be more effectively delivered via direct face-to-face contact than in written or online formats. These personalised features of campus-based learning are sometimes limited by the availability of academic staff, especially those at the professorial level and those engaged in projects funded by research grants. There is a risk that the increasing pressures on academic staff to achieve greater research outputs will further impact upon their ability to spend time with students. The campus experience might be enhanced through a commitment to developing high levels of student-staff contact. It is also important that academic staff develop a stronger understanding of the ways in which their engagement with students might inform and enhance their research so that teaching and research are viewed as complementary activities.

## ***3. Opportunities to engage with campus-based modes of teaching and learning***

On-campus learning facilitates a diverse range of teaching methods that differ to those offered by online learning, and enables students to undertake campus-based classes such as labs, practicals, design studios and performance workshops. It might also allow teaching staff to develop quality teaching and learning outcomes through direct contact with their students. However, given the diverse range of variables that contribute to quality teaching and learning outcomes, it is difficult to accurately define the relationship between the campus experience and the quality of teaching and learning. Arguments that set up a qualitative dichotomy between on-campus and online learning are particularly unhelpful since the two modes have distinctly different (though potentially complimentary) educational benefits.

Scholars who argue for the value of the university campus suggest that learning is a situated process that is enhanced when it occurs in a physical location (Jamieson, 2003: 124). Similarly, academic writing in the field of campus planning and design frequently speculates that well-designed campus spaces relate positively to learning outcomes. It is further argued that student retention can be improved through a stronger focus on the educational conditions on campus. For example, Vincent Tinto argues that ‘to be serious about student retention, universities would need to recognise that the roots of student attrition lie not only in their students and the situations they face, but also in the very character of the educational settings in which they ask students to learn’ (2009:2). Paul Temple also suggests that ‘a physical, material form affects what takes place in the university in important ways’ (2014: xxvi). However, he cautions against drawing definitive links between the physical campus and learning outcomes, stating that ‘it is hard to produce empirically verifiable propositions about how space affects outputs, let alone outcomes, in universities’ (2014:3).

## ***4. Opportunities for collaborative, interactive and informal learning***

A campus-based education provides opportunities for peer learning in both formal and informal settings. Classroom teaching is increasingly adopting a more collaborative approach to cultivate interactions between students in class. Outside the classroom, new campus design features include an emphasis on collaborative learning spaces that aim to foster face-to-face communication, conversation and interaction between students in informal settings. Many studies suggest that such spaces are crucial for their facilitation of ‘active learning,’ which includes an emphasis on problem solving and critical thinking (Coulson et al, 2015; Bennett,

2009; Chism, 2006). However, as Andrew Cox points out, such studies tend to privilege one approach to learning and their 'claim that knowledge is a social construction seems to be construed to mean that learning requires direct social interaction' (2011:199). There are multiple ways in which active learning takes place, not all of which require collaboration or interaction. Thus while collaborative spaces are useful for some forms of informal learning, they provide only one possible spatial arrangement to support learning.

Peter Jamieson argues that the entire campus should be viewed as a learning space. While he supports the increased focus on informal learning spaces, he proposes that universities still need 'a more nuanced campus development strategy informed by a subtle understanding of informal learning' (2009: 19). With reference to the Saltire Centre at Glasgow Caledonian University, which was designed on a massive scale to support student-led informal learning, he notes that problems emerge when one site is designed to fulfil too many purposes for too many people, and points to the problematic impact of mass-scale sites on the other parts of the campus. As Jamieson's case study illustrates, collaborative facilities need to be balanced with other settings, so that travelling across a campus will be 'a journey through an engaging and evolving landscape' (2009: 23).

### ***5. Opportunities for student engagement with extra-curricular activities***

Andrew Norton suggests that one of the key reasons that 'demand for the on-campus experience is likely to remain strong' is that 'young people are more than likely to want the student lifestyle on-campus' (2013: 39). For school leavers in particular, the appeal of the 'student lifestyle' is a driving force behind the desire for a campus-based education. The opportunities for academic and social engagement offered by the campus have the capacity to significantly enrich the student experience at university. Yet student engagement means more than simply interaction with peers and academics and participation in campus-based activities, it is also thought to be a condition for academic success. For example, Vincent Tinto argues that 'the more students are academically and socially involved, the more likely they are to persist and graduate' (2009: 4).

The campus experience provides opportunities for an extensive range of academic, co-curricular and social forms of engagement. Engagement activities organised by universities include orientation programs, competitions, workshops, public presentations, career information sessions, leadership and mentoring programs, engagements with workplace and industry and internships. Such activities have the potential to support the acquisition of more diverse graduate attributes and compliment classroom teaching and learning. Equally, student-led activities provide important opportunities for students to be involved in clubs and societies, sporting activities, the performing arts and music, creative writing, journalism, student politics and various other activities that can cultivate skills in areas such as leadership and communication and enrich students' experiences of University life. The University of Melbourne Student Union has over 200 clubs including faculty and course related clubs that allow students to get to know people from their courses, which can assist students to make social connections and support opportunities for informal peer-learning. University campuses offer students the opportunity to gain access to a range of resources and facilities including student support services, libraries and sporting facilities, and also provide opportunities for cultural engagement with access to galleries, film screenings and performances.

