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THE NETHERLANDS AND POLAND

**THE NETHERLANDS**
55 HEIs (incl. 14 universities)
840,000 students total
90,000 international students
7 mln m²
19.286 USD expenditure/per student

**POLAND**
132 HEIs (incl. 96 universities)
1,600,000 students total
55,000 international students
12 mln m²
9.687 USD expenditure/per student

Table 1. Number of strategies of public universities in the Netherlands and in Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Universities with strategic plans referring to campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>96**</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 Open University and 41 Universities of Applied Sciences were excluded.
** 36 Universities of Applied Sciences were not analysed.
Source: own elaboration.
Table 2. Campus goals of Dutch and Polish universities mentioned in their general strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Campus goals</th>
<th>% of strategies</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>Poland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
<td>Stimulating innovation</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting culture</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulating collaboration</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting image</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving quality of place</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional</strong></td>
<td>Supporting users activities</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing users satisfaction</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing flexibility</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>Decreasing costs</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increasing real estate value</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlling risks</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Reducing footprint</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Netherlands
Focus on three perspectives:
- organizational
- functional
- physical

Poland
Focus on two perspectives:
- functional
- financial

POSSIBLE REASONS FOR THE DIFFERENCES IN CAMPUS GOALS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES
FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND DEMOGRAPHY

Projected population change in European countries, 2015-2100

Education spending, 2016

USD per student annually

- < 5 000
- 5 001 to 10 000
- 10 001 to 15 000
- 15 001 to 20 000
- > 20 001

Source: Own elaboration based on: OECD 2018.
Ownership and management of university buildings

THERE IS NO COMPARABLE ESTATE DATA ON EUROPEAN LEVEL IN:

- **EUROSTAT**
- **UNESCO**
- **OECD** (Centre for Effective Learning Environments (CELE) focuses mainly on the relations between infrastructure conditions and learning performance)
- **INTERNATIONAL RANKINGS OF UNIVERSITIES** (Shanghai Ranking, QS Top Universities, U-multirank)
IS THERE A NEED FOR TRANSNATIONAL COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES?
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CAMPUS GOALS DEPEND on

- **autonomy**
  - organisational perspective
    - goals to support, quality ambitions

- **public funding**
  - financial perspective
    - costs, income, value

- **demography**
  - functional perspective
    - users, mix of functions / spaces

- **accountability**
  - physical perspective
    - m2, condition, location, quality

Source: Own elaboration based on: DEN HEIJER 2011.