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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

[T]he best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise.  
*Andrew Carnegie*

Background on the Study

Higher education scholar Larry Lauer (2006) set the stage for his cautionary tale of modern day fundraising by urging readers to be prepared for the fact that “everything is changing” (p.19). He also asked, with a hint of sarcasm, if higher education was truly ready to confront these challenges. Lauer’s concerns unfortunately proved to be grounded in reality. Just four short years since his 2006 text, *Advancing Higher Education in Uncertain Times* was published, our nation is now deeply entrenched in one of the most significant economic downturns since the Great Depression (Speck, 2010). Despite these modern day difficulties, higher education has proven to be quite successful in reaching out to alumni, friends and corporations for financial support. From our nation’s infancy, colleges and universities have benefited from the work of dedicated fundraisers and passionate donors alike. Indeed, American higher education is fortunate to exist in a society whose commitment to philanthropy is deeply engrained in our culture and history (Lindahl, 2010).

One illustrative example is found in the historical account of the formation of Harvard University. Despite losing two of his colleagues, who also attempted the harsh voyage home to England, William Hibbens returned to the Colonies in 1641 with a 500 £ gift for the fledgling institution (Worth, 2002). These funds were vital to the success of Harvard and positioned the campus to achieve great things in the decades and
centuries to come. While much has changed in the four centuries which followed this journey, one fact remains constant: higher education still relies on the generosity of others to thrive in both prosperous and lean times. In the years right before the most recent downturn in our nation’s economy, fundraising actually witnessed strong gains and record performance.

The Council for Aid to Education conducts an annual survey of institutions of higher education known as the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey. In the final year of strong performance, national giving to colleges and universities in the United States increased by 6.3% over the previous year to a record setting and staggering $31.6 billion (Kaplan, 2008b). Furthermore, despite a year-over-year decrease of 1.5% in alumni contributions, the 2008 instrument recorded alumni giving level was still 16.5% higher than totals reported in 2005 (Kaplan 2008a). In the span of just two years, this trend changed and, in 2009, contributions to colleges and universities in the United States decreased by 11.9% to $27.5 billion with reported endowment holdings underperforming by 22.3% from the previous year (Kaplan, 2010). These results were compounded by a record low level of alumni participation of 10%, leaving institutions perplexed and seeking insights.

Understanding the important role that alumni support plays in an institution’s legacy is a necessary endeavor if our institutions are to continue to provide access to higher education, social advancement and opportunities to improve the lives of all who pass through its doors. As evidenced by the trends of the last three VSE administrations, alumni donor patterns continue to evolve. Careful analysis and systematic attention to institutional characteristics may provide the insight needed to
improve fundraising success in the years to come.

Statement of the Problem

Because advancement has grown in complexity and importance over the years (Worth, 2002), presidents, board members and advancement professionals need a much richer understanding of how they compare against their peers and the factors driving donations from alumni (Cook, 2008). The vast majority of advancement practitioners learn their craft through “on-the-job” training and by attending a steady stream of conferences (Lindahl, 2010). What lacks is a firm understanding of donor theory and there is a scarcity of practice embedded in actual data. Weighing the costs and benefits of offering advanced degree programs is also not typically considered from an advancement perspective. Likewise, an institution’s historical identity as either a private or public entity introduces a further layer of complexity. While the advancement community believes that private institutions have larger endowments and secure more gifts, it is not as clear to practitioners the impact of campus culture on these patterns.

Encouraging advancement to rely on data to drive decisions and become smarter about leveraging limited staff resources would maximize success (Birkholz, 2008). Restricted giving involves funds a donor specifically places restrictions on how they can be used by the institution (Worth, 2002). Providing campus leadership with data-driven clarity is intensified when considering how campus culture also impacts restricted giving patterns.

Gasman and Drezner (2008), in chronicling the history of restricted giving, noted that originally donors gave without placing requirements on how the funding would be
spent. This is evolving in today’s advancement landscape and modern donors are increasingly restrictive in their giving preferences (Nahm & Zemsky, 2001). Without a keen understanding of how patterns of restricted giving evolve across institutional and cultural lines, leaders are not equipped to make the necessary strategic decisions needed to convince greater numbers of alumni donors to give.

This trend is problematic for a number of reasons including the need to establish a greater level of support from private donors during a time of declining state support (Mayer, 2010), the need to bolster the ranks of prospective donors with qualified and knowledgeable alumni who can contribute (Peterson, 2010), and the reality that the advancement field is not keeping up with the diversity of today’s student population (Gasman, 2008; Ambler, 2008; Rodriguez, 2008; Chao, 2008; Lovell, 2008). These factors, if left unchecked, might threaten to disrupt the patterns of future giving.

Purpose of Research

This study examines these trends and draws connections between institutional classification, governance typology and patterns of total, unrestricted, and restricted giving. This dissertation also expands our understanding of philanthropy in higher education by critically deconstructing a national dataset of institution-reported fundraising totals for the 2007-2008 academic year. This work examines institutional alumni giving differences in terms of highest degree offered (baccalaureate, masters or doctoral), overall alumni giving, total restricted giving and total unrestricted giving for both private and public institutions who participated in the 2008 VSE study. Finally, it is of value to determine total percentages of restricted giving by common categories.
reported in the VSE to produce a “restricted giving index” for campus leaders to analyze and compare their own restricted giving against a backdrop of national data during a strong fundraising year. The advantages such an index offers annual fund managers, major gift officers and senior leadership an additional mechanism to analyze their own fundraising successes and challenges. Consistent with this need, Ostrander (2007) documents an ever-increasing trend of increased levels and expectations of donor control in the philanthropic process and this study represents a timely analysis of this evolution. This knowledge, when combined with savvy leadership and a robust data-driven culture would result in structural changes to staffing, messaging and prospect cultivation and stewardship.

Research Questions

In recognition of the need for better data on alumni giving on a national level, this study addresses the following four research questions for institutions who participated in the VSE:

Q1: Is there a significant difference among public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni funds raised per student full-time equivalent (FTE)?

Q2. Is there a significant difference among public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni restricted gifts per student FTE?

Q3. Is there a significant difference between public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni unrestricted gifts per student FTE?

Q4: What percentage of total alumni restricted contributions per student FTE are typically reported by public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions?
With regard to a theoretical foundation grounding this study, this study relies heavily on the research on community and culture in higher education by Boyer (1990), the individual and social giving models of Sargeant and Shang (2010) and Tierney’s (1988) examination of the six dominant elements of campus culture. Taken together, these theories provide a level of analysis by which the alumni fundraising processes under consideration are clarified and placed within a broader educational context.

Definitions of the Terms

Advancement: Advancement is an administrative function within higher education which includes several key areas of practice related to securing gifts of time, talents and treasures for the campus from individuals, corporation, foundations or other entities.

Alumnus/donor: For the purpose of this study, an alumnus/donor is any individual who contributed a gift of cash, assets, equities or insurance premiums to an alma mater, either on an annual basis or for a one time gift in the 2007-2008 academic year, in return for a tax deduction or other financial and non-financial benefits (recognition, naming rights, etc.) and whose gift was subsequently coded and reported to the VSE as an alumni contribution during the specified time period.

Baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions: This study is greatly informed by the work of Ernest L. Boyer (1990) in his Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching funded study and resulting text entitled Campus Life: In search of community. This study will adopt Boyer’s (1990) methodological approach to adapt The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s A Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning, 1987 edition. Consistent with this approach and for the
purposes of this study, Baccalaureate institutions will include primarily undergraduate institutions that award degrees mainly in the fields of art and science at the baccalaureate level. Masters institutions encompass comprehensive institutions which offer baccalaureate degrees through the masters degree. Doctoral institutions encompass both doctorate granting and research universities which award a full range of academic credentials from the baccalaureate degree up through and including the doctorate.

Restricted gift: A restricted gift is any alumni donation of cash, assets, equities or insurance premiums to a college or university, either on an annual basis or for a one time gift in the 2007-2008 academic year, in return for a tax deduction or other financial and non-financial benefit with a specific direction, request for use or limit placed upon the institution by the donor. Restrictions on gifts are understood by the fundraising field to limit the ability of the institution to apply funds beyond the original scope of the donor’s intent.

Unrestricted gift: An unrestricted gift is any alumni donation of cash, assets, equities or insurance premiums to a college or university, either on an annual basis or for a one time gift in the 2007-2008 academic year, in return for a tax deduction or other financial and non-financial benefit without any specific direction, request for use or limit placed upon the institution by the donor. Unrestricted gifts are typically understood by the fundraising field as gifts meant to expand the ability of the institution to meet unforeseen and unforeseen needs. Unrestricted gifts provide campus leadership with autonomy in deciding how to apply specific alumni contributions.
Significance of the Study

This study provides a mechanism for advancement staff to better direct donors to specific areas of giving where the institution may be under-performing as compared to peers. The findings from this study provide institutions with an important tool to combat decreases in state funding through a renewed effort to focus on alumni contributions. Understanding institutional comparisons in terms of total alumni unrestricted and restricted giving for different degree levels provide senior level advancement administrators, presidents and foundation board members important insights to gauge success and areas in need for improvement. These findings furnish institutional leadership with a new source of data to respond to the question “should we attempt to evolve our campus culture and offer a masters or doctoral degree program?” Finally, this study provides insights into institutional characteristics, culture and donor patterns which should alter solicitation strategies, communication pieces and advancement staff training in the hopes of increasing the total amount of dollars raised for the institution.

If campuses are to continue to succeed in an era of declining resources, higher education must have a comprehensive snapshot of the fundraising landscape and how institutional culture either positively or negatively impacts this important goal.

Limitations

The decision to utilize the VSE instrument results in a 15% capture rate of all institutions of higher education in the United States. Likewise, the VSE does not seek out or solicit data from the growing for-profit or online institution sector of higher education. Additionally, the VSE dataset reports total dollars raised and not individual
gifts. All individual alumni donor data is thus treated in aggregate and individual donor characteristics are lost.

Despite these limitations, the VSE is considered a foundational data source for private giving analysis in higher education and is viewed as the gold standard for researchers interested in institution-specific data. The VSE estimated that the 2007 survey respondents accounted for 84.9% of voluntary support raised by institutions of higher education (Kaplan, 2008a). To demonstrate the scale of magnitude of this group of respondents, in terms of total dollars earned, the selected institutions garnered $6.37 billion in reported income from alumni contributions during the study year utilized for this dissertation. As is evident in the literature review, numerous studies on individual donor behavior can be found across a diverse array of disciplines. Yet relatively few studies focusing on a national data set exist. This dissertation makes a contribution to the understanding of fundraising practices in higher education.

**Delimitations**

Two year intuitions ($n = 146$) are deemed beyond the scope of this study and were subsequently filtered out of the dataset. All systems of higher education data ($n = 8$) and specialized institutions ($n = 62$) will be removed due to their incongruence with the research questions at hand. Finally, any institutions that chose not to participate in the full VSE study and thus not report restricted giving data to the VSE (as well as other responses to questions beyond the scope of this study) were excluded from this study ($n = 172$). When this process concluded, $N = 652$ institutions remained in the dataset and were subject to statistical analysis.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order to best understand the problem at hand the following section examines, identifies and draws conclusions about the current research and writings on restricted giving and unrestricted giving by alumni at public and private institutions of higher education. This section also details the historical evolution of advancement within United States higher education from its earliest roots embedded in philanthropic practice. The section also provides a cursory overview of the key theories linked to donor motivation and why donors choose to give to their alma mater. Although the vast majority of research on these theories are squarely focused on the individual, and this study attempts to examine institutional data, this research provides a critical lens to examine the underlying causes and institutional conditions which may lead to the larger institutional phenomenon under consideration. Finally, this section outlines the cultural differences between public and private institutions across degree level by examining the work of Boyer (1990).

With regard to process, texts, historical documents, conference papers, articles from peer-reviewed journals of higher education literature, unpublished dissertations and works from professional magazines within the field of higher education, advancement, economics, marketing, public policy and human resources fields were reviewed. Despite this wide array of sources, it should be noted that the field of advancement is still largely operating in a practice-oriented capacity as opposed to a data-driven model (Birkholz, 2008). Advancement practitioners often utilize the best
practices from other campuses on their home campuses with little regard for formal research on whether or not this practice is effective.

Numerous conferences and professional association meetings take place with little to no formal conference proceedings ever becoming published or forwarded to an educational clearinghouse. Despite this challenge, scholars such as Caboni (2008) document and describe how advancement is increasingly professionalizing itself, adopting a systematic body of theory and a mastery of knowledge. Caboni finds that the field of advancement is at a critical point in its evolution and as research increases in scope and quality new insights will emerge. Consistent with this viewpoint, this study contributes additional work and research on the area of institutional characteristics. As this line of inquiry continues to also come into sharper focus, practitioners and scholars alike will begin to take note of its inherent value to aid the field of advancement.

Brief History of Philanthropy and the Evolution of Advancement

It is important to outline a brief history of philanthropy and its eventual connection to advancement in higher education settings. At its core, fundraising is charged with engaging donors, corporations and foundations in acts of philanthropy. With its Greek origins, the term philanthropy underscores the belief in engaging in activities which demonstrate a love for humankind. Philanthropy first appeared in writings in the colonies in 1628 (Curti, 2008). Walton (2008a) demonstrates that philanthropy has always had a connection with higher education even back to colonial times. Whether it was gifts of candles and blankets to a fledgling colonial college or scholarships raised to educate Native Americans or freed slaves, private support bolstered our institutions of
learning. In its early days, higher education in the United States was inextricably linked to the generosity of a few successful citizens.

In chronicling the impact of major gifts on domestic higher education, Walton and Gasman (2008) describe how in 1886 John D. Rockefeller’s gift of $600,000 resurrected the then closed University of Chicago. The authors chronicle how another donor, who for most of his life was viewed as a miser, left all of his fortune to establish Johns Hopkins University bearing his name. Furthermore the authors detail how Leland and Jane Stanford donated land and wealth to establish Stanford University. During this same time, across the San Francisco Bay, the University of California was also fortified by the generosity of the Hearst family through their gifts and estate.

While many Americans think of major donors in the 20th century as largely a male enterprise, Walton (2008b), in chronicling the historical role women have played in philanthropy, pointedly describes how Columbia University would not be as successful as it is today without the generosity of Grace Hoadley Dodge. Dodge served in leadership positions at Columbia and demonstrated that philanthropy towards an institution involved much more than just writing large checks to a campus. Dodge pioneered the way for women to view philanthropy as a legitimate and powerful expression to bring about social change through the improvement of education. Dodge was deeply committed to ensuring access to higher education for women of her time and believed that higher education should be the main vehicle for social change. Over the course of her relationship with Columbia University, Dodge served as a trustee on Columbia’s board (which was unusual for her time), a faculty member on campus and an administrator in the president’s office (Walton, 2008b). Her commitment to educating
women did not end with her passing in 1915. She left almost $500,000 and a significant portion of her estate to bolster Teacher’s College at Columbia University.

The history of philanthropy in the United States was also central to our burgeoning leadership in the sciences and medicinal arts. Kohler (2008), in describing the earliest forms of philanthropy to academic science operations notes that the Carnegie Foundation played a significant and important role in bolstering research in higher education prior to 1920. Despite offering just over $100,000 per year, the Carnegie Foundation grants created a legacy of change for higher education. The then-director of the foundation, Robert Flexner used his position and the funds from the foundation to create a mandate to separate teaching from research in higher education (Kohler, 2008). While his beliefs deeply divided the academic community, the legacy of his leadership and the funding provided by the Carnegie Foundation set our nation on a path where innovation would be linked to personal generosity. Other philanthropists took note of the work of the Carnegie Foundation and in ten short years over 100 other foundations were established across the nation. Kohler (2008) points out that by the end of 1930, over $43 million was expended on research, $7.9 million on scholarships and $46.8 million on general support for higher and professional education by foundations. During the same time frame, Kohler (2008) documents that over $97.9 million was being directed to higher education medical facilities and teaching hospitals by many of the same foundations. Ultimately, the funds higher education received to engage in research and medicine continued to grow in the decades to come. The lasting impact of this decade of private support shifted the conversation over the roles of teaching and research in our colleges and universities towards a research-oriented
contingent of higher education practitioners. Armed with new funding, better facilities and a growth in support for graduate students the research agenda had taken hold. More importantly, these funds also in large part determined the future pecking order of elite research institutions in the United States. Kohler (2008) asserts that the relationships established between the major foundations, emerging regional research institutions and the National Research Council rivaled the support land-grant institutions received from the federal government and ultimately created a landscape where innovation and discovery were the norm in higher education.

This discussion has centered on the critical role of the wealthy individual and the foundations they established to aid higher education. But as Cohen (1988) chronicles, higher education in the United States was preparing for massive growth in enrollments in the 20th century. With this influx of students’ institutions of higher education began to realize in the early to mid 1900s that engaging individual alumni as donors was also going to be a key element to long-term financial success.

