For a number of reasons, higher education institutions may seek a new, stronger position in the increasingly competitive market. The process of radically changing a brand or organization is known as rebranding, and is prevalent among corporations. While the drivers and goals of rebranding may be different between corporations and higher education institutions, the complex process is very similar. This paper offers eight guidelines adapted from corporate rebranding practices that higher education institutions should consider when making their own transformation. These guidelines are demonstrated through analysis of Arizona State University which has undergone a significant rebranding in the last decade. Though many are reluctant to do so, higher education institutions can use practices found in the corporate environment to better themselves in a multitude of ways including academically, financially, or socially.
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Introduction

In most ways, higher education institutions are very different from corporations. However, this does not mean that institutions cannot benefit from using corporate practices. Competition for resources is getting more aggressive, which is forcing institutions to rethink their competitive advantage and position in the changing education market. The goal of this paper is to examine how higher education institutions can apply corporate practices of rebranding to radically change their values, image or position. Before assessing the application of rebranding practices, this paper first outlines the drivers for rebranding, as well as desired and potential outcomes of the process, in both corporations and higher education institutions. After developing an understanding of the principles of rebranding in both settings, eight guidelines are constructed to steer a successful rebranding process in a higher education institution from start to finish. The examination focuses on the planned transformation of Arizona State University (ASU) over the past decade by looking at its strengths and weaknesses in each of the eight areas. Finally, the examination concludes with a discussion of the effects rebranding had on ASU, and what other institutions can learn.

Corporate Rebranding

Background

According to the American Marketing Association, a brand is defined as, “a name, term, symbol, design, or combination of them intended to identify goods or services of one seller or a group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors.”¹ Corporate branding is the initial expression of the corporate vision. A brand consists of both tangible and intangible elements. Tangible elements include physical expression of the brand, such as logo and slogan, while intangible elements include values, image, and, and feelings.² The identity of a brand comes from an organization itself. It is the way an organization portrays its philosophy and strategy to the outside audience through its communication, behavior, and aesthetics. On the other hand, brand image is created from the commonly held perceptions and beliefs about an

organization in the minds of an external audience. Ideally, a brand’s identity should align with its image. When an organization’s identity and image are misaligned, a rebranding is needed to modify the image to reflect a change in identity. While branding refers to the initial articulation of a brand, rebranding refers to the change between the initial brand and a new formulation. Rebranding is the planned and implemented process of creating a new name, term, symbol, design, or combination intended to develop a new differentiated position in the mind frame of stakeholders and a distinctive identity from those of competitors. Corporate rebranding differs fundamentally from product rebranding, namely in size and scope (See Table 1).

Table 1. Corporate versus Product Rebranding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Corporate Rebranding</th>
<th>Product Rebranding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>CEO/Top Executives</td>
<td>Middle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>All Personnel</td>
<td>Middle Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Department</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Internal/External Stakeholders</td>
<td>Customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Advertising &amp; Organization Interactions</td>
<td>Advertising/Publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Founders &amp; Subcultural Groups’ Values</td>
<td>Contrived Values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all brands need to be continually updated and refreshed to stay relevant in the current market. The degree of rebranding can be marked along a continuum. Rebranding can include minor, intermediate, and complete changes. At one end of the continuum is evolutionary rebranding. Evolutionary rebranding is a continuous process that describes fairly minor developments in a company’s brand image such as modification of logos or slogans. These changes are the least risky, and sometimes occur so gradually that they are hardly perceptible to outside observers. With intermediate changes, a company keeps its name to preserve brand value that has been developed over a long period of time, but attempts to reposition itself in the market. At the opposite end of the spectrum from evolutionary rebranding is radical, or revolutionary, rebranding. Revolutionary rebranding describes a major, identifiable change in positioning and aesthetics that fundamentally redefines an organization, such as a completely
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different name or alterations in brand values and promises that are new to stakeholders. This is the riskiest type of rebranding because it erases any previous brand identity.

**Drivers of Corporate Rebranding**

Rebranding can occur for both positive and negative reasons in response to events that occur gradually or suddenly, either internally or externally. Rebranding signals that there has been a change of sufficient magnitude in an organization that warrants the redefinition of its identity. Externally, a rebrand may occur to stay relevant with changing consumer needs and tastes, or industry standards may change and rebranding becomes a legal obligation. Additionally, new competitors may enter the market. A rebrand could also become necessary to overcome a negative reputation or image resulting from a scandal or crisis. Internally, a rebrand can be driven by a change in organizational structure or strategy. Changes in organizational structure include mergers and acquisitions, spinoffs, bankruptcy, going public, or uniting many brands under one name. Changes in strategy include globalization, localization, divestment and refocus, and diversification. Finally, rebranding can be driven by overall underperformance. Indicators of underperformance include slowed or halted growth, falling revenues and profits, failure to attract top talent or losing top talent to competitors, fewer leads and lost bids, as well as the inability to differentiate from competitors. The most common driver of rebranding is mergers and acquisitions, followed by spinoffs then brand image issues. Overall, rebranding itself is a message and should be the manifestation of actual change within an organization.

**Outcomes**

Rebranding is not something organizations should jump into without sufficiently considering every factor. The process is often more time consuming and complex than anticipated by management. The two biggest potential issues with rebranding are the amount of
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resources it entails and the possibility of losing brand equity. Rebranding requires significant financial investments to change internally and then communicate that change to external stakeholders. If the rebrand fails, it can be even more costly to attempt to change the brand back. For instance, in 2002, Royal Mail spent £1.5 million to become Consignia. Fifteen months later, the name was dropped in response to public outcry. It cost an estimated £1 million to revert the organization back to Royal Mail. The failed rebrand contributed to 17,000 jobs being cut, revenue losses of £1.1 billion, and a rise in the price of stamps.\footnote{Murray-West, Rosie. "Consignia disappears with 30,000 postal jobs." \textit{Telegraph} [United Kingdom] 14 Jun 2002. Web. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/3298220/Consignia-disappears-with-30000-postal-jobs.html>}
\footnote{Lomax and Mador, 82-95}
\footnote{"Definitions"}
\footnote{Taylor}
In addition, removing or changing a brand name or logo of an organization affects the balance sheet. Brand names and logos are tangible assets. When the name is eliminated, so is the asset. This forces many organizations to take a non-cash charge after rebranding.\footnote{Another potential pitfall of rebranding is losing brand equity that has been created over years of investment. Brand equity is defined as the value of a brand. It is based on consumer attitudes about positive brand attributes and favorable consequences of brand use.\footnote{Aaker, David. "Measuring brand equity across products and markets." \textit{California Management Review.} 28.3 (1996): 102-121. Print.} The more equity a brand has, the higher loyalty, awareness, perceived value, and association the brand will have.\footnote{Aaker, David. "Measuring brand equity across products and markets." \textit{California Management Review.} 28.3 (1996): 102-121. Print.} Rebranding may alienate market segments that are attached to the brand and thus weaken the equity of the brand.\footnote{Gotsi, Manto, and Constantine Andriopoulos. "Understanding the pitfalls in the corporate rebranding process." \textit{Corporate Communication: An International Journal.} 12.4 (2007): 341-355. Print.} The response from stakeholders will be varied, but it can almost be guaranteed that there will be some who do not approve of the new brand. This can lead to negative publicity. In the past, it used to be that only people in media positions such as journalists could have a voice. However with today’s social media, it is very easy for a consumer to voice their opinion and influence other people.

