



University of Georgia  
Institute of Higher Education



# Predicting Community Engagement?

The Carnegie Foundation's  
Elective Classification

Drew Pearl  
Graduate Student  
University of Georgia



# Overview

- The Community Engagement classification
  - Are there financial predictors?
- Logistic regression models and publicly available data
- The Community Engagement classification requires more than financial commitment



# The Carnegie Foundation Classification System

- Originally designed to aid researchers in higher education
- Institutions have expanded the classification system for use with rankings
- Elective classifications were developed to fill gaps in the national data with descriptive information



# The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification

- First of the elective classifications designed to “respect the diversity of institutions and their approaches to community engagement; engage institutions in a process of inquiry, reflection, and self-assessment; and honor institutions’ achievements while promoting the ongoing development of their programs.”

(Driscoll, 2008, p.39)



# Conceptual & Theoretical Framework

- Scholarship of Engagement
  - Boyer (1990, 1996)
- Resource Allocation in Higher Education
  - Massey (1996)
- Academic Capitalism
  - Rhoades & Slaughter (1997); Slaughter & Leslie (1997)



# Purpose of this Study

- Can financial variables (both in terms of revenue and expenses) serve as significant predictors of whether or not an institution received the Carnegie Foundation's elective Community Engagement classification?



## Methods – Sample

- All public 4-year colleges and universities
- Cross-sectional data from academic year 2009 to examine institutions that received the 2010 Community Engagement classification
- Final sample: 446 institutions, 47 of which are classified as Community Engaged



# Methods – Variable Selection

- Financial data obtained from the Delta Cost Project
- Dependent variable: Whether or not an institution received the Community Engagement classification





# Methods – Variable Selection

- Independent variables
  - Land-grant status
  - State appropriations
    - Per FTE student
    - Share of total revenue
  - Public service spending
    - Per FTE student
    - Share of total spending



# Methods – Variable Selection

- Independent variables (con't.)
  - Public service-related spending
  - Proportion of public service expenditures devoted to salaries and wages
  - Amount of public service expenditures devoted to salaries, wages, and fringe benefits



# Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
carnegie_class	0.11	0.31	0	1
Indgrnt	0.15	0.36	0	1
stateappfte	7,584.36	5,828.59	192.09	106,297.9
stateappshare	0.33	0.10	0.01	0.69
psspendfte	1,341.39	5,697.42	0.46	11,698.2
psspendshare	0.08	0.07	0.00	0.46
psrelatedfte	1,858.66	6,692.40	0.84	136,076.9
sharepssalwag	0.49	0.14	0.01	1
laborsharepscost	0.64	0.19	0.01	1.25



## Findings

Variable	Model 1 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)	Model 2 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)
Indgrnt	.041 (.433)	.225 (.407)
stateappfte	.0001** (.0001)	-3.51e-06 (.000)
stateappshare	-3.00 (1.802)	-.917 (1.551)
psspendfte	.001 (.001)	-
psspendshare	9.005** (3.447)	3.725 (2.198)
psrelatedfte	-.001 (.001)	-



## Findings (con't)

Variable	Model 1 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)	Model 2 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)
sharepssalwag	-1.716 (4.474)	.762 (1.206)
laborsharepscst	2.124 (3.279)	-
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.037	0.019
n	446	446
LR $\chi^2$	11.24	5.57
p	0.1883	.3507
Log likelihood	-144.568	-147.406

Note: \*\* =  $p < .05$



## Summary of Findings

- First model – includes all 8 independent variables
  - 2 significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) : state appropriations per FTE; public service spending share
  - Entire model is NOT significant ( $p = 0.189$ )
  - Low pseudo  $R^2$  (0.037)



## Summary of Findings

- Second model – 5 independent variables
  - 3 removed due to high correlations and possible multicollinearity: public service spending per FTE, public service-related spending per FTE, labor share of public service costs
  - NO individual variable had a significant effect
  - Entire model is NOT significant ( $p = 0.351$ )
  - Low pseudo  $R^2$  (0.019)



# Discussion

- The financial variables selected do not serve as predictors of an institution receiving the Carnegie Community Engagement classification
- This is good!
  - Simply allocating money is not enough
  - It is the programs that are important





# Limitations

- Community Engagement classification is not intended to be exhaustive
- Limited by the data that are publicly available
- Study only examines public, 4-year institutions
- Cannot separate institutions that applied and did not receive the award and those that did not apply



University of Georgia  
Institute of Higher Education



# Questions?

For more information, contact:

Drew Pearl

Institute of Higher Education

University of Georgia

[pearlaj@gmail.com](mailto:pearlaj@gmail.com)