Student engagement is also potentially enhanced by the capacity to live in close proximity to the campus. At the Parkville campus of the University of Melbourne, the residential colleges facilitate opportunities for academic support, co-curricular activities and developing friendships. They also allow for greater ease of

access to the university, less time spent traveling and a stronger sense of engagement with the university community. The ongoing developments of student accommodation close to the University may further develop student engagement with the campus experience.

### **6. Opportunities for social contact and developing friendships**

From the student perspective, the opportunities for social contact may be one of the most significant aspects of the campus experience. In 2014 nearly three quarters of first year students surveyed agreed that coming to campus is important for making friends, suggesting a strong awareness of the social possibilities of on-campus study (Baik et al, 2015). Strange and Banning describe the encounters that emerge from informal contact between students as ‘socially catalytic’ (2000:146). Indeed, these encounters frequently form the basis of life-long relationships, with a significant number of people reporting having met their spouse and closest friends at university. Social encounters at university also cultivate collegial networks that often prove to be valuable in the workplace.

Social contact between students is not only important for developing friendships, it may also contribute to reduced rates of student attrition, and potentially to improved learning outcomes. Baik et al suggest that ‘It will be increasingly important for universities to provide environments where social interaction is encouraged – not only for its own sake, but for the informal learning opportunities that emerge in conversations.’ They argue that ‘the benefits of incidental learning in social settings should not be underestimated in any discussion of course delivery in higher education’ (2015:93).

### **Conclusion: Implications for the University of Melbourne**

As discussed earlier in this paper, to ensure the highest quality education and to attract the best students in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, universities need to offer a campus-based experience that sets them apart. In a shifting policy environment, it is likely that there will be even greater pressure on institutions to demonstrate the specific benefits of their campus experience. Stephen J. Toope argues that in the future only ‘a limited number of global university “brands,”’ will be able to claim the reputational advantage to ‘justify student expenditure on the on-campus experience’ (2014:5). If this is the case, the University of Melbourne may be in a privileged position to capitalise upon its established reputation and campus-based education across its six main campuses and other urban and regional locations.

In the Sir Robert Menzies Oration on Higher Education in 2005, Peter McPhee emphasised that ‘The ‘Melbourne Experience’ is a campus-based education in a learning environment characterised by both a rich architectural heritage and new technologies’ (2005). He suggested that the University was faced with the challenge to define and provide a campus experience that builds on student engagement with digital learning technologies, while also creating a place that fosters social interaction and collaborative learning (2005). Since 2005, developments to the University campuses have focussed precisely on these needs. Recent developments at the Parkville campus including the renovated Baillieu and Giblin-Eunson libraries, the new Melbourne School of Design building and the redevelopment of the Arts West precinct, have employed design principles intended to facilitate collaboration and engagement, create a sense of community and support digital learning strategies. The development project at the Southbank campus, comprising a new visual arts wing and a new conservatorium building, aims to establish a unified arts precinct and bring the broader community onto the campus. The University’s goal to be more energy efficient in the design of its campuses is exemplified by the Melbourne School of Design at the Parkville campus, the Green Roofs Project at the Burley campus and the Dookie 21 Project at the redeveloped Dookie

campus. Such projects illustrate that the University is committed to developing the role that its campuses play in improving the student experience, enhancing teaching and learning, engaging with the broader community and supporting a sustainable future.

Academics at the University of Melbourne express confidence that a campus-based experience will continue to be valued by students, and many argue that the role of the campus may in fact intensify in the future (Voice, 2012). However, at a time when students are understandably asking why it is necessary to go to campus when it is possible to study online, it is not enough to assume consensus on the value of the campus experience. It is important that the benefits of the campus are better understood, protected and strengthened. As the higher education landscape rapidly changes, a key challenge for the University is to better articulate and promote the distinctive value of the University of Melbourne campus experience.

### Acknowledgements

Thank you to Professor Richard James at the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education for his helpful comments and suggestions on drafts of this paper.