If carried out properly, rebranding can have numerous short term and long term benefits on an organization and its stakeholders. The process can improve focus within an organization so that employees and management have common goals and priorities. A successful rebrand can also increase the confidence of employees and raise morale. Finally, rebranding can give an organization a competitive advantage in the market by increasing relevancy and awareness.
Higher Education Rebranding

Background

Many higher education insiders hold the opinion that corporate practices are not appropriate in educational settings. Issues such as branding strategy and positioning, as well as issues with marketing and management are typically shied away from for the fear that it undermines the fundamental goal of education. However, as competition for resources in a changing environment gets more difficult, many institutions are attempting to improve their position in the market by utilizing rebranding practices used in the business sector. Higher education rebranding begins with reaffirming mission, values, and culture while examining its competitive advantage. There are often divergent views on how the founding mission of an institution can be fulfilled in a dynamic environment. Once an institution determines how it can differentiate, it must figure how to deliver on its promises and send a clear, meaningful message to the market.

Similar to corporations, rebranding higher education institutions can be risky. Most stakeholders have a close, personal relationship with their institutions, which is less predominant on the corporate side.

In order for a rebranding to be successful, the reason behind the new vision or position needs to be perceived as genuine. If people believe that the change is only to benefit the institution, the rebranding will fail. It is also important that a desired outcome of rebranding is differentiation in the market place. The marketing messages of most institutions are all very similar. In addition, when most institutions project their message onto the external audience, they make it about themselves instead of about the student. With so many options available, simply trying to attract people to your institution by being a place of higher education is not good enough in today’s environment. The rebranding initiatives need to resonate emotionally and be based on belief systems that drive behavior. The brand should be designed around the students, faculty, and alumni of an institution and how members define themselves within that context. The same is true for corporations. The most successful organizations do not simply sell based on the features of their products or service, rather they focus on the people that they are serving.

---
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Drivers and Goals for Higher Education Rebranding

Many of the drivers behind corporate rebranding are the same or similar to those behind higher education rebranding. Institutions can merge, such as Case Tech and Western Reserve to form Case Western Reserve University, or absorb other institutions, which often requires a rebranding strategy. Like corporations, institutions can rebrand in attempt to overcome a bad reputation after a scandal, or a generally negative image.\textsuperscript{21} Institutions have even gone as far as completely changing their name because of reputation.\textsuperscript{22} The most common driver of rebranding for institutions in recent history is financial pressure. Revenues are shrinking and costs are rising. Financial support from state and federal governments has been in decline, which causes both public and private universities to work with less. Costs for institutions are considerable and continuous. Buildings, libraries, classrooms, laboratories, and technology constantly need to be maintained and updated.\textsuperscript{23} Finally, institutions are faced with a number of external competitors. These include other geographically, academically, or athletically similar institutions. They also have to compete against newly created online education programs that are typically run for-profit. Overall, universities face many of the similar challenges that corporations do, yet also have a unique set of drivers for rebranding.

The three general goals of rebranding for an institution are to build interest, relationships, and revenues. Not every institution is looking to achieve these same goals from rebranding, but usually a mix of each. By building interest, an institution can increase student enrollment and demand for their programs. The same principle applies for recruiting the best faculty possible. In addition, many institutions are looking to expand into a new market, whether that be the next state or another continent. The second element is to build relationships with students and faculty, alumni, and the community. This will increase retention rates, as well as alumni satisfaction which can translate into participation at alumni events, audiences, and networking.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, better alumni relations leads into the third element- increasing revenue. Alumni are often the largest donors to their alma mater. Other ways rebranding can affect a university’s revenue

\textsuperscript{21} Recently George Washington University has launched a ten year strategy to shed its ‘rich kid’ reputation and reposition itself as an academic powerhouse and an internationally recognized research institution.

\textsuperscript{22} In 1996, Trenton State College became The College of New Jersey because Trenton was known for its crime and there were other similar sounding regional institutions with negative connotations including Trenton State Prison and Trenton State Mental Hospital.


stream is by being able to charge more for higher perceived value, and convey immediate value to new institution offerings. Finally, an overall better institution is in general more likely to receive higher endowments.

Eight Guidelines to Rebranding

I: Do Your Homework

Regardless of the type of organization rebranding, it is imperative that internal and external research is conducted before, during, and after the process to understand strategic direction, current standing in the market, implementation process, and outcomes. The most effective way to do this is through action research. Action research is defined as a long term disciplined process of inquiry conducted by and for those taking the action. The researchers are also the primary users of their findings. Action research is a seven step process including: selecting a focus, clarifying theories, identifying research questions, collecting data, analyzing data, reporting results, and taking informed action. Ways to collect data include planning meetings, interviewing stakeholders, holding workshops, and conducting surveys. In the rebranding process, action research helps decision makers understand the brand from a multiple stakeholder perspectives which the organization can then use to gain consensus when redeveloping the brand. Action research differs from traditional market research because it takes values into account, can be interdisciplinary, aims to generate change, and involves the researcher throughout the entire process. In addition, action research is future oriented and encourages systematic and reflective development. While the researchers’ stake in the outcome of a study can be motivational, it can also cause a greater bias.

Many organizations that rebrand hire an outside consulting or advertising agency. While it can be too expensive for smaller organizations, a third party can be helpful to an organization both internally and externally by anything from gathering data to developing and marketing a new brand. A third party creates a less biased atmosphere when collecting data and allows for joint exploration and articulation of an organization’s brand values which creates a more
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thorough picture of the brand.\textsuperscript{28} Accurate and appropriate research is an absolute necessity for a successful rebrand. Collecting useful research is a long term process, thus why many organizations that rebrand too fast end up failing.

\textit{II: Have a Clear Vision}

If a leader has a strong vision, an organization can use research to figure out how they are going to implement that vision. However, if an organization knows there needs to be a change, but is less certain on a vision, it is best to first use research to figure out what changes in a rebranding need to be implemented. Re-visioning, or repositioning, is the phase of rebranding where objectives are set to determining the changes that need to take place in an organization to reach a desired end goal and create a radically new position in the market.