*Early Advancement Practices*

Worth (2002) asserts annual fundraising programs relying on individual donors first entered the higher education landscape as early as the 1800s in the form of loosely configured alumni associations. These bodies were designed to allow alumni to return to campus, renew bonds of friendship and loyalty and pledge funds to help their alma mater. In terms of a wider comprehensive impact on fundraising in higher education, the earliest evolution occurred ironically outside of the academy. In 1902, Lyman L. Pierce serving as an executive for the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA)
began a new concept in non-profit fundraising – the campaign (Worth, 2002). Pierce’s efforts to raise $300,000 were further enhanced when a fellow YMCA executive from the Chicago area by the name of Charles Ward was engaged in 1905 to help the Washington chapter complete its campaign goals. Ward’s efforts and expertise would eventually lay the philosophical and structural background upon which today’s advancement community still rely.

Ward mandated the use of prospect research, donor rolls and a campaign progress instrument he deemed the “campaign clock” (Worth, 2002) with great effectiveness. Nine years later, academic leadership at the University of Pittsburgh decided to employ Ward at the campus to raise $3 million for the first organized higher education campaign. Ward’s efforts at the University of Pittsburgh and the staff he trained would eventually solidify his role as the pre-eminent leader/founder of the higher education fundraising arena.

Ward and his protégés’ efforts were deemed so successful that they soon became replicated and in turn developed into standard practices in educational fundraising. Worth (2002) asserts that Ward achieved three major accomplishments which defined the beginning of the development profession. First, Ward’s utilization of a systematic approach to fundraising was a direct departure from the work of disorganized campaigns. Second, Ward believed in a well-trained and informed development officer who stood out in direct opposition to previous solicitors who were gifted in charisma and charm. Third, Ward believed in utilizing an institution’s own leadership and alumni volunteers to assist with and make the request for support. Prior to this adaptation, institutions of higher education and not for profit entities enlisted the
support of third-party fundraisers who were employed and paid commissions off of every gift raised.

Ultimately, Ward succeeded in changing advancement in higher education due to a combination of logic-driven and measurable outcomes which placed a higher degree of emphasis on thinking through fundraising prior to making any active solicitations. Clarifying Ward’s impressive contributions to advancement further, Sargeant and Shang (2010) assert his ultimate contribution to fundraising was his exploitation of four key principles when launching any campaign. Ward believed in short time frames for campaigns and felt as though it was easier to convince others to work for a cause if they believed it would end in a reasonable time period. Second, Ward believed in developing a carefully crafted list of prospects and the importance of a key group of lead donors who could set the pace for the rest of the campaign to follow. Third, Ward believed in instilling a value of sacrifice in the employees and volunteers involved in the campaign. By telling his staff that the job at hand would be difficult, Ward instilled a sense of pride and accomplishment in his cadre of workers. Finally, Ward required the organization to demonstrate publicly why the campaign mattered and what impact it would have on the every-day citizen. In engaging donors with these four ground rules, Ward proved to be a very powerful fundraiser and many of these tactics remain at the center of fundraising techniques today.

Despite Ward’s successes, it would not be until the post-World War II era that educational fundraising would emerge as a legitimate sub-field within higher education with legitimate calls for independent research (Curti, 1957). A major event bolstering this assertion occurred in 1958 when the American Alumni Council (AAC) and American
College Public Relations Association (ACPRA) met in West Virginia at the Greenbrier Resort. When the respective membership representatives convened they were determined to look past historical grievances and antagonistic tendencies between the two organizations and set forth on a new direction for how campuses could approach advancement. The resulting Greenbrier Report was named for the location where the conference took place and outlined several recommendations to alter administrative practice. First, the report stressed the need for a specific institutional advocate or leader to organize philanthropic activities in order to alleviate the burden of managing a fundraising campaign from the institution’s president (Worth, 2002). Prior to the Greenbrier Report, scholars of the time often referred to the university president and his role in fundraising as “more of a cultured mendicant than anything else” (Day, 1946). The Greenbrier Report empowered campus leaders to move past individual involvement and encouraged leaders to create and support organized structures and positions all working together to support greater philanthropic activities.

The ultimate legacy of the Greenbrier Report resulted in a larger group of staff charged with raising funds and the birth of the advancement function as we understand it today (Brittingham, Pezzullo, et al., 1990). The legacy of this gathering continued to evolve and in 1974 the AAC and ACPRA merged into the present-day Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

The Modern Advancement Staffing Landscape

Advancement in the years following the creation of CASE developed specific sub-specialties. In order to frame institutional success regarding successfully raising
funds from alumni, one must have an understanding of the various forces at play “behind the scenes” contributing to this success.

The oldest facet of advancement which still exists today is alumni relations. These staff members plan a wide range of engagement programs, services and events designed to provide alumni with positive interactions with the campus, faculty, students and fellow alumni. These staff members often also organize or facilitate alumni club or chapter events around the state and nation, faculty lectures in local communities, tailgate events at away games, and class or affinity group reunions (an affinity group is any group of alumni who share a common undergraduate experience, e.g. residence life staff members, tour guides, student government association, etc.). Alumni relations staffs are often responsible for managing student/alumni programs including mentoring and scholarships in addition to hosting the primary alumni web portal and offering an alumni magazine. Cohen (1998), Lauer (2006), and Worth (2002) urge institutions to pay significant attention to the need for and connection with robust alumni relations operations and eventual fundraising success.

As the field of advancement evolved away from volunteer managed solicitations to a more professionally competent staff, development officers increasingly joined the ranks of advancement units. Serving as the main fundraising arm of the advancement operation, development officers are responsible for managing several sub-areas of solicitation depending on the type and amount of gift sought. Annual giving programs and their associated staff members are typically charged with executing yearly micro campaigns designed to bring in smaller gifts of $1 - 1,000 from large numbers of donors
(Worth, 2002). These initiatives are primarily developed to cultivate a large group of active donors who believe in the mission of the organization (Sargeant & Shang, 2010).

Major gifts officers focus on bringing in donors from the $1,001 - 1,000,000 level with the majority of their time spent on securing gifts of at least $25,000 (Worth, 2002). Principle gifts ($1,000,000 and higher) are often managed by the senior leadership of the advancement area in concert with senior administrative and academic leadership. Due to their size, these gifts are rare, yet they play a critical role in the success of the development operation (Mayer, 2010; Worth, 2002). Development officers soliciting major or principle gifts frequently travel regionally and nationally to meet with prospective donors in the interest of securing a gift or building a relationship further. Synthesizing all of these types of giving opportunities into one over-arching structure is commonly referred to as a capital campaign (Sargeant & Shang, 2010). Capital campaigns are a very organized attempt to exploit a limited timeline to achieve a pre-established series of goals or financial impact points. In a higher education setting, capital campaigns are typically employed to fund new buildings, facilities, grow endowments and/or build out donor rolls (Sargeant & Shang, 2010).

Increasingly necessary in this digital fundraising age, development officers also rely upon and provide feedback to staff members specifically charged with mining alumni databases, public records and increasingly complex online resources. Advancement research analysts assist development officers with their work and actively partner to maintain detailed records of donor interactions, conversations and correspondences. Lauer (2006) and Birkholz (2008) chronicle the critical nature of these advancement staff members and outline how the future landscape of
advancement will continue to see growth in this sub-specialty in the future. Both Lauer and Birkholz assert that advancement operations which excel at data management will be much more effective at reaching increasingly challenging fundraising goals.

Another sub-group of advancement staff are the individuals tasked with creating and supporting an increasingly complex marketing and communications plan. These staff members are considered to be the public relations arm of the advancement world. Through their efforts, marketing and communications professionals produce all of the institution’s campaign literature, solicitations, event invitations and honor rolls (Worth, 2002). Increasingly, these staff members also manage numerous online social media accounts as this form of communication becomes more widely adopted and expected (Ward, 2010) in advancement circles.

A final facet of the modern day advancement division is staff members who are experts in donor stewardship. Successful fundraising campuses realize that positively managing the donor experience is a key to future gifts (Day, 1998; Sargeant & Shang, 2010; Weerts & Ronca, 2008; Worth, 2002). These individuals are responsible for donor thank you notes, screening future solicitations, ensuring the donor is properly thanked and credited in the database. These staff are also charged with ensuring that a specific institution’s bill of donor rights is being followed and communicated broadly (Day, 1998). Ultimately, these specialists are empowered to ensure donors have a generally positive feeling about their interaction with the fundraising arm of the development operation.

With specific regard for individual donors and their motivations to contribute, it is worthwhile to have a basic understanding of the social, environmental or psychological factors driving philanthropic behavior. Although these theories were not originally
designed to focus on institutional giving, this author believes they do hold larger value in attempting to explain the potential phenomenon at hand with regard to why certain alumni who come from specific types of institutions may have different motivations and patterns for donating and hence their inclusion in this review.

Campus Culture and Its Significance for This Study

In order to provide an additional filter by which to view this study, it is important to describe how campus culture is formed and supported in higher education. This awareness provides a context to examine the findings of this study and describes a much more robust picture of the impact of institutional culture on alumni giving beyond total dollars raised for restricted and unrestricted purposes.

Ernest Boyer’s Campus Life: In Search of Community

American higher education experienced massive amounts of change during the 1960s, 1970s and into the 1980s (Boyer, 1987; Cohen, 1998). Culture wars were raging on campus (Cole, 2009), the arts and humanities were coming under increasing attacks as the fields of health and science exploded (Freeland, 1997) and college presidents were concerned about campus tensions as the undergraduate population increased in both size and diversity of student (Boyer, 1987, 1990). The nation was coming to grips with a changing student demographic and increasing tensions outside of the classroom were having deleterious effects on student’s academic performance. As Boyer (1990) describes the college campus during the 1980s he found it necessary to highlight the challenges administrators were facing such as excessive drinking,
sexual and racial harassment, and a general movement away from an intellectual engaged and civil community. It is within this context that the American Council on Education enlisted Ernest L. Boyer to lead a study of campus presidents and their opinions concerning campus life and community. The study solicited and secured funding from the Carnegie Foundation to proceed and as the findings were published a re-emergence and focus on building community in higher education ensued. Boyer's (1990) work resulted in an expectation that academic leaders think differently about learning outside the classroom and urged an adoption of a campus compact to aid decision makers in building a civil, respectful and engaging campus community.

Methodologically, Boyer relied on two national surveys to secure data. First, 382 responses were gathered from the National Survey of College and University Presidents (representing a 76% response rate). Second, 355 responses were gathered from the National Survey of Chief Student Affairs Officers (representing a 71% response rate). Data from both studies were weighted and qualitative theme analysis was conducted on a series of deliberately open-ended questions concerning campus-life issues of greatest concern. A third element of the study consisted of an in-depth and intensive series of campus visits to 19 institutions. These visits helped to bolster the findings by providing further evidence of successes and challenges regarding campus community.

With regard to institutional classification, Boyer and his research team decided to deliberately modify the classification system employed in The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s A Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning, 1987 edition. The researchers believed that this decision represented a sound way to bifurcate the nation’s institutions of higher education in order to draw out distinctive
differences amongst large clusters of institutions. Furthermore, the researchers were interested in institutions which served a majority of undergraduate students. As such, Boyer imposed a delimitation on the study and effectively removed graduate-only institutions, specialized institutions and institutions with less than 300 students.

One final methodological decision involved combining Research Universities I and II and doctorate-granting universities and colleges into a two-strata combined classification of institutions who awarded a full-spectrum of degrees including the baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degrees. Likewise the two categories of comprehensive universities and colleges were also combined into one. These institutions primarily award baccalaureate through the masters degree. Boyer’s study also included both highly selective and selective liberal arts institutions that primarily awarded the baccalaureate degree. Despite their valuable contribution to our understanding of community, for the purposes of this literature review, analysis of Boyer’s findings regarding respondents from two-year institutions including community colleges, junior and technical colleges are deemed beyond the scope of this study and have been excluded.

Once the quantitative and qualitative data analysis was complete from the two dominant surveys and the information gathered from the site visits compiled Boyer proposed six principles that, if implemented, would help define the type of educational environment, culture and community institutions of higher education should emulate.

First, Boyer demonstrates that success should be based on building a campus where purposeful community is entrenched. Boyer asserts that when faculty and
students collaborate, teaching and learning are strengthened and common academic goals can be achieved.

Second, Boyer affirms the principle that colleges and universities should constitute open communities. Central to this belief is the notion that freedom of expression must be preserved, valued and bolstered on the campus. In order to achieve this goal, campus administrators, faculty and students must all treat each other with respect and civility even in the face of disagreement or conflict.

Third, Boyer appeals to campuses to become “just communities” where individual differences are celebrated, unique contributions of every member of the community are honored, and campus leadership recognizes and values the unique qualities of each student, faculty and staff member.

Fourth, Boyer defines community as existing within an orderly and structured set of expectations which he defines as a college or university acting in a disciplined manner. Strictly speaking, Boyer believes in the common good of the greater community and required both individuals and groups to recognize their own obligations and responsibilities to the larger social fabric of the campus.

Fifth, Boyer finds that a strong community is a caring community. Recognizing, supporting and enhancing community service, wellness and engagement activities provide a firm foundation for a caring campus which values its members and encourages their growth.

Sixth, Boyer documents the need for campus communities to celebrate their unique contributions, legacies, history and traditions which have defined their past and provide direction for their future. Central to this concept is the belief that traditions must
be shared broadly and passed down from one generation of student to the other in order to remain relevant. Strong communities harness traditions and leverage them to actively create community through celebrations of the past, present and future.

Despite the global impact of these findings, Boyer’s work also highlights distinct cultural differences between institutional typologies which emerged from the two national studies. Boyer finds that research and doctorate granting institutions were slightly more than twice as likely to indicate harassment was a moderate or major problem on campus as compared to liberal arts institutions. Additionally, only 15% of liberal arts presidents indicated that racial intimidation/harassment was a moderate to major concern as compared to 48% of research and doctorate granting institutions. Slightly more comprehensive institution presidents (18%) indicated similar concerns as compared to the liberal arts institutions. Given differences in size and population it is not surprising that the larger and often more ethnically diverse research and doctorate granting institutions expressed this concern. This finding was echoed in the study when examining the notion of racial tension and hostility on campus. Sixty-eight percent of research and doctorate granting institutions indicated moderate to major concerns with regard to racial tension. This reported rate is more than double the liberal arts institutions (28%) and three times the amount of the comprehensive institutions (20%). The manner at which students perceive and treat each other at the larger research and doctorate granting institutions tends to indicate a culture where dissonance and discord stand in stark contrast to the perceptions of the leadership at the liberal arts institutions. Culturally speaking, it is important to note that distinct differences in student enrollment exist at these two types of institutions and this no doubt impacted the Boyer study.
This trend is repeated when examining the use of alcohol on campus. While alcohol abuse was the greatest concern indicated the most frequently by presidents, once again differences emerge. Research and doctorate granting institutions and Comprehensive institutions reported the highest levels of concern regarding alcohol abuse (82% and 84% respectively) with liberal arts presidents reporting slightly less concern (75%). Not surprisingly, Boyer found similar cultural differences with regard to moral issues on campus. Liberal arts institutions were much more likely to agree with the need for codes of conduct for students, active suspension or dismissal of undergraduates who use illegal substances. Similarly, comprehensive institutions tended to also outperform research and doctorate granting institutions in these categories but not to the same degree as the liberal arts campuses.

Of significant interest to this study is Boyer’s work on the role caring plays in a community. Fully 78% of comprehensive institutions believed that nonparticipation by students in events was a moderate to major problem on campus. This compares to 70% of leadership at liberal arts institutions. Rounding out the bottom of the sample, slightly more than half (52%) of research and doctorate granting institutions shared a similar concern. This item points to a distinct cultural difference on campuses where student involvement outside of the classroom is viewed as an integral cultural component of the campus experience. Given the connection between co-curricular engagement and affinity (Walton & Gasman, 2008) the Boyer study illuminates the perspective of campus leadership regarding the need for a robust and engaged student body and it appears that by examining the data that research and doctorate granting institutions may not care as much about non-participation by students. Despite these
findings, the Boyer text contains a robust appendix which allows the reader to drill further down into the differences between institutional cultures.

When examining the campus life issues of greatest concern to presidents, patterns emerge where the leadership at liberal arts institutions tends to be more concerned about student apathy, incivility between students, quality of residence life, lack of student leadership and a deterioration of campus community. These concerns point to campuses which care about their communities and who understand the need to foster student experiences where undergraduates can become entrenched in the life of the campus. Research and doctorate granting institution leadership were focused on a different set of issues and expressed a higher level of concern regarding campus security and crime (as these institutions self-reported greater frequencies of crime-related events), inadequate facilities and advising and the upward cost pressures of student attendance. This pattern of responses within the data indicates research and doctorate granting institutions expressed greater concerns about infrastructure and processes as opposed to the liberal arts focus on sustaining community. Paradoxically, the comprehensive institution responses indicated concerns which rested between the pro-community liberal arts institution and the pro-process/infrastructure research and doctorate granting institutions.