### References

- Baik, Chi, Ryan Naylor and Sophie Arkoudis (2015) 'The First Year Experience in Australian Universities: Findings from Two Decades, 1994-2014.' (Centre for the Study of Higher Education, the University of Melbourne)
- Bennett, Scott (2009) 'Libraries and Learning: A History of Paradigm Change.' *Libraries and the Academy*, 9:2, 181-197
- Chapman, M. Perry (2006) *American Places: In Search of the Twenty-First Century Campus*. Westport, CT: Praeger
- Cochrane, Tom (2014) 'To lecture or not lecture: is technology reinventing the campus,' in *The Conversation*, 11 March 2014. Available online at: <http://theconversation.com/search?q=To+lecture+or+not+lecture%3A+is+technology+reinventing+the+campus>. Accessed October 8, 2015
- Coulson, Jonathan, Paul Roberts and Isabelle Taylor (2015) *University Trends: Contemporary Campus Design*, London & New York: Routledge
- Cox, Andrew M (2011) 'Students' Experience of University Space: An Exploratory Study' In *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 23: 2, 197-207
- Davis, Glyn (2013) 'The Australian Idea of a University,' in *Meanjin*, Vol. 72, No. 3, Spring 2013: 32-48
- Edwards, Brian (2000) *University Architecture*. London: Spon Press
- Fraser, Kym, ed. (2014) *The future of learning and teaching in next generation learning spaces*. Bingley, U.K: Emerald
- Harrison, Andrew and Les Hutton (2014) *Design and the changing educational landscape: space, place and the future of learning*. London: Routledge.

- James, Richard, Kerri-Lee Krause and Claire Jennings (2010) 'The First Year Experience in Australian Universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009.' (Centre for the Study of Higher Education, the University of Melbourne)
- Jamieson, Peter (2009) 'The Serious Matter of Informal Learning,' *Planning for Higher Education*, 37: 2, January – March
- Jamieson, Peter (2003) 'Designing more effective on-campus teaching and learning spaces: a role for academic developers' In *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8:1-2, 119-133.
- Kennedy, Gregor (2012) *Negotiating a disruption of learning time and space*. Keynote presentation, 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Curriculum, Teaching & Learning Colloquium: *Learning to Connect, Connecting to Learn*. La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, 6<sup>th</sup> – 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2012
- Kennedy, Gregor (2014) *Making university spaces places for learning*. Keynote presentation, *Teaching Matters 2014*, University of Tasmania, Launceston, Australia, 2<sup>nd</sup> - 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2014
- Kvan, Tom (2014) 'Rethinking an inclusive university campus' in *The Conversation*, 12 March 2014. Available online at: <http://theconversation.com/rethinking-an-inclusive-university-campus-21522>. Accessed October 8, 2015
- Lefebvre, Henri (1991) *The production of space*. Trans. Donald Nicholso-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell
- Lodge, Jason (2014) 'The campus is dead: long live the campus?' in *The Conversation*, 10 March 2014. Available online at: <http://theconversation.com/the-campus-is-dead-long-live-the-campus-21372>. Accessed October 8, 2015
- McPhee, Peter (2005) 'Faces in the Crowd? The 'Melbourne Experience' past, present, future' The Sir Robert Menzies Oration on Higher Education
- Monahan, Torin (2002) 'Flexible Space and Built Pedagogy: Emerging IT Embodiments,' in *Inventio*, 4:1. 1-19
- Nelson, Robert (2014) 'Gardening against learning: how campus design kills conversation,' in *The Conversation*, 19 March 2014. Available online at: <http://theconversation.com/gardening-against-learning-how-campus-design-kills-conversation-21514>. Accessed October 8, 2015
- Norton, Andrew, (2013) *The online evolution: when technology meets tradition in higher education*, Grattan Institute
- Oblinger, Diana G, ed. (2006) *Learning Spaces*. Boulder Co: Educase.
- Reiach, Stephen, Clemens Averbek and Virginia Cassidy (2012) 'The Evolution of distance education in Australia: Past, Present, Future,' in *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education* 13: 4, 247-252
- Soderlind, Laura (2014) 'Inspiring spaces are learning places,' in *Voice*, 10:8, August 11-September 7 2014.
- Stanford 2025: Learning and Living at Stanford, An exploration of undergraduate experiences in the future. Available online at: <http://www.stanford2025.com/>. Accessed July ,2 2015
- Strange, Charles Carney and James H. Banning (2000) *Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Temple, Paul, ed. (2014) *The Physical University: Contours of space and place in higher education*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis

Tinto, Vincent (2009) 'Taking Student Retention Seriously: Rethinking the First Year of University' Keynote speech delivered at the ALTC FYE Curriculum Design Symposium, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, February 5, 2009

Toope, Stephen J. (2014) 'I Love You, Please Change: Universities and their relationships' (Taking Action for Canada: Jobs and Skills for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century) Canadian Council of Chief Executives

Van Note Chism, Nancy (2006) 'Challenging Traditional Assumptions and Rethinking Learning Spaces,' in Diana G. Oblinger (ed.), *Learning Spaces*. Boulder Co: Educase

*Voice*, Volume 8, Number 8, August 13-September 9 2012. Available online at: <http://voice.unimelb.edu.au/volume-8/number-8/education-2030-workforce>. Accessed July 2, 2015