Behind every great vision is a visionary. Many studies have discerned that a major success factor when rebranding is a clear vision at the top management level. The management leader or leaders need to understand and support the organization’s strategic direction and realize the importance of the brand reflecting that strategy.\textsuperscript{29} Rebranding often fails because managers do not have a clear assessment of desired change for current values and existing images.\textsuperscript{30} Managers need to clearly communicate their vision and one way to do this is through a brand positioning statement which describes differentiation attributes, sales proposition, and market positioning. This statement is generally used internally to develop the marketing message.\textsuperscript{31} It is also important that the new vision for an organization is ambitious— but not too ambitious. In order to not alienate stakeholders, it is necessary for an organization to balance the existing brand with the need for innovation. When creating a new vision, there is a fine line between satisfying current stakeholders that relate to the core ideology of the brand, and progressing so it remains relevant or grows in the contemporary market. Not abandoning traces of brand memory and remaining true to the initial brand will provide legitimacy to stakeholders and make the new brand more acceptable.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{28} Lomax and Mador, 82-95
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{30} Gotsi and Andriopoulos, 341-355
\textsuperscript{31} Taylor
\textsuperscript{32} Merrilees and Miller, 537-552
In 2002, Michael Crow became the President of Arizona State University, located outside of Phoenix. In his inaugural address, he revealed his vision to radically transform not only the institution itself, but also create a “new” American university:

The new American university would cultivate excellence in teaching, research, and public service, providing the best possible education to the broadest possible spectrum of society. The new American university would embrace the educational needs of the entire population—not only a select group, and not only the verbally or mathematically gifted. The success of the new American university will be measured not by who the university excludes, but rather by who the university includes, and from this inclusion will come its contributions to the advancement of society.\(^{33}\)

He ambitiously believed that ASU could surpass its current standing in academics, teaching, research, and public service, as well as serve as a leader for the reconceptualization of the American research university. Crow believed that a traditional university model would be ineffective at growing ASU because of factors such as changing demographics and economic and environmental concerns. His vision was revolutionary because he did not wish to attempt to replicate better universities that tended to resemble one another, rather he wanted to create a new type of institution that was based on the needs of the time and did not measure its success on historic design elements. Crow made it clear that he did not want to completely abandon successful elements of the university, but create new designs that responded to the relatively new increase in knowledge production, specialized academic disciplines, new disciplines, as well as the fall of disciplinary boundaries. The name of Crow’s vision fittingly became known as, “The New American University.”

Crow’s articulation of his vision was the beginning of ASU’s ten year rebranding process. Crow was a strong leader with clear strategic direction and the ability to communicate his vision. After his initial address, a University Design Team (UDT) articulated the New American University’s mission and core values which represented new standards, guiding principles, and ways to measure progress at ASU. The mission was to establish ASU as the model for a New American University, measured not by who is excluded, but rather by who is included; pursuing research and discovery that benefits the public good; assuming major responsibility for the economic, social, and cultural vitality and health and well-being of the

The core values stated that ASU is committed to excellence, access, and impact in everything they do. They measure themselves by the outcomes students achieve, the accomplishments of graduates, the research contributed to the public good, and by the economic, social, and cultural vitality of the communities that surround the institution. The mission and values are direct, clear, and convey exactly what ASU stands for.

The objective of Crow’s vision was for ASU to become a world-class, competitive research institution that would provide years of lasting value to the community, state and nation. Crow hoped to do this by creating unique schools within the university that specialized in conducting interdisciplinary research through a cooperative environment, and applying this research to benefit the community. The more concrete goals included improving ranking, attracting and retaining the best students and faculty, and being able to provide higher education to all qualified Arizonians. In addition, Crow hoped the new university model would generate funding for research from both federal sources and private investment.

**III: Know Where You Stand**

If an organization does not know its desired end position, it should at least know where it stands in the market. Even if the organization knows its desired position, it is still important to know where it stands in the market before figuring out how to reach the end goal. The best way to go about gauging the position of an organization or brand is by conducting a brand audit. A brand audit is a comprehensive situation analysis to determine sources of brand equity, as well as determine how effective branding strategies have been. A brand audit looks at an organization both internally and externally, qualitatively and quantitatively. Externally it is important for an organization to understand its customers and market environment. While it is obviously important to have data on factors such as market size, demographics, and market potential, organizations should also collect information such as the attitudes, awareness, and perceptions of the brand, as well as values, motives, and self-perceptions of customers. Likewise, internally a

---


brand audit will judge the scope of an organization, its resources, and its activities, but it is also important to research management and employees’ attitudes, perceptions, fears and aspirations.37

When conducting a brand audit during the rebranding process, it is key to seek input from all stakeholders and understand all viewpoints. For the most part, qualitative information for brand audits is collected through means such as interviews or surveys. However, to synthesize all stakeholder views, it may be beneficial to host workshops with representatives from each stakeholder group. This will allow communication to flow and researchers will be able to better get a sense of all perspectives.38

A brand audit can be useful in a multitude of ways. It clarifies focus and vision, and helps to show misalignments between the message an organization thinks it is sending and the message that its customers and stakeholders perceive. It will also help better identify core competencies of an organization, and hopefully provide insight on how to communicate its message effectively to all audiences. In addition, a brand audit can improve internal alignment by shedding light on organizational or management issues. A brand audit can be especially useful for universities to determine what attracts potential students and faculty, its reputation across different groups, and what marketing messages relate to different groups.39

*****

Arizona State University used, and continues to use, many resources for collecting both qualitative and quantitative data. The University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness (UOEEE) conducts original survey research projects for administrative planning, decision making, policy development, accreditation, and official reporting. Results are used for both official reporting to external constituents and internally to improve ASU programs, processes and policies. Likewise, the University Office of Institutional Analysis provides university data to requestors, including the UOEEE, for decision-making, planning, and reporting needs. For many projects, including those related to the rebranding, the university creates in-house councils and committees to organize and write reports. They also used third party consultants to collect and analyze data and make strategic recommendations.

37 Daly and Moloney, 30-36
38 Miller and Merrilees, 172-179
For the New American University, initial brand positioning research was documented in the University Design Team’s strategic plan. They examined a range of challenges that ASU would face in the rebranding process. Some of these challenges included socioeconomic change in the surrounding area, an underperforming school system in Arizona, increasing demand for higher education based on projections of the number of high school graduates, physical constraints of the original campus, and limited public and private financial support.40

The university used several tactics to gain values and perception based knowledge. One of these tactics was a longitudinal survey of opinion leaders. Every four years, between 300 and 550 opinion leaders are polled to determine satisfaction with ASU, its direction, leadership and operations. This poll was useful for gauging an outside perspective on the university. Examples of questions include whether the respondent is satisfied with the direction the university is headed, words they would use to describe ASU, and how the university could strengthen.41 Another survey the university used was the “National Image and Perception Study” conducted in 2000 and 2003 by Stamats Communications, Inc which used telephone interviews with 1,200 prospective students in four geographical areas across the country to develop the benchmark image positioning of ASU. The study explored factors that influenced college choice decisions, identified ASU’s perceived position within a national model, and contrasted perceptions of ASU with a national competitive group. In addition to the phone interviews, there were also four focus groups in each area. This helped the university see what was important to potential future customers, and learned what marketing strategies work.42

