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Overview

• The Community Engagement classification
  o 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
  o Boyer (1990, 1996)

• Resource Allocation in Higher Education
  o Massey (1996)

• Academic Capitalism
  o 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
  o Land-grant status
  o State appropriations
    • Per FTE student
    • Share of total revenue
  o Public service spending
    • Per FTE student
    • Share of total spending
Methods – Variable Selection

• Independent variables (con’t.)
  o Public service-related spending
  o Proportion of public service expenditures devoted to salaries and wages
  o Amount of public service expenditures devoted to salaries, wages, and fringe benefits
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>carnegie_class</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lndgrnt</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateappfте</td>
<td>7,584.36</td>
<td>5,828.59</td>
<td>192.09</td>
<td>106,297.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateappshare</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psspendfте</td>
<td>1,341.39</td>
<td>5,697.42</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>11,698.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psspendshare</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psrelatedfте</td>
<td>1,858.66</td>
<td>6,692.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>136,076.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharepssalwag</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laborsharepscost</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)</th>
<th>Model 2 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lngrnt</td>
<td>0.041 (.433)</td>
<td>0.225 (.407)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateappfte</td>
<td>0.0001** (.0001)</td>
<td>-3.51e-06 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stateappshare</td>
<td>-3.00 (1.802)</td>
<td>-.917 (1.551)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psspendfte</td>
<td>0.001 (.001)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psspendshare</td>
<td>9.005** (3.447)</td>
<td>3.725 (2.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psrelatedfte</td>
<td>-.001 (.001)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Model 1 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)</td>
<td>Model 2 $\beta$ (Std. Err.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharepssalwag</td>
<td>-1.716 (4.474)</td>
<td>.762 (1.206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laborsharepcost</td>
<td>2.124 (3.279)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR $\chi^2$</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.1883</td>
<td>.3507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log likelihood</td>
<td>-144.568</td>
<td>-147.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** = $p < .05$
Summary of Findings

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

• Second model – 5 independent variables
  o 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
  o NO individual variable had a significant effect
  o Entire model is NOT significant ($p = 0.351$)
  o 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
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