With regard to their views on improving campus life, once again data points to a differentiated experience. Fully 92% of liberal arts institutions believed that exerting greater effort to build a stronger overall sense of community would improve campus life. This finding compares to 81% and 74% of research and doctorate granting and comprehensive institutions (respectively) believing it would be very important to invest
greater effort to build overall community. This pattern is repeated with regard to closer links between classroom and out-of-class activities. Ironically, 89% of leadership at research and doctorate-granting institutions believed that providing more leadership opportunities to students would improve campus life. This compares to 66% and 62% of comprehensive and liberal arts institutions, respectively. It would appear that this data describes a situation where once again process outweighs engagement and adopts an “if you build it, they will come” approach at the research and doctorate granting institutions. This stands in direct contrast to the belief by 62% of liberal arts presidents who believed offering more events to bring large numbers of faculty, staff and students together would be very important to supporting campus life. On this same metric, 57% of comprehensive institutions shared this belief and only 42% of research and doctorate institutions believed this was very important.

One final data point of relevance to this study is the five year change in concerns about campus life as reported to campus leadership from donors. 35% of campus presidents believed that donors had increased concern regarding campus life at liberal arts institutions. This compares to 32% of leaders at research and doctorate granting institutions and only 27% for leaders at comprehensive institutions. This data yet again points to greater levels of differentiation amongst donors and their perceptions of the importance of campus life at the institutions they support.

Taken on the whole, the Boyer study examines the underpinnings of what makes a community thrive at an institution of higher education. Variations within the data between the three categories of institutions highlight distinct cultural and operational differences at these campuses. Equally evident are the differences in approaches and
solutions to improve community by the leaders who steer these institutions. Ultimately, Boyer’s call for renewed emphasis on community is a return to the roots of higher education. Boyer’s belief in the campus compact as a tool to re-engineer campus life requires substantive changes in how students are perceived, treated and engaged. As data suggests, liberal arts institutions appear to be more committed to this process than both the comprehensive and research and doctorate granting institutions.

*Tierney’s Six Elements of Campus Culture*

In his foundational work on deconstructing and defining the elements of a campus culture, Tierney (1988) identifies 6 major elements contributing to higher education culture. First, Tierney suggests that the campus environment itself is a key indicator of culture. Specifically, Tierney urges researchers to understand the college or university’s place in the community and develop definitions which help inform and define these roles. Furthermore, Tierney urges educators to ponder how the community (faculty, staff and students) responds to their environment and thinks about it. How the campus is situated, the amount of open space, and the aesthetic look and feel of the institution contribute to its environmental culture.

Second, Tierney links institutional mission with culture and believes it not only defines a campus but serves as a rallying point for faculty and staff. Specifically, Tierney asserts that institutional mission should inform policies, practices and decisions. The institution must be unified in its understanding of the mission to avoid being divided and heading off in numerous disconnected directions.

Third, Tierney connects socialization with culture. Understanding how incoming
students, new hires on faculty and staff, alumni, guests and visitors become connected to the campus is vital to understanding a college or university culture. Defining and exploiting formal and informal socialization processes on campus also determines culture. Additionally, leadership is required to ensure intentionality with regard to socialization processes to promote maximum cultural impact.

Fourth, Tierney links information and culture. Institutions need to understand how information is shared consistently across the campus and by whom. Considering how the college or university communicates vitally important information needed for long-term survival is also an important consideration for leadership to examine. Tierney posits that communication channels need to remain open, flexible and multi-faceted to promote information exchange amongst all campus parties.

Fifth, Tierney draws a direct connection between institutional strategy and culture. Recognizing how an institution makes decisions may be just as important as the decisions themselves. Examining whether or not decision making processes are open and transparent or taking place behind closed doors also impacts culture. Culture is related to and connected with strategic planning. Widely sharing and disseminating a college or university strategic plan is one vital element contributing to cultural identity. Equally as necessary, Tierney asserts colleges and universities must explain or document how poor decisions are dealt with and be transparent regarding the consequences on individual decision makers. Tierney’s definition of culture also relies upon the systems in place to ensure the campus learns from bad decisions.

Finally, Tierney underscores that culture is vitally dependent on leadership at all levels. An institution that hires and retains sound individuals to lead the campus is far
better than a culture where a campus experiences a never-ending turnstile of ineffective practitioners. As an additional element of leadership, Tierney’s definition of culture encompasses a necessary awareness by leaders that they understand the rules of engagement at their institution. Culture is strongest at institutions which recognize and value both formal and informal leadership as being integral to its success. Ultimately, Tierney’s work demonstrates that culture can be examined and enhanced through the process of manipulating formal and informal levers at an institution. With specific regard to this study, Tierney’s work provides an additional lens to examine the differences between the 6 types of institutions under consideration and how these institutional types differ in the application of the principles defined above.

Horgan and Scire’s Campus Conditions Which Define a Culture

Although specifically examining the conditions which lead to a campus culture of service learning and civic engagement, Horgan and Scire (2007) identify several campus conditions which could explain how a campus culture could be maximized for impact. Horgan and Scire demonstrated that senior level leadership is a key indicator of shaping, creating or bending a campus culture. The authors describe the involvement and engagement of key stakeholders as being instrumental to building a campus culture. The authors believe that engaging current students in any process and developing recognition programs and rewards are also a key strategy in enhancing campus culture.

Furthermore, Horgan and Scire demonstrate that a concerted effort to focus on documenting forms of evidence and metrics for success represent a strong foundation
for future efforts. Campuses must communicate how they are progressing towards their goals and present data on how the community is responding to the goals and objectives implemented by senior leadership. Horgan and Scire’s work is relevant to this study when attempting to understand the conditions which lead to a campus culture where advancement and fundraising are valued and successful.

Campus Characteristics Across the Literature

While the work of Boyer (1990) and Tierney (1988) are helpful in understanding campus culture, previous work has also focused on other elements of the campus experience. With regard to baccalaureate institutions, Cohen (1998) described how these campuses typically have a liberal arts tradition as a centrally defining characteristic. These institutions also typically have a low student to faculty ratio and are primarily residential (Boyer, 1990). Birnbaum (1991) found that these campuses typically are collegial in nature and working relationships between faculty, staff and students are valued. Cohen (1998) accurately depicted private baccalaureates as largely tuition and fee driven as compared to their public baccalaureate counterparts who have historically relied on state support. Boyer (1990) did find both private and public baccalaureates as having highly engaged student populations in the life of the campus.

Regarding characteristics which help illuminate the masters institutions, Cole (2009) described in great detail the evolving impact of the professional schools of engineering and business at these institutions. Additionally, Birnbaum (1991) characterized these institutions as political and bureaucratic in nature. Like most public
institutions of higher education, the public masters institutions are focused on access and rely on state funds for support. These institutions also display a commitment to serving the public of their states and producing an educating workforce (Cohen, 1998). Despite these intentions, these campuses do suffer from an over-reliance on campus policies and procedures (Boyer, 1990).

With regard to both private and public doctoral institutions these campuses typically maintain robust athletic departments and programs consisting of a wide variety of sports teams, maintain and manage a wide array of professional schools, degrees and specialized programs (Cole, 2009). Birnbaum (1991) categorized these institutions as being anarchical in nature and reliant upon loosely coupled systems for administrative control and oversight. Like the masters institutions, these campuses typically are focused on policies and procedures (Boyer, 1990) and place a high degree of emphasis on advancing a robust research agenda (Cole, 2009). For a complete categorization of the various types of campus used in this study as they relate to the literature mentioned above please refer to Appendix A.

Theories Explaining Donor Behavior

*Mann’s Theory on Donor Intent*

Mann (2007) outlined 6 key areas of theoretical perspectives impacting fundraising in higher education. His work focuses on understanding which theories reflect the actual intentions of donors, which theories apply to donors or volunteers separately and together and ask if the current practices within advancement mesh with the relevant theoretical constructs.
Charitable giving: Alumni donated to be altruistic, for reciprocity or for direct benefit. With regard to the impact of this theory on fundraising, alumni gave when they felt a sense of debt to their campus, displayed a level of pride in their accomplishments and believed they had a moral responsibility to give back.

Organizational identification: Alumni associated themselves with where they felt they had a connection. When the organization matched their own values they wanted to belong and support it. When donors of this type were asked to give back they had to believe in the fundraising goals of the campaign and the leadership behind them.

Social identification: Alumni identities were influenced by where they saw themselves in relation to others and society and whether or not deep relationships were built during their time within a group. Socially identified donors wanted to support projects that were closely tied to their smaller affinity groups. These donors wanted to be asked to give to specific groups or projects on the campus and not necessarily to a large capital fund or unrestricted gift account.

Economics: Alumni felt motivated to make a gift that delivered a direct benefit: greater the need, the greater the gift. These donors had to understand the direct benefit of their gift of time or talent. If a campus did an adequate job of explaining the need and outlining a case for the total number of students who benefited from the gift, the economically driven donor would be much more likely to give.

Services-Philanthropy: Alumni were motivated by receiving substantive, quality, and relevant services from the campus both in the present and in the past. These donors were driven by the belief that they had been given not just a good product, but most importantly that this product or service was delivered with professionalism. These
donors and volunteers needed to be treated with absolute care and positive customer service if they were going to remain donors. Growth in the area of stewardship staffing reflected this reality in the current advancement landscape.

**Relationship-Marketing:** Donors had customer relationships with institutions ranging from transactional to relational. Positive relationships were categorized as relational and negative relationships were viewed by the donor as transactional. This theory outlined the need for colleges and universities to institute a rigorous and well-designed communications plan to reach out and connect with potential donors and active donors alike. Good communication led to better gifts and poor communication resulted in apathy and indifference on the part of alumni. Institutions which worked hard at establishing positive relationships built around trust, openness and service were in the best position to count on greater gifts of time and treasures from relationship-oriented alumni.

**Sargeant and Shang’s Individual Giving Model**

Sargeant and Shang (2010), relying on a comprehensive meta-analysis, developed an individual giving model which the authors utilize to explain alumni donations. The first aspect of the model recognizes that initial attention by the donor plays a key role. Sargeant and Shang assert that donation decisions are first triggered by overt stimulation. How donors learn of a campaign, a need or a cause is the first step in securing a gift. This stimulation, however, must be linked to an internal condition within the individual and it must resonate with how the donor feels at that particular moment. If the institution successfully raises the attention of the donor, and the
message resonates, the model then progresses to the second phase.

In the second, or perception phase, the donor further explores the solicitation and begins to internalize the possibilities for giving and how he/she might make an active contribution towards the goal. If the donor is able to develop an intellectual match with the goals of the organization he/she will then begin to think more critically about what their gift may mean for both themselves and the organization.

It is at this point that Sargeant and Shang (2010) assert that the donor enters into the third phase of the model, one of emotional connection. The authors identify five key steps/processes which stimulate an emotional reaction in the donor. First, the donor will evaluate whether or not the chance to give is consistent with their goals. Second, the donor will evaluate whether or not the chance to give creates a condition where the donor might realize a reward, and simultaneously avoid a negative consequence. Third, the donor will subconsciously determine who is ultimately responsible for the benefits of his/her gift and whether or not the donor can see the person, people, or institution they would impact. If there is no connection between the donor and the beneficiary, the decision to donate may suffer or cease outright. Fourth, the donor will ask whether or not they have the ability to impact the need being presented to them. This subconscious process ultimately directs the donor to consider the impact on the institution if they do or do not give financially. Finally, and most importantly, the donor will ask whether or not he/she has the power to positively impact the institution and cause a beneficial change to the condition presented in the initial solicitation. These five steps take place internally within the individual and utilize whatever information he/she has at the time.
Assuming the donor has an emotional connection to the institution, and the initial request for support, they then enter into the next stage of the Sargeant and Shang’s (2010) model, which is knowledge. In order for donors to give, they must fully understand the request at hand. This stage will either support their decision to emotionally invest in the gift or cause reason for concern. The authors assert that knowledge flows from a very basic level of awareness, or the superordinate concept. For example, a female donor who attended a private, Liberal Arts institution may have some level of knowledge of education across the United States. As the donor moves to a more knowledgeable level of awareness, or basic level concept, she may reflect on the individual impact of private higher education in the United States. Continuing to a deeper view of higher education, the donor moves to a personalized level of awareness, or member. At this stage she is beginning to focus on her experiences as a graduate of Dartmouth University. At the deepest level of knowledge, or facts, the donor is recalling the memories, friends, experiences and benefits of attending her alma mater. Sargeant and Shang (2010) assert that fundraisers need to address and determine which spheres of knowledge will improve their chances of working with the donor towards a gift. Through repeated solicitations and meetings, the advancement professional, donor and institution all exchange information and knowledge with each other. This process deepens the possibility a gift will occur and increases the knowledge of all parties involved.

Understanding, shaping and refining attitudes describe the next phase of the individual giving model. Sargeant and Shang (2010) explain that fundraisers and institutions must become adept at helping donors develop a positive attitude about the
gifts they are about to donate. Specifically, institutions and fundraising staff must examine communication messages they are employing in the solicitation phase. Factors needing to be analyzed include the credibility of the person sending along the communication, the nature of the content and the emotional appeal of the solicitation. Successful institutions recognize the value of segment analysis and avoid easy mistakes by first investing in research to understand their donor bases. Of increasing value is the need for the institution to intentionally focus on the message being delivered by sharing multiple perspectives on the issue or solicitation. Specifically, Sargeant and Shang (2010) recommend institutions of higher education employ a two-sided message regarding the call to give and empowering alumni, who are typically better educated, the chance to weigh the pros and cons of donating.

Inextricably linked to this phase of the individual donor model is the need to frame the presentation of the appeal to an institution’s donor base. Fundraisers and the institutions that employ them have a wide variety of messages at their disposal to convince potential donors to give. Sargeant and Shang (2010) urge institutions to weigh the relative strengths and weakness of each message for a given audience. Under this model, successful institutions know which messages will resonate with which aspect and type of donor and those messages that do not. Campuses who succeed at raising gifts become quite adept at distilling down multiple messages into carefully crafted and tested themes which will resonate with the largest segments of their donor base. The final aspect under the institution’s control is the decision making process surrounding how beneficiaries are portrayed.

Sargeant and Shang (2010) highlight the fact that successful institutions know
how to paint a story for potential donors by using the beneficiaries of their donations as a motivation tool. Determining who, how and why certain beneficiaries should be presented requires deliberate thinking and sound strategy. The authors assert that institutions must think about how the beneficiaries are perceived by the donor and understand the strengths and weaknesses of these decisions.

*Sargeant and Shang’s Social Giving Model*

Working in concert with the individual giving model, Sargeant and Shang (2010) developed a synergistic model to also explain the social considerations of the fundraising process. Prior to a campus being successful at employing the individual giving model, Sargeant and Shang underscore the need to examine the social influences which help explain individual donor patterns. At the entry point to the model, the authors recognize the larger societal influences on the institution and the potential donor. National policy, media headlines, and the economy all influence either how successful or unsuccessful an institution may be in raising funds from alumni. Institutions that do not recognize this element of the model do so at their own peril. The next layer of the model capitalizes on the assertion that successful institutions have a firm grasp of the localized social factors at play when a donor considers making a gift.

Specifically, the researchers document the need for an understanding of 6 main clusters of individuals impacting a donor’s personal social group. Successful institutions understand the donor’s campus connections, organizations of involvement, local community groups, significant others in the life of the donor such as mentors, close family friends, relatives, acquaintances, and even strangers. Each of these clusters
contributes to and determines the donor’s base of social influence, social network and social identities. Taken together, successful fundraisers leverage this information with the previously described individual giving model to create a comprehensive system to understand donor intent and the gift-giving process. Intentionally factoring in social processes at the macro level and drilling down to the individual donor’s micro level results in a potentially powerful tool to increase both quantity and quality of gifts.

Previous Studies on Alumni Giving

Leveraging the individual, social and institutional processes at play when a donor decides to give, it is instructive to place this study within the context of the larger field of research related to alumni giving. Prior to documenting relevant studies and to promote a transparent process, it is wise to first capture and describe studies that were specifically excluded from this analysis.

In determining criteria for exclusion, works that failed to analyze either large datasets of multiple institutions or work which did not focus on elements of institutional culture as predictor variables for giving were excluded. Van Slyke, Ashley, and Johnson (2007) examined non-profit performance and fundraising effectiveness at educational institutions interested in securing donations from African-Americans. Despite this important line of inquiry, this study was specifically excluded due to the author’s lack of analysis of giving on a national level and across multiple institutions. Okunade and Berl (1997) did utilize a national dataset of institutions in their study of determinants of charitable giving amongst alumni, but methodologically the researchers decided to narrow their focus squarely on examining alumni contributions from
graduates of business schools. This intentional narrowing necessitated their exclusion. Leahy (2009) did initially rely on VSE data for his dissertation on fundraising performance but his eventual delimitation to only focus on Drexel University prompted non-consideration. Despite the positive implications of Leblanc and Ruck’s (2009) research on utilizing cluster-analysis to predict giving at very large public land-grant institutions the authors decision to limit this study to just a single campus required removal from this review. Maniaci’s (2003) dissertation on private masters universities did rely on VSE data but the researcher was primarily interested in future tuition dependency and its relationship to giving. Maniaci’s work is therefore incongruent with this study’s research questions and is excluded. Finally, Weerts, Cabrera, and Sanford’s (2010) work examining patterns of volunteerism at a public university are excluded due to the researcher’s study design. Despite drawing upon donors for their sample, Weerts et al. did not translate these selection criteria into future giving patterns but rather focused exclusively on the conditions which lead to volunteerism.