In 2002, at the time of the inception of the New American University, Arizona State University was the largest of three state-funded public universities in Arizona and the fifth largest in the nation. Having been formally established as Arizona State University in 1958, it was one of the newest public research universities in the United States.43 The institution had an uneven academic reputation and was not listed on any of the respected rankings of higher education institutions such as U.S. News & World Report list of best colleges. In addition, ASU’s infrastructure was inadequate for the university’s existing student population and incapable of

40 One University in Many Places
42 Ibid.
serving the growing numbers of qualified Arizona high school graduates. Facilities were cramped and poorly equipped, and many were in a state of disrepair. Many institutional information technology systems were in need of replacement. There were few residence halls available, so the vast majority of students lived off campus even as freshmen, exacerbating problems with retention and graduation rates. Community relations were strained by concerns over traffic congestion and negative impact on property values because of large numbers of students living in off-campus rental housing. Finally, the university relied primarily on state funding, with relatively few private investors. The low-tuition model provided few resources for financial aid, which meant that help was unavailable to those students who needed it most.44

**IV: Make a Plan**

There are many theoretical frameworks that outline the process of rebranding. While each framework differs slightly in rhetoric and design, there are generally four phases common to all: analyzing, planning, implementing, and evaluating. One downfall of these frameworks is that planning is not necessarily a stage in and of itself, but rather is necessary in every stage of the process. Companies that rebrand successfully plan each element of the process thoroughly—from the situation analysis through the evaluation. Rebranding is a complex process that requires a significant amount of time. Operational considerations should be integrated into the decision making process to ensure an organization has the necessary resources to facilitate a successful rebranding. Resources include, but are not limited to, the appropriate number of staff, expertise, and finances. Short term and long term goals need to be achievable given available resources. Again, if the organization does not have necessary expertise in-house, a consultant may need to be brought in to help.

It is important that a new brand image is developed and integrated with input and support from all divisions of an organization. Firstly, this will help determine the resources and potential scope of the rebranding. Representatives from departments such as human resources, marketing, accounting, information technology, et cetera, should all work together with top management to determine how they can affect, and will be effected by, a new position in the market.45 Secondly, this synergy between departments will also increase the coordination of brand strategy across all
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aspects of the marketing mix including product or service design, customer service, distribution, pricing, and relationship management. Each brand element needs to be aligned to the overarching brand vision to be effective.\textsuperscript{46} Finally, strategic vision and organizational culture are strongly linked, and there is a need for mutual long term support between them. Each department of an organization can have differences in culture and therefore have different expectations of a rebranding. Syncing all aspects of the organization in the development and implementation of the new brand helps to close the gap between differences and makes sure that each division is projecting the same values and images of the new corporate brand in their attitudes and behaviors.\textsuperscript{47}

****

The quest to become the New American University was divided up into three phases: design and planning (2004-2006), implementation (2005-2009), and university integration and linkage (2007-2012).\textsuperscript{48} There were two main areas of planning that needed to happen. First was an overall plan on how the university was going to accomplish its new mission of integrating teaching, research, and public service. Secondly, a plan was needed to physically redesign the university’s campuses. The University Design Team worked with Crow to create an Enterprise Plan which designed strategies to achieve goals. The UDT synced eighteen faculty members in different positions across the university including administrators such as the Vice-President of Student Affairs, provosts and deans from different colleges, and professors ranging from the biology to fine arts to electrical engineering departments.\textsuperscript{49} This Enterprise Plan that the UDT created is just one part of ASU’s strategic planning framework that is used to achieve both the university’s goals (See Figure 1).\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{46} Merilees and Miller, 537-552
\textsuperscript{49} One University in Many Places
\textsuperscript{50} 2013 Self Study Report

\textbf{Figure 1. ASU Planning Methodology}
While Crow first announced his vision of the New American University in November, 2002, the first report detailing the design process of the transformation was not released until April, 2004. The term ‘design process’ refers to the planning, realization of final design, and implementation strategies that would be used to bring about the new university. The team devised eight design imperatives, or guiding principles, that would measure the progress of the transformation.\footnote{One University in Many Places}

1) **Leverage Place**- Embrace cultural, socioeconomic, and physical setting.
2) **Transform Society**- Catalyze social change by being connected to social needs.
3) **Value Entrepreneurship**- Use knowledge and encourage innovation.
4) **Conduct Use-inspired Research**- Research should have purpose and impact on societal problems.
5) **Enable Student Success**- Determine excellence based on outcomes and commit to intellectual and cultural diversity.
6) **Fuse Intellectual Disciplines**- Create knowledge by transcending academic disciplines.
7) **Be Socially Embedded**- Connect with communities through mutually beneficial partnerships.
8) **Engage globally**- Connect with people and issues locally, nationally, and internationally.

These design imperatives were not intended to be rigid categories, but instead spur new thinking, suggest new possibilities, and inspire the creative potential of the academic community. It was realized that not all imperatives would be relevant to every individual or team. These specific guidelines were necessary because it showed stakeholders that the new mission and values were not just intangible, idealistic ideas but also backed by concrete, measurable examples of how the university was going to achieve its goals.

In addition to the eight guiding principles, the UDT laid out the initial university design process for creating a college/school centric model. At the time, the university was comprised of three geographically dispersed campuses: the Main campus in Tempe, the West campus in northwest Phoenix, and the Polytechnic campus in Mesa. Additionally there was a fourth campus in downtown Phoenix that was currently in the design process. Overall, there was a lack of clear definition of campus identities and little collaboration between them even though they were part of a unified institution.\footnote{Ibid.} To make the whole greater than the sum of the parts, a complete
redesign of the university was necessary. In order to increase interdisciplinary study, as well as reduce costs, the plan included assigning each campus a different mission that united design and activities of the schools by consolidating, moving, redirecting, and developing programs. The planning process was led by the ASU Comprehensive Development Plan Executive Group which included nineteen senior executives from different offices of the university, as well as lead architects and planners and additional consultants. After two full years, a Master Development Plan outlining the design plan for each campus was approved by the Arizona Board of Regents.

V: Involve all Stakeholders

Stakeholders include people or groups that have an interest or are affected by an organization. This is obviously a very large, diverse group, but it is important for an organization to identify their most important stakeholders. Primary stakeholders are the people or groups that are directly affected by the actions of an organization, while secondary stakeholders are indirectly affected. Key stakeholders are those who can affect the actions of an organization. Corporations and universities have similar types of stakeholders (See Table 2). Just as it is important to include all stakeholders in the brand audit, it is equally as important to include stakeholders in the rebranding process itself.

Table 2. Corporate and Higher Education Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Stakeholders</th>
<th>Higher Education Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investors</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors</td>
<td>Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Lost Prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Groups</td>
<td>Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>Accreditation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitors</td>
<td>Other Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Community</td>
<td>Surrounding Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most successful organizations, not just at rebranding, have a high level of brand orientation. Brand orientation is an approach in which the processes of the organization revolve around the creation, development, and protection of brand identity through ongoing interaction with target customers with the aim of achieving lasting competitive advantages in the form of brands. In a sense, brand orientation occurs when all stakeholders share ownership in a brand and live that brand in their daily life.

