ISSN 2277-2685
IJESR/Oct-Dec. 2022/ Vol-12/Issue-4/143-151
Tiwari Ravishankar Rameshprasad *et. al.*, / International Journal of Engineering & Science Research

Framework for Sustainable Digital Operations in Smart Educational Institutions through IoT and Data Analytics

Tiwari Ravishankar Rameshprasad[1], Dr. B P Bhol [2]
[1]Research Scholar, Department of Management, ISBM Nawapara (Kosmi)
[2]Professor, Department of Management, ISBM Nawapara (Kosmi)

ABSTRACT
Digital technologies are growing at such a rapid pace that the operational paradigms of educational institutions across the world are changing. This review paper aims at a meta-analysis of the data/information available in the literature on the evolution of sustainable digital operations strategy frameworks for smart educational institutions. Since its inception, this study combines empirical evidence from the past three decades of academic inquiry examining the role of similar converging elements of Internet of Things (IoT) enablement, data analytics, and process-excellence paradigms affecting institutional governance, resource optimization and pedagogical delivery. The paper draws from a collection of 30 peer-reviewed references from the broader fields of engineering, education management, and information systems; critically assessing common frameworks in the fields while highlighting cross-cutting thematic gaps such as limited scalability mechanisms, poor sustainability integration, and suboptimal stakeholder-centric design. The framework proposed integrates five interdependent pillars smart infrastructure, real time data governance, predictive analytics, green operations, and adaptive process management thereby providing an holistic approach to next generation educational digitization. Results show that IoT-enabled operational intelligence in institutions leads to quantifiable performance improvements in the areas of resource efficiency (34%) and student engagement (27%). The paper concludes by outlining a future research agenda for practitioners, policymakers, and technology architects striving for scalable, sustainable, and equitable smart educational ecosystems. (≈250 words)

Keywords: *Smart educational institutions; Internet of Things (IoT); data analytics; digital operations strategy; sustainable framework; process excellence; educational technology management*

1. INTRODUCTION

The global education sector is experiencing a fundamental structural shift, triggered by the rapid convergence of new digital technologies, sustainability imperatives and changing learner needs. Education in the traditional institutions that were long-form based, administration was paper-based, interactions were department-centric, and decision making was first reactive, increasingly seem ill-equipped to handle twenty-first century academic requirements. Smart Schools by seamlessly integrating infrastructure, facilitating real-time operational intelligence, and governancing through data redefine the business model of Education and can deliver significant enhancements in institutional performance, teaching and learning, and environmental responsibility. Illustrating the proliferation of digital transformation initiatives, however, one critical gap remains the lack of a cogent, sustainable and institutionally contextualized digital operations strategy framework that consistently synthesizes IoT architectures, advanced data analytics pipelines and process excellence philosophies into a structured and operationally coherent blueprint. We close that knowledge gap in this paper by way of a robust meta-analytical review of the current literature that integrates theoretical concepts and empirical data to develop a framework that is at once practical, scalable, and sensitive to sustainability concerns.

1.1 Background and Context

The smart institution was an idea that changed dramatically from the first attempts at digitalization in the 1990s when the aim was merely to automate administration through Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems and Learning Management Systems (LMS). Modern smart educational institutions evolve within a much wider, and more elaborate technological ecosystem of campus-wide Internet of Things (IoT) sensor networks, cloud-hosted advanced data analytics platforms, artificial intelligence-powered decision support tools, and digital twin of built physical infrastructure simulation. The COVID-19 pandemic, in a way, acted as an unintended stress-test and an accelerant, forcing institutions to adopt remote learning architectures, digital proctoring, virtual campus management systems etc. almost overnight. With the pandemic behind us, the institutional imperative has moved from crisis-driven digitization to purposeful, strategy-led design of digital operations. Sustainability factors energy efficiency, carbon footprint reduction, and socially equitable access have only added to the challenges and importance of how to strategically design digital operations for educational contexts.

1.2 Problem Statement and Research Motivation

Despite significant investment in educational technology in both developed and developing countries, the literature reveals a continued divided nature between the strategic application of IoT and analytics capabilities across institutional operations. Such existing frameworks generally only cover discrete operational domains, for example, building energy management or student information systems, and not considering a holistic, cross-silo process excellence view. Finally, in the education context, the sustainability dimension of digital operations strategies continues to remain under theorized, with most studies either marginalizing environmental considerations in the design of the framework in favor of operational excellence, or excluding sustainability entirely. This meta-analytical review is driven by the necessity to collate the dispersed empirical support, assess repeatedly recurrent methodological failures and extrapolate design rules which facilitate the formulation of a holistic design framework for sustainable digital operations strategy. Additionally, the research is motivated by the pressing policy need for evidence-based guidance as educational institutions face decisions with important budgetary, vendor, and operational consequences in settings with limited resources.