*Studies Adopting a Multi-Institutional Perspective*

With regard to studies fit for inclusion in this review, there is a dearth of research utilizing a national dataset in the area of advancement. Caboni and Proper (2007) conducted a longitudinal 15 year analysis from 1992 through 2007 of 241 doctoral dissertations related to fundraising and found that only 7.1% of these documents utilized a national dataset. Additionally, 92.1% of these studies utilized self-collected data. 22.4% of the dissertations analyzed by Caboni and Proper relied on a single institution for data. Caboni and Proper assert that for the promulgation of a body of knowledge
concerning fundraising and advancement to occur, more research is required which examines institutional phenomenon on a larger scale. Despite this concern, a few recent studies do meet these criteria and require analysis.

In a subsequent study, Caboni, Hartley, Willmer and Proper (2009), relying on data from the Council of Independent Colleges and CASE investigate the impact of institutional age on endowment size and total funds raised. Additionally, the researchers were curious to ascertain if advancement staff size also impacted advancement performance. Examining the responses of 274 institutions via regression, Caboni, et al. found that institution age does matter in terms of overall fundraising success. Not surprisingly, the researchers also confirmed that larger staffs do raise statistically significant more funds than smaller staffs. One surprising finding was that the size of the endowment did not impact efficiency at raising funds and less endowed institutions were just as able to successfully compete for gifts.

Lee (2009) analyzes data from 147 institutions, 100 private and 47 public, to examine the relationships between institutional characteristics and endowment growth. Lee selected all institutions who reported VSE data in 1995 who had endowments valued at over $120 million and tracked their reported endowments up through and including 2005. Multiple regression analysis was then employed to determine relationships between the institutional factors and reported endowments. Lee stratified her institutions along three lines research, masters and baccalaureate. Surprisingly, research institutions grew their endowment by 188% compared to masters institutions who grew their endowments by 124% and baccalaureate institutions who trailed with a 118% endowment growth. When the research team controlled for enrollment, this trend
remained in place and unchanged with research institutions clearly in the lead. This finding was a reversal of the data when the researchers examined the total endowment per student enrolled. In this case, Lee found that baccalaureate institutions had the highest ratios followed by the research institutions with the masters institutions lagging in last place. Lee’s research is instructive as it confirms that alumni giving ratios are not only tied to endowment growth but that these ratios are deeply rooted in the overall quality of the student experience.

Clotfelter (2003) examines giving patterns at 34 private elites by analyzing data from alumni who were enrolled in 1951, 1976 and 1989 via the College and Beyond study financially underwritten by the Andrew W. Mellon foundation. 12,214 total respondents constitute the study and variables included marital status, number of children, profession, high school attended, college major, honors designation, and aspects of the undergraduate experience. Due to the stratification of the respondents, the study allowed Clotfelter to also incorporate inter-generational attitudes into the analysis. After employing regression, it was found that donating was highly correlated to the quality of the undergraduate experience and other key indicators of satisfaction with the institution. Clotfelter also found significant correlations between giving and how active a role campus faculty and staff played in the life of alumni by taking an interest in them personally. Finally, the researcher found distinct giving differences between alumni who attended liberal arts colleges and private universities with the latter receiving less support.

Monks (2003) analyzes giving patterns amongst a sample of alumni from 28 elite private institutions via an alumni survey sent out to the class of 1989 in the year 2000.
With specific regard to this study, Monks found significant correlations between alumni giving and involvement in student government, intercollegiate athletics, Greek letter organizations, religious organizations and a robust residential life experience.

Regarding the academic undergraduate experience, generous donors were much more likely to have had an academic internship, a close working relationship with a faculty member or deep contact with their major advisor. Monks’ work points to the impact the culture of a campus can have on donations.

Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano (2002) utilize data from the VSE in conjunction with a proprietary database by Peterson’s Higher Education Database to analyze average alumni donation patterns at 415 institutions of higher education. Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano constructed several key variables including student quality, institutional value add [sic] and “alumni taste for giving.” Student quality was assessed by examining percentage of students in the top 10% of their class, merit scholarship recipients and either an ACT or SAT score. “Institutional value add” was constructed by looking at student to faculty ratios, percentage of full-time faculty with a doctorate, and number of bound volumes in the institution’s library. “Alumni taste for giving” was developed by looking at alumni participation in the larger system, institutional classification and typology. The researchers found gains in giving as average SAT scores increased and as the faculty to student ratio increased. Surprisingly, national merit scholars tended to correlate negatively with gains in giving. Liberal arts institutional identification also correlated at a higher rate to increased contributions and alumni who attended business schools were less likely to donate. Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano also demonstrate a strong, and statistically significant, financial linkage.
between institutional academic reputation and gains in giving.

*Studies Involving Campus Culture as a Predictor of Donating*

Gaier (2005) examines the relationship between satisfaction with the undergraduate academic experience and alumni involvement as donors and volunteers. Relying on logistic regression, Gaier found statistically significant increases in both giving and volunteerism for alumni who had higher degrees of satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience. Specifically, respondents who were very satisfied with coursework in the major were 85.3% likely to donate compared to a 39.2% giving rate by alumni who were very dissatisfied. Similarly, 85.2% of alumni who were very satisfied with the quality of instruction in major courses were likely to give as compared to 42.5% of alumni who were very dissatisfied. Finally, Gaier found that high degrees of satisfaction with the overall academic experience yielded donor probability rates of 85.6% compared to alumni who were very dissatisfied who were predicted to give 48.4%. Ultimately, Gaier’s work demonstrates a positive connection between the undergraduate academic experience and gains in donations.

McDearmon and Shirley (2009) studied institutional factors related to young alumni donors and non-donors at a large public university. Utilizing multiple regression, the researchers analyzed the responses of 2,273 respondents to ascertain their willingness to contribute to the campus. McDearmon and Shirley found that being an in-state student, overall satisfaction with the student experience and prior giving to another charity, not the campus, correlated highly with young alumni giving.

Sun, Hoffman and Grady (2007) examined the attitudes of 1,754 alumni over a
two year period at a large public research institution. The authors segmented respondents in terms of the degree by which they had previously donated, or not donated, to the institution. Factor analysis was utilized to distill down the original instrument’s 71 variables into 38 which best corresponded with the researchers alumni-giving decision model. Sun, et al. found that the overall quality of the student experience significantly defines and explains donor behavior. Likewise, the authors found that alumni who had developed significant relationships with faculty and staff during their years on campus were much more likely to give as well as alumni who believed the institution was committed to their education.

Weerts and Ronca (2007) conducted a logistical regression analysis of 1,421 alumni donors who were also volunteers at a large public research institution to ascertain the connection between volunteerism, donating and engagement. The authors found that academic engagement emerged as a statistically significant predictor of volunteerism amongst alumni donors. The researchers conclude that institutions are effectively ensuring their long term financial survival by focusing resources and time on building thriving and deeply engaging student communities both within and beyond the classroom.

In a subsequent study, Weerts and Ronca (2009) analyzed the probability of using and creating classification trees to understand donor behavior. Looking beyond the utilitarian outcomes of their work and the impact it would have on administrative practice, one finding did emerge of direct interest to this study. When analyzing their data, the researchers found that satisfaction with the undergraduate experience was significantly correlated to donor activity. Weerts and Ronca also hypothesize that their
findings confirm the importance of undergraduate satisfaction and involvement in academic organizations and engagement.

Wunnava and Lauze (2000) studied 21,185 donors who attended a small private liberal arts college to determine factors which contributed to increased levels of participation and donating. The researchers divided the respondents into two categories occasional and consistent donors. Regression was then employed to determine which variables best predicted future donations. Volunteerism patterns for the campus proved to have a high degree of impact on future donations with frequent volunteers contributing in greater numbers than non-volunteers. Wunnava and Lauze found that frequent volunteers were one and a half times more likely to give. Interestingly, having a previous relative attend the institution and an interest or former participation in athletics were also significant predictors of donor behavior for the consistent donors. The two variables were less predictive for the occasional donor indicating a distinct difference in experience.

Holmes, Meditz and Sommers (2008) utilized a probit framework to analyze data on 22,641 alumni from a highly selective liberal arts institution. The researchers were curious to ascertain how alumni giving patterns were related to athletic success during the year of the donation. Methodologically, the researchers utilized the men’s ice hockey and football team win/loss records to conduct the analysis. Holmes et al. found that former athletes were 22% more likely to give than non-athletes. Surprisingly though, the researchers determined that former student leaders and undergraduate fundraising campaign volunteers were the most likely to donate. Regarding the impact of winning on the field and increased donations, Holmes et al. found gains in giving
occurred when the hockey team posted a successful season while paradoxically giving
decreased when the football team won on the field.

Summary

Taken together, Boyer (1990) and Tierney (1988) provide a definitive set of
criteria campus administrators, advancement officers and institutional leaders should
employ to evaluate and enhance campus culture. Furthermore, examining the cultural
differences which emerged in the Boyer study provides a foundation to help further
analyze possible differences in alumni giving as reported in the VSE. Tierney’s six
elements of culture provides a robust set of criteria describing the underlying
organizational, leadership and structural challenges which impact how institutions of
higher education evolve. These criteria may serve to inform and influence
advancement related decisions which impact fundraising performance. Sargeant and
Shang’s (2010) individual and social giving models draw a direct connection between
the influence and impact of a campus environment and eventual success in securing
donations.

With regard to previous studies that rely on multiple institutions for data, research
appears to cluster around the impact of private institutions, their donors and respective
endowment sizes. Data in these studies report that these institutions outperform other
classifications of institutions with regard to alumni donations. However, relatively few
studies exist which identify a broader continuum of institution types and the impact of
this typology on donor behavior. This study should serve to contribute to the body of
literature in this regard. Despite this challenge, a consistent pattern emerges of
increased giving when increased levels of satisfaction and campus engagement are present. This pattern is also consistent with gains in giving reported in single institution studies as well. Donor perceptions regarding the quality of the impact of campus culture and forms of involvement on their experience also strongly correlate to increased levels of donations. The role of campus staff and faculty in the lives of students emerge as a fairly consistent pattern where alumni were more likely to donate to their alma mater when these relationships were perceived to be positive, strong or important to the donor.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Questions Revisited

This study investigated four primary research questions. First, is there a significant difference amongst public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni funds raised per student full time equivalent (FTE)? Second, is there a significant difference amongst public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni restricted gifts per student FTE? Third, is there a significant difference between public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni unrestricted gifts per student FTE? Finally, what percentage of total alumni restricted contributions per student FTE are typically reported by a sample of public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions who participated in the 2008 Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) study? This chapter explains the methods and procedures utilized to arrive at conclusions to the questions.

Instrument

The Council for Aid to Education (CAE) houses the leading source of data on private giving to education via the VSE and consistently manages data on roughly 85% of total voluntary support to domestic institutions of higher education (CAE website, 2010). Data is captured via a reciprocal relationship with the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), which financially underwrites the VSE.
CASE is the largest professional association of advancement staff in the nation with over 3,400 colleges and universities, primary and secondary independent and international schools, and nonprofit organizations in 59 countries (CASE website, 2010). As of 2009, CASE had over 61,500 dues paying advancement staff members and nearly 22,000 professional members, making it the largest higher education advancement professional organization in the world (CASE website, 2010). These two organizations provide the foundation and support for the VSE study.

The first VSE study was conducted in 1954 and was designed as a centralized location for higher education institutions to track and understand private giving to campuses. The VSE study evolved from a survey administered from the then American Alumni Association (CAE FAQ, 2010). The instrument provides global benchmarking abilities for institutions to compare performance on both private and public sources of funding across broad categories of institution types. Data is typically treated utilizing basic frequency and descriptive statistics and shared to participating institutions via a proprietary Data Miner web-based application. This tool is available once an institution pays a separate subscription fee which varies based on whether the institution is related to the education field or is a non-educational institution/state system.

Subscriptions are priced per institution and typically expire on a year by year basis. Fees for annual results varies and range from $35 per year for historic findings (1954-2008) to $75 for the PowerPoint CD version and $100 for the latest hard copy of the VSE study findings in bound book form.

It should be noted that the VSE maintains longitudinal data in an archive dating back to 1969 and is frequently cited by higher education policy experts for public
comments to representative bodies and trustees alike. The VSE provides institutions with opportunities to strategically position their own fundraising performance in a national context by examining peer institutions to ascertain the relative strength and weakness of current fundraising performance.

The VSE offers institutions three separate formats to submit data, including a minimal survey, partial survey and full survey. Institutions are encouraged to utilize the full survey whenever possible but due to time or staffing constraints, 100% adoption of the full instrument is not the norm.

Measurements

*Independent Variables (Input)*

For Research Questions 1 through 3, the independent variable included the three degree granting sub-categories of institution (baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate typology) as categorized by either public or private status, as reported by the institution to the VSE. The degree granting sub-categories were assigned by the researcher by examining the self-reported Carnegie classifications and private/public status variables and appropriately re-coding each institution in a new variable using one of the six following groups: private baccalaureate, private masters, private doctorate, public baccalaureate, public masters and public doctorate.

*Dependent Variables (Output)*

The dependent variable for Research Question 1 is a computed total alumni giving for 2008, as reported by the institution, divided by the institution’s student FTE.
The decision to utilize the enrollment of FTE students as a denominator recognizes the use of this value to equalize size of institutions and will provide an apple-to-apple comparison across institutions of varying size. This methodological decision is modeled after the work of Harrison (2008) who used this approach in his longitudinal study of institutional type and giving.

Similar to Research Question 1, the dependent variable for Research Question 2 is a computed total of all restricted alumni giving for 2008, as reported by the institution, divided by the institution’s student FTE. Total restricted giving is computed by adding reported alumni contributions across the VSE restricted giving categories, which are total gifts to academic departments, student aid and scholarships, faculty/staff compensation, research, public service and extension, library support, physical plant, athletics and a general “other” restricted giving category.

The dependent variable for Research Question 3 is a computed total amount of all unrestricted giving by alumni for 2008 divided by the institution’s student FTE. This variable is computed by the researcher by subtracting the total amount of reported alumni restricted giving from the overall amount of alumni giving reported by the institution to the VSE.

Population, Sample, and Subjects

A total of 1,052 institutional survey respondents originally took part in the 2008 VSE study (Kaplan, 2008b) and contained a strong mix of 492 public and 538 private institutions (this does not include system level data or unclassified institutions participating for the first time). For this specific study, 146 two year institutions were
deemed to be beyond the scope of this study and were subsequently filtered out of the dataset. Additionally, eight systems of higher education and 62 specialized institutions were removed. Finally, any institution that chose not to provide restricted giving data to the VSE was excluded from this study. When this process was concluded, 652 institutions remained in the dataset represented by 383 privates and 269 publics. Of the 652 institutions referenced above, 212 are baccalaureate granting institutions (189 private, 23 public), 255 are masters granting institutions (134 private, 121 public) and 185 are doctorate granting institutions (60 private, 125 public). A total of 58.7% of the institutions utilized in this study are classified as privates and 41.3% are designated as publics.

It should be noted that this entire group was utilized for analysis purposes and represents the population under study. No specific sampling techniques were employed by the researcher. To demonstrate the fundraising impact of this group of colleges and universities, in terms of total dollars secured, these institutions raised an average of $1,663 per FTE enrolled from alumni.

Procedure for Data Collection

The VSE gathers data submitted by chief information officers within each institution’s advancement function. Typically, all data submitted are first screened and authorized by the vice president for institutional advancement prior to release. With specific regard to reliability and validity, it is important to note that participating in the VSE survey is voluntary and requires participating members to report their performance following the guidelines in the CASE management and reporting standards document.
adopted for universal use by the CASE membership. This document includes rigidly prescribed standards for institutions to use in reporting their fundraising results to CASE for its annual Survey of Educational Fundraising Campaigns and the VSE. Likewise, these standards are frequently used as benchmarks when external accreditation staffs visit a campus to examine the advancement function. As an additional safeguard, data is also screened by CAE researchers who make a concerted effort to clean data and question any institution whose data appear out of line with national trends and/or their own historical data (CAE website, 2010). At this time, formal reliability and validity studies on the instrument do not appear in the literature. The 2008 VSE data is culled from the fundraising progress experienced during the 2007 - 2008 academic year. On July 1 of each year, the survey is opened for data entry. On October 1 of each year, the VSE officially closes. Finally, on January 1 of each year, data are downloaded from the site for analysis by CAE staff with input from CASE.

With specific regard for the data used in this study, the researcher contacted Ann E. Kaplan, Director of the VSE study at the Council for Aid to Education in early February 2010. Prior to her arrival at CAE, Ms. Kaplan served as the managing editor and principle researcher for Giving USA, an annual snapshot of philanthropic activities in the United States across all major sectors (education, health care, etc.). Relying on her experience and expertise with philanthropic research, the researcher engaged in a series of conversations to narrow down the specific data needs and variables requested from the CAE. Upon confirmation of the researcher’s graduate student status, Ms. Kaplan subsequently furnished a dataset as requested. Smith (2008) strongly urges secondary data researchers to report any restrictions requested by the original data
owner. With regard to restrictions placed upon the researcher for this particular study, CAE staff requested that all data be treated in aggregate form and that no individual institution’s data be released without prior consent from the CAE or VSE staff. The researcher agreed to these terms and no subsequent restrictions or limitations were requested of the researcher. Data was then transmitted electronically to the researcher in Microsoft Excel CSV format five weeks later and subsequently imported by the researcher into SPSS v18. Following standard secondary data analysis techniques as described by Smith (2008) the researcher scrubbed the data, recoded variables from string to number format and ran frequency reports to ensure the data management process did not compromise the initial data supplied by the CAE.