As previously stated, not all of Arizona State University’s eight design imperatives would be relevant to every stakeholder. Each imperative has its unique set of relevant stakeholder. For the analysis of ASU’s involvement of stakeholders in the New American University rebranding process, the focus will be on the seventh design element - social embeddedness. The task of determining the readiness of the university and developing a plan of how the university would fulfill the imperative of becoming socially embedded began in September, 2004. This task was lead by an outside consulting firm, and lasted almost two years. In the initial stages of the development, the firm conducted one-on-one informal interviews with over two hundred internal and external stakeholders including faculty, staff, and administration from each of the four campuses of the university, as well community leaders, funders, and officials in the Phoenix area (See Figure 2). The interviewees were also asked to recommend other potential prospects for additional interviews. The firm involved other universities across the country that with similarities to ASU that showed promising practices of community engagement. Fifteen universities were visited in the spring of 2005. Visits included interviews and meetings with administration, faculty, center directors, and others who were integral to the development of community engagement programs.

---

The findings of the internal and external interviews and the national research were first presented to Crow, his top administrators, and the newly created Social Embeddedness Steering Committee. Over the following year, the definition of social embeddedness and the vision and values the university needed were developed. The concept and model were then submitted to academic chairs and faculty members across the university. Finally, the work was presented to the larger community in May 2006, and discussions were led focusing on sustainability, leadership, and creating a university-wide culture of social embeddedness. Two years after beginning the process, a first draft of the university’s vision of social embeddedness was created. The designers noted that it would be critical for the community to share in the process of defining the final working plan. Broad dissemination of information and discussion with students, community leaders, residents of Phoenix, and faculty and staff would be necessary to actualize a plan. The team laid out a two year Community Dialogue plan that included many ways of involving external stakeholders. This involved updating the original interviewees on the status of the project, using ASU students, staff, and faculty to provide information to 15,000 Arizona residents, and conducting directed focus groups and regional forums. In addition, the plan involved holding various speaker series, events, and seminars (See Appendix A). The end result would be a working social embeddedness program at the University.

**VI: Achieve Employee Buy-in**

The most successful rebrandings show that it is especially important for employees to be involved in the rebranding process, even though the process is often perceived as Management’s responsibility. Employees can be introduced to the rebranding process at any time during the rebranding process. Early introduction brings more passionate involvement and support in final decisions, but at the cost of greater confusion about the direction of the new brand. It is easier to communicate and educate a new brand to stakeholders when the new position is well defined, rather than debating about vague alternatives. However, there may be more resistance from employees. Most successful organizations that have successfully rebranded first achieved a

---


consensus of the executive team and then involved middle management to spread the new vision throughout the organization.  

Regardless of when employees are introduced to the new brand, it is necessary to have employees on board before launching the rebrand to the public, rather than post-launch. When rebranding occurs because of a financial situation, there is often a focus on shareholders and publicity. This can leave employees feeling that they are on the receiving end of the process, and see the rebranding as a constraint. Employees that are not prepared for a rebranding launch will be more vulnerable to any negative publicity that may follow. Employees that have a higher level of support for rebranding in an organization show more overall commitment to that organization which leads to loyalty, psychological identification, concern for future well being, and increased operating performance. Employees are the link between senior management and customers; they are responsible for creating and managing the external image of an organization. Customer’s interactions with employees are one of the primary factor when forming an opinion on a brand. If employees do not understand or support the new brand, they will not be able to carry out the brand’s promises in customer encounters.

A brand cannot be assumed by stakeholders. Employee buy-in is achieved by communication through internal marketing and training. Management’s new brand vision should be communicated through a combination of managed internal communication channels such as the internet, e-mail, online discussion boards, as well as through meetings, focus groups and brand books. Communication to employees should be consistent, continuous, and relevant. Many organizations have found success by having several middle management brand ‘advocates’ to transmit the new information and values from senior management to employees. Employees should also be formally trained to acquire new policies and procedures that are a result of a rebranding. This helps transform brand rhetoric into useful practices. Training can be conducted through in house training programs that encourage dialogue and participation such as

---
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situations, workshops, and role plays. Though, many organizations use e-learning programs as alternative or additional training, as it is more standardized and requires fewer resources.63

As previously stated, there will most likely be people within an organization who do not fully support a rebranding, or certain aspects of it, so managers will need to consider the tradeoff of having an employee on board who does not support the vision, or letting them go. Sometimes managers feel that letting an employee go is the only option for employees who will not change and may possibly represent the new brand poorly. However, this can lead to negative publicity for the company, potential lawsuits for perceived discrimination, or other employees may follow them. This could be especially devastating for a small organization.

*****

Employee buy-in may be one area where Arizona State University could have achieved better results. In 2002, there were over 5,000 staff, including administrators, professionals, and classified staff and 2,000 faculty members, both tenured and non-tenured.64 For the most part, faculty and staff supported the new vision. In 2003, one year after Crow’s inauguration, the university hired a consultant to conduct a study to gauge faculty and staff perceptions of the new vision. All answers were unaided and unprompted in response to eight questions including, if and how they had heard about the vision, whether they embraced the vision, and what they thought the probability of success for implementation was. The results showed that almost all of the faculty and staff had heard of the new vision, though slightly less were familiar with the vision. Most were generally favorable towards the vision and supported the objectives (See Appendix B). Faculty and staff noted they received most of their information from a publication called ASU Insight which was an internal newspaper specializing in news for faculty and staff.65

Many employees supported the new vision and rebranding, but did not support Crow and his management style. This employee dissonance was not necessarily a cause of the rebranding, but rather the change in administration. Crow’s newly implemented strategy for the university may have perpetuated the issue, but it is likely that these employees would have still had the same feelings regarding Crow’s micromanagement and the pressure he placed on the faculty regardless. A former dean of the university summed up the issue by noting that, “Institutional
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governance relies on a healthy balance of power between the wisdom of the faculty and the administrative authority vested in the president by the governing board." He also noted that many employees, especially those who resisted change to begin with, disliked how Crow ignored and changed existing policies and ran the institution like a corporation. "This approach has accelerated change, but at the expense of buy-in by the faculty." This sentiment did not deter Crow. In his mind, employees were a means to an end. He believed that the way to achieve the vision was to retain and hire only people who fully supported it. Employee relationships was a factor Crow was willing to sacrifice. Because of his strong commitment to this position, employee backlash had fewer repercussions than it would have in other situations.

VII: Sell the New Brand

The final stage of the implementation phase is launching the new brand to make stakeholders aware of the change. A brand roll-out plan should be created to develop a launch schedule for promotion and advertising. A brand launch is a rare opportunity for an organization to command attention and make a statement in the marketplace. It determines how the public will regard the new brand, so it is important that it is done with thought and consideration. The main objective of launching the new brand is to communicate the new image to target audiences by creating segmented messages that people notice, find relevant, and respond to. Rebranding is generally promoted through advertising. An integrated marketing communications (IMC) strategy is considered a cost efficient promotional tool because it reinforces and synthesizes a consistent message across different media formats and is able to reach a large variety of audiences. While there are variations in specific advertisements, they are all linked to the repositioned corporate brand. The sequencing and timing of media is important; there should first be a lead medium such as television advertisements that portrays the new brand image across to consumers through modified repetition. Following should be other forms of media, such as radio and print advertisements that offer a more subtle reminder of the rebranding. Different formats of media have different roles, but each is linked to a common purpose.
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While advertising may be the choice of large organizations with a sufficient budget, often a more direct approach is needed for organizations with fewer resources. Even organizations that can afford extensive advertising can benefit by including non-mass media in the marketing mix. A public relations campaign including special events, press releases, or feature stories can be advantageous when trying to change attitudes. Interaction between employees and customers in rebranding achieves greater involvement of stakeholders. Activities that have proven to be beneficial in creating brand awareness include customer involvement in brand building exercises and employee contributions to in-store, cause related experiences. Overall, no matter how an organization goes about selling a new brand image, it is important for stakeholders to gain awareness. If they do not know the organization, they are not going to choose it. Particularly true for universities, it may take prospective students or donors to decide amongst a pool of qualified institutions, but with an ineffective message they can eliminate one in just seconds.

**Visual Identity**

Corporate brands are viewed as symbolic expressions and need to be translated into meanings audiences respond to. Brand name, slogan, and logos are visible manifestations of an organization’s desired position. One of the biggest mistakes that organizations make when it comes to rebranding is jumping into the visual side of rebranding without having clear meaning behind new labels. It is necessary that a new brand be built in a logical order. A new visual identity should reflect new values and vision, not vice versa. There are many examples of rebrandings that only involve superficial makeovers of an organization attempting to refresh an image through inconsequential change such as a new font or color for a logo, but these miss the opportunity to actually progress or reposition within the market. That being said, rebranding can include changing the visual identity associated with a brand, but only in due time and with the intention of signaling actual change within an organization. Creating a new visual identity is a task that requires condensing complex attributes and philosophies of an organization into a single design that is instantly recognizable and marketable. The design is used across all facets of the organizations including internal communication devices such as stationary, reports, office
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design, PowerPoint templates, and proposals. It is also used in all external communication such as advertisements, brochures, press releases, website, and even on an organization’s vehicles.

An organization’s visual identity can be as much of a commodity as its products or services. Many organizations protect their design by trademarking slogans or logos. In addition they can create brand guidelines that impose limits on what designs are allowed, thus ensuring consistency across all visual communications. These guidelines outline the laws regarding logo usage, typeface options, color palette, image style, and describe icons and their functional roles. Deviation from such guidelines is subject to penalty.\(^\text{74}\)

Over the past twenty years, many higher education institutions have restyled their insignia to build a university wide identity and become more eye-catching thus transforming themselves into market players. An institution’s brand has become a way that an institution markets its reputation. Many institutions have replaced traditional emblems with figurative images and meaningful text with more “corporate like” logos that reflect little of the history, mission, or character of the institution but are highly marketable. Some institutions differentiate their identity by using the traditional emblem on official documents such as diplomas, and the new image in advertisements to attract younger audiences.\(^\text{75}\) While the consideration used to be whether an image would look good in print, it has now become important that a logo be able suitable for social media, such as being able to be a Facebook or Twitter icon. Lastly, an institution can use its brand as a source of revenue through merchandising, so it is important that is visually appealing.

*****

Before the creation of the New American University, the marketing of Arizona State University was very decentralized; each school has its own public relations arm that operated independently of the university system. There was a need to unify ASU’s brand image to help raise the visibility of the entire university in addition to its individual schools. There was no basic template for language, typefaces, color schemes and images, or framework for publishing materials for the entire university which made individual marketing campaigns much more expensive and uncoordinated. In addition, it was especially necessary to coordinate individual schools’ marketing to promote the new vision. To do so, the university hired a consultant to
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conduct a communications audit. The consultant reviewed current marketing materials at the time and conducted interviews with relevant stakeholder to generate recommendations to help establish a more unified brand across the university.\textsuperscript{76} There were three goals that ASU needed to achieve in regards to marketing and communications. Firstly, it was important that ASU first fix the issues that it already had. Secondly, it needed to sell the rebranded vision. Lastly, it had to achieve the designated goals of the rebranding.

The university’s Office of Public Affairs created a Communication Guide to university branding. Overall, the guide required that a logo be on everything produced, and everything produced must clearly look like it is from ASU. This strengthened the ability of the university to communicate its mission and message, as well as provided a visual relationship between audiences and all facets of ASU. Outlined by the guide are clear definitions of brand vision, values, tone, and promise. In addition, the Communication Guide set parameters for using and communicating the brand in regards to the use of graphics, typography, language, and content in mediums ranging from print, web, video, photography, social media, to apparel and merchandise. Furthermore, the guide outlined the acceptable uses and formats of different aspects of brand identity including logo, mascot, university seal, registered marks and trademarks for general affiliations and endorsed identities.\textsuperscript{77} Finally, Branding and Marketing Councils were established to discuss and approve promotional materials put together by different departments. There are repercussions if a department’s publications do not support the brand portfolio.

The first step ASU took to promote the New American University vision was to develop a new website (www.newamericanuniversity.asu.edu) to showcase the new mission, vision, and design aspirations for the university. The site offers numerous resources on the New American University and also allows students to get involved and discuss their personal experiences at ASU. This marketing tool was not designed to help achieve the goals of the new brand, rather to disseminate information and create awareness achieving overall buy-in. Later in the rebranding, the university hired design consultants to help translate the brand visually and verbally. The team created a framework for a comprehensive communication program including guidelines and communication strategy for brand rollout, and a year-long plan to launch the brand to the public.


The campaign created is known as the “Challenges Project.” The Challenges Project was first introduced via another new website (www.asuchallenges.com) which featured a video that focused on the challenges faced in the 21st century and ASU’s commitment to meeting them. The site also engaged students, faculty and members of the community by encouraging their input on what global issues matter most to them. The site was the first part of a major, multifaceted campaign encompassing the entire university based around a series of challenges confronting the country, Arizona, and greater Phoenix. Roughly one year after the launch of the website, the entire campaign was unveiled to the public by the Alumni Association and the ASU Foundation at the 2009 Founders’ Day event. The campaign was based around eight specific questions that the university asked:

How do we...

1) Educate in a rapidly changing world?
2) Focus information and technology to produce meaningful change?
3) Build strong, vibrant communities?
4) Create a sustainable way of life?
5) Promote economic opportunity and security?
6) Lead healthier, more fulfilling lives?
7) Defend and extend human rights?
8) Understand the past and present for the sake of the future?