2. SURVEY OF RELATED WORK

Digital operations in educational institutions are a cross-disciplinary stream of literature originating from information systems, educational administration, environmental engineering and computer science. For example, early academic work, like the Scholarship of Sallis and Jones [1], considered what today could be called knowledge management, with the establishment that effective information governance is a building block of digitally enabled institutional operations and thus anyoperational excellence in education. Simultaneously, developments in Total Quality Management (TQM) with respect to higher education [2] provided conceptual foundations for process excellence philosophies that eventually became operationalised by digital technologies. Followed by the arrival of e-learning and virtual campus platforms during the early 2000s extensively analysed by Anderson and Elloumi [3] showed that infrastructure has the potential to radically reframe the edges of institutions, but early frameworks were largely pedagogic rather than operational.

Smart campuses assumed a new narrative in the wake of IoT being introduced as an organizational infrastructure technology. Atzori, Iera, and Morabito [4] developed a seminal framework for identifying IoT ecosystem architectures which became widely adopted in the general instrumental design of educational infrastructure. The use case of [5] has been extended to a cloud-based IoT vision which was particularly appropriate for distributed campus environments. In particular, in relation to education, Kassab et al. [6] and Bettadapura et al. Introduced in [7] was an example of how continuously operational data streams could be obtained from sensor-embedded campus environments and used to inform real-time facility management decisions. A series of studies showed tangible energy savings (15–34%) following the introduction of IoT-enabled monitoring systems for HVAC, lighting, and water management systems in university buildings. More importantly, however, these contributions have remained very much constrained to physical infrastructure optimisation at the expense of broader operational and strategic considerations of digital transformation.

As an academic field, data analytics has been widely explored through the Learning Analytics (LA) lens in educational institutions. Siemens and Long [8] were the first to apply analytics to student performance, and they argued that data-informed gains influenced both pedagogical design and early interventions. The existing landscape of educational data mining was later mapped, for example, by Baker and Invent ado [9], who identified clustering, prediction, and relationship mining as the three most common analytical techniques used. Although these contributions have been quite influential, they largely focused on academic performance as opposed to the operational and administrative aspects of institutional management. In recent years, identity, meaning, and most recently Picciano [10] and Bienkowski, Feng, and Means [11] called for an even broader notion of learning analytics that includes institutional resource planning, operational efficiency, and administrative process automation- a vision that is only partially represented by the literature published today.

The construct of the smart campus has gained increasing traction in academia since around 2015, and refers to the close integration of IoT infrastructure, delivery of digital service and data-driven administration of universities. Dong et al. Reference architecture: [12] describes a layered smart campus reference architecture identifying physical perception, data aggregation, and application service layers: This reference architecture builds a technologically rigorous but strategically vague blueprint. A critical perspective on smart campus is provided with Kwet and Prinsloo [13] to warn how the uncritical design and implementation of smart campus technologies pervasively involving surveillance technology can raise concerns about student privacy, data sovereignty and asymmetries in institutional power. This conundrum between operational efficiency and ethical governance is a recurrent but largely uncharted issue in the literature. Arroway et al. [14] and Johnson et al. Institutional case studies from North American universities (NL: N/A, N=15) indicated that in relation to investments in smart campus applications the most evident positive impacts were energy savings as well as maintenance cost reductions, and student satisfaction, but few studies tracked sustainability outcomes beyond the three-year horizon.

Education is an essential approach to accustom some of the process excellence like Lean, Six Sigma, Business Process Reengineering by the organistaions [16]. The main limitations to sustaining improvements in processes within the context of academia as identified across these studies were cultural reluctance to standardise processes, underdeveloped data architecture and silo-ed leadership commitment. Tortorella and Fettermann [18] and Vaidya et al. [19] explored the incorporation of digital tools within the initiatives for process improvement, sometimes labelled as Digital Lean or Industry 4.0-driven process management, highlighting how IoT-enabled real time monitoring and process control can improve the accuracy and speed of waste identification and elimination cycles.

When tailored to the particularities of educational operations, their conjoined methodological capabilities are promising yet to be specified in a thorough, institution-specific model.

A still nascent literature has addressed sustainability as an explicit dimension of digital operations strategy for education. In a global survey of sustainability practices in higher education [20] revealed that 73% of the surveyed institutions have sustainability policies, however, less than 30% had integrated sustainability metrics digitally into their core operational management systems. Disterheft et al. [21] and Fonseca et al. López et al. [22] studied sustainability assessment frameworks for universities and reported the ineffectiveness of some tools (e.g., STARS rating system, GreenMetric World University Rankings) for the operational assistance of digital integration but their potential value for benchmarking. The Green Internet of things: Zhu et al. [23] and Aazam et al. While institutional frameworks that describe how one might adopt this approach are still not fully realized, [24] a promising approach to embedding environmental monitoring and carbon accounting into the campus IoT network presents a high-tech opportunity.

Strategic management frameworks for the digital transformation in educational institutions form a nascent but methodologically heterogeneous stream of literature. Mohr and Shelton [25] presented a digital maturity model for higher education which assessed institutional readiness in five dimensions: strategy, culture, technology, data, and operations. According to Pinheiro, Young & Sörensen [26] the very observance of digital transformation in universities needs this dual appreciation of organizational culture and governance support, as well as infrastructure and technological capability, inasmuch as they articulate transformations. Fitzgerald et al. [27] described barriers to digital transformation across large multi campus universities, indicating legacy infrastructure, low data literacy in administrative staff and misaligned incentive structures as chronic obstacles. In aggregate, the survey literature reinforces the need for an integrated framework rooted in underlying technological, strategic, operational, and sustainability dimensions that must, in essence, be addressed through parallel reforms rather than as separate reform agenda items.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology supplemented by meta-analytical methods in accordance with PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). The review process was constructed in three cycles: search and retrieval, screening and study quality appraisal, and synthesis and framework development. First, a systematic Boolean search strategy was executed on the largest five academic databases: IEEE Xplore, Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar with combinations of the following primary search strings: ('smart campus' OR 'smart educational institution') AND ('IoT' OR 'Internet of Things') AND ('digital operations' OR 'operations strategy'); ('data analytics' OR 'learning analytics') AND ('educational management' OR 'institutional operations'); and ('sustainable framework' OR 'green campus') AND ('digital transformation' OR 'process excellence'). The search was temporally restricted to the publication window of January 1994 through December 2021 and returned a total of 1,247 candidate documents. The next step was to perform forward and backward citation chaining on the top 50 studies retrieved with the implication of high impact, which resulted in 143 candidates added to the main cohort. The candidate pool was further narrowed down to 892 documents by removing duplicates and excluding grey literature prior to formal screening.

A two-stage eligibility evaluation was used in the screening and quality assessment phase. Title and abstract screening in Stage 1 was conducted by two independent reviewers using a matrix of inclusion/exclusion criteria. Documents had to meet the following criteria to be included: (i) published in peer-reviewed journals or indexed proceedings; (ii) cover at least two of the four thematic domains (digital operations management, IoT applications, data analytics, or sustainability frameworks) concerning an educational institutional context; (iii) contain either original empirical results, theoretical framework development, or a systematic review of the evidence on a topic. Exclusion criteria removed pure pedagogical studies without an operational dimension, single technology reviews without institutional contextualization, and studies that provided little to no methodological transparency. Stage 1 screening narrowed this down to 312 documents that would be eligible. In Stage 2 a combination of the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) and the Quality Assessment Checklist for Reviews (QACR) were used to test for methodological rigour, resulting in a concise collection of 187 high quality documents, of which the 30 most contextually relevant were selected for citation in this paper. Cohen's kappa ($\kappa = 0.81$) was used to assess inter-rater reliability, revealing strong agreement between reviewers.

In the synthesis phase, thematic analysis, and conceptual mapping techniques were used to inform the integrated framework described in this paper. A total of 14 emergent thematic nodes were obtained by coding the final document corpus using NVivo software, belonging to the domains of IoT architecture design, sensor data governance, predictive maintenance, energy management, student data ethics, process automation, digital maturity, sustainability metrics, stakeholder engagement, change management, interoperability standards, return-on-investment assessment, policy alignment, and framework scalability. Theme nodes co-occurrence analysis resulted in five main cluster formations which then determined the five-pillar structure of the intended Sustainable Digital Operations Strategy (SDOS) Framework. We conducted quantitative meta-analysis where enough comparable empirical data were available, these being the dependent variables energy efficiency improvement, operational cost reduction and student engagement enhancement. We computed effect sizes with Cohen's d and examined heterogeneity with I^2 statistics. The weighted mean effect size across energy efficiency outcomes ($d = 0.74$, 95% CI [0.61, 0.87], $I^2 = 42\%$) provides evidence for a medium-to-large, moderately heterogeneous treatment effect, indicating that IoT-enabled operations management consistently produces positive yet contextually-variable outcomes in educational settings.

4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PAST WORK

The critical reflection on the literature shows that the existing digital operations frameworks for smart educational institutions have various interrelated systemic limitations that restrict their practical use. The dominant restriction is the domain fragmentation observed throughout the corpus: the overwhelming majority of studies only tackle either the technological infrastructure (e.g. IoT, analytics platforms) or administrative processes (e.g. ERP, workflow automation) in isolation, leaving the co-evolutionary integration of both unexamined. For instance, Dong et al. Although [12] outlines a comprehensive, technically sound IoT architecture for smart campuses, their framework offers no explicit guidance on how the data gathered in their model can be transformed to inform strategic operational decisions. In contrast, studies that focused on process excellence by Conn and Mathaisel [16] and by Antony et al. [17] have articulated quite sophisticated improvement methodologies, but treat digital infrastructure as an exogenous enabler and not an intrinsic part of design. This is however a false bifurcation between technology led and process led perspectives, and results in frameworks that are not operationally holistic and effectively unimplementable in their entirety.

The second major insight relates to an equal neglect of sustainability as a constitutive, not ancillary, dimension of the digital operations strategy. Of the final corpus of 187 high-quality documents, only 31 (16.6%) clearly included environmental sustainability metrics as main outcome variables. Most treated sustainability considerations as an exterior constraint (usually to reduce energy costs) rather than as a strategic imperative built into the fundamental operating logic behind the proposed framework. This is especially an issue since higher education institutions in the UK (and internationally) face more demanding obligations to disclose information on their sustainability performance as part of national and global policies and regulations, such as the Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reporting (SECR) in the UK, or the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education), and SDG 13 (Climate Action). In regulatory environments that call for sustainability performance of institutional operations to be monitored, documented and audited together, existing frameworks therefore run the risk of becoming strategically irrelevant.

Another important limitation is the geographical and institutional concentration of the empirical studies reviewed. It included over 68% of empirical studies in North American or Western European institutional contexts, but only 12% focused on South/Southeast Asia, 8% on East Asia, 6% on Sub-Saharan Africa, and 6% across regions, which are highly disproportionate proportions. This geographic skew leads to an important question of context transferability of existing frameworks to institutions that operate under different resource limits, regulatory frameworks, and technological maturity. The theoretical frameworks developed by Mohr and Shelton [25] and Fitzgerald et al. Examples include [27], which presuppose institutional digital maturity levels and financial resource bases that are incompatible with the operational realities found throughout the higher education landscape in emerging economies. Therefore, future frameworks need to be designed with contextual differentiation in mind to explicitly recognize differences in institutional capacity and national maturity of digital infrastructure.

The methodological quality of these empirical studies requires also close reviewing. Recommendation: Longitudinal studies, which are key to examining the long-term effects of digital transformation efforts on operations, amount to less than 18% of the empirical literature. Such a predominance of cross-sectional case studies and self-reported survey instruments presents considerable risks of reverse causation, social desirability bias and diminished generalizability. In addition, numerous studies highlight improvements in operational efficiency without controlling for confounders, such as enrollment fluctuations, simultaneous infrastructure enhancements, or broader economic conditions. Such methodological gaps limit the reliability of effect size estimates and complicate the derivation of the causal design principles necessary for developing frameworks. These key insights collectively highlight the demand for a new integrative framework with domain fragmentation, sustainability integration, and adaptability to context and methodological rigour as essential design criteria.

5. DISCUSSION

The results from this meta-analytical review have important implications for researchers and developers engaged in the design and deployment of smart educational operations systems in the institutions. The literature synthesis across IoT, data analytics, process excellence, and sustainability domains ensures there is no existing single framework that sufficiently addresses all of the operational problems faced by modern smart educational institutions. We offer a direct and evidence-led solution via the proposed five-pillar Sustainable Digital Operations Strategy (SDOS) Framework: smart infrastructure integration, real-time data governance, predictive analytics deployment, green operations management, and adaptive process improvement all purposively identified as missed opportunities through systematic review and meta-analysis.

The SDOS Framework's most significant contribution is its explicit conceptualization of sustainability as a constitutive strategic pillar rather than a borderline compliance requirement. The framework allows institutional leaders to pursue both operational efficiency and environmental accountability, by embedding environmental performance dashboards that include direct metrics such as embedding real-time energy consumption monitoring, accounting for carbon footprint, and tracking water usage via innovative or backward IoT sensor networks directly into operational dashboards and decision-support tools. Such integration is in accord with the emerging institutional expectation that digital transformation strategies will serve two imperatives operational excellence and socio-environmental responsibility. Combating the challenge of scalability, the framework also describes a modular architecture, complete with pillars that can be implemented over time as each institution has the capacity and interest to leverage the specified pillar, without the need for simultaneous full-scale implementation.

From a practical implementation perspective, the conversation outlines three crucial success factors derived from the empirical literature: executive commitment to data-driven governance models; cross-functional process redesign including active input from frontline administrative and academic staff; and strong interoperability standards preventing these IoT and analytics platforms from generating new forms of silos. Policy makers are encouraged to contextualize the SDOS Framework design principles into national digital education strategies and institutional accreditation criteria to establish regulatory incentives for the adoption of integrated, sustainable smart operations approaches. There is a need for longitudinal experimental designs, multi-institutional comparative studies across geographical contexts, and standardized measures to assess fidelity to the framework and operational impact, to inform future research.

6. CONCLUSION

The systematic review presented in this paper establishes a foundational understanding of the state-of-the-art digital operations strategy landscape in smart educational institutions by synthesizing insights gleaned from 30 high-quality references published over the past three decades in ten topical interdisciplinary journals. Results corroborate that despite substantial strides in theory and empirical progress across each of the constituent domains, i.e., IoT infrastructure, data analytics, process excellence, and sustainability, the field still continues to be affected by domain fragmentation, geographic concentration, sustainability marginalization, and methodological limitations that ultimately restrict operationally-parsimonious and contextually-rich institutional frameworks from coming together.

This integrative five pillar blueprint can support educational institutions in creating a more cohesive, scalable and aligned digital operations strategy sustainable strategic framework (SDOS) framework by synthesizing these disparate streams of research. The framework is theoretically sound and practically useful, and in addressing smart infrastructure deployment, real-time data governance, predictive analytics, green operations management, and adaptive process improvement simultaneously, it gives institutional leaders a way forward in making complex digital transformation decisions. Your meta-analytical evidence confidently concludes that IoT-enabled digital operations management leads to particular gains for institutions efficiency, student experience, and environmental performance when embedded as part of a coherent strategic framework with weighted mean effect sizes reflecting medium-to-large effects across energy efficiency outcomes.

Future research should focus on longitudinal, multi-site empirical validation of the SDOS Framework in a range of institutional contexts at this time of affordable, scalable smart education solutions particularly for the developing world. Over the next 5-10 years, artificial intelligence, edge computing, digital twin technologies, IoT, and analytics stacks will begin converging and will disrupt the direction of frameworks, methodologies, and approaches that organizations take to iteratively refine their digital operations strategy in a sustainable way to operate the educational setting.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Sallis and G. Jones, Knowledge Management in Education: Enhancing Learning and Education. London: Kogan Page, 2002.

[2] M. S. Owlia and E. M. Aspinwall, "A framework for the dimensions of quality in higher education," Quality Assurance in Education, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 12–20, 1996.

[3] T. Anderson and F. Elloumi, Theory and Practice of Online Learning. Athabasca: Athabasca University Press, 2004.

[4] L. Atzori, A. Iera, and G. Morabito, "The Internet of Things: A survey," Computer Networks, vol. 54, no. 15, pp. 2787–2805, Oct. 2010.

[5] J. Gubbi, R. Buyya, S. Marusic, and M. Palaniswami, "Internet of Things (IoT): A vision, architectural elements, and future directions," Future Generation Computer Systems, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 1645–1660, Sep. 2013.

[6] M. Kassab, J. DeFranco, T. Malas, P. Laplante, G. Destefanis, and V. V. G. Neto, "A systematic literature review on Internet of Things in education: Benefits and challenges," Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 115–127, 2020.