Data Analysis

In order to answer the first through third research questions, descriptive statistics including frequencies, means and standard deviations are reported. Operationally, main effects within ANOVA was calculated utilizing PASW version 18.0 to compare means of giving across the six sub-groups (baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degree offering institutions) separated out by public or private status (Field, 2009). Consistent with American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual 6th edition (2009), means, standard errors, F-statistics, p values employing $\alpha = 0.05$ for statistical significance (Field, 2009), and effect sizes utilizing Cohen’s $f^2$ indicating the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2008) are reported by the researcher. The researcher relies on the widely adopted effect size benchmarks of Cohen (1988) for interpretation of the $f^2$ results.
Cohen (1988) recommends researchers interpret $f^2$ effect sizes of 0.02 as small, 0.15 as medium, and 0.35 as large. Post hoc analysis is also undertaken for any statistically significant ANOVA result (Field, 2009). For the fourth research question, the researcher reports average percentages of restricted giving totals across the following variables: funding for academic divisions, faculty/staff compensation, public service support, physical plant support, research support, library support, student financial aid support, athletic support, a general category of “other” restricted giving, total restricted giving, total unrestricted giving and total alumni giving for 2008 for both publics and privates across the baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degree levels.

Institutional Review Board Permission Procedures

IRB was contacted to ascertain the need for filing. Upon consultation with my chair, I informed the staff within the IRB function in writing that this study relied on secondary data and did not involve individual donors. Furthermore, IRB was informed that all institutional data was to be treated in aggregate form and individual institutions were afforded protection from disclosure. IRB staff subsequently confirmed that this study did not require IRB approval as proposed within this document. It should be noted that even though the IRB waived the need to file for this study, I was still properly trained through successful completion of the online training course facilitated by the National Institutes of Health, *Protecting Human Research Participants*, which was completed in fall 2008. The completion certificate ensuring compliance was filed with the Office of Research Services for a previous study.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to examine the trends and draw connections between institutional classification, governance typology and patterns of total, unrestricted, and restricted alumni giving. This study was also designed to expand the understanding of philanthropy in higher education by critically deconstructing college and university fundraising through the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) study as reported in the 2007 through 2008 academic year. This was achieved by examining institutional alumni giving differences in terms of highest degree offered (baccalaureate, masters or doctoral), overall alumni giving, total restricted giving and total unrestricted giving for both private and public institutions who participated in the 2008 VSE study. Finally, this study offered a mechanism to analyze and report total percentages of restricted giving by common categories reported in the VSE to produce a “restricted giving index” for campus leaders to analyze and compare their own restricted giving successes and challenges against a backdrop of national data during a strong fundraising year.

Background Data on the Institutions Included in the Study

The researcher recoded institutions into one of the six pre-determined categories based on self-reported Carnegie Classification. Table 1 details the breakdown of the population including in the study by campus type and percentage. Full time equivalent (FTE) statistics were used by the researcher to control for differences in campus size. As would be expected, both the private and public doctoral institutions had the largest
mean enrollments. Yet an examination of the total FTE revealed that public masters and public doctoral institutions enrolled the greatest total number of FTE students. Public masters and public baccalaureate institutions followed in regard to average enrollment. Private masters and private baccalaureates had the smallest average enrollments. Table 2 represents enrollment data for the institution types included in this study.

Table 1

*Population Summary by Institution Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Mean and Total FTE Enrollment by Campus Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mean FTE</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>1,731.40</td>
<td>327,237.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>3,407.70</td>
<td>78,376.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>3,369.00</td>
<td>451,440.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>9,679.30</td>
<td>1,171,193.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>10,531.20</td>
<td>631,874.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>23,371.70</td>
<td>2,921,456.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Population</td>
<td>10,060.15</td>
<td>3,831,316.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to provide an additional layer of data to describe this population, the researcher examined average reported endowments per FTE. The average endowment per FTE for the entire population was $77,377.13. On the whole, private institutions outperformed their public counterparts at every degree level. It should be noted that three private institutions chose not to report endowment size resulting in 649 institutions included in the endowment calculations found in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mean Endowment per FTE</th>
<th>Total Endowment per FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 143,605.18</td>
<td>$ 28,654,169.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 5,002.44</td>
<td>$ 115,056.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$ 50,893.11</td>
<td>$ 4,139,676.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$ 3,798.17</td>
<td>$ 459,578.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 264,878.03</td>
<td>$ 15,627,803.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 24,171.77</td>
<td>$ 3,021,471.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Population</td>
<td>$ 77,377.13</td>
<td>$52,017,754.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for the Research Questions

*Results for Research Question 1: Total Alumni Giving per FTE*

Research Question 1 for this study was, “Is there a significant difference among public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni funds raised per student full-time equivalent (FTE)?” A one-way ANOVA was used to test for total alumni giving differences among the six types of institutions of higher education (private baccalaureate, public baccalaureate, private masters, public masters, private doctoral and public doctoral). A statistically
significant difference emerged in total alumni giving per student FTE across the six types, \( F(5, 651) = 37.181, p < .001, f^2 = .29. \)

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicate that the private baccalaureate alumni \((M = $3,276.20, 95\% \text{ CI} [$3,865.96, $10,418.36])\) gave a statistically significant higher amount than the private masters alumni \((M = $1,024.33, 95\% \text{ CI} [$1,564.20, $3,612.86]), p < .001.\) Likewise, the private baccalaureate alumni \((M = $3,276.20, 95\% \text{ CI} [$3,865.96, $10,418.36])\) gave a statistically significant higher amount than the public baccalaureate alumni \((M = $201.91, 95\% \text{ CI} [$957.41, $1,361.23]), p < .001.\) The private baccalaureate alumni \((M = $3,276.20, 95\% \text{ CI} [$3,865.96, $10,418.36])\) also gave a statistically significant higher amount than the public masters alumni \((M = $169.48, 95\% \text{ CI} [$394.41, $733.37]), p < .001.\) Additionally, the private baccalaureate alumni \((M = $3,276.20, 95\% \text{ CI} [$3,865.96, $10,418.36])\) also gave a statistically significant higher amount than the public doctoral alumni \((M = $676.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [$729.23, $2,082.63]), p < .001.\) Comparisons between the private baccalaureate alumni \((M = $3,276.20, 95\% \text{ CI} [$3,865.96, $10,418.36])\) and the private doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \(p = .933.\)

Comparisons between the private masters \((M = $1,024.32, 95\% \text{ CI} [$1,564.20, $3,612.86])\) alumni and the public baccalaureate were not statistically significant at \(p = .714.\) Comparisons between the private masters \((M = $1,024.32, 95\% \text{ CI} [$1,564.20, $3,612.86])\) alumni and the public masters were not statistically significant at \(p = .085.\) Comparisons between the private masters \((M = $1,024.32, 95\% \text{ CI} [$1,564.20, $3,612.86])\) alumni and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \(p = .885.\)
Analyzing the giving patterns of the private doctoral alumni ($M = $3,637.27, 95% CI [$6,022.35, $13,296.89]) yielded a statistically significant higher total amount of giving than the private masters alumni ($M = $1,024.33, 95% CI [$1,564.20, $3,612.86]), $p < .001$. Additionally, private doctoral alumni ($M = $3,637.27, 95% CI [$6,022.35, $13,296.89]) gave statistically more than the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91, 95% CI [$957.41, $1,361.23]), $p < .001$. Likewise, private doctoral alumni ($M = $3,637.27, 95% CI [$6,022.35, $13,296.89]) gave a statistically significant amount more than the public masters alumni ($M = $169.48, 95% CI [$394.41, $733.37]), $p < .0001$. Private doctoral alumni ($M = $3,637.27, 95% CI [$6,022.35, $13,296.89]) also gave a statistically significant amount more than the public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70, 95% CI [$729.23, $2,082.63]), $p < .001$. Comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91, 95% CI [$957.41, $1,361.23]) and the private masters were not statistically significant at $p = .714$. Comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91, 95% CI [$957.41, $1,361.23]) and the public masters were not statistically significant at $p = 1.000$. Comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91, 95% CI [$957.41, $1,361.23]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .964$.

Likewise, comparisons between the public masters alumni ($M = $169.48, 95% CI [$394.41, $733.37]) and the private masters alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .085$. Comparisons between the public masters alumni ($M = $169.48, 95% CI [$394.41, $733.37]) and the public baccalaureate alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .1.000$. Comparisons between the public masters alumni ($M = $169.48, 95% CI [
and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .631$.

Finally, comparisons between public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70, 95% CI [$729.23, $2,082.63]) and private masters alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .885$. Comparisons between public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70, 95% CI [$729.23, $2,082.63]) and public baccalaureate alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .964$. Comparisons between public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70, 95% CI [$729.23, $2,082.63]) and public masters alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .885$.

In analyzing the total alumni giving trends by campus type, a clear pattern emerged where the private institutions outperformed their public counterparts. Private baccalaureates raised $3,074.29 per FTE more than the public baccalaureates. Likewise, private masters secured $854.85 more per FTE than public masters institutions. Finally, the private doctoral institutions garnered $2,960.67 more per FTE than the public doctoral institutions. Table 4 demonstrates the average total alumni giving per FTE across each of the six typologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Alumni Giving per FTE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$3,276.20</td>
<td>$3,643.96</td>
<td>$265.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$201.91</td>
<td>$591.49</td>
<td>$123.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$1,024.33</td>
<td>$1,320.68</td>
<td>$114.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$169.48</td>
<td>$287.70</td>
<td>$23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,637.27</td>
<td>$4,928.38</td>
<td>$636.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$676.70</td>
<td>$717.31</td>
<td>$64.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>$1,663.25</td>
<td>$2,897.05</td>
<td>$113.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for Research Question 2: Total Alumni Restricted Giving per FTE

Research Question 2 for this study was, “Is there a significant difference among public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni restricted gifts per student FTE?” A one-way ANOVA was used to test for total alumni restricted giving differences among the six types of institutions of higher education (private baccalaureate, public baccalaureate, private masters, public masters, private doctoral and public doctoral). A statistically significant difference emerged in total alumni restricted giving per student FTE across the six types, $F(5, 651) = 28.90, p < .001, f^2 = .22$.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicated that the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $353.04, 95% CI [$687.74, $1,393.82]) gave a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than the private masters alumni ($M = $132.47, 95% CI [$177.46, $442.40]), $p < .001$. Likewise, the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $353.04, 95% CI [$687.74, $1,393.82]) gave a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $55.51, 95% CI [$271.41, $382.45]), $p = .024$. The private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $353.04, 95% CI [$687.74, $1,393.82]) also gave a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than the public masters alumni ($M = $44.14, 95% CI [$54.17, $142.45]), $p < .001$. Comparisons between the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $353.04, 95% CI [$687.74, $1,393.82]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .631$.

Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the private masters alumni ($M = $132.47, 95% CI [$177.46, $442.40]) and the public baccalaureate alumni were
not statistically significant at $p = .970$. Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the private masters alumni ($M = 132.47, 95\% \text{ CI} [177.46, 442.40]$) and the public masters alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .584$. Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the private masters alumni ($M = 132.47, 95\% \text{ CI} [177.46, 442.40]$) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .088$.

Private doctoral alumni ($M = 789.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [1,026.85, 2,606.25]$) gave a statistically significant greater amount of restricted gifts than the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 353.04, 95\% \text{ CI} [687.74, 1,393.82]$), $p < .001$. Private doctoral alumni ($M = 789.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [1,026.85, 2,606.25]$) also gave a statistically significant greater amount of restricted gifts than the private masters alumni ($M = 132.47, 95\% \text{ CI} [177.46, 442.40]$), $p < .001$. Additionally, private doctoral alumni ($M = 789.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [1,026.85, 2,606.25]$) donated a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than public baccalaureate alumni ($M = 55.51, 95\% \text{ CI} [271.41, 382.45]$), $p < .001$. Private doctoral alumni ($M = 789.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [1,026.85, 2,606.25]$) contributed a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than public masters alumni ($M = 44.14, 95\% \text{ CI} [54.17, 142.45]$), $p < .001$. Finally, private doctoral alumni ($M = 789.70, 95\% \text{ CI} [1,026.85, 2,606.25]$) gave a statistically significant larger amount of restricted gifts than public doctoral alumni ($M = 275.35, 95\% \text{ CI} [381.79, 932.47]$), $p < .001$.

Public doctoral alumni ($M = 275.35, 95\% \text{ CI} [381.79, 932.47]$) donated a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than public masters alumni ($M = 44.14, 95\% \text{ CI} [54.17, 142.45]$), $p < .001$. Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = 55.51, 95\% \text{ CI} [271.41, 382.45]$) and
the private masters alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = .970 \).

Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the public baccalaureate alumni \((M = $55.51, 95\% \text{ CI} [$271.41, $382.45])\) and the public masters alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = 1.000 \). Comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the public baccalaureate alumni \((M = $55.51, 95\% \text{ CI} [$271.41, $382.45])\) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = .225 \).

The ability to restrict giving offers donors the best chance of directing their gifts to a specific area of personal interest. Examining the average total alumni restricted giving trends by campus type resulted in a clear pattern where the private institutions outperformed their public counterparts in total restricted giving per FTE. This gap was greatest at the doctoral level where private institutions outperformed public doctoral institutions by $514.35 per FTE. Private masters institutions also outperformed their public counterparts by $88.33 per FTE. Finally, the private baccalaureate institutions garnered $297.53 more in restricted gifts than their public peers. Table 5 details the average total alumni giving per FTE across each of the six typologies.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Alumni Restricted Giving per FTE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$353.04</td>
<td>$531.01</td>
<td>$38.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$55.51</td>
<td>$166.79</td>
<td>$134.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$132.47</td>
<td>$158.13</td>
<td>$13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$44.14</td>
<td>$50.16</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$789.70</td>
<td>$926.81</td>
<td>$119.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$275.35</td>
<td>$335.27</td>
<td>$29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>$265.17</td>
<td>$478.62</td>
<td>$18.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for Research Question 3: Total Alumni Unrestricted Giving per FTE

Research Question 3 for this study was, “Is there a significant difference between public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni unrestricted gifts per student FTE?” A one-way ANOVA was used to test for total alumni giving differences among the six types of institutions of higher education (private baccalaureate, public baccalaureate, private masters, public masters, private doctoral and public doctoral). A statistically significant difference emerged in total alumni unrestricted giving per student FTE across the six types, $F (5, 651) = 35.371, p < .001, f^2 = .27$.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicated that the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 2,923.16, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[3,796.54, \:9,642.86]$) gave a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts than the private masters alumni ($M = 891.86, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[1,561.00, \:3,344.72]$, $p < .001$. The private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 2,923.16, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[3,796.54, \:9,642.86]$) also gave a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts than the public baccalaureate institutions ($M = 146.39, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[691.31, \:984.09], p < .001$. Additionally, private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 2,923.16, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[3,796.54, \:9,642.86]$) donated a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted funds than the public masters alumni ($M = 125.34, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[416.21, \:666.89], p < .001$. Finally, private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 2,923.16, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[3,796.54, \:9,642.86]$) contributed a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts than the public doctoral alumni ($M = 401.41, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[497.35, \:1,300.17], p < .001$. Comparisons between the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 2,923.16, 95\% \text{ CI} \:[3,796.54, \:9,642.86]$) and the
private doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = 1.000 \).

Comparisons between the private masters alumni (\( M = $891.86, \) 95% CI [$1,561.00, $3,344.72]) and the public baccalaureate alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = .715 \). Comparisons between the private masters alumni (\( M = $891.86, \) 95% CI [$1,561.00, $3,344.72]) and the public masters alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = .092 \). Comparisons between the private masters alumni (\( M = $891.86, \) 95% CI [$1,561.00, $3,344.72]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = .535 \).

Private doctoral alumni (\( M = $2,847.58, \) 95% CI [$5,632.86, $11,058.10]) gave a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts per FTE than the private masters alumni (\( M = $891.86, \) 95% CI [$1,561.00, $3,344.72]), \( p < .001 \). Likewise, private doctoral alumni (\( M = $2,847.58, \) 95% CI [$5,632.86, $11,058.10]) donated a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts per FTE than the public baccalaureate alumni (\( M = $146.39, \) 95% CI [$691.31, $984.09]), \( p < .001 \). Additionally, private doctoral alumni (\( M = $2,847.58, \) 95% CI [$5,632.86, $11,058.10]) gave significantly higher amounts of unrestricted gifts per FTE than the public masters alumni (\( M = $125.34, \) 95% CI [$416.21, $666.89]), \( p < .001 \). Finally, the private doctoral alumni (\( M = $2,847.58, \) 95% CI [$5,632.86, $11,058.10]) contributed a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts per FTE than the public doctoral alumni (\( M = $401.41, \) 95% CI [$497.35, $1,300.17]), \( p < .001 \).

Comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni (\( M = $146.39, \) 95% CI [$691.31, $984.09]) and the public masters alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = 1.000 \). Comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni (\( M = $146.39, \) 95% CI [$691.31, $984.09]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at \( p = 1.000 \).
CI [$691.31, $984.09]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .997$. Similarly, comparisons between the public masters alumni ($M = $125.34, 95% CI [$416.21, $666.89]) and the public doctoral alumni were not statistically significant at $p = .938$.

When alumni give without restriction, institutions have the greatest flexibility to apply these gifts. When analyzing the pattern of unrestricted giving across the six campus typologies private institutions once again commanded the highest levels of unrestricted giving per FTE. This difference was greatest at the baccalaureate level with privates outperforming publics by $2,789.77 per FTE. This pattern was repeated at the masters level with privates outperforming publics by $766.52 per FTE. Finally, at the doctoral level privates raised $2,446.17 more in unrestricted gifts than public doctoral institutions. Table 6 details these differences.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Alumni Unrestricted Giving per FTE by Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Alumni Unrestricted Giving per FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for Research Question 4: Construction of a Restricted Giving Index

Research Question 4 for this study asked, “What percentage of total alumni restricted contributions per student FTE are typically reported by public and private
baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions?” The researcher compared total amounts of restricted giving by the six institution types across the nine categories reported to the VSE utilizing descriptive techniques and calculated total percentages of restricted giving by category and institution type for 2008. Appendix B captures this data across all of the nine VSE restricted giving categories. To further break down these patterns, the researcher employed an additional step and calculated total amounts per FTE for each restricted giving category utilized by the VSE. Prior to presenting this additional data, it is instructive to for the researcher to provide a basic description of the various restricted giving categories as commonly understood by the field of advancement. These categories have remained stable in previous VSE instruments and are described in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Basic Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Divisions</td>
<td>Gifts in support of academic departments, programs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff Compensation</td>
<td>Gifts for endowed chairs, staff pay, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Gifts directed towards supplies, materials or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service &amp; Extension</td>
<td>Gifts for external community relations or endeavors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Gifts for text-based collections, subscriptions, texts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>Gifts in support of the physical campus, buildings, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>Gifts pertaining to scholarships, aid or fellowships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Gifts for both intramural and extramural athletic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Denotes any other restricted gift as defined by institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to restricted alumni giving directed towards academic divisions, a total of $33,711.18 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Specifically, private doctoral institutions raised the most per FTE in this
category with $13,174.44, followed by public doctoral alumni at $9,542.75 per FTE and private baccalaureate alumni at $5,652.94. These institutions were followed by private masters institutions whose alumni restricted $3,418.52 per FTE, public masters alumni who contributed $1,838.07 per FTE in restricted gifts towards academic divisions. Public baccalaureates finished last with $84.46 per FTE. Table 8 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of its overall restricted giving within its typology classification. As an example, giving to academic divisions by private baccalaureate institutions constituted 8.47% of the $66,725.38 total of all restricted gifts by private baccalaureates. Ultimately, giving to academic divisions constituted 19.50% of the overall restricted gifts for 2008 across all six campus types.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Academic Divisions</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$5,652.94</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$84.46</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$3,418.52</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$1,838.07</td>
<td>34.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$13,174.44</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$9,542.75</td>
<td>27.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$33,711.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to restricted alumni giving directed towards faculty/staff compensation a total of $2,661.74 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Private baccalaureate institutions accounted for $1,113.80 per FTE, public doctoral institutions represented $652.01 per FTE, private doctoral institutions captured $608.24 per FTE, private masters institutions secured $267.49 per
FTE and public masters institutions raised $20.20 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions did not report any restricted giving towards faculty/staff compensation per FTE in this study. Table 9 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to faculty/staff compensation constituted 1.54% of the overall restricted gifts for 2008 across all six campus types.

Table 9

Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Faculty/Staff Compensation by FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Faculty/Staff Compensation</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$1,113.80</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$267.49</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$20.20</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$608.24</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$652.01</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$2,661.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to restricted alumni giving directed towards research, a total of $7,265.92 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Private doctoral institutions accounted for $4,896.27 per FTE, private baccalaureate institutions garnered $1,145.78 per FTE and public doctoral institutions yielded $1,065.57 per FTE. Private masters institutions secured $137.52 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $18.80 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for research at $1.98 per FTE. Table 10 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to research
constituted 4.20% of the overall restricted gifts for 2008 across all six campus types.

Table 10

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Research by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Research</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$1,145.78</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$1.98</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$137.52</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$18.80</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$4,896.27</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$1,065.57</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$7,265.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding restricted alumni giving directed towards public service and extension, a total of $2,083.00 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Public doctoral institutions account for $705.98 per FTE, private baccalaureate institutions garnered $515.50 per FTE and private masters institutions yielded $418.15 per FTE. Private doctoral institutions secured $295.69 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $140.48 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for public service and extension at $7.20 per FTE. Table 11 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to public service and extension constituted 1.20% of the overall restricted gifts for 2008 across all six campus types.

Tracking restricted alumni giving directed towards libraries accounted for a total of $5,321.72 per FTE by the entire population under study. Private baccalaureate institutions accounted for $3,118.49 per FTE, public doctoral institutions secured $886.52 per FTE and private masters institutions yielded $657.76 per FTE. Private
doctoral institutions attracted $579.99 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $57.95 per FTE.

Table 11

_Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Public Service and Extension by FTE_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Public Service and Extension</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 515.50</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 7.20</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$ 418.15</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$ 140.48</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 295.69</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 705.98</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$ 2,083.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for libraries at $21.01 per FTE. Table 12 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to libraries constituted 3.08% of the overall restricted gifts for 2008 across all six campus types.

Regarding restricted alumni giving directed towards physical plant a total of $6,233.01 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Private doctoral institutions accounted for $2,083.12 per FTE, private baccalaureate institutions garnered $2,079.32 per FTE and public doctoral institutions yielded $1,200.10 per FTE. Private masters institutions secured $535.01 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $311.05 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for the physical plant at $24.41 per FTE. Table 13 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a
percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to physical plant constituted 3.61% of the overall restricted giving for 2008.

Table 12

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Library by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Library</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$3,118.49</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$21.01</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$657.76</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$57.95</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$579.99</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$886.52</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$5,321.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Physical Plant by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Physical Plant</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$2,079.32</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$24.41</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$535.01</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$311.05</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$2,083.12</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$1,200.10</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$6,233.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining restricted alumni giving directed towards student aid and a total amount of $31,647.75 per FTE was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Private baccalaureate institutions accounted for $17,383.32 per FTE, private doctoral institutions garnered $5,888.36 per FTE and public doctoral institutions yielded $4,526.39 per FTE. Private masters institutions secured $2,688.39 per FTE and
public masters institutions raised $906.47 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for student aid at $254.82 per FTE. Table 14 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to strident aid constituted 18.30% of the overall restricted giving for 2008.

Table 14

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Student Aid by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Student Aid</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$17,383.32</td>
<td>26.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$254.82</td>
<td>19.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$2,688.39</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$906.47</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$5,888.36</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$4,526.39</td>
<td>12.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$31,647.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patterns of restricted alumni giving directed towards athletics yielded a total amount of $28,221.16 per FTE which was restricted for this purpose by the entire population under study. Public doctoral institutions accounted for $10,619.90 per FTE, private baccalaureate institutions secured $7,230.26 per FTE and private doctoral institutions collected $6,613.03 per FTE. Private masters institutions secured $2,696.82 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $937.15 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for athletics at $124.00 per FTE. Table 15 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to athletics constituted 16.32% of the overall restricted giving for 2008.
Table 15

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to Athletics by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to Athletics</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 7,230.26</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$ 124.00</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$ 2,696.82</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$ 937.15</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 6,613.03</td>
<td>13.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$ 10,619.90</td>
<td>30.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$ 28,221.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patterns of restricted alumni giving directed towards “other” yields a total amount of $56,402.05 per FTE as garnered by the entire population under study. Private baccalaureate institutions accounted for $28,485.91 per FTE, private doctoral institutions collected $13,242.72 per FTE and private masters institutions secured $6,931.80 per FTE. Public doctoral institutions yielded $5,871.99 per FTE and public masters institutions raised $1,110.57 per FTE. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of restricted giving for “other” at $759.06 per FTE. Table 16 outlines this pattern and includes a specific percentage for each campus type as a percentage of overall restricted giving within its typology classification. Ultimately, giving to “other” constituted 32.62% of the overall restricted giving for 2008.

Patterns of restricted alumni giving across all nine VSE categories yielded a total amount of $172,894.64 per FTE for the entire population under study. Private baccalaureate institutions accounted for $66,725.38 per FTE or 38.59%, private doctoral institutions collected $47,381.82 per FTE or 27.41% and public doctoral institutions secured $34,418.48 per FTE or 19.91%. Private masters institutions secured $17,751.36 per FTE or 10.27% and public masters institutions raised $5,340.70
per FTE or 3.09%. Public baccalaureate institutions attracted the lowest amount of total restricted giving across all nine VSE categories at $1,276.90 per FTE or 0.74%. Table 17 outlines these data.

Table 16

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving to “Other” by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Restricted Giving to “Other”</th>
<th>% Within Campus Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$28,485.91</td>
<td>42.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$759.06</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$6,931.80</td>
<td>39.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$1,110.57</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$13,242.72</td>
<td>27.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$5,871.99</td>
<td>16.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$56,402.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

*Total Restricted Alumni Giving Across All VSE Categories by FTE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>Total Restricted Giving</th>
<th>% of Total Restricted Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$66,725.38</td>
<td>38.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Baccalaureate</td>
<td>$1,276.90</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Masters</td>
<td>$17,751.36</td>
<td>10.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Masters</td>
<td>$5,340.70</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Doctoral</td>
<td>$47,381.82</td>
<td>27.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Doctoral</td>
<td>$34,418.48</td>
<td>19.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 2008</td>
<td>$172,894.64</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

As the funding model of higher education continues to evolve it is critical that institutions grapple with how to best achieve financial stability through a purposeful fundraising effort which results in an increase of gifts (Mayer, 2010; Speck, 2010). It is no longer possible to simply just hope that alumni give back to their alma maters. Academic leadership must recognize that financial flexibility in times of both prosperity and difficulty is directly tied to the generosity of alumni donors and their perceptions of the campus. Until campus fundraising units operate in an environment with improved data about the philanthropic tendencies of alumni and the impact of campus culture on giving, institutions of higher education may never fully reach their potential.

This study was designed to bring attention and focus to this complex issue. Examining the trends and drawing connections between institutional classification, governance typology and patterns of total, unrestricted, and restricted giving provides a much needed lens to view this phenomenon. Furthermore, critically deconstructing college and university fundraising through the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) study as reported in 2007-2008 provided a national snapshot of these patterns and addresses the critical need for research in higher education advancement to look beyond a single campus (Caboni & Proper, 2007). This study examined institutional alumni giving differences in terms of highest degree offered (baccalaureate, masters or doctoral), overall alumni giving, total restricted giving and total unrestricted giving for both private and public institutions who participated in the 2008 VSE study. Finally, this study brought a much needed level of awareness to the issue of restricted giving by
alumni. As Gasman and Drezner (2008) and Nahm and Zamsky (2001) highlighted, restricted giving is continuing to become a popular choice for a new generation of donors. Without an understanding of these patterns, institutions may not be fully prepared to serve donors who are increasingly becoming more intentional with their giving. Analyzing and reporting total percentages of restricted giving by common categories reported in the VSE produces a “restricted giving index” for campus leaders to analyze and compare their own restricted giving successes and challenges against a backdrop of national data during a strong fundraising year.

Brief Summary of the VSE Database
The American Alumni Association conducted the first VSE study in 1954. It was designed to assist higher education track private giving to campuses. Since then, the survey has grown to over 1,000 campuses and evolved to also capture fundraising totals for parent giving, corporate contributions, foundations, religious organizations, fundraising consortia and other organizations. Additionally the VSE collects data on total endowment sizes, total number of students, total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) and self-reported Carnegie Classification status. In 2008, the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) offered institutions three separate formats to submit data, including a minimal survey, partial survey and full survey. The CAE encourages institutions to complete the full survey whenever possible but does not penalize institutions for completing the minimal or partial versions of the survey. Presently, VSE data are most frequently manipulated via descriptive statistics by researchers at the CAE and staff from Council
for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The VSE database contains a large amount of archival data from 1969 to present.

Discussion of the Research Questions Central to This Study

Research Question 1: Total Alumni Giving

This study investigated differences in total alumni giving. Specifically Research Question 1 investigated if there was a significant difference amongst public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni funds raised per student FTE?

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, standard deviations and standard error of the means are reported. Main effects within ANOVA were calculated to compare means of giving across the six sub-groups of institutions (Field, 2009). In addition to the means and standard errors, $F$-statistics, $p$ values employing $\alpha = 0.05$ for statistical significance (Field, 2009), and effect sizes utilizing Cohen’s $f^2$ indicating practical significance are reported by the researcher. Tukey post-hoc comparisons were also undertaken for any statistically significant ANOVA result (Field, 2009).

When looking at total alumni giving per FTE for 2008, it is apparent that the private institutions outpaced the publics across the baccalaureate, masters and doctoral levels. Differences in total alumni giving amongst the six campus typologies revealed a statistically significant difference and had a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Appendix C presents this data in a matrix format.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicated that the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $3,276.20) gave significantly higher amounts than the
private masters alumni ($M = $1,024.33), public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91),
public masters alumni ($M = $169.48) and the public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70). The
giving patterns of the private doctoral alumni ($M = $3637.27) yielded a statistically
significant higher amount of total giving than the private masters alumni ($M =
$1,024.33), the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $201.91), the public masters alumni
($M = $169.48), and the public doctoral alumni ($M = $676.70).

Comparisons between the private baccalaureate alumni and the private doctoral
alumni did not yield a statistically significant difference. Likewise, comparisons between
the private masters alumni and the public baccalaureate alumni, public masters alumni
and the public doctoral alumni did not yield a statistically significant difference.
Additionally, comparisons between the public baccalaureate alumni, the private masters
alumni, the public masters alumni, and the public doctoral alumni did not yield a
statistically significant difference. Similarly, comparisons between the public masters
alumni, the private masters alumni, the public baccalaureate alumni and the public
doctoral alumni did not yield a statistically significant difference. Finally, comparisons
between public doctoral alumni, the private masters alumni, the public baccalaureate
alumni and the public masters alumni did not yield a statistically significant difference.

At the baccalaureate level the difference in giving between the privates and
publics per FTE is $3,074.29. This gap is very pronounced and based on this variable
alone it would appear that public baccalaureates may be at a severe disadvantage
when it comes to alumni contributions. At the masters level the difference in giving per
FTE between the privates and the publics was $854.85 per FTE and although did not
trigger a statistically significant difference, the public institutions are lagging behind. At
the doctoral level the difference in total alumni giving per FTE between the privates and the publics was $2,960.57. This gap was a statistically significant finding and surprised the researcher who believed this element of the study would have been much closer between the two typologies.

With regard to overall alumni giving per FTE, it does appear that Boyer’s (1990) work on community applied quite well at the baccalaureate level. When applying Boyer’s work on community in a fundraising capacity, one would expect that as campus complexity raises a corresponding reduction in gifts and giving would occur. Findings from this study are inclusive in this regard as the dip in the data at the masters level does rebound at the doctoral level. When examining overall giving per FTE strictly within the private colleges and universities, it is apparent that the private doctoral institutions outperformed the baccalaureates on average gifts but did not meet the threshold for statistical significance. This pattern did not hold true when comparing the private doctoral and private masters institutions as the doctoral institutions outperformed the masters cohort with a statistically significant outcome.

Ultimately, the findings on overall alumni giving may confirm the work of Mann (2007) who posited that social identification was indeed a significant element of how donors choose to give. Examining the cultures of private institutions, and specifically the types of alumni they produce, would be a wise next step for public campuses to explore. These data also bolster Tierney’s (1988) work on culture and socialization and the strong performance by alumni at private institutions may be a reflection on how these campuses socialize and integrate students into the fabric of the campus. While public institutions should have their own unique characters, perhaps certain private
elements of the student experience could be modified for application in the public setting to move these campuses more along the paths identified by Boyer and Tierney.

Research Question 2: Total Alumni Restricted Giving

This study investigated differences in total alumni restricted giving. Specifically Research Question 2 investigated if there was a significant difference amongst public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni restricted gifts per student FTE?

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, standard deviations and standard error of the means were reported. Main effects within ANOVA were calculated to compare means of giving across the six sub-groups of institutions (Field, 2009). In addition to the means and standard errors, F-statistics, p values employing α = 0.05 for statistical significance (Field, 2009), and effect sizes utilizing Cohen’s $f^2$ indicating practical significance are reported by the researcher. Tukey post-hoc comparisons were also undertaken for any statistically significant ANOVA result (Field, 2009).