This unveiling was ASU’s first public expression of its aspirations as a New American University. The questions were designed to convey the scope and significance of the daily work that goes on at ASU. The campaign invited the public to see that the university was living up to its social contract with its communities, as well as how the university community was innovating to address many of society’s most pressing and diverse global challenges, and how the university would continue to do so in the future. The university’s advertisements are all tied to the Challenges Project (See Appendix C). Overall, the campaign offers a coherent message for the university in its entirety across various advertising mediums, and also promotes the vision and identity for the New American University brand.

---


**VIII: Evaluate**

Many organizations spend time and resources on the planning and implementing phases of rebranding, but fail to create a well articulated comprehensive evaluation plan or methodology to measure results and instead, rely on anecdotal evidence. Evaluation of the rebranding needs to be carefully designed at the onset of the process and be both interactive and reflective. An evaluation team should be formed to define what benchmarks and metrics determine ‘success’. This team can include internal employees and management, an outside evaluation consultant, or a combination of both. The team will set initial parameters for assessment and then determine how to implement the evaluation process. In addition, it is necessary to have a team not only to collect and analyze quantitative and qualitative data, but to synthesize it to make it useful.\(^8^0\) Many of the techniques and metrics used in the situation analysis phase will be able to be used in this phase as well.

Evaluation of the rebranding ought to be an ongoing element throughout the entire transformation. Short term evaluation should monitor and analyze specific activities and programs using qualitative and quantitative data. It is unlikely that even the best laid plans will go off without a hitch. Without proper evaluation, opportunities to refine the rebranding will be missed. Evaluation allows an aspect of a plan to be altered when a need for change is evident.\(^8^1\) Many research techniques used in the brand audit that assess perceptions about the brand from multiple stakeholders will also be useful for this type of evaluation. In addition, long term evaluation is also necessary. Most managers expect the results of a rebranding to have effects immediately. While this may happen to some extent (positive or negative), some tangible evidence may take years to manifest. A longitudinal study of both the process to implement the plan, as well as the results, should be conducted to see the effect over time. Finally, reports of results and discussions of challenges, lessons learned, and next steps should continually be shared with stakeholders inside and outside of the organization to keep them informed and involved.

****

Institutions of higher education have an advantage over corporations when it comes to evaluating a rebranding. Colleges and universities have to report to higher authorities to remain

\(^{80}\) Fern Tiger Associates  
\(^{81}\) Daly and Moloney, 30-36
accredited and receive funding. Public universities, including Arizona State University, have to report the condition of their institution to their higher education governing board on a regular basis which provides the added benefit of being able to evaluate short term results. This board can also help determine what metrics define success. The vision and design of the New American University overlap with the goal areas of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR): educational excellence and access, research excellence, workforce and community, and productivity. ABOR already has metrics in place to measure these goals (See Appendix D). ASU was, and continues to be, committed to using these same metrics as a way to measure change and progress, determine which areas need to be improved, and inform internal and external stakeholders on how well the university measures up.82 In addition to ABOR’s areas of academics, research, community, and productivity, ASU additionally measures progress through investment in the institution, major partnerships and collaborations, impact through knowledge creation and development, organizational transformation, and infrastructure investment.83 As stated earlier, ASU uses many resources for collecting data which are also used for university evaluations. These include the University Office of Evaluation and Educational Effectiveness, the University Office of Institutional Analysis, as well as numerous councils and committees. The university credits improvements in performance to the evaluative processes that university has in place. System-wide commitment to evaluation has allowed ASU to make consistent and incremental adjustments where needed which have long term effects on the university.

Higher education institutions also have an advantage for measuring long term effects of a rebranding. Most higher education commissions require an institution to complete a self-study report every ten years in order to be reaccredited. Even if this self-study were not required, it would still be an extremely helpful tool for institutions to determine the long term implications of a rebranding. A self-study process is meant to build on an institution’s ongoing self-evaluation processes and be used not only to receive reaccreditation, but also to meet the objectives of an institution.84 A self-study report is beneficial in evaluating a rebranding effort because it evaluates the current quality of an institution as a whole, and provides an overall assessment of the state of an institution rather than a snapshot provided once every ten years.
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ASU’s ten year self-study coincided with the ten year anniversary of the New American University. The main goal of the self-study process was to provide evidence supporting renewal of ASU’s accreditation and demonstrate compliance with federal higher education legal requirements. However, additional goals were articulated by President Crow.

These included summarizing major changes in the university, reflecting on the distinctive nature of mission, vision, goals of ASU as the New American University, and presenting background and evaluative perspectives on all operations of the university. The self-study process is very time consuming. The final report was submitted to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) in January 2013, but the initial study plan had been approved almost two years earlier in April 2011. Furthermore, the Self-Study Coordinator had been appointed nearly a year and half before in August 2009. In addition to being time consuming, the study is also very resource intensive. The Self-Study Coordinator was responsible for overseeing a Steering Committee responsible for all five areas of HLC Criteria for Accreditation, as well as a resource and editorial team (See Figure 3).

Since the report is so recent, it is unclear how the university will use the specific information it collected to further the New American University. However the study lays out important information for the future, including opportunities and obstacles that ASU faces in carrying out its mission. In addition, the report will serve as a baseline for measuring future efforts towards improving.

Figure 3. Self-study Organizational Structure
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Results of the New American University

The results of Arizona State University’s New American University over the past ten years are significant. Today, the university has the largest enrollment of any university in the United States. In the area of academic excellence and access, ASU has become a top university. *U.S. News & World Report* has ranked ASU in the top tier of national universities since 2008. ASU is also ranked 78th in The Academic Ranking of World Universities. Since 2009, ASU had been place on *Forbes* list of 100 of “America’s Best Colleges.” Additionally, individual academic programs at ASU have been ranked among the best in the nation. ASU has also increased its number of faculty who have received the highest awards in their fields by adding 188 new award recipients, fellows or academy members. These include new Sloan Research Fellows, Pulitzer Prize winners, Fulbright American Scholars, Guggenheim Fellows, and Nobel Laureates. The university continues to break records for the quality of incoming students in regard to test scores and class ranking. Records have also been broken for the number of transfer students from community colleges due to the strong partnerships ASU has formed with community college systems throughout Arizona. Over the past ten years, the number of degrees awarded has grown over 50%, and ASU is consistently ranked as one of the top ten producers of Fulbright and Marshall Scholars in the United States. ASU has also made significant strides in diversifying. Racially, ASU has ranked as one of the top institutions for ethnic minorities by top publications focused on diversity. Minority enrollment as percentage of total student population has increased by 44% to almost one-third of the total student body. Minority employees as a percentage of total employees have also increased by 25%. Economically, the number of first-time, full-time low-income Arizona freshmen grew a whopping six-fold. In addition, the number of Pell grant recipients has also increased significantly.

ASU is continually working toward its goal of accommodating 100,000 students by 2020. There has been considerable investment in the university’s infrastructure. A new campus and a global innovation park were added, and capacity in existing locations expanded. Classroom, classroom laboratory, library, office, residence hall and other space has increased by 79%. In addition, the university’s information technology infrastructure was overhauled. Overall, almost $600 million has been invested in renovations and new facilities. ASU has also made considerable strides in other areas where it evaluates its transformation. In 2011, research-related
expenditures reached a record high of $343.6 million, almost double the amount ten years prior. The university, which had primarily relied heavily on state funding, has also increased outside investment in the university from local and state governments, students and their families, and private investors. ASU’s endowment grew from $221 million in 2003 to $515 million in 2011. The university has also undergone considerable organizational transformation. The university has expanded its academic portfolio to meet needs for a highly skilled, innovative workforce by adding 51 new bachelor’s degrees, 42 master’s degrees and 31 doctoral degrees, and creating 31 new interdisciplinary schools.

Many major partnerships and collaborations have been formed domestically, such as with the Mayo Clinic, as well as globally with ten international institutions. Community engagement and alumni engagement has also become more prevalent at the university. Since 2008, ASU has been named to the President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll—the highest federal recognition a university can receive for its commitment to volunteering, service learning and civic engagement. In 2010 more than 15,000 students engaged in 400,000 hours of community service. Currently the university has 505 community outreach programs in 176 locations, offered by 115 units, totaling 743 outreach opportunities. The university also established the Office of the Vice President for Education Partnerships to improve the academic performance of students in Arizona from early childhood through high school completion to promote the attainment of a college degree. The partnership works with over 100,000 local students. Finally, the university has launched a major rebuilding of the alumni volunteer chapter network, a broad series of new programs, events, benefits and services to boost alumni engagement which is a significant indicator of institutional quality.88

Conclusion

Even the most thought-out rebranding lead by the most seasoned professionals can still fail. Three-quarters of the way through ASU’s rebranding, the downturn in the economy was a severe setback and threatened the progress that the university had already made. The economy, combined with new state spending measures in 2008, led to state budget shortfalls. This, as well as enrollment growth proportionate to the state’s population growth, created a decline in the

amount of state resources per full-time equivalent student of 52%. To deal with shortfalls, the university had to increase other sources of revenue, target cost reductions focused on administrative and academic efficiency, and use temporary sources of support. For instance, tuition increased substantially from 2009 to 2012. In that same time, 2,055 positions were eliminated through the layoffs, non-replacement of retirees, and elimination of vacant positions. In addition, employees that did remain faced pay reductions of up to 14%.89

It is inevitable that a rebranding will face challenges, and it is important for an organization to have a solid vision and process to stand behind when dealing with these challenges. ASU’s response in 2008 limited the impact of the budget reductions to a level that preserved important objectives of the university including program quality and outcomes. Challenges can also serve as opportunities for organizations to learn what they need to do going forward to avoid the same issues. The setback forced ASU to formulate a comprehensive strategic business planning framework for the coming decade that further diminishes the institution’s reliance on financial support from the state to sustain and build institutional quality.90

Overall, rebranding is an important and complex process that is undertaken for many reasons and in many ways. Although rebranding is typically an infrequent activity in an organization, the increase in rebranding activity means that managers will be more likely to be involved in a rebranding process during their career. Individual managers therefore need to be familiar with process issues and opportunities of rebranding in order to be effective. The eight guidelines presented should be used as considerations for higher education institutions in the rebranding process. They are not specific steps or procedures, rather overarching ideas what should be integrated into a process in order to increase the likelihood of success.
ASU - Community Dialogue

Walk ABOUT Arizona

- Reach 15,000 Arizona residents (households/focus ASU sites)
- Provide information re: ASU invite to September 2007
- Ask re: ASU image/Arizona needs

Think ABOUT Arizona

- Update original directions (2005+) about societal direction of Social Embeddedness Design Imperative
- Focus groups Participant organized by reg nonprofit

Talk ABOUT Arizona

ASU / Regional Forum(s)
- Present 2007/08 focus
- Analyze brainstorm ideas/patent tips
- Disseminate SE publication/concepts
- Announce Innovation Trust winners
- Introduce ASU "SE Director"
- Kick off web-based forum

Making Change come ABOUT in Arizona

Days from each of 4 committees
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee
- Community/ASU 2007/08 Theme Committee

Think ABOUT Arizona

- Focus groups through regional nonprofits

Establish committees with members from ASU (faculty/staff students at 4 campuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Oversight</th>
<th>Speaker Series</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Seminars</th>
<th>Community dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;SE in Action&quot; Review Team</td>
<td>Create &quot;Working Plan&quot; for Social Embeddedness</td>
<td>Participate in hiring &amp; review of SE Director</td>
<td>Ongoing oversight of Social Embeddedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>Develop metrics</td>
<td>Create documentation standards</td>
<td>Oversee interim and 5-year evaluations of SE at ASU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Appendix A
Appendix B

Detailed results of the Faculty and Staff Perceptions Study conducted by Stamats Communication, Inc.-

- 92% faculty/staff had heard of Vision
- 84% were very/somewhat familiar with Vision
- 58% had attended at least one presentation by President Crow
- 83% had very/generally favorable toward Vision
- 89% placed very high/high priority on expanding research capacity
- 88% placed very high/high priority on becoming more embedded in community
- 70% placed very high/high priority on growing/expanding
- 86% felt President Crow had high/very high probability of achieving Vision
- 6 of the 8 main guidelines could be recalled
Appendix C

Challenges Project advertising across various mediums:

Print:

Train Wraps:

Billboards:
Appendix D

AZ Board of Regents Success Measures:

Educational Excellence and Access:
1) Bachelor’s Degrees awarded
2) Master’s Degrees awarded
3) AZ community college transfers
4) Bachelor’s Degrees awarded to AZ community college transfers
5) 4 year graduation rate for AZ community college transfers
6) 6 year graduation rate
7) Educational quality
8) Cost of attendance as percentage of AZ median family income
9) Freshman retention rate
10) Undergraduate enrollment
11) Total enrollment
12) College going rate (from k-12)

Research Excellence:
13) R&D expenditures
14) Doctoral Degrees awarded
15) Invention disclosures transacted
16) Patents issued
17) Intellectual property income

Workforce and Community:
18) Community engagement activities impact
19) Service and engagement activities expenditures
20) Degrees awarded in high demand fields
21) Diversity of graduates
22) New companies started
23) Milken Institute State Science and Technology ranking
24) AZ adults with Bachelor’s Degrees
25) Number of professional practice Doctoral Degrees awarded

Productivity:
26) Bachelor’s Degrees awarded per 100 Full-time equivalent students
27) Comprehensive Financial index
28) Peer institution’s average tuition
29) Online degrees and certificates
30) Employment of graduates who stay in AZ
31) Education and related expenses per degree
32) College, online & other enrollment

Source:
Campbell 37