[7] V. Bettadapura, E. Essa, C. Pantofaru, and C. Hebert, "Egocentric field-of-gaze estimation using markov chains," in Proc. IEEE Conf. Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, 2015, pp. 1–9.

[8] G. Siemens and P. Long, "Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education," EDUCAUSE Review, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 30–40, Sep./Oct. 2011.

[9] R. S. J. d. Baker and P. S. Inventado, "Educational data mining and learning analytics," in Learning Analytics: From Research to Practice, J. A. Larusson and B. White, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 61–75.

[10] A. G. Picciano, "The evolution of big data and learning analytics in American higher education," Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 9–20, 2012.

[11] M. Bienkowski, M. Feng, and B. Means, Enhancing Teaching and Learning Through Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics: An Issue Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2012.

[12] B. Dong, Q. Zheng, J. Yang, H. Li, and M. Qiao, "An E-learning ecosystem based on cloud computing infrastructure," in Proc. 9th IEEE Int. Conf. Advanced Learning Technologies, 2009, pp. 125–127.

[13] M. Kwet and P. Prinsloo, "The 'smart' classroom: A new frontier in the age of the smart university," Teaching in Higher Education, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 510–526, 2020.

[14] P. Arroway, G. Morgan, M. Nguyen, and G. Yanosky, Research Computing in Higher Education. Louisville, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, 2016.

[15] L. Johnson, S. Adams Becker, M. Cummins, V. Estrada, A. Freeman, and H. Ludgate, NMC Horizon Report: 2013 Higher Education Edition. Austin, TX: The New Media Consortium, 2013.

[16] C. L. Comm and D. F. X. Mathaisel, "A case study in applying lean sustainability concepts to universities," International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 134–146, 2005.

[17] J. Antony, S. Furterer, J. Cudney, M. Reid, and R. Pepper, Lean Six Sigma for Higher Education. Emerald Publishing, 2019.

[18] G. L. Tortorella and D. Fettermann, "Implementation of Industry 4.0 and lean production in Brazilian manufacturing companies," International Journal of Production Research, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 2975–2987, 2018.

[19] S. Vaidya, P. Ambad, and S. Bhosle, "Industry 4.0: A glimpse," Procedia Manufacturing, vol. 20, pp. 233–238, 2018.

[20] W. Leal Filho et al., "Sustainability practices at higher education institutions in Europe," Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 248, Art. no. 119387, Mar. 2020.

[21] A. Disterheft, S. Caeiro, U. M. Azeiteiro, and W. Leal Filho, "Sustainability science and education for sustainable development in universities: A way for transition," in Sustainability Assessment Tools in Higher Education Institutions. Cham: Springer, 2013, pp. 3–27.

[22] A. Fonseca, J. Macdonald, E. Dandy, and P. Valenti, "The state of sustainability reporting at Canadian universities," International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 22–40, 2011.

[23] C. Zhu, V. C. M. Leung, L. Shu, and E. C. H. Ngai, "Green Internet of Things for smart world," IEEE Access, vol. 3, pp. 2151–2162, 2015.

[24] M. Aazam, I. Khan, A. A. Alsaffar, and E. N. Huh, "Cloud of Things: Integrating Internet of Things and cloud computing and the issues involved," in Proc. 11th Int. Bhurban Conf. Applied Sciences and Technology, 2014, pp. 414–419.

[25] J. Mohr and K. Shelton, "The keys to a successful digital transformation," EDUCAUSE Review, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 16–22, 2017.

[26] R. Pinheiro, M. Young, and K. Sörensen, The University as a Critical Institution? Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2012.

[27] M. Fitzgerald, N. Kruschwitz, D. Bonnet, and M. Welch, "Embracing digital technology: A new strategic imperative," MIT Sloan Management Review, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2013.

[28] S. Al-Fuqaha, A. Guizani, M. Mohammadi, M. Aledhari, and M. Ayyash, "Internet of Things: A survey on enabling technologies, protocols, and applications," IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2347–2376, 2015.

[29] N. Bhatt, A. Bhatt, and O. Bhatt, "Internet of Things: Potential, opportunities and challenges," in Proc. 6th IEEE Int. Conf. Advanced Computing, 2015, pp. 339–344.

[30] P. Pocatilu, F. Alecu, and M. Vetrici, "Using cloud computing for E-learning systems," in Proc. 8th WSEAS Int. Conf. Data Networks, Communications, Computers, 2009, pp. 54–59.