With regard to total alumni restricted giving per FTE, the private institutions once again outpaced their public counterparts. Differences in total alumni restricted giving revealed a statistically significant difference between the six campus typologies and had a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Appendix C presents this data in a matrix format.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicate that the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $353.04) gave a statistically significant higher amount of restricted gifts than the private masters alumni ($M = $132.47), the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $55.51) and the public masters alumni ($M = $44.14). Private doctoral
alumni ($M = 789.70$) gave a statistically significant greater amount of restricted gifts than the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = 353.04$), the private masters alumni ($M = 132.47$), the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = 55.51$), the public masters alumni ($M = 44.14$) and the public doctoral alumni ($M = 275.35$). Finally, public doctoral alumni ($M = 275.35$) donated a statistically significant greater amount of restricted gifts than public masters alumni ($M = 44.14$).

Comparisons between the private baccalaureate and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant result. Likewise, comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the private masters, the public baccalaureate alumni, the public masters alumni and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant finding. Finally, comparisons of restricted alumni giving between the public baccalaureate alumni, the private masters alumni, the public masters alumni and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant result.

This research question was designed to understand how the six different types of campuses performed at securing restricted alumni gifts. The mean difference in total alumni restricted giving between the private and public baccalaureates was $297.53$ per FTE and this statistically significant difference highlights how the privates baccalaureates may be more willing to work with donors on restricting gifts. It would appear that despite a marginally better performance by the privates at the masters institutions the overall masters category appears to be lagging behind in determining how best to meet the needs of donors who wish to restrict gifts. The greatest gap between privates and publics occurred at the doctoral level. The difference in total alumni restricted giving at the doctoral level was $514.35$ per FTE. While restricted
giving varies across individual categories at the doctoral level, see Appendix B, the private institutions did perform much more strongly than their public counterparts. To further possibly explain this strong performance, it may be helpful to apply the previous research by Monks (2003) which identified alumni donors from elite private institutions as being much more likely to have had excellent academic experiences and close working relationships with faculty. The differences in restricted giving may point to alumni who specifically want to give back to faculty and staff with whom they developed significant personal relationships. Examining how faculty form relationships with students differently at the private and public doctoral institution could prove beneficial in further understanding this pattern.

Ultimately, the total restricted giving amounts started strong at the baccalaureate level, dipped at the masters level and made up ground and surpassed the baccalaureate performance at the doctoral level. This pattern was consistent for both the privates and the publics and once again highlights that Boyer’s (1990) work on community may not represent a proverbial silver bullet to address restricted giving patterns at the larger and more complex campuses.

**Research Question 3: Total Alumni Unrestricted Giving**

This study investigated differences in total alumni unrestricted giving. When seeking gifts, institutions generally prefer gifts that provide academic leadership with a maximum amount of flexibility. Campus presidents and boards are increasingly interested in bolstering these types of giving opportunities for alumni. Specifically Research Question 3 investigated if there was a significant difference between public
and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions and their overall amount of alumni unrestricted gifts per student FTE.

Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, standard deviations and standard error of the means are reported. Main effects within ANOVA were calculated to compare means of giving across the six sub-groups of institutions (Field, 2009). In addition to the means and standard errors, $F$-statistics, $p$ values employing $\alpha = 0.05$ for statistical significance (Field, 2009), and effect sizes utilizing Cohen’s $f^2$ indicating practical significance are reported by the researcher. Tukey post-hoc comparisons were also undertaken for any statistically significant ANOVA result (Field, 2009).

With regard to total alumni unrestricted giving per FTE, the private institutions once again outpaced their public counterparts. Differences in total alumni restricted giving revealed a statistically significant difference between the six campus typologies and had a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Appendix C presents this data in a matrix format.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the six groups indicated that the private baccalaureate alumni ($M = $2,923.16) gave a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts than the private masters alumni ($M = $891.86), the public baccalaureate institutions ($M = $146.39), the public masters alumni ($M = $125.34) and the public doctoral alumni ($M = $401.41). Likewise, private doctoral alumni ($M = $2,847.58) gave a statistically significant higher amount of unrestricted gifts per FTE than the private masters alumni ($M = $891.86), the public baccalaureate alumni ($M = $146.39), the public masters alumni ($M = $125.34) and the public doctoral alumni ($M = $401.41).

Comparisons between the private baccalaureate and the private doctoral alumni
did not reveal a statistically significant result. Likewise, comparisons between the private masters and the public baccalaureate, public masters and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant finding. Additionally, comparisons between the public baccalaureate, the public masters and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant result. Finally, comparisons between the public masters and the public doctoral alumni did not reveal a statistically significant difference.

In contrast to gifts with narrowly defined purposes, unrestricted giving represents a critical element of flexibility for campus leadership. When looking at the data from the 2008 VSE across the six degree typologies, variances in total alumni unrestricted giving yielded a statistically significant difference and had a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Consistent with the previous findings concerning total alumni giving and total restricted giving the pattern of private success continued with public institutions performing a distant second. This difference was greatest at the baccalaureate level with the privates securing on average $2,776.77 more per FTE than the public baccalaureates. The pattern continued at the masters and doctoral levels with privates outperforming the publics by $766.52 per FTE and $2,446.71 per FTE respectively. It is interesting to note that once again both the private and public masters institutions fared poorly in this scenario trailing both the baccalaureate and doctoral institutions.

With regard to total unrestricted giving similar challenges of applying Boyer’s (1990) work emerged. While giving was greatest at the baccalaureate level for the privates, serving to confirm the impact of a small tight nit community, this is not the case for the public baccalaureates as they were significantly outperformed by the public
doctrinal institutions. One possible reason for this difference may not lie within the work of Boyer but rather may be tied to staff size. Caboni, Hartley, Willmer and Proper (2009) found that staff size did matter in the ability to raise gifts. Private baccalaureate institutions have had to rely on sophisticated fundraising teams for far longer than the public baccalaureates. Campus leadership working at public baccalaureates may want to conduct benchmarking to ensure fundraising staff are not under-resourced. While trimming staff costs in a limited funding environment is vital, trimming back advancement staffs may compound the institution’s fiscal challenges. In addition to investigating staffing patterns at other public baccalaureates it may be wise to investigate private baccalaureates as well to adopt best practices related to structure, data management and messaging.

With regard to total unrestricted giving, it was a surprise that the gap between the total amounts per FTE was as close as it was between the private baccalaureate and private doctoral institutions. Given the cultural differences between these campuses as evidenced by Boyer (1990), Birnbaum (1991) and Cole (2009), I expected a larger gap in unrestricted gifts per FTE between the two campus types.

Research Question 4: Restricted Gifts by Category and Campus Type

This study investigated what percentage of total alumni restricted contributions per student FTE are typically reported by a sample of public and private baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate degree granting institutions who participated in the 2008 VSE study. The researcher utilized descriptive techniques and calculated total percentages of restricted giving by category and institution type for 2008 to produce the overarching
index found in Appendix B. In order to complement this index the researcher also conducted an extra step to develop total amounts of restricted giving by campus type by VSE category. Overlaying this extra amount of analysis with the restricted giving index provided additional clarity the phenomenon under study.

When analyzing the data concerning the restricted giving patterns of the institutions in this study, several interesting trends emerged. While the VSE did capture restricted giving along eight specific categories, the instrument did have a ninth variable defined as “other.” At the baccalaureate level both the privates and publics reported other restricted giving at 42.69% and 59.45% respectively. Masters privates reported 39.05% of restricted gifts as “other” and doctoral privates reported 27.95% of restricted gifts as “other.” It is clear from this analysis that the VSE either missed certain categories of restricted gifts or other patterns of restricted giving occurred which did not fit neatly into the pre-defined VSE categories. When examining the six campus typologies and looking at total percentage of restricted gifts being categorized in the “other” category fully four of the six types report the greatest percentage of their restricted gifts in this variable making more nuanced observations rather difficult. When looking at the other eight restricted giving categories, it is clear that donors made different choices about their funding depending on campus type. A complete snapshot of the percentages of restricted giving reported by each of the six institutional types across the nine VSE variables in this study can be found in Appendix B.

When looking at restricted giving for academic divisions, or those gifts in support of academic departments and programs, private doctoral institutions garnered the greatest total amount per FTE at $13,174.44 which represents 27.21% of the total
restricted giving per FTE for this cohort. Interestingly, public doctoral institutions secured a total of $9,542.75 in restricted gifts per FTE for academic divisions which constituted 27.21% of the total restricted gifts for this group. Private baccalaureates and private masters followed in terms of total restricted giving per FTE to academic divisions with $5,652.94 and $3,418.52 respectively. The public masters institutions secured a total of $1,838.07 in restricted gifts for academic divisions which represented 34.42% of their total restricted giving. While this amount may not be as high as the previously mentioned institutions it does represent the largest percentage of restricted giving for any institution when not factoring in the “other” category. The private baccalaureates finished in last position with a total of $84.46 per FTE which is 6.61% of their total restricted giving for 2008.

With regard to restricted giving directed to faculty and staff compensation, or gifts for endowed chairs, staff pay, etc., the private baccalaureates raised the most restricted gifts per FTE with a total of $1,113.80 or 1.67% of their total restricted giving. Public doctoral institutions followed with a total of $652.01 or 1.86% of their total restricted giving and the private doctoral campuses rounded out the top three institutional types with a total of $608.24 per FTE or 1.28% of their total restricted giving. It would appear on the surface that alumni care about the quality of the faculty at these institution types for possibly very different reasons. Given the focus on high quality teaching at the baccalaureate level and the need for outstanding faculty to conduct research at the doctoral institutions, it did not come as a surprise that these data reflect these trends. What is interesting to note is that not a single public baccalaureate institution reported
any restricted giving to faculty/staff compensation in the 2008 VSE. Given the strong performance by their private counterparts this was a surprising finding.

As one would expect when examining restricted giving directed to research, or gifts directed towards supplies, materials or equipment needed to conduct research, the private doctoral institutions garnered the highest total amount per FTE with $4,896.27 which represents 10.33% of their total restricted giving in 2008. Surprisingly, private baccalaureates secured more restricted gifts than the public doctoral institutions which was an unexpected finding given the mission and culture of public doctoral research institutions. These total gifts per FTE were $1,145.78 which represented 1.72% of the total private baccalaureate restricted giving and $1,065.57 or 3.04% of the total public doctoral restricted giving. While the VSE did not differentiate or define research per se it would be speculative to assume that donors considered all research equally and by no means would it be wise to categorize research as purely hard science at the doctoral level or inquiry as limited to the humanities at the baccalaureate level. What is interesting to note is the disparity that existed once again at the baccalaureate level as the public baccalaureates finished last with a total of $1.98 per FTE raised for research. Clearly, the two campus types were either communicating the need differently or the privates have more experience directing donors to these opportunities on campus.

With regard to restricted gifts directed to public service, or those gifts utilized for external community relations or endeavors, not surprisingly the public doctoral institutions secured the greatest amount of total restricted gifts per FTE with $705.98 which represent 2.01% of their total restricted giving for 2008. Despite a common conception that public institutions should support their local communities, both the
private baccalaureates and the private masters institutions outperformed the public masters and the public baccalaureates when securing restricted gifts for public service and extension. The private baccalaureates and private masters recorded a total of $515.50 per FTE and $418.15 per FTE respectively. It was not surprising to see that the private doctoral institutions rose less than the public doctoral institutions in this category by $295.69 per FTE, given their strong performance in the research category. What did emerge as an unexpected result was the strong performance by the private masters institutions who secured a total of $418.15 per FTE for public service and extension. This finding demonstrated that some movement may be occurring within the private masters institutions to differentiate themselves from their private doctoral peers, but additional study is warranted to ferret this out for certain. Once again, public baccalaureates performed the weakest by securing a total of $7.20 per FTE for public service.

Not surprisingly when looking at restricted giving to libraries the private baccalaureates secured the greatest total amount per FTE with $3,118.49 which represented 4.67% of their total restricted gifts. Given the focus on and attention paid to literature and texts within the liberal arts tradition, alumni clearly were concerned about the quality of the library at the private baccalaureates. Their performance on this metric was $2,251.97 more than the next highest total of $866.52 per FTE by the public doctoral institutions. Alumni from the private masters institutions also fared well with an average library gift per FTE of $657.76 which represented 3.71% of their total restricted giving for 2008. The Private Doctoral institutions secured a total of $579.99 per FTE for the library which was 1.22% of their total restricted giving. Once again, the public
masters and baccalaureate institutions finished last with totals of $57.95 per FTE and $21.01 per FTE, respectively. As costs continue to increase for campuses to provide a strong library with an expanding array of digital sources, it will be very interesting to track the impact of this giving trend for these two institution types into the future. Ultimately, it would appear that not only will these areas of the campus continue to operate with reduced funding but they may not be doing as adequate of a job of communicating the need for these types of gifts.

Concerning restricted giving for the physical plant, or those gifts in support of the physical campus, buildings, etc., private doctoral and baccalaureate institutions finished strongest with $2,083.12 per FTE and $2,079.32 per FTE, respectively. These amounts represented 4.40% of the total restricted giving amounts for doctoral and 3.12% for baccalaureates in 2008. Public doctoral institutions followed with $1,200.10 per FTE which was 3.42% of their total restricted giving for 2008. In order of descending performance, private masters, public masters and public baccalaureates round out the categories. Respectively, these institutions secured total restricted gifts per FTE of $535.01, $311.05 and $24.41. Once again the public baccalaureates secured the lowest amount per FTE, which repeated a consistent pattern throughout the restricted giving index. Given the reality that all buildings age and campuses need to invest in their infrastructure, this giving trend presents unique challenges to the public baccalaureate institutions to keep pace with funding campus improvements. While publics have historically relied on bonds and other forms of financing, the time may be approaching when these campuses will need to be more aggressive at securing private gifts to support their plans for enhancement.
By far the biggest dichotomy presented in the restricted giving index occurred in the student aid category, or those gifts pertaining to scholarships and fellowships. In this variable, the private baccalaureates outperformed all other institution types and the next best average amount per FTE by over $11,494.96. This amount represented the single greatest percentage of total restricted gifts for the private baccalaureates with 26.05% (not including the “other” category mentioned above) of their 2008 performance. Private doctoral institutions reported the second highest total securing $2,083.12 per FTE or 12.43% of their total restricted giving for 2008. Public doctoral institutions followed with $4,526 per FTE or 12.91% of their total restricted giving. While performing better in this category, as compared to the other restricted giving variables, the public masters and public baccalaureates rounded out the sample with $906.47 and $254.82 respectively raised in total per FTE for student aid. This represented 16.97% for the public masters and 19.96% for the public baccalaureates total restricted giving in 2008.

Based on these findings, it would appear that student financial aid continues to be a strong message to deliver to potential donors and matching donors who want to restrict their gifts for this purpose with opportunities to do so would prove advantageous for most institutions. As tuition costs rise at both publics and privates, campuses will need to continue to provide avenues for donors to give to student aid. Clearly, alumni who graduated from private baccalaureate institutions want others to experience the same education they received and have opted to support student aid programs to achieve this goal at vastly greater levels as compared to other institution types in this study.

One of the more interesting variables in the restricted giving index was in the arena of restricted giving for athletics, or those gifts for intramural and extramural
athletic activities, teams, coach’s salaries, etc. Given alumni passion for the modern athletic landscape in higher education, it is not surprising to see alumni restricting gifts for this purpose. What did emerge as a surprise was the very strong performance of public doctoral institutions in this study. These campuses raised a total of $10,619.90 per FTE for athletics which represented 30.28% of all restricted gifts. Ironically, when choosing where to donate their funds, more alumni appear to have chosen athletics over research, library support, student aid, etc. in terms of the total amounts raised at the public doctoral institutions. Clearly, the pull of Division I sports is strong at the public doctoral level. Another interesting finding occurred at the private baccalaureate level with these institutions outperforming the larger private doctoral institutions in total gifts per FTE for athletics. In this case, the private baccalaureates raised $7,230.26 per FTE or 10.84% of its total restricted giving for 2008 as compared to the $6,613.03 or 13.96% of the total restricted gifts for 2008 for the private doctoral institutions. The private and public masters institutions followed with public baccalaureates finishing at the bottom with $124.00 per FTE.

Ultimately when examining the total percentage of restricted giving across the entire study by campus type, private institutions do a better job of engaging donors with aspirations to restrict their gifts. The private baccalaureates secured 38.59% of the total amount of reported restricted gifts per FTE for 2007-2008. By contrast, public baccalaureates secured only 0.74% of the total amount of reported restricted gifts. This pattern repeats at the masters level with private institutions securing 10.27% of the total amount of restricted gifts as compared to 3.09% for the public masters institutions. Finally, this pattern is consistent at the doctoral level with private institutions securing
27.41% of the total amount of restricted gifts for 2007-2008 as compared to 19.91% secured by the publics. In analyzing the pattern of total restricted giving for 2007-2008, the privates secured $131,858.56 or 76.27% of the total amount reported to the VSE by institutions in this study. This is a striking finding which points to a serious imbalance in performance by governance type.

When looking at the total restricted giving by degree type the doctoral institutions appear to also be the most successful at attracting restricted gifts. In total doctoral institutions secured $81,800.30 or 47.32% of the total amount reported to the VSE by institutions in this study.

Implications for Professional Organizations

Given the lackluster performance of the public masters institutions in the total alumni giving, total restricted giving and total unrestricted giving sections of this study, CASE may wish to devote specific conferences, tracks and online speakers to address the challenges faced by these campuses when securing alumni gifts. CASE should also focus attention on developing printed and online resources concerning these campus types and highlight data and research on campuses that are excelling in raising significant restricted and unrestricted gifts at the masters level. CASE may wish to investigate offering a new webinar on successful tactics at the masters institutions by highlighting campuses that performed strongly as compared to their peers on the VSE. This webinar could be bifurcated across private and public typologies to ensure attendees have the best experience possible. It should be noted however that these sessions must be data-driven for maximum effect.
This study also demonstrated that when comparing restricted giving categories across institution types wide variances occurred in the data. CASE may wish to organize round-tables of advancement leaders and campus presidents to discuss the challenges of balancing the need to increase unrestricted giving while also trying to address increasingly restrictive donors. Conferences on student philanthropy and engaging young alumni as donors could be tailored to address this topic in an open and transparent manner. It is ironic that campuses are hoping to increase unrestricted giving yet a majority of the focus and attention on engaging seniors in class gifts is restricted in nature. CASE may wish to work with ASAP, the student advancement arm of CASE, to address this contradiction and/or develop new strategies to convince seniors and young alumni of the need for unrestricted giving.

Given the utilitarian applications of the restricted giving index produced in this study, CASE could add this index to its samples, research and tools section of the organization’s website to increase the exposure of this tool to academic leadership or as another alternative, this index should be converted into a CASE white paper and included in the CASE white paper series currently offered by the association.

Another area where CASE could assist the field is by providing an outlet for data driven research at the regional and international conferences. Currently, concurrent sessions are typically selected by educational session coordinators who rely on peer-based networks. Regional leadership should be encouraged to reach out to higher education scholars at colleges and universities in their states to ensure higher-order advancement work is being shared. This study, in addition to the studies cited in chapter two, should be shared with practitioners to help inform practice and evolve the
conversations away from the apprenticeship model currently dominating the advancement field. Currently, CASE is the prime outlet for advancement education for the vast majority of practitioners and as such it could play a critical leadership role in elevating the conversations about how we approach fundraising practice.

A final category of professional associations which are increasingly focusing on fundraising is within the realm of student affairs. NASPA, ACPA and regional student affairs associations are directing sessions on fundraising for student affairs initiatives. Emerging cadres of student affairs practitioners who have fundraising responsibilities are joining the ranks of attendees at the major national conferences. The findings of this study, which document the strong fundraising success within the private institutions as compared to the publics, when combined with previous research offers another insight into the connection between attending private institutions and higher orders of giving. Student affairs fundraisers whose divisions also manage financial aid functions could utilize the restricted giving index in this study to make the case for the continued need to engage donors who have an interest in financial aid and student support scholarships.

Finally, NASPA, ACPA and CASE may wish to investigate hosting a joint conference to allow these two sub-specializations within higher education a chance to gather, reflect and improve practice to secure additional gifts from alumni. As soon as these two fields truly understand that they are mutually beholden to each other for success institutions will continue to lose out on potential donors and the valuable gifts they offer our campuses.
Implications for Practice

This study highlighted that differences do exist between campus type and fundraising outcomes especially at the private and public masters institutions. Based on these data, it appeared that the masters institutions may be wedged between two competing messages. Baccalaureate institutions traditionally focused on quality of instruction, small class size and a collegial environment and fundraise with these themes in mind. Donors appeared to be restricting gifts to impact these beliefs as demonstrated by the strong performance in total restricted gifts to student aid at the baccalaureate level. Likewise, doctoral institutions traditionally focused on research, the development of academic centers and institutes and to a lesser extent athletic prowess. Once again, donors appeared to be restricting gifts in these areas as evidenced by the strong performance in support for academic departments and athletics. Overall fundraising performance across both the total alumni giving and total unrestricted giving mirrored these patterns.

While further investigation is needed to explore this phenomenon, it is this author’s belief that the masters institutions may not have as clear of a fundraising imperative to communicate to their donors. As Sargeant and Shang (2010) outlined that having a clear message and a call to action for donors is a key first step in developing a successful fundraising campaign. As these institutions do not exclusively focus on teaching and small classes or on an expanded research agenda and complex specialization, they appear to be at a competitive disadvantage when securing gifts. Advancement offices need to pay particular attention to the careful crafting of messages and communications to alumni to ensure that the campus needs are clearly and
succinctly communicated in a way that is different from the competition at the Baccalaureate and Doctoral levels.

This study also highlighted the need for the chief advancement officer to be part of an active leadership team when discussing key campus issues related to academic expansion. Should a historically baccalaureate campus begin conversations about expanding into the masters arena, it may be instructive for the chief advancement officer to bring up potential fundraising concerns related to this action. The fundraising findings from this study for the masters institutions should impact the strategic planning process as campuses consider entering the race to enhance campus position within the Carnegie Classification system. While fundraising may be only one source of revenue for a campus to consider, and as resources become tight, leadership may increasingly need to scrutinize expansion plans.

Another area of potential opportunity for advancement rests within the alumni relations function. In order to enhance the fundraising success at the masters institutions these staffs should examine how to build partnerships with the schools and colleges who offer the masters degree and try to engage alumni prior to graduation. As student alumni associations continue to grow around the country as a mechanism to engage future alumni, care should be taken to ensure that these organizations are open to both undergraduate and graduate students at the masters campus. At present, these organizations are typically limited to undergraduates and by doing so the masters campus may be missing out on an opportunity to improve fundraising success with graduate students.

An additional challenge related to the masters campus is one of affinity. If a
graduate with a masters degree has to choose between their undergraduate and graduate institution, difficulties may arise when competing for a limited amount of philanthropic funding and this may be evident in the VSE findings above. Advancement should consider specialized messaging to graduates with the masters degree to address this concern. Fundraisers at every level should be given specific responses to counter alumni concerns in a manner which expresses a sincere need for the donor’s gifts to the masters institution.

With regard to the greater public higher education system, advancement officers and campus leadership at public campuses must begin to recognize that in order to remain competitive changes need to occur to build better relationships with alumni. While private institutions recognize the need to provide an outstanding product and good customer service to students, it appears that public institutions need to evolve in a similar direction. As Boyer (1990) urged, public institutions, and especially masters and doctoral institutions may want to place more focus on the tuition paying student and their experience and less attention on policies, bureaucracies and archaic practices. If public institutions expect to see the gains in fundraising by the privates in this study they will seriously need to rethink how they cultivate relationships with current students.

Another area where Public campuses should develop a more private approach to fundraising is with the Senior Class Gift. Considering that establishing a legacy of philanthropy at an early stage is vitally important, senior class gift organizers at public institutions should visit private campuses to investigate best practices for cultivating gifts from graduating seniors. While these programs rarely raise enough funds to cover staffing and program expenses on an annual basis, they do lay the groundwork for a
greater base of future donors. Public institutions should consider investing in and expanding such programs.

Another implication for advancement surrounds the relationship between athletic fundraising and total campus fundraising. As evidenced by the results in the restricted giving index, alumni care passionately about college sports. Advancement needs to build bridges between the athletic fundraisers and the general campus fundraisers to ensure that donors who come in to the giving pipeline articulated by Sargeant and Shang (2010) are aware of additional opportunities and needs the campus may have. Athletics have long been viewed as a window for the public to look in to the campus. In a fundraising sense, athletics may also be a window for donors to deepen their connection to and philanthropy with the institutions. Far too often, institutions are territorial about donors and if the athletic department does not recognize that these donors could provide support to other areas of campus it may be doing so at its own peril.

An additional area of opportunity for advancement rests in the need to further partner with and communicate with student affairs. As evidenced by the work of Holmes, Meditz and Sommers (2008) which found that former student leaders were much more likely to give and by McDearmon and Shirley (2009) who found overall satisfaction with the student experience correlated highly with young alumni giving and by Sun, Hoffman and Grady (2007) who found that the overall quality of the student experience significantly defines and explains donor behavior it appears an opportunity may be slipping through the fingers of the public institutions. While robust partnerships between student affairs and advancement are more common at private institutions, it is
far less the case in the publics. It may be wise to replicate this collaboration in our public institutions to determine if the gains made by the privates in this study may begin to be felt by our public institutions in the years ahead. Given alumni interest in student aid across all campus typologies, student affairs may be in a unique position to support this interest by creating leadership scholarships and other programs which recognize campus leadership. By doing so, advancement and student affairs could partner together to build attractive donor programs which both increase the amount of financial support the institution receives but also build additional affinity in current students who need the funding to maintain enrollment.

One final area of impact this study affords advancement is in the realm of restricted giving. Advancement officers should examine these findings to compare their own restricted giving performance against a national dataset. While restricted gifts create challenges for campuses to administer and track, these difficulties should not preclude a campus from trying to secure as much funding as possible from its alumni. Leadership in advancement should examine their own restricted giving trends and determine if their campus performance is either consistent with or incongruent to the data presented in this study. Once this investigation is concluded, appropriate action may include holding focus groups with donors who prefer to restrict their gifts to determine their rationale for these decisions, developing strategies to inform donors about restricted giving options or promoting pre-existing campus needs which may align with donor wishes. This level of analysis will become increasingly important if campuses wish to prepare for the evolving trend of increases in restricted giving described by Gasman and Drezner (2008) and Nahm and Zamsky (2001).
Recommendations for Future Research

The VSE represented a rich data source ripe for further analysis and examination. Future studies could include a longitudinal analysis of alumni total giving, restricted giving and unrestricted giving over a period of several decades utilizing the degree typology outlined in this study. This line of inquiry would help even out fundraising performance across both strong and weak years of the economy and offer new insights into the long-term successes and evolution of the field of advancement as it relates to campus typology and culture.

One area of further study addresses a limitation of this study. Since the VSE only reported total giving amounts on an institutional level, more fine grain analysis is needed on individual donor patterns at the campuses included in this study. Specifically, it would be instructive to ascertain the median, mode and range of gifts for each institution. By doing so, the net impact of a single large gift, commonly referred to as a mega-gift (Worth, 2002), by one donor could be ferreted out.

An additional area of study concerns the large percentages of giving identified as “other” by the institutions in this study, specifically the 42.69% of total restricted giving by the Private Baccalaureates and 59.5% of total restricted giving by the Public Baccalaureates. Future qualitative research should be conducted with advancement officers who report data to the VSE to deconstruct this category and provide clarity to this larger metric. This research would enable advancement officers to determine if indeed apple to apple comparisons could be made between institutions who report restricted gifts to the VSE. These data may also lead to structural additions to the VSE instrument itself.
Specifically concerning restricted gifts, public baccalaureates performed very poorly in comparison to the other typologies in this study. Future research is needed to better understand the culture, challenges and possible hurdles these institutions face when trying to succeed at raising restricted alumni donations. While quantitative surveys may yield interesting data, this researcher believes a series of qualitative site visits with a representative sample of these institutions may offer richer insights to their situations. Specific interviews could be held with the annual fund staff, major gift officers and personnel from the student affairs unit to examine the campus conditions, structures and cultures which either promote or hinder the development of a loyal and philanthropic cadre of alumni.

Given the conflicting findings regarding the correlation between endowment sizes and fundraising success outlined in the literature review of this study, it would be worthwhile to conduct a longitudinal analysis of endowment sizes across the six degree typologies as reported to the VSE. In addition to determining if differences were statistically significant, further analysis could be employed to demonstrate if a relationship exists between long-term endowment growth and fundraising success within the alumni population. This data is collected and housed within the VSE.

While this study specifically examined alumni giving across both restricted and unrestricted arenas, the VSE study also captured similar data on parent giving, corporate contributions, foundations, religious organizations, fundraising consortia and other organizations. This study could be replicated in each of these categories across the six degree typology lines to ascertain if the alumni findings hold firm across these
other donor constituent groups. Differences between donor type and campus type may prove insightful and further clarify the advancement landscape.

Another area where data housed and stored at the VSE could prove rich for analysis is in the arena of estate planning and gifts bequeathed to institutions of higher education. Advancement is spending considerable effort and resources on building estate planning programs for alumni. The VSE specifically tracked the total number of provisions within wills (or through revocable trusts) and the face value of such provisions. Likewise, the VSE tracked the total present value of these provisions for the institution. This data could be mined to see if alumni giving patterns are consistent with the findings in this study.

Another possible line of inquiry exists within the two-year category of institutions who participated in the VSE. For the 2008 year alone, 146 two-year institutions participated in the VSE. The data from these campuses represented a considerable opportunity for scholars interested in the future financial landscape of the two-year campus. Investments in fundraising, endowment sizes and categories of restricted giving may represent variables of interest to the community college/junior college researcher.

One final area of possible study is the amount of investment institutions make in the advancement arena. While this data is optional for institutions who participated in the VSE to provide, it would be fascinating to understand the relationship between these investments and fundraising success. The VSE tracks salaries, benefits, current operation expenditures, capital expenditures and total expenditures across development/fundraising, alumni relations/affairs, advancement communications and
marketing, advancement services and advancement management. Each of these data points could be utilized to connect investment with performance across a national dataset. Regression could be employed to understand the relationship between these variables, endowment size, campus typology and alumni giving.
APPENDIX A

CAMPUS CHARACTERISTICS ACROSS TYPE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>BPR</th>
<th>BPU</th>
<th>MPR</th>
<th>MPU</th>
<th>DPR</th>
<th>DPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts Tradition (Cohen, 1998)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Student to Faculty Ratio (Boyer, 1990)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Academic Specialization (Cole, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Athletic Programs (Cole, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily Residential (Boyer, 1990)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Professional Schools (Cole, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial in Nature (Birnbaum, 1991)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political in Nature (Birnbaum, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchical in Nature (Birnbaum, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Access (Cohen, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Policies and Procedures (Boyer, 1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Building Community (Boyer, 1990)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Higher Order Research (Cole, 2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily State Supported (Cohen, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily Tuition/Fee Supported (Cohen, 1998)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Serving the Public (Cohen, 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Engaged Student Population (Boyer, 1990)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Active Faculty in Student Life (Boyer, 1990; Clotfelter, 2003; Monks, 2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

RESTRICTED GIVING INDEX BY FTE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CAMPUS</th>
<th>Academic Divisions</th>
<th>Faculty / Staff Compensation</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Public Service / Extension</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Physical Plant</th>
<th>Student Aid</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Private</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>26.05%</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
<td>42.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Public</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>19.96%</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
<td>59.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Private</td>
<td>19.26%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
<td>39.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Public</td>
<td>34.42%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
<td>16.97%</td>
<td>17.55%</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Private</td>
<td>27.80%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>13.96%</td>
<td>27.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Public</td>
<td>27.21%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>3.42%</td>
<td>12.91%</td>
<td>30.28%</td>
<td>16.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
The values reported above in each category represent the specific percentage of total restricted giving for the 2008 VSE reporting year.
APPENDIX C

TUKEY POST HOC ANALYSIS MATRIXES FOR

RESEARCH QUESTIONS 1-3
Comparison made horizontally across each campus type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Type</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
<th>Less ThanSig.</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
<th>Less ThanSig.</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
<th>Less ThanSig.</th>
<th>Greater ThanSig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE BAC.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$3,276</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC BAC.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$201</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE MASTERS</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC MASTERS</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE DOCTORAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,637</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DOCTORAL</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison made horizontally across each campus type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIVATE BAC. (n=189) M=$353</th>
<th>PUBLIC BAC. (n=23) M=$55</th>
<th>PRIVATE MASTERS (n=134) M=$132</th>
<th>PUBLIC MASTERS (n=121) M=$44</th>
<th>PRIVATE DOCTORAL (n=60) M=$789</th>
<th>PUBLIC DOCTORAL (n=125) M=$275</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE BAC.</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .024</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .933</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=189)</td>
<td>M=$353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC BAC.</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .024</td>
<td>Lessthan Sig. = .970</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = 1.000</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td>M=$55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .970</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .584</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=134)</td>
<td>M=$132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC MASTERS</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = 1.000</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .584</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=121)</td>
<td>M=$44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=60)</td>
<td>M=$789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .631</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .225</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .088</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=125)</td>
<td>M=$275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison made horizontally across each campus type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIVATE BAC. (n=189) M=$2,923</th>
<th>PUBLIC BAC. (n=23) M=$146</th>
<th>PRIVATE MASTERS (n=134) M=$892</th>
<th>PUBLIC MASTERS (n=121) M=$125</th>
<th>PRIVATE DOCTORAL (n=60) M=$2,848</th>
<th>PUBLIC DOCTORAL (n=125) M=$401</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE BAC. (n=189) M=$2,923</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC BAC. (n=23) M=$146</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .092</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = 1,000</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE MASTERS (n=134) M=$892</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .715</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .092</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC MASTERS (n=121) M=$125</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .092</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE DOCTORAL (n=60) M=$2,848</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = 1.000</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DOCTORAL (n=125) M=$401</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .997</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .938</td>
<td>Greater Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td>Less Than Sig. = .0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCES


