ENGAGING STUDENTS IN STUDENT PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS TO

IMPACT FUTURE GIVING: A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF THREE PUBLIC

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

by

VINCENT A. MILLER

(Under the Direction of Dr. Charles Knapp)

ABSTRACT

Fund raising in higher education focuses on soliciting prospective donor bases to secure funds necessary to carry out various programs essential to the excellence of the institution and alumni have traditionally been the main source of charitable contributions. Alumni, having attended the institution and been socialized in the culture, should have a greater affinity to support their institution's needs than non-alumni. While we know alumni donors attribute the student experience as being a key motivator in their decision to give, there is very little information on how current college students begin thinking about giving. Instead of waiting until the student graduates to being cultivating alumni support, some institutions are creating environmental factors of philanthropy programs associated with the student experience to engage students in giving.

This qualitative analysis sought to extend Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome Model (I-E-O Model) and situate giving as an outcome based on student engagement utilizing the a modified interview protocol from Kuh et al.'s *Involving Colleges* study to identify out-of-class learning environments associated with student philanthropy programs. This study of

three public, research universities sought to examine student involvement in student

philanthropy programs and determine the impact of that involvement in future giving.

INDEX WORDS:     Student Philanthropy, College Student Giving, Student
                 Engagement, Student Involvement, I-E-O Model, Involving
                 Colleges

ENGAGING STUDENTS IN STUDENT PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS TO

IMPACT FUTURE GIVING: A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF THREE PUBLIC

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS


by


VINCENT A. MILLER

BS, Louisiana Tech University, 2001

MA, Louisiana Tech University, 2004


A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree


DOCTOR OF EDUCATION


ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

ENGAGING STUDENTS IN STUDENT PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS TO

IMPACT FUTURE GIVING: A MULTI-CASE STUDY OF THREE PUBLIC

RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS


by


VINCENT A. MILLER




Major Professor:    Charles B. Knapp

Committee:          Karen L. Webber
                    Sheila Slaughter

DEDICATION

To the late J. Doug Toma, Ph.D. who's vision and determination created the opportunity for me to complete this degree. As director of the Executive Ed.D. program, even through his illness, he fought to ensure the first cohort within the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia was successful.

To my parents, Ken and Ann Miller, who have always demonstrated the value of education and for providing me continual support.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As state allocations to higher education continue to decrease, public institutions have a growing need for private support.  Fund raising in higher education focuses on soliciting prospective donor bases to secure funds necessary to carry out various programs essential to the excellence of the institution and alumni have traditionally been the main source of charitable contributions.  Private support is a major source of institutions discretionary funds allowing institutions to be innovative, take risks, and make investments in the future (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Leslie & Ramey, 1988). Alumni, having attended the institution and been socialized in the culture, should have a greater affinity to support their institution's needs than non-alumni.  In addition, alumni contributions are considered by *US News and World Report* to be a reflection of the quality of the educational experience.  The need for private support and the desire to increase institutional rank are two significant factors motivating institutions to increase alumni giving.

As early as the 1870s, institution leaders have rallied support by calling upon its alumni to give back (Curti & Nash, 1965).  Though empirical studies have attributed many factors as significant motivations for alumni-giving, several recent case studies highlight the student experience and active involvement while on campus as a being positively correlated with an alumni decision to give (Pumerantz, 2004; Sun, 2005).

Weerts and Ronca (2009) however found that more alumni report having a positive student experience than those who actually give.

While we know alumni donors attribute the student experience as being a key motivator in their decision to give there is very little information on how current college students begin thinking about giving.  Instead of waiting until the student graduates to begin cultivating alumni support some institutions are creating environmental factors within the student experience through philanthropy programs to engage students in giving.  Under the notion that students today are alumni tomorrow many universities have begun to educate students on the importance of charitable giving and create opportunities for students to participate in campus educational and giving campaigns.  Through these organized efforts defined as student philanthropy programs, institutions are teaching students the importance of giving to their alma mater with the intention of impacting the giving behavior of future alumni.  If the goal is to only impact institutional rank in *US News and World Report* through increased percent of alumni contributions, institutions could simply target graduating seniors to make a minimum gift of $1.00 at the time of graduation.  Researchers, however, caution that meaningful efforts to involve students through creating awareness, developing gratitude, and cultivate giving is likely to have a more sustainable behavior of alumni giving to the institution (Nishi, 2010).  The institutions studied in this research are implementing student philanthropy programs to involve students in meaningful giving.

In December 2009, a survey of nearly 200 development, alumni relations, and student giving professionals of public and private institutions of varying sizes reported 43% of the institutions have developed student philanthropy programs in the prior three

years (Ezarik, 2010).  The Council for Advancement in Support of Education's Affiliated Student Advancement Programs (CASE ASAP) has become the national association recognizing student philanthropy program efforts of member institutions.  Though student philanthropy programs have recently become of great interest, very little research has been conducted on multiple public university approaches to implement student giving campaigns directing students to donate to the university foundation as part of their college experience.

Previous single case studies have been conducted on student participation in campus student advancement organizations designed to support the institution's development efforts.  Both Friedman (2003) and Conley (1999) found a significant difference in giving rates of alumni who were members of the student advancement organizations than those of their peers who were not involved.  Hurvitz's (2010) dissertation thesis is the first to research how institutions tackle the task of involving the entire study body through understanding how student philanthropy programs have impacted the campus culture at Ivy-Plus institutions.  Hurvitz found that designing programs to fit the campus culture and enhance the full student experience should be behind the decisions related to student philanthropy.

In understanding the student experience, Astin (1984) found that the student's undergraduate college experience is strongly influenced by the campus environment and various forms of involvement.  Agreeing with Astin, Kuh, Schuch, Whitt, and Associates (1991) reported that 70% of what a student learns results from out-of-class experiences.  Further, these authors report that involved students are more satisfied with their overall experience and are more likely to graduate than non-involved students.  Student

interactions with faculty, administrators and peers can also have a deep and lasting influence thus educators may intentionally seek to include activities and events in the institutional environment that can influence educational outcomes.  Astin (1984) developed the Input-Environment-Outcome Model (I-E-O Model) to assess different forms of student involvement by identifying the characteristics of students and their involvement once influenced by the campus environment.  Kuh et al. further explored Astin's work on student involvement and related literatures to provide a set of conditions that leads institutions towards establishing a campus culture of student learning and involvement significant to the college student experience.

It is plausible to suggest that institutions can introduce student philanthropy programs into the campus environment as part of the student experience to impact giving. This qualitative analysis sought to extend Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome Model (I-E-O Model) and situate giving as an outcome based on student engagement utilizing the interview protocol from Kuh et al. *Involving Colleges* study to identify out-of-class learning environments associated with student philanthropy programs.  This study of three public, research universities sought to examine student participation in student philanthropy programs and determine the impact of that involvement on future giving. Specifically, this study seeks to examine the kind of education and fundraising campaigns being implemented to involve undergraduate students in giving, how students are responding to the student philanthropy environment, and what benefits and/or limitations exist for institutional administrators.

This research used a qualitative analysis because it provided an opportunity to ask broad, open-ended questions that can lead to stories and participant observations of the

role student philanthropy programs play at each institution. By conducting a multiple-case study, I explored the varied differences of student philanthropy programs at each institution. Conclusions drawn from more than one case are often viewed as more powerful than a single-case alone (Yin, 2009). This research documents varied strategies of education and fundraising campaigns implemented to involve undergraduate students in giving. While a quantitative study may have provided metrics on outcomes of participation rates and amount of money donated, examining the breadth and depth of student engagement in philanthropy programs through personal interviews with staff members, alumni, and students at three institutions provided valuable, rich information and a more useful framework in which practitioners can consider future activities related to increased student giving.

In selecting institutions to participate in this study, I relied on the Council for Advancement in Support of Education's (CASE) directory of Affiliated Student Advancement Programs (ASAP) to guide my initial search. As the professional association for higher education fundraising professionals, CASE became the host organization for the Student Alumni Association and Student Foundation Network (later changed to ASAP) in 1992 (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, n.d.). Involving undergraduate students in comprehensive philanthropy education and giving campaigns is relatively new so my search of relevant public, research institutions could not be conducted using the CASE ASAP website, thus I enlisted the expertise of the CASE ASAP program manger to recommend member institutions that better fit this research study. Four institutions were identified, three of which agreed to participate if participant responses remain confidential.

It is important to note that previous studies on student philanthropy have focused on a single case (Conley, 1999; Ezarick, 2010; Friedman, 2003; Nishi, 2010), or with a small number of elite, private institutions Hurvitz (2010). This study of three public, research institutions represents characteristics that may apply to a larger fraction of institution types not yet studied through multiple-case exploration. In each previous study (Conley, 1999; Ezarick, 2010; Friedman, 2003; Hurvitz, 2010; Nishi, 2010), the campus experience and student involvement with student philanthropy programs was shown to be significant to alumni giving. With the growth of establishing student philanthropy programs at institutions, this study contributes to the gap in the literature on student giving and continues to provide a framework for practitioners to provide programs that impact the overall student experience.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Philanthropy in American Higher Education

Philanthropy in American higher education can be traced back to the early colonial settlements and the colleges established to educate the next generation of new world leaders and the native population. Early philanthropy was tied to religion, whether it was to support the goal of educating citizens in the faith or to satisfy the belief that giving to a college could secure a place in heaven. Many English who were not as familiar with or connected to the colonial colleges saw the colleges as an avenue to support the missionary work and Christian education of America (Thelin, 2004). The first colonial college to be documented as receiving philanthropic support, Harvard, got its namesake in recognition of John Harvard, who bequeathed to the college half his estate, including books and money (Curti & Nash, 1965).

William Hibbens, Hugh Peter, and Thomas Weld are considered the first documented "fund raisers" in American higher education. In 1641 they sailed from Boston to London to solicit gifts for Harvard College (Worth & Asp II, 1994). Promotional literature and letters of appeal were created to tell the story of the college and promote the need to support charity and good works of the settlements. Harvard's promotional literature, *New England's First Fruits,* became the first of thousands of American college publications used to promote giving (Curti & Nash, 1965). Harvard's first scholarship endowments were established as a result of this type of appeal, and

larger contributions were accompanied by written deeds of conveyance to ensure the funds were used as intended. The first capital campaign in 1669 can also be linked to Harvard's interest in constructing a new building. This news traveled to several surrounding communities that collected contributions to send in support of this project (Curti & Nash, 1965).

Harvard also received the first endowed professorship from philanthropist and London merchant Thomas Hollis. Hollis was very vocal about his area of interest and suggested that revenue from his contribution be used to hire a dedicated professor of divinity. Since Hollis felt strongly that Harvard should relax its religious policies, he carefully drafted the specifications for hiring the professor of divinity so as not to restrict the religious background of any qualified man. In what is now referred to as "Orders," Hollis made it very clear that he was to be personally involved in the hiring of the professor and the selection of students his donations supported. Hollis was the largest single contributor to Harvard through the 18th century (Curti & Nash, 1965).

Following the activities at Harvard, fund raising by the leaders of the other colonial colleges became critical for their survival. As ministers, most college presidents were experienced in asking for collections to support a specific mission. Almost every college president would spend weeks or even months at a time on a fund-raising trip (Thelin, 2004). Many of the local gifts consisted of land, lumber, crops, and cattle as these were the resources necessary to physically construct and launch the school and were gifts many settlers could afford to give. These gifts and many more small contributions suggest the devotion of the colonists to the idea of higher education.

At the turn of the 19th century, more social welfare and public agencies began to surface with their own fund-raising efforts competing with college donors' resources. It was not until the early 1900s that Charles Sumner Ward, a Chicago YMCA executive, was recognized for his fund raising skills, which were notably different from the standard process of asking for individual solicitations. Ward was hired in 1914 by the University of Pittsburg to conduct a campaign that included methodic and systematic strategy. For the first time, fund raising became a systematic process of gift solicitations conducted by volunteers and institutional leaders under a consultant. There was careful organization and selected leaders, increased publicity, a defined timeline, and report meetings (Worth & Asp II, 1994).

Ward and a few of his hired associates established their own consulting firms to lead campaigns for colleges as "resident managers." They would place themselves on the campus to lead the campaign and, once complete, move to another campus and begin the process again. Up until World War II, institutions would conduct campaigns once or twice a decade, yet the economic growth after World War II led many campuses to begin establishing permanent fundraising professionals as part of the institution's staff (Worth & Asp II, 1994).

By the 1930s, private foundations became the source of some early support of research through grant allocations and post-doctoral fellowships in the areas of medicine, natural sciences, and to a lesser extent, social sciences (Gumport, 2005). During this time John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie established the two largest foundations in support of research: the Rockefeller Foundation, established in 1913 with $182 million; and the Carnegie Corporation, established in 1911 with $125 million. In the 1920s,

Rockefeller and Carnegie focused their support on their separate research institutes, Rockefeller Institute of Medicine and Carnegie Institute of Washington. However, the shift to grants and fellowships began to target more projects at a broader number of institutions. Some institutions obtained the resources necessary to institutionalize research and graduate education as two separate functions (Gumport, 2005).

*Importance of Alumni Giving*

Numerous events, such as endowed professorships and educational foundations, indicated the growing importance of alumni giving. As early as the 1870s and 1880s, educational leaders made statements in speeches and letters that suggest alumni support is critical to maintaining and advancing the institution. These statements, recounted by Curti and Nash (1965), set the expectation of alumni support:

> [Alumni giving] would attach the alumni to the university as nothing else could, for, by a subtle principle in human nature, men care readily more, as a rule, for those whom they have benefitted than for those whom they have received benefits, and the alumni will prove no exception to the rule; they will be far more deeply attached to the university when they shall have bestowed something upon her besides criticism. (Andrew D. White in Curti and Nash (1965), p.187).

Also noted in Curti and Nash:

> No graduate of the college has ever paid in full what it cost to educate him. A profit of the expense was borne by the funds given by former benefactors of the institution. A great many men can never pay the debt. Very few can, in their turn, become munificent benefactors. There is a large number however, between these two, who can and would cheerfully give according to their ability in order that the

college might hold the same relative position to future generations which it held to their own. The sense of gratitude, the sense of responsibility, the enlightened interest in the cause of education, which are felt by these men, constitute a resource which has never yet been tried, but which would yield richly. (William Graham Sumner, in Curti and Nash (1965), p.187).

And further, this work also cites the following:

While Michigan was chiefly dependent on the state for assistance, reasonable hope that the men she had been sending forth into all honorable callings and professions might testify to their indebtedness to the University by increasing her power and usefulness. Let it not be thought that the aid furnished by the State leaves no room for munificence. (James B. Angell in Curti and Nash (1965), p.187).

Alumni support of education had varied success since its beginnings. Organized alumni support gained momentum after 1918, as recipients of a college education felt they had even more reason to give. Yet before World War I, alumni giving was on a relatively small scale. Early examples of this inconsistency in support include the College of New Jersey's efforts to renew itself in the 1830s, falling just short of its goal of $100,000 dollars; on the other hand, Rutgers announced in 1843 the need to build a new library and raised only $2,000 from its alumni over the course of three years. Prior to 1895, only ten Dartmouth alumni had ever given more than $5,000 dollars, totaling $363,367. During that same time period Dartmouth received more than $1,375,000 in contributions from seventeen non-alumni friends (Curti & Nash, 1965).

To increase its donor prospects, institutional officials began to involve more alumni in the success of the college, as demonstrated through naming alumni to boards of trustees. After the period of World War I, several colleges documented some large contributions by alumni to their alma mater. Many large donations were designated for specific purposes, and institutions sought the need for annual unrestricted gifts to support operating expenses. Contributions of any level by alumni and others allowed colleges to expand campuses, improve programs, admit more students, and offset rising costs (Curti & Nash, 1965). In 1890 a few Yale graduates established the first alumni fund, taking 15 years to raise their goal of $104,500. By 1910, however, Yale was receiving close to $500,000 a year for operating expenses from over 8000 alumni contributors. As institutions became more diverse in their offerings and moved away from the original religious mission, alumni contributions were becoming more critical to offset the declining support of churches and religious organizations (Curti & Nash, 1965).

From the early years of fundraising, officials knew the importance of alumni in helping to achieve their goals. In 1960 Henry T. Heald, then president of the Ford Foundation, suggested the continued strength of any university rests with its alumni. To quote Heald;

> New generations of alumni provide the continuity that perpetuates a university. Its officers come and go, its faculties change, its programs and buildings are replaced, but its alumni maintain a lifelong relationship with the university. They are keepers of the tradition, preferred stockholders of the enterprise, the mark of its accomplishments (Reichley, 1977, p.275-276).

In 1960 alumni provided $180 million in support of their institution (Reichley, 1977).  In 2010 the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) reported alumni support at $7.10 billion, down from $8.7 billion in 2008 (Council for Aid to Education , 2011).  In an overview of giving to educational organizations, 14.7% of all U.S. households gave in 2006, with an average gift amount of $505 (Center on Philanthropy Panel Study, 2009). This study, in which respondents were categorized by age, income, and education level, found that donors with a bachelor's degree or higher and a household income greater than $100,000 show higher giving rates and larger average gifts  (Center on Philanthropy Panel Study, 2009).

A college degree has both an economic and a social value that could affect donors.  The Bureau of the Census shows that higher education leads to higher earnings, with a bachelor's degree recipient earning nearly double a high school graduate (Porter, 2002).  Additionally, college earners  have a better quality of life for themselves and their offspring, improved health, higher savings levels, and increased charitable giving and community service (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).  With a greater disposable income and a focus on community service, these college graduates have added impetus to donate to their alma mater.

Alumni Factors of Giving to Education

Several studies have been conducted to examine factors or motivators of alumni giving to their alma mater.  As so many studies that exist, we also see varied correlations suggested for each set of factors studied.  Baldwin (2008) concluded that there does not appear to be a consensus on what motivates people to give.  Further, researchers who study donor motivation agree on some donor factors but disagree on others.  A donor's

gift to the institution might reflect the donor's own interest to improve his or her reputation, or in the case of alumni, the university's academic quality might reflect greater earning potential with the alumnus having more available funds for voluntary support  (Leslie & Ramey, 1988; Schmidt, 2010).

Up until work done by Leslie and Ramey (1988), previous studies had failed to address the underlying factors that affect giving decisions of donor groups (alumni, nonalumni individuals, business organizations, foundations, and other).  However, Leslie and Ramey (1988) conducted a time-series analysis of total philanthropy to higher education from 1932 to 1974 in an attempt to better understand voluntary contributions to colleges and universities, which have traditionally represented 8 to 10 percent of all charitable giving.  These researchers state that their conclusions are logical speculations and could apply to higher education fundraising generally; "however, the differentiation of fundraising strategies by group solicited often is critical" (p.129). Their findings might be more valuable to consider for messaging when appealing to one or more groups.  For all donor groups, Leslie et al. suggest emphasis on the importance of the institution's public profile and the correlation of that profile with quality, the magnitude of public and private investment in the institution, and shortfalls in state support.  Alumni, in particular, may also respond well to a demonstration of critical financial need and emphasis on traditions and prestige (Leslie and Ramey, 1988).

Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) differ to previous findings on demonstrating critical need having stated the donor's interest to give may in some instances be enhanced by the demonstration of additional state support.  One example cited by the researchers suggest a donor wanting to support a specific research activity, may view state support as

a measure of quality. Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) note, "these donors prefer institutions of high quality, especially in regards to the area in which the activity will be conducted, and state funding helps provide the basic infrastructure that helps determine quality" (p. 212).

Leslie and Ramey (1998), Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008), and Baade and Sundberg (1996) all agree that institutional quality, as it relates to alumni giving, was an important factor. In Baade and Sundberg's (1996) study of over 125 public and private doctoral-granting research universities and 250 liberal arts colleges for fiscal years 1989 and 1990, the researchers also found that curricular and extracurricular experiences and the "personal-feel" of the campus environment affected alumni contributions. Baade and Sundberg (1996) reported that not only do the quality of education affect potential alumni earning power, but the varied campus experiences also strengthen the bond between the institution and the alumnus. "Alumni are more likely to respond favorably to an institution's fund raising efforts if their collegiate experience has been positive," (p.76). In addition, Baade and Sundberg (1996) concluded that higher student wealth, better institutional quality, and greater development efforts result in larger alumni gifts, although gifts at public universities are lower than those at private institutions.

In 2003 Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano conducted an empirical study to better understand how current institutional decision-making affects the future of alumni contributions. The researchers compiled a sample of 415 institutions containing reported statistics on alumni numbers, donations, and solicitations as maintained in the Voluntary Support of Education Database. These were matched with information on institution and student body characteristics reported to Peterson's Higher Education Research Division.

Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano's findings suggest an institution's academic reputation, measured incoming student ability, faculty-student ratio, function and structure, and career choices of graduates affect donations from alumni. Specifically, using reported SAT scores or converted ACT scores to measure incoming student achievement, their findings show that measures of average incoming student achievement in high school highly correlate to alumni giving.

Cunnningham and Cochi-Ficano (2003) also found that institutions that provide a greater amount of need-based scholarships receive greater voluntary support. "One dollar of need-based aid seems to contain an element of 'seed money' that engenders larger donations from the pool of alumni," (p.556). In contrast, they suggest that non need-based aid is pure cost to the institution and does not significantly impact donor behavior (Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2003). Both studies conducted by Baade and Sundberg and Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano were unable to account for direct measures of a student's familial wealth but used other characteristics such as high school achievement or tuition costs as related indicators to support the idea that wealthier families can afford to send their students to higher achieving, more prestigious schools.

Researchers caution that institutional administrators should consider the implications that policy decisions on enrollment management and budget allocations will have on future alumni support. The factors associated with their findings do not necessarily suggest that adjustments to minimal entering academic requirements or changes to expenditures per student will directly impact alumni contributions (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2003).

Peter Schmidt (2010) summarized two additional studies of alumni giving in his April 2010 article titled "Pumping Up Alumni Giving at Public Colleges: Studies Find Surprising Trade-Offs" published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Schmidt states that new research findings suggest increased institutional selectivity does not necessarily produce a greater number of alumni who donate to their alma mater and large campus enrollments can have a negative impact on alumni giving. Referenced by Schmidt, Simone examined the influence of institutional selectivity on alumni giving of 147 public, research universities using entering freshman SAT/ACT scores during the 11-year period of 1996 to 2007. His study found that, when other factors are taken into account, SAT/ACT scores alone do not predict average amounts student donate when they become alumni, suggesting a shift in how donor influence by institutional prestige should be interpreted (Simone, 2010).

In addition to the earlier findings, three researchers at the University of Minnesota—David J. Weerts, Thomas Sanford, and Olena Glushko—reviewed 23 variables of 67 public flagship universities to see if they could explain differences in rates of alumni giving participation. Findings indicated a negative correlation between alumni giving and large campus enrollments, as well as between giving and students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (SES). Weerts et al. purport that SES students are less likely to have the capacity to give or to have philanthropic behavior modeled in their family. Also campuses with larger enrollments have less engaged students or inadequate fundraising personnel and resources to keep a large alumni population involved with the institution (Weerts, Sanford, and Glushko, 2010).

Student Engagement and Alumni Giving

As several alumni factors of giving exist, there is evidence that increased student engagement will lead to increased alumni giving (Ashcraft, 1995; McNulty, 1977; Minniear, 2006; Pumerantz, 2004; Sun, 2005; Weerts & Ronca, 2009). Though empirical studies have attributed many factors as significant motivations for giving, several recent case studies highlight the student experience and active involvement while on campus as being positively correlated with the decision of alumni to donate. Both Sun (2005) and Pumerantz (2004) recently completed dissertation studies of institutional factors of alumni giving, finding that students have significant motivation to give if they were actively engaged on campus and had a positive student experience while enrolled. "These results indicate that satisfaction is greater among alumni who believed that the university contributed to their education. In other words, if they are satisfied with their previous student experience, they are more inclined to give" (Sun, 2005, p.61).

In a study of public comprehensive colleges and universities in the California State University system and their top four peer institutions, Pumerantz (2004) adds:

> Ultimately, it is the experiences the alumni had while they were students and the connections with faculty and staff that have the greatest impact on alumni giving…. The experiences attained during the time the students are most captive are the most meaningful for the institution's success at gaining that future alumni support" (p. 102).

Two additional studies found that, evaluating the student experience and then asking alumni to give highly correlated with alumni giving, as did the alumni belief that the institution needs the money (Minniear, 2006; Weerts & Ronca, 2009). A study

conducted by Ashcraft (1995) on the impact of undergraduate involvement looked at factors such as community service, participation in Greek life, and interpersonal relationships on alumni giving.  Alumni who were engaged in those types of activities were more likely to give (Ashcraft, 1995).  A 1977 study by McNulty of students at Loyola University in Chicago found a positive relationship between involvement and alumni giving (McNulty, 1977).

<div align="center">Student Engagement and Student Philanthropy Programs</div>

Despite the studies tying student experience to willingness to donate, Weerts and Ronca (2009*)* caution that more alumni reported having a positive student experience than the number of alumni who actually donated, suggesting a positive student experience does not automatically lead to giving.  Institutions have seen a steady decline in the percent of alumni giving with rising tuition costs and the belief that the institution does not really need the money (Masterson, 2010).  Since the experience students have while on campus reflects their attitude towards the institution as alumni, future donor support starts with engaging students about philanthropy during the student experience. Various student philanthropy programs have been designed to attempt to take advantage of this relationship with student engagement and some programs engage students better than others.

Turning students into donors is a socialization process that involves orienting them to voluntary giving, actively engaging students in development activities, and strategically timing program initiatives (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993).  Many institutions have begun involving students on committees, in decisions, and through programs that place students at the center of operations as they

relate to student philanthropy education and giving programs, thus providing an early answer to the objections related to high tuition or institutional need.  In December 2009 a survey was conducted of nearly 200 professionals focusing on development, alumni relations, and student giving.  Coming from public and private institutions of varying sizes, these professionals reported that 43% of the institutions had developed student philanthropy programs in the prior three years (Ezarick, 2010).

Programming for future alumni at institutions began to take shape in the late 1960s and early 1970s.  Growing campus student populations with impersonal experiences and generational gaps between students and alumni led to a need for better understanding and teamwork to support higher education.  Student alumni programs, today now part of a broader label as student philanthropy programs, were developed not only to connect students and alumni, but also to introduce students to the alumni experience.  These programs varied in their early design, ranging from sending all students the alumni magazine, sponsoring campus events and student awards, to promoting the alumni organization, and matching students with alumni for dinners, internships, and job shadowing (Reichley, 1977).

In 1992 the Council for Advancement in Support of Education (CASE) professionally acknowledged the Student Alumni Association/Student Foundation Network, an organization originally headquartered at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2010).  Now called the CASE Affiliated Student Advancement Programs (ASAP), this network consisted of student alumni associations, student foundations, and similar organizations at more than 300 CASE member institutions (Council for Advancement in Support of Education,

2010).  As found on the CASE ASAP website, the first student alumni association was established at Indiana University in the late 1940s but it was not until 1973 at a conference of 300 students representing 67 institutions that a unanimous vote was cast to establish the Student Alumni Association/Student Foundation Network.  Though the purpose of these organizations often reflected the various personalities and missions of the institutions, the roles of these organizations could include campus tours, calling potential donors to solicit contributions, educational fundraising, student giving programs, student recruitment, community outreach, and special events.  Some of these programs solicit gifts from currents students to develop a "habit" of support and involve students with campus an alumni programs (Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993).

After researching the top student philanthropy programs in 2007, Academic Impressions, a for-profit company providing professional development for higher education leaders, named the following three core components for student philanthropy programs: creating awareness; developing gratitude; and cultivating giving (Nishi, 2010).

- Awareness as a *cognitive* learning outcome:  Are your students aware of how their education is funded?  Do they understand the importance of private giving?

- Gratitude as *affective* learning outcome:  Is gratitude expressed for the support students have received?  Do your students appreciate private support of their educational opportunities?

- Giving as *behavioral* learning outcome:  Have the students' awareness and gratitude prompted them to donate? (Ezarik, 2010).

The three core components were modeled after the University of Pennsylvania's (Penn) efforts to implement a comprehensive student philanthropy program in 2004. After beginning the program, Penn has seen a steady increase in meaningful giving, as measured by students' willingness to give annually without "a dangling carrot," and has doubled their young alumni's participation in the annual fund. Several challenges in implementing student philanthropy programs were also identified, including managing faculty/staff pushback, getting buy-in from leadership, obtaining program resources, educating students on the importance of giving to the institution, managing students' sense of entitlement, and recruiting and retaining student volunteers (Ezarik, 2010).

Student philanthropy programs may find their fit within advancement, student affairs, or a combination of both. In 1991 a survey of 545 members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and CASE was conducted to learn more about what types of programs were offered on campuses for currently enrolled students and where they were housed. Responses revealed that 73% of private colleges and universities responding had student programs devoted to development activities, as did 56% of public colleges and universities, 32% of community colleges; and an almost even divide between involvement from student affairs (49.7%) and advancement (50.3%). These activities were included in 48% of institutional advancement goals but only 32% of student affairs goals (Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993).

In addition, a sizeable number of private colleges and universities (52%), public colleges and universities (29.4%), and community colleges (14%) report sponsoring programs designed to inform students of their future role as alumni, and 52% of institutional advancement reported having student philanthropy programs as part of staff

responsibility, compared to 20% of student affairs respondents. Joint efforts between advancement and student affairs existed at very few institutions (20-25%), yet collaboration at these institutions included efforts in phone-a-thons, annual telethons, graduation picnics, career networks and workshops, senior class fund drives, parents' associations, internships, senior banquets, student foundations, senior challenge campaigns, alumni ambassadors, pre-alumni council advisement, homecoming weekends, career days for alumni, scholarship programs, student ambassador programs, and student alumni associations (Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993).

Both student affairs and advancement professionals face challenges of balancing resources and time to devote to development programs focused at current students and the priority given to such programs, which may compete with or be viewed as outside the mission of the department. If collaboration did exist, at the very least an understanding of how each area can support the students' maturation towards becoming a contributing alumnus could greatly enhance student philanthropy programs (Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993). The student experience can also be enhanced with well-crafted messages of student philanthropy throughout other campus programs, making students aware of the life-long commitment the institution has to their success and inviting students to take ownership of their alma mater after graduation. Additional programs centered on awareness of giving to the institution will also remind students of the importance of giving and teach them the impact of previous donations on their student experience.

Students also have potential to give during their enrollment. Soliciting graduating seniors to make a contribution to their institution, known as a senior class gift, is a widely used fund-raising educational tool to focus students on giving. For some, the senior class

gift is part of the campus fabric, and a tradition many committed students feel compelled to keep.  Having current college students participate in giving may seem precipitous, given the rising cost of tuition and increased student debt, but many institutions are seeing success through increased student participation in their annual fundraising efforts.  To engage more than graduating seniors, other student campaigns involving all students have recently been documented; three such examples are given below:

In January of 2010, the University of Cincinnati launched its "Proudly Pennies" campaign, a student-led initiative aimed at raising one billion pennies for the university's ongoing Proudly Cincinnati capital campaign.  The website reports Proudly Pennies is spearheaded by the Student Government Association and supported by the student body, with a goal to raise one billion pennies, the equivalent of $10 million.  As of September 2011, students had raised $1.6 million through the Proudly Pennies campaign, though the website suggests students, alumni, faculty, staff, and local business are all called to participate (University of Cincinnati, 2011).  At the conclusion of the campaign, student representation will partner with the university president to determine the best use of the funds raised.

Similar efforts to involve all students in giving was recently launched at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during the 2008-2009 academic year to improve the quality of academics, athletics, and student life.  Student contributions of any size are recognized through the student's membership in the Heelraisers Society.  Members receive perks for giving at certain levels, are recognized in the Heelraisers Honor Roll, and receive additional benefits that are determined annually.  Through the efforts of the Heelraisers Council—a student group involved in marketing, event

planning, senior class gift, peer solicitations, and meetings with student groups and representatives in academic units —students are made aware of giving opportunities and encouraged to participate. Additionally, students at North Carolina at Chapel Hill receive leadership recognition in the 1793 Society for an annual gift of $250, with additional benefits and invitations to special campus events (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2010).

The University of Alabama launched its Students Playing Important Roles in Tradition (SPIRIT) campaign in 2005 as part of the university's "Our Students. Our Future." $500 million capital campaign. The SPIRIT campaign encourages students to give a minimum of $2 to support first-generation scholarships. Nearly one-third of University of Alabama's students are first-generation college students. To encourage student participation, by making student giving accessible, students can give online by credit card, in person at tables set-up at various campus locations or can swipe their Action Card (university debit card) using BAMA Cash or Dining Dollars at designated SPIRIT stations on campus (The University of Alabama, 2008). As of May 2008, the campaign had raised $40,716 and awarded 20 scholarships.

Baldwin (2008) further explored how the University of Alabama is engaging students to influence giving, finding implications for the university that affect the student experience. She found that all employees at the institution must take ownership in the fund raising process, recognizing that their contact with students is an opportunity to make a difference and build on the student's connection to the institution. Leaders are expected to establish and clearly communicate a path for the institution and to ensure that the student experience is so meaningful that students want to give back (Baldwin, 2008).

Although student philanthropy programs have recently become of great interest, very few studies overall have been conducted on multiple public university approaches to implement student philanthropy programs that will engage students in donating to the university foundation as part of their college experience. The themes of those studies that are available include research on the use of public relations techniques to cultivate enrolled students as alumni donors; donor behaviors of participants in student philanthropy organizations versus those alumni who were not organization members; and student philanthropy culture at Ivy-Plus institutions (Conley, 1999; Friedmann, 2003; Hurvitz, 2010; Sheridan, 2006).

When exploring how institutions use public relations techniques to cultivate students as alumni donors, Sheridan (2006) stated that 95% of the participants recommended cultivating donations during the undergraduate years. Both Friedman and Conley focused on participation in student advancement organizations where the purpose is to support the intuition's development efforts (Conley, 1999; Friedmann, 2003). For Friedman's study, the institutions selected for her mixed-method research all had established student advancement organizations affiliated with CASE ASAP, Conley focused on a single institutional case. Both Friedman and Conley found a significant difference in participation rates of alumni who were actively engaged members of the student advancement organizations than those who were not members. They found that student advancement participants were well informed about the importance of giving to their alma mater and had developed a relationship with the foundation. The student organizations were also used as an avenue for communicating the institution's expectations of alumni support (Conley, 1999; Friedmann, 2003).

Hurvitz's (2010) study is the first to research how multiple institutions tackle the task of educating all students on the importance of giving as alumni. Focusing on what she categorized as the nine Ivy-Plus institutions, in her qualitative study Hurvitz identified common initiatives at private universities used with all students. These initiatives included career networking and mentoring, social programs, and senior-giving campaigns, all of which use solicitation techniques and donor recognition levels that mirror the institution's alumni cultivation strategy. Hurvitz also found that institutions that invest more human and financial resources in student philanthropy programs have better notoriety and success. Institutions can increase their success by gaining more resources and support, increasing collaboration, and being more strategic in their efforts. Designing programs and partnerships that fit the campus culture and engage students in the full student experience should be behind all decisions that could shape student philanthropy (Hurvitz, 2010).

<div align="center">Effective Student Engagement</div>

Student engagement has been part of the literature on student success in college for years yet it has evolved in its label and meaning. Early research by Ralph Tyler recorded the effects of time on task on learning, which was later framed by Robert Pace to consider the quality of effort on tasks. The Theory of Involvement, by Alexander Astin, further popularized the concept (Harper & Quaye, 2009). Early research was an attempt to determine what common factors led some students to progress and graduate while other students were not as successful. College students who were engaged in their experience exhibited outcomes related to learning. Astin (1984) proposed that the amount of learning and development that occurs during a student's educational

experience is determined by the quantity and quality of the students interactions with faculty, time on campus, involvement in academics, and participation in campus activities. To assess student success, Astin (1984) developed the Input-Environment-Outcome Model (I-E-O Model) which examined the backgrounds students bring to college (Input) and the outcome once intermingled with the campus environment. Pascarella (1985) also examined how various inputs also interact with institutional environments that influence learning and development. Pascarella theorized that student outcomes are determined by what a student brings to campus and the experiences they have while in college.

The I-E-O Model can be very complex as various institutional environmental characteristics could affect individual experiences differently (Hu & Kuh, 2003). Astin's (1984) Theory of Involvement was a comprehensive effort to synthesize the array of literature and findings from his own research in a simple form that not only reflected the knowledge of influences on student development, but also could be easily understood by college administrators to help design more effective learning environments. Kuh et al. summarized Astin's five postulates of the Theory of Involvement in his works on student learning outside the classroom (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991):

1. The investment of physical and psychological energy in various activities is involvement.
2. Students vary their involvement levels in organizations, investing differing amounts of time and energy in different activities.

3. Involvement can be measured based on hours of time spent or student comprehension level resulting in either quantitative or qualitative features and can be measured as such.

4. The amount of time and energy a student invests in an activity is proportionate to the student's educational return on investment.

5. Effective educational policies and practices allow for and encourage students to be involved.

According to these postulates, both the institution and the student have a significant role in the learning associated with the student experience. The institution has to provide meaningful opportunities that complement the institution's mission, and the students will learn based on their level of engagement with the experience.

In their study called *Involving Colleges,* Kuh, Schuh, Whitt and Associates (1991) examined the balance of public and private four-year institutions regarding in-depth out-of-class involvement opportunities to gain a better understanding of ways the institution promotes student learning and personal development. Drawing upon previous research, the *Involving Colleges* study examined 14 colleges and universities during the 1988-89 academic year that were identified as providing rich out-of-class learning opportunities for students (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991). Kuh et al. found that no single factor could ensure involvement and learning on the part of the student, nor can student behavior or institutional culture be easily changed. If the activities, policies, and practices are compatible with the institution's mission, philosophy, and culture, a high level of student involvement in those activities is likely to exist. The researchers affirm that students, in general, are more likely to be involved in activities to which the

institution and other students devote their time, energy, and resources (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991).

Today, the use of the word *engagement* is widely used to explain a student's involvement or experience through time and effort, popularized by findings on student success as measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE; Schroeder, 2003). Developed from a previous instrument by C. Robert Pace, the *College Student Experiences Questionnaire*, and based on student responses related to their involvement in a variety of educational activities, the NSSE instrument indirectly measures the extent to which institutions use good educational practices of engagement to enhance learning (Kuh, 2001). As more college presidents are concerned with college rankings, NSSE provides institutions with student measures of quality of undergraduate education and allows administrators to benchmark one's institution with others that have similar attributes. Survey questions are clustered into five areas: Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, Student and Faculty Interaction, Supportive Campus Environment, and Enriching Educational Experiences, all of which can be easily understood and discussed (Schroeder, 2003). The survey also gives students the opportunity to evaluate their overall educational experience and the likelihood that they would choose the same institution again. The collection of items on the instrument thus provides student's responses to the institutional environment and the extent to which it promotes engaging behaviors. If students are satisfied and engaged, it seems plausible that these students might be more likely to give, either as a current student or alumnus.

Conceptual Framework

There is a sizable literature to confirm the relationship between student inputs, environmental experiences, and outcomes such as satisfaction and graduation; however, no one has sought to extend Astin's I-E-O Model to examine how engaging students in student philanthropy programs can impact student giving as an outcome.  This study seeks to extend Astin's I-E-O Model and situate giving as an outcome based on student engagement utilizing the interview protocol from Kuh et al. *Involving Colleges* study to identify the out-of-class learning environment associated with student philanthropy programs.  Understanding that researchers cite the student experience as being highly correlated with alumni factors of giving, opportunity exists to determine if involving current students in programs targeted at getting them to make a financial donation to their institution as part of the college experience can impact future alumni giving.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study used a multiple-case study approach to describe efforts taken at three,

public research universities to implement student philanthropy programs to impact the

undergraduate student experience.  Case study research can be written with different

motives from a single presentation of an individual case to broader generalizations based

on multiple-case study evidence (Yin, 2009).  Since very little research exists on student

philanthropy programs, none I have found which attempt to extend Astin's I-E-O Model

to examine how engaging students in student philanthropy programs can impact student

or alumni giving as an outcome, the results of this study more closely align with a broad

set of generalizations taken from the multiple-case exploration.  Specifically, this study

seeks to examine the kind of education and fundraising campaigns being implemented to

involve undergraduate students in giving, how students are responding to the student

philanthropy environment, and what benefits and/or limitations exist for institutional

administrators.

Statement of the Problem

While we know alumni donors attribute the student experience as being a key

motivator in their decision to give there is very little information available on how current

college students begin thinking about giving.  This study thus seeks to examine student

involvement in student philanthropy programs and determine the impact of that

involvement on giving.  As such, student perceptions of giving could be seen as an

outcome of student involvement in relevant tasks. Specific research questions that guided this study are:

- Are, and if so, what kind of education and fundraising campaigns are being implemented to involve undergraduate students in giving;

- How are students responding to the environments of student philanthropy programs that impact student engagement; and

- What benefits and/or limitations exist for institutional administrators?

Because I sought answers to these questions that would lead to broader generalizations (Yin, 2009), I selected a multiple-case, qualitative study in order to explore the stories and participant observations of the role student philanthropy programs play at each institution to identify common themes of information that surfaced from the data. Conclusions drawn from more than one case are often viewed as more powerful than a single-case alone (Yin, 2009). This study of three institutions and the student philanthropy programs established within each, helped achieve this goal.

Data regarding student participation rates and average student gifts may provide some insight and could be factors for a quantitative study of the overall impact of student philanthropy programs yet may limit the ability for unique characteristics of the institution and its programs to be identified. Additionally, student philanthropy programs are relatively new and a database of student giving data for comparison does not currently exist.

## Data Collection

Three public, four year research universities with similar undergraduate enrollments of 15,000 – 20,000 students served as the participant institutions for this

study. I identifyied institutions with similar size of undergraduate population to control for variance in student philanthropy program outcomes due to the number of possible student donors. Institutions of this size may also have additional resources from general operating budget and larger endowments to invest in student giving. I also chose to focus on institutions with varied years' experience and program strategies involving all undergraduate students in making a philanthropic gift to the university's foundation in support of programs at the institution.

*Case Site Selection*

The Council for Advancement in Support of Education (CASE), the professional association for higher education fundraising professionals, became the host organization for a Student Alumni Association and Student Foundation Network in 1992 (Council for Advacement and Support of Education, 2011). Later changed to Affiliated Student Advancement Programs in 2008, this community is comprised of student alumni associations, student foundations and similar organizations at more than 300 CASE member institutions. Members identify with one of four categories:

- Student alumni association - sponsored by the alumni relations office and primarily involved with alumni programs (i.e., student alumni council and student alumni relations committee)

- Student foundation and class gift programs - sponsored by the development office and primarily involved with annual giving campaigns, senior challenge and other fundraising activities (i.e., student development board)

- Student ambassadors - primarily involved as institutional ambassadors at functions sponsored by the admissions office, alumni office or president's office (i.e., tour guides)

- Spirit groups - usually affiliated with public relations, residence life or athletics; many are the keepers of the campus mascot (Council for Advacement and Support of Education, 2011)

I conducted an initial search of the membership directory on the CASE ASAP website, and twenty-five institutions were labeled in the student foundation category. In an attempt to better understand the characteristics of potential case institutions for this research, I reviewed the details of the organizations to determine the type of fundraising activities associated with each institution. Diploma frame sales, membership dues, care package sales, car washes, bake sales, discount cards, and flower/candy sales were all associated with various member institutions. Based on a review of the literature, I was more interested in those institutions that had implemented programs to involve all undergraduate students in making a philanthropic gift to the university's foundation in support of programs at the institution. On December 7, 2010 I then conducted an initial informational phone interview with the CASE ASAP program manager, Robyn Neely, to gain her insight on student philanthropy programs and her recommendation for member institutions that better fit this research study. "This is a growing interest at many of our member institutions, and I admit we [CASE ASAP] have not compiled a lot of information on this topic. We made it our goal to provide more resources on student philanthropy programs this upcoming year and hope to have it online for our members in 2011" (Neeley, 2010).

Once understanding my interest in this topic, Neeley (2010) provided four institutions that were public, research universities that, in her observation, demonstated efforts to involve all undergraduate students in giving and were presenting aspects of their programs at regional or national conferences or had recently completed an award application for recognition of outstanding programs. I then contacted the director of development at each of the four institutions and provided an introduction to this study seeking the institution's participation (Appendix A). Officials at three of the four institutions agreed to participate if information provided remained disassociated with the individual respondents.

*Participant Selection*

At each of the three institutions, student philanthropy programs were affiliated with the university advancement annual giving department; therefore I conducted interviews of administrators within that unit of the institution. In addition to advancement professional, comments from students and alumni participants were important populations from which to gain insight into their perceptions on giving and to inform the benefits or limitations related to giving that might exist for institutional administrators as stakeholders in the outcome of the student philanthropy programs. Thus interviews were completed with:

- Chief annual giving staff members;
- Student philanthropy programs staff members in Annual Giving;
- Students who volunteered with student philanthropy programs; and
- Alumni who were once student participants in philanthropy programs.

Due to time limtations on this study and the institutions' interest in protecting donor

records, student and alumni participants were selected by the institution's chief annual

giving staff member.  Since the case study method is designed to examine contemporary

events to expand and generalize concepts and not to detail frequencies, a random

sampling is not as important (Yin, 2009).  In each case, respondents were able to expound

upon their involvement with student philanthropy programs in response to the interview

question set.

*Interview Protocol*

Inteviews of administrators, student volunteers, and alumni closely associated

with student philanthropy programs at each institution provided a purposeful sample to

gather data related to the research questions.  I developed three sets of semi-structured

questions with pointed follow-up responses to identify institutional factors and conditions

related to out of class learning opportunities for students (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, &

Associates, 1991;  Schroeder, 2003).  A slightly modified set of questions were used for

each of three populations—administrators (Appendix B), students (Appendix C), and

alumni (Appendix D).  As a multiple-case study, it was critical to speak to a sample from

each population and take the same steps to gather supporting data to ensure consistency

to identify commonalities across cases.  Interviews were standardized, carfully following

the scripted protocol, which is more common for mulitiple-case studies with larger

sample sizes (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

I first piloted the interview questions with administrators and students at my own

institution who have expressed interest in the very early stages of developing student

philanthropy programs.  Using their feedback, I solidified the final questions for this study, shown in the appendices.

*Recording and Storing Data*

Qualitative data were collected using individual interviews, and one focus group of two students.  Interviews were transcribed and data were analyzed to identify common multiple case themes of information that surfaced from the data.  Not only did I record the responses to the interview question, but I also documented my observations of the interview and the setting to further inform the context of the interview (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).  The recordings and transcriptions were stored in a password-protected database maintained by the researcher.  Paper documentation was scanned and maintained digitally along with the interview transcripts and recordings both in a secure, password protected online storage service and behind a password protected computer owned by me as the researcher.

*Confidentiality*

In the letter of purpose and inquiry to the chief advancement officer (Appendix A), I stated my intent to conduct this study as a means of informing practice for public institutions when working with student philanthropy programs.  I did not anticipate any objection to participating in this study.  Officials at one institution complied yet asked to have their institution and respondents remain confidential due to ongoing preparations to copyright program components and filings on intellectual property control.  I chose to protect the responses of all participants at each institution by removing the names of all three institutions from my findings and use the labels, administrator, alumnus, and student, in place of participant names.

Participants were provided a combined introductory email and consent statement (Appendices E and F) before interviews were conducted. Interviews of institutional staff and students were conducted in a private room at the institution; interviews of alumni were conducted by phone. All interviews were digitally recorded and later transcribed for data analysis. Copies of signed consent forms and email responses were retained with the researcher in a password digital file.

Data Analysis

One form of multiple-case report of findings contain multiple narratives covering each case individually, represented in separate sections, and a cross-case analysis of findings and results (Yin, 2009). This study follows this format with single case narratives to describe how education and fundraising campaigns are being implemented to involve undergraduate students in giving and cross-case analysis of findings to show how students are responding to the environments of student philanthropy programs that impact student engagement, and what benefits or limitations exist for institutional administrators. For the cross-case analysis, knowledge informed by the literature review and information gathered from the site visit, was used to identify common themes or "buckets" of information that surface in the data. Using these themes, I concentrated on what the data analysis was showing, ensuring every theme that informs the research was identified and combining like themes into topics of findings (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). I once again reviewed the information and organized the topics by research question in order to present the findings for written response and analysis. As the pattern and themes developed, I conducted validity checks by circulating my findings from a particular transcript to the appropriate interviewee as a form of member checking to see if the

interviewee related to the same themes.  Lastly, I made every attempt to ensure that all themes had been explored and rechecked for newly identified or overlooked themes.

I triangulated these findings with resources found on institution websites and documents received on the visit to ensure similarities existed in description of programs and outcomes.  As Yin (2009) suggests, I also attempted to collect quantitative data on student participation in order to substantiate my findings but was not granted permission to this data from each institution.

*Position as Researcher*

Even though I currently worked in the field and was involved in student philanthropy education, I had only two years of experience working with a newly establish student philanthropy programs and admit to not being able to inform best practices from my experience.  As a measure of removing bias, I did not include my own institution as part of this study.

Part of my responsibilities in my work role is to think strategically about introducing students to giving to their alma mater and reviewing and learning from peer organizations is part of that process making me more open to the research.  Given my limited experience, I have not yet formed my own professional opinions as to what will or will not work with college students and even that opinion would be limited to just my own campus experiences.  It is important to ensure that steps taken to conduct this study can be applied to a similar situation, even if the outcomes of the study provide a different response in order to provide continual opportunities for discovery within student philanthropy programs and better inform the field.

*Limitations*

This study is limited to three public institutions, similar in size, with a history of offering student philanthropy programs. Though the institutions were similar there were also important differences between the institutions and the student philanthropy programs. The students selected, by each institution, to participate in this study were members of student philanthropy committees and had a role in the solicitation of other students and shared responsibility in the student campaign goal being reached. A comparison to student donors who were not intimately involved in the success of the student campaign or non-student donors is not included.

In regard to student engagement, additional factors exists that may change a student's perception of his or her overall campus experience. For example, if the student balances several hours of work with his or her academic time during the week he or she may not be involved in campus programs which may help to form emotional ties to the institution. Online, commuting, and non-traditional students may also be limited by the amount of time they engage in the campus community due to other obligations that restrict their physical presence on the campus.

Even though the overall college experience is a key determining factor in giving, there are also a significant number of intervening variables that impact donations from alumni (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2002; Leslie & Ramey, 1988). According to these scholars, incoming student ability, student's socio-economic background, smaller, more personal campus environment, amount of money spent on student-financial aid, and career path and achievement are some of the variables that highly correlate with levels of alumni giving. These variables are likely to have the same

impact on a current student's decision to give. This study did not seek to explore these variables as student inputs, yet I as the researcher acknowledge that these variables will impact the outcome of student giving.

Limitations also exist in the consistency and reporting of participation data on student philanthropy programs. A standard for collecting and reporting that data to a single clearinghouse or searchable database, much the same as alumni giving, does not exist lending to inconsistencies in how institutions may record and report the success of their student philanthropy programs.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This study sought to examine student involvement in student philanthropy

programs and to determine the impact of that involvement on giving.  This chapter first

provides data to highlight the institutional characteristics; then is organized by the

responses to the research questions that guided this study.

When asked of campus leaders what institutional philosophy exists behind their

efforts to involve current enrolled students in giving, responses were often the same.  In

summary, "student philanthropy programs exist to educate students on the importance of

private giving and the sources of institutional revenue" (Administrator, Institution B).

Similarly stated, "It's about educating students about philanthropy, before they leave, so

when they graduate and get our phone calls and emails, they will hopefully respond"

(Administrator, Institution A).  Institutions are also receiving less financial support from

state allocations spurring the need to cultivate additional donors.  As graduating class

sizes are getting bigger alumni giving percentage is going down and institutions place

value in this percentage as a factor towards institutional rank (Administrator, Institution

A).  Administrators realize that students are not going to donate large amounts of money

so the focus is on education and awareness towards giving to the institution in order to

familiarize students with the need to give before being solicited as graduates.

The three institutions studied had varied approaches to involving students in

student philanthropy programs and had annual giving staff and established budgets

dedicated to implementing education and fundraising initiatives.  Each institution also

had a volunteer student philanthropy committee closely advised by the annual giving

personnel that carried out activities throughout the year.  The student philanthropy

committees also supported other advancement and alumni program efforts for the

institutions.  The philanthropy committee members were very involved students on

campus, holding leadership roles in other organizations such as student government and

Greek life.  "A student's involvement plays a role in the success of student philanthropy

programs by expanding the network and reach of the student philanthropy committee

through the other student organizations" (Administrator, Institution C).

Through interviews conducted with staff, I discovered that each institution also

had a long history of involving students in Senior Class Gift program solicitation.  These

programs were targeted at graduating undergraduate students and historically directed

towards raising funds for a single campus project funded by that graduating class.  I was

surprised to learn of the frustrations of annual giving officers that existed due to the

foundation holding multiple years of senior funds designated towards a single project that

were not fully funded and carried out because funds to cover the expense of the projects

were not raised.  Since the early 2000s, officials at the three institutions evaluated their

student giving programs in an attempt to find a strategy to engage all undergraduate

students in giving and to assist the senior class in reaching a goal that impacted the

campus community.

The reported dollars raised and participation percentages of student giving

suggested that development officials at these institutions are seeing success from their

efforts.  In 2011, interview respondents reported receiving $35,000 (Institution A) to

$117,000 (Institution C) in student contributions and pledges to support various programs on each campus. Alumni respondents also stated they have continued to contribute to the institution and at larger amounts than they expected due to their involvement in giving as an undergraduate. "The experience was critical in the depth of my giving I think I would have given something as an alumnus had I been asked it just wouldn't be as big and I would not spend time convincing others they should give too" (Alumnus, Institution B).

General Institution Data

Based on responses to interview questions and institutional data publicly available, the three participating public institutions appear to offer similar campus experiences for students. Shown in Table A, each institution had similar undergraduate enrollments in the study year, similar total student expenses, each had nearly three-fourths or more of students receiving any type of aid; and all share the Carnegie Classification of Research Universities – very high activity. Institution C, however, has a 99% admit rate possibly impacting the significant difference in overall graduation rate.

Table 1

*General Institutional Data*

| Institution | Location | Total UG Enroll | Total Enroll | UG Admit Rate | Overall Grad Rate (For first time, full time students matriculating 2004) | 2010 Est. Total Student Expense (Tuition, Fees, Room and Board) | % Re'vg Any Aid |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | Northeast Town: Fringe | 17,345 | 25,498 | 54% | 80% | $24,738 | 80% |
| B | Southeast Suburb | 18,579 | 29,390 | 32% | 88% | $20,305 | 70% |
| C | Midwest Town: Remote | 19,205 | 23,588 | 99% | 59% | $19,244 | 84% |

*Note:* UG = undergraduate

(National Center for Education Statistics. 2011)

From a historical perspective, each public institution is more than 120 years old, one of which was established more than 200 years ago and claims to be the nation's

oldest state university.  Data was collected from the Integrated Postsecondary Education

Data System (IPEDS) and the *U.S. News and World Report* (Table B) to gain a better

understanding of each institution's Alumni Giving Percentage and recent endowment

totals.  Institutions A and C have similar size endowments at $248 million and $344

million, respectively.  Institution B has a much larger endowment total exceeding $2.3

billion.  However, as reported by *U. S. News and World Report* (2009), each institution

had similar percent of alumni giving, ranging between 18 and 22 percent.

Table 2

*Value of Endowment Assets 2007-2009 and U.S. News Institutional Rank and Alumni Giving 2010*

| Institution | 2007 Endowment Funds | 2008 Endowment Funds | Percent Change in Endowment 2007-2008 | 2009 Endowment Funds | Percentage Change in Endowment 2008-2009 | US News Institutional Rank (Alumni Giving Rank) | US News Alumni Giving Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | $248,147,876 | $232,969,030 | -6.5% | $245,845,448 | 5.5% | Top 70 | 19% |
| B | $2,178,924,581 | $2,335,824,025 | 7.2% | $1,903,574,557 | -22.7% | Top 30 (38) | 22% |
| C | $344,741,503 | $337,210,624 | -2.2% | $259,808,538 | -29.7% | *Third Tier | 18% |

(Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems, 2011; U.S. News and World Report, 2010)

Finally, to further illuminate an understanding of students' perception of the

institution's student experience, I conducted a search on each institution's website for the

most recent National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results.  Shown in Table C,

this data was not used as a control variable in this study, but simply as information to

help understand the institutional climate.  I focused on item frequency distributions for

survey questions 13 and 14 offered to both freshmen and seniors which reports student's

rating of their entire experience and whether they would select the institution again.

Generally, responses from freshmen and senior respondents indicated high satisfaction

with their educational experience.  When asked if they would choose the same institution

again responses of "Probably Yes" and "Definitely Yes" ranged from 85 to 92 percent for

freshmen and 83 to 90 percent for seniors.  All three institutions have similarly high

responses favorably reflecting both freshmen and senior students' impressions of their experience.

Table 3

*National Survey of Student Engagement Item Frequency Distributions*

| Survey Question | Responses | Institution A (2009) * | | | | Institution B (2008) | | | | Institution C (2007)* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | First Year (FY) Students | | Seniors (SR) | | First Year (FY) Students | | Seniors (SR) | | First Year (FY) Students | | Seniors (SR) | |
| 13. How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? | Poor | 12 | 1% | 13 | 1% | 5 | 0% | 11 | 1% | 6 | 1% | 8 | 1% |
| | Fair | 119 | 10% | 113 | 12% | 88 | 6% | 73 | 6% | 60 | 10% | 68 | 10% |
| | Good | 667 | 52% | 525 | 50% | 560 | 39% | 385 | 32% | 316 | 53% | 339 | 46% |
| | Excellent | 473 | 37% | 377 | 36% | 771 | 55% | 728 | 61% | 215 | 36% | 314 | 43% |
| | Total | 1,271 | 100% | 1,028 | 100% | 1,424 | 100% | 1,197 | 100% | 597 | 100% | 729 | 100% |
| 14. If you could start over again, would you go to the *same institution* you are now attending? | Definitely No | 42 | 3% | 43 | 4% | 21 | 2% | 26 | 2% | 16 | 3% | 18 | 3% |
| | Probably No | 143 | 11% | 134 | 13% | 88 | 6% | 82 | 7% | 52 | 8% | 57 | 8% |
| | Probably Yes | 508 | 40% | 391 | 38% | 434 | 30% | 279 | 23% | 196 | 33% | 234 | 32% |
| | Definitely Yes | 579 | 45% | 460 | 45% | 883 | 62% | 810 | 68% | 334 | 56% | 420 | 58% |
| | Total | 1,272 | 100% | 1,028 | 100% | 1,426 | 100% | 1,197 | 100% | 597 | 100% | 729 | 100% |

*Note:* Most recent data as of 2011. Data publicly available on each institutions Institutional Research or Assessment website.

As no institution's characteristics studied are the same, there are several similarities between each. Shown in the previous tables, key areas such as undergraduate enrollment, cost of attendance, alumni giving percentages, and students' response to satisfaction with their collegiate experience might create similar environments at each institution for student philanthropy programs to be researched. The analyses of the research questions that guided this study are further outlined below in this chapter.

Education and Fundraising Campaigns That Involve

Undergraduate Students in Giving

For each of the three institutions studied, involving students in giving to the institution had some similarities but also had varied differences in history and strategy. For this section, I decided to reflect the stories of each institution separately to provide a full view of the student philanthropy programs at each institution.

*Institution A*

For Institution A, processes in how the Senior Class Gift was collected and recorded was challenged under new senior leadership in the Office of Advancement upon realizing contributions from parents on behalf of their student were being counted towards the student goal. They made a decision to no longer solicit and count parent contributions, greatly impacting the amount of money received and further minimizing the chance of the senior class donors to fund a significant project on campus. The following year, in 2009, advancement administrators established a new group of student volunteers, a student philanthropy committee, to evaluate the current student giving efforts at the institution and develop a new process that would be directed to all students allowing students to make donations to support the many programs and departments at the institution. That summer, a student intern working with an annual gift coordinator and the student philanthropy committee conducted research and prepared a proposal for the Board of Trustees and advancement leadership on the new, open approach targeting all students. In recounting the board meeting, the administrator stated:

> The board understood the challenges of future alumni support and the private, Ivy
> League institutions have been soliciting their students since the day they showed
> up on campus. I do not know if we are going to get to that mentality, but we are
> working on it (Administrator, Institution A).

Based on further responses from this administrator, the presentation made by students received overwhelming support and a trustee member expressed additional interest in helping the efforts to be successful in its first year:

An annual giving staff member and I met with the board and we brought with us

the student intern who had done a lot of research about student philanthropy

programs. He proposed what we thought we should do. My colleague and I sat

back to see who was taking interest and who was excited about it. This one

particular board member was asking a lot of questions and showed a particular

interest (Administrator, Institution A).

This trustee board member, a successful 1960s alumnus, later offered a matching gift of

$25,000 challenging the student body to donate the same amount thus setting the

expectation of success for the student philanthropy committee and the annual giving staff.

If the students contributed $25,000 or more he would give $25,000 to the institution's

general foundation fund. The student respondents at this institution stated the matching

gift challenge helped to create some urgency they could express in making the gift now

and their donation having double the impact. They appreciated the alumnus who was

willing to invest $25,000 in them. "I think that is pretty amazing for a donor because it is

a lot of money. It basically doubles my gift and it goes back to help me" (Student,

Institution A).

In response to the trustee's commitment the institution's annual giving

administrators had to shift resources and priorities to meet the board members

expectations and ensure campus success. Financial resources for student philanthropy

education were previously allocated for the fiscal year but an increase was needed. "We

used to print a booklet for graduating seniors and it was costing around $12,000 to print.

We shifted these funds to support the matching gift challenge" (Administrator, Institution

A). According to the interviews, a total budget of nearly $15,000 was established to

create education and fundraising programs, marketing, and direct appeals.  Human

resources were also reallocated.  An annual giving staff person now focused more time

on advising the student philanthropy committee, cultivation of student affinity groups,

and administrative tasks associated with planning and implementation of student

philanthropy programs.  The telethon solicitation team also focused more on calling

students during semester breaks and the student volunteer team of more than twenty

students actively worked all year to solicit contributions.  A staff person in marketing

also worked with the student philanthropy committee and the trustee to develop a video

directed towards students as the audience.

Over the course of the 2010 – 2011 academic year, two centrally coordinated

programs took place on campus to engage students.  The first program, *Philanthropy Day*

was held during the fall semester and served as an educational event to thank donors. In

stating the purpose of *Philanthropy Day* an administrator stated, "We talked to students

about the importance of a gift to the Foundation and that was our education program"

(Administrator, Institution A).  *Philanthropy Day* was a full day of awareness on the

impact of giving to the institution's Foundation and students were invited to write thank

you cards to donors.  Students were also encouraged to change their Facebook profile for

the day to promote the common message of *Philanthropy Day*.  While students engaged

other student volunteers and staff, they were educated on the impact of donations made to

the foundation and the importance of everyone giving back.  To ensure the message was

consistent, student philanthropy committee volunteers were trained by staff on what

information was important to share.

I learned about the program and recited the same speech to students. I said

exactly what I was supposed to say and it impacted other students. I gave one

student my spill and then he wanted to join our group (Student, Institution A).

Students were also encouraged to write thank you cards and, by doing so, were

entered into a drawing for one of two Apple iPads provided by another one of the

Institution's trustee members. The annual giving office used the thank you cards to thank

alumni donors for their contribution. The day was also used to train student philanthropy

committee volunteers on how they could communicate asking for a gift.

Even when we are meeting alumni for the first time you cannot just ask them for

money. That is not how it works. You need to build a relationship, educate them,

build trust, and provide them a good reason to give. Same with students. You

cannot just say; "Jason, can I have $5?" We used this as a training to teach the

student philanthropy committee about how they can communicate asking for a

gift (Administrator, Institution A).

The second program, held early in the spring semester, was a fundraising program

called *Tuition Runs Out* day. This program was a symbolic day when tuition and fees no

longer supported a student's education and other forms of support including private

donations covered the remaining expense. "*Tuition Runs Out* is where we really solicited

for student donations. We talked about our challenge donor and how he can help them

impact the campus" (Administrator, Institution A). The video promoting the matching

gift challenge was sent to all students via email and also encouraged students to stop by

the *Tuition Runs Out* booth and make their contribution. Student volunteers and annual

giving staff solicited students for a contribution or pledge of any amount to any fund

supporting the institution.  Students were given promotional materials including t-shirts and lapel pins for stopping by the booth and hearing the message of the student philanthropy committee.

Outside of these two events student volunteers along with the annual giving staff person working with student philanthropy programs made presentations in student organization meetings and in classrooms.

We spoke to sections of the first-year class, residential assistants, community volunteer program leaders, Greek organizations, student government leadership, and even the marching band.  We did a presentation on campus traditions and giving to the foundation to illustrate giving as a tradition.  This was very successful because we had a smaller audience; we could tailor the message to the group, and could answer questions.  We actually had a sub-committee of the student philanthropy committee, called the Outreach Committee that scheduled and help deliver these presentations around campus (Administrator, Institution A).

Several efforts were taken to educate students on the importance of giving and to encourage students to give towards the matching gift challenge.  The student telethon callers also dedicated several weeks to make calls to students to explain the challenge grant and solicit students for contributions and pledges.  Periodically, tables were also set up in dining locations and residence halls staffed by student volunteers to solicit contributions and pledges from students.  Results of these efforts are categorized in subsequent research question analyses.

*Institution B*

The Annual Giving staff at Institution B faced similar challenges in 2006

promoting a Senior Class Gift contribution directed towards a single campus project. The

senior class gift program had a rich history and had been in place since 1900. By 2006 it

was mildly successful "with participation rates around nine to ten percent"

(Administrator, Institution B). Contributions were remaining stable and not increasing

even though the graduating class sizes were getting larger. The Senior Class Gift focused

on a single class project, voted on by the senior class students, and for the past few years

the project was not seen favorably.

> The entire class would vote on what the gift would be and maybe one-third of the
>
> class would vote. The project chosen would win by a narrow margin from a
>
> fraction of the class and there was a group of students who did not like it
>
> (Administrator, Institution B).

As a result of low student interest, the senior class project was not fully funded and many

previous projects intended for a specific purpose did not have the necessary fund

balances needed to complete the project. Administrators feared the funds needed to carry

out the projects would never be contributed by that class and the costs associated with the

project continue to increase more than the original goal. At Institution B, a student

philanthropy committee of student volunteers also existed but was not meeting

expectations of the annual giving staff and its purpose was not valued. In an effort to re-

evaluate the entire student giving process a student intern was directed to research student

giving programs at other institutions and to create a proposed new process for the

institution.

After a semester of research and consultation with the annual giving staff and student philanthropy committee, it was decided that the contributions from the senior class should not be directed towards a single class project; rather to any fund at the foundation supporting the Institution. Additionally, all students, not just seniors, should be solicited for participation in an annual giving campaign. Seniors would still be recognized separately if their contribution was at or above the suggested amount of their graduating year (ex. $20.11 for 2011 graduates) and freshman, sophomore, and junior class students were encouraged to give at least $5.00. "Since making the change, participation from the senior class grew from 9% to 42%." (Administrator, Institution B).

A separate senior class committee of more than 70 students, known as *Class Marshals*, also had a long history of existence at this institution and created activities for the senior class that included soliciting for the senior class project each year. Membership in this committee was viewed as an honor among peers and was an extension of the student government. As part of the change in the process, the student philanthropy committee and *Class Marshals* teamed together to solicit as many students as possible to make a contribution or pledge to the foundation. Student telethon callers also targeted students over the course of the year soliciting contributions and pledges towards the student annual campaign.

According to the interviews, an annual budget of $12,000 - $13,000 existed for the Senior Class Gift and had now been reprioritized to create giving education and fundraising programs, marketing, and direct appeals. "It's a small budget compared to all of annual giving but having some money for these programs is significant. It's just enough to publish our materials and get them out to students" (Administrator, Institution

B).  Given the immediate success from the program changes a full-time staff person was added to annual giving as Director of Student Giving in 2009.  Two additional student interns supported the annual giving office staff and the president of the volunteer student philanthropy committee was also paid hourly to work in the office 10 hours a week.

To maintain the history of the senior class gift program, the now called *Class Campaign* was branded alongside general student giving.  Students were introduced to a visual logo specifically designed for their class when they attended orientation as freshmen.  Stickers and other promotional items bearing the logo were used throughout the four years to build a brand identity among each student class, which was later used to promote class giving.  "We have a big banner made of the class logo and hang it in the student union.  All of the logos for the four classes enrolled are hung year-around" (Administrator, Institution B).  When the graduation year approaches the senior class, the logo for that year is used in more locations for promoting senior class activities led by the *Class Marshals* and for the *Class Campaign*.  "The *Class Marshals* plan service projects and social nights.  They send an email telling you to arrive early and sit in the same section at a game.  The class logo banner is always there and you know you are part of a bigger group when you arrive" (Student, Institution B).

In 2007, the senior advancement officer shared with the chancellor the changes implemented to the *Senior Class Gift* program and the Chancellor at the time made a challenge to the graduating class.  He promised that if 25 percent of the graduating class participated in the new giving program he would allocate $20,000 from an anonymous private fund to the student need-based scholarship fund.  This gift challenge set the expectations for both students and the annual giving staff to ensure every effort was taken

to achieve the goal. A donor matched challenge gift continued to be a strategy taken each subsequent year at Institution B to motivate students to donate during the annual *Class Campaign.*

All students were solicited to give throughout the year but public emphasis on meeting the class goal was targeted towards the graduating class. An internal goal of 5% participation from freshmen, sophomores, and juniors was set to measure future success of each class. "The *Class Campaign* is very public. Students are aware from day one what goal they are trying to reach. It's usually a percent or two higher than the previous graduating class" (Administrator, Institution B). Email solicitations to all students were distributed throughout the academic year and were usually scheduled around other student philanthropy program dates. "We solicit undergraduates 4 or 5 times during the year. The emails are usually centered around our events sharing information and asking them to make a contribution" (Administrator, Institution B). Efforts were also taken to target certain populations of students. "We target scholarship recipients because they have benefited directly from private giving. This year we are also targeting study abroad students because that is popular here and students want to support those programs" (Administrator, Institution B). Student philanthropy committee members make other solicitations to their peers and are incentivized with a small gift if they each secure 25 donations or pledges in the *Class Campaign*.

Student donors at Institution B were also recognized for their contribution. Those who were not graduating during the calendar year were recognized in a donor honor roll found on the Institution's foundation website in a section dedicated to student giving programs. Donors graduating during their class year received a Class of 20## car decal

with the class logo included in the design.  If an individual student donated a gift in the amount of their graduation year or more (ex. $20.11), they also received a lapel pin to wear at graduation.  As a public memorial, the results of participation by the graduation class in the *Class Campaign* class was recognized by a stone paver at the campus bell tower that included the class logo and the total percent participation from the class engraved on the stone.

Since 2007 at this institution, educational programs coordinated by the student philanthropy committee, had also been implemented to teach students the importance of giving to the foundation and to create awareness of the need for private giving.  The main program during the fall semester was a tuition runs out program called *Stop: Tuition Ends Here*.  A red stop sign was used as the backdrop for messages informing students of the symbolic day when tuition no longer supported a student's education and other forms of support including private donations covered the remaining expense.  "Student's net tuition and fees were only 10.2 percent of the Institution's revenue source and this day marks when 10% of the revenue is over" (Administrator, Institution B).

A similar program, called *Tag Day, was* hosted in the spring.  "This day, usually in late February is the day when classes would end if private support was not supporting the Institution" (Administrator, Institution B).  Large price tags, similar to something observed on the *Price is Right* television show, were placed all over campus to let students know a large amount of resources exist at the Institution because of private giving.  "The price tags include a PAID stamp with a statement that reads; 'PAID by friends, alumni, and students'" (Administrator, Institution B).  Student philanthropy

committee also set up a booth at the student union to hand out *Tag Day* t-shirts and solicit students to make donations or pledges.

Smaller programs had also taken place each semester. A *Day of Giving Thanks* program was held each semester to encourage students to write "thank you" cards to faculty or staff. "When students stopped by our table at the union to write a 'thank you' card we would ask them for a donation. We would ask them to consider their gift to the department or area their faculty or staff person worked" (Student, Institution B). Student donors during the semester were also recognized for their contribution. "We wanted to do something to say 'thank you' to student donors so we set up a donor break room during finals week. We have donuts, coffee, ice cream, and games" (Student, Institution B). Results of student philanthropy programs at Institution B are categorized in subsequent research question analyses.

*Institution C*

At the time of this study, Institution C also had a volunteer student philanthropy committee in existence for nearly thirty years advised by annual giving staff within the Office of Advancement. Until 2006 the primary purpose of this committee was to serve as student ambassadors at alumni and foundation functions. During this time, the student committee also conducted limited philanthropy education programs such as *Philanthropy Day* to promote the importance of giving to the Foundation but it was not a consistent part an annual education or giving strategy. Institution C did not have a senior class giving program.

In 2006 the annual giving staff decided to re-evaluate the purpose of the committee to determine if it was still meeting the expectations of the staff and the needs of the Institution's Foundation. This administrator described the result of this evaluation;

> We decided we needed a change so we went through a reorganization of the student group and began assessing the impact they were having. We refocused that group to serve as ambassadors of philanthropy and began engaging them with alumni at a much higher level. We began doing a lot more professional development in terms of training students and in terms of how to interact and participate in the cultivation and stewardship process (Administrator, Institution C).

During this time the Institution was also launching the public phase of its capital campaign and dedicated time educating the student philanthropy committee on the process. In an effort to support the process, the students felt compelled to create a student donor program as a way of contributing to the pubic phase of institutions capital campaign. Closely advised by the annual giving office staff person, the students were encouraged to conduct a mini-feasibility study with university senior administrators and other students to determine if there was interest and support in such a program.

> Senior administrators were impressed students were willing to make such a contribution and offered administrative and financial support from the Institution. The Vice President for Student Life and Dean of Students (one person) was extremely supportive of the idea and made himself available for future questions or discussions the students would have (Administrator, Institution C).

Further conversations with senior leadership suggested a need-based award for students who have exhausted all financial options was an area of great need for students. At Institution C more than 85% of the students at the institution were on some type of financial aid (Administrator, Institution C). The student philanthropy committee began talking to students about supporting need-based awards and learned that donating to support need-based awards was of high interest to students. That year the first student campaign was launched by the student philanthropy committee directing 100% of the funds donated towards a newly established need-based award program. Student financial hardships supported by need-based awards was a need that many students resonated with.

It was about me or my roommate who could one day be impacted by tragedy or hardship. It was something that we saw happening to other students. When we spoke to fraternities, sororities, or others you could see the light bulb go off. This is something that could really happen. We had a lot of opportunity to expand the message and make an impact (Alumnus, Institution C).

The first year, the Foundation Board of Trustees agreed to underwrite the student philanthropy committee expenses and the students set a financial goal of $3,500. Surprisingly, the student campaign surpassed the $3,500 goal the first day of soliciting their peers and the student committee, after consulting with the annual giving staff, raised their goal to $35,000 for the first year. After the first year of the student campaign, a local business was identified by annual giving staff as looking for a way to have its brand in front of students while financially supporting the Institution. The annual giving staff person worked with members of the student philanthropy committee to prepare a proposal for the business to underwrite the expense of the student campaign. "After five

years, the same company has increased their financial support and two additional businesses provide significant in-kind contributions" (Administrator, Institution C). The respondent did not share annual expenses yet the budget allocated for the 2011 campaign expenses was $45,000.

The student campaign had also become a year-around cycle of identifying student leadership, planning, and implementation that requires the support of a dedicated annual giving staff person and several other foundation staff during the several campaign events. "We now consider this one of our major annual giving initiatives. During the major weeks in the spring, all hands are on deck. Even our accounting team is at events taking contributions" (Administrator, Institution C). In implementing the student campaign, the student philanthropy committee was the governing body of the student campaign and members are part of the annual student campaign advisory board. The program has gained such popularity with students that now applications are solicited from the student body to serve as campaign co-chairs and the student philanthropy committee interviews and selects two to four co-chairs to lead the initiative. An honorary chair, historically an institution faculty or staff person, was also selected to serve as a spokesperson at various campaign events. In the early years of the campaign the honorary co-chair was important to the campaign success.

> We always try to pick someone on campus who is a faculty or staff member who has the name recognition to give it credibility. This was really important during the early years of the campaign. It was important to have the head basketball coach endorse the campaign. He was not active in any decisions being made but

he spoke about the student campaign at speaking engagements, was available to take pictures, and really endorsed the campaign (Alumnus, Institution C).

A campaign advisory board of 30 to 40 students was divided into separate smaller committees each with specific responsibilities for the campaign. The entire campaign advisory board also met collectively at different frequencies, depending on the time of year, to discuss progress and make decisions to ensure the student campaign goals were met. Intentional efforts were placed on recruiting and selecting students who represented many populations of the student body including international students, student government, Greek organizations, residence hall staff and students, club sports teams, and off campus students. According to one student, the student advisory board members were "eloquent, influential, intelligent, creative, and strategic thinkers" (Student, Institution C). Committees were formed to accomplish campaign preparation tasks. An additional 100 or more student volunteers were solicited to assist in making presentations to student groups, hosting campaign events, and volunteering at tables to solicit students during the main campaign week.

In preparation for the upcoming year's campaign, co-chairs were selected in April and attended a retreat in May to discuss the previous year's results and to set goals for the upcoming year. "Work continues over the summer reviewing the campaign process and making decisions on which aspects to keep, modify, or disregard" (Student, Institution C). Discussions also take place between the student philanthropy committee and the annual giving staff advisor as to which student populations were well represented donors—Greek students, honors students, etc.—and which groups could be targeted the upcoming year to improve campaign results—international students, off-campus students,

etc. In the first six weeks of fall semester, a full student advisory board were recruited and selected with intentional consideration to students who represented large student donor prospect groups and under performing student groups. "At one of the first advisory board meetings we got to hear the stories of students who benefited from need-based financial support and were willing to discuss their hardship with us. This really made the campaign real" (Student, Institution C).

In late fall semester, intentional efforts to build momentum around the campaign were taken. The student philanthropy committee worked with athletics to provide time during a home basketball game, the more popular sport on campus, to unveil the campaign logo to students. The student and honorary co-chairs were also introduced. Advisory board members then began to speak with student groups to introduce the campaign logo and solicit volunteers and group donations. In reflecting on the campus culture after five years of conducting the campaign on campus, one student stated: "Students know we are coming. Some student organizations give us checks when we come present to them and their members are going to volunteer and donate individually" (Student, Institution C). As more students volunteer to help spread the message of the campaign, continual efforts to visit groups of students were taken.

In January and February, efforts were directed towards getting students to make an early contribution and building excitement about the public campaign week. "In late February or early March all of the efforts culminate into a public campaign week of organized solicitations at tables in the student union and public places on campus" (Student, Institution C). Students were encouraged to donate a minimum of $10 and receive a t-shirt with the campaign logo in exchange for their contribution. The t-shirt

has become a popular exchange for student gifts. This is mostly attributed to student donors being asked to wear their t-shirt to a designated basketball game where the grand total of how much was raised was announced. The basketball game also serves as a venue to collect any final contributions to the campaign.

*Summary*

Based on the information revealed in participant interviews and institutional documents reviewed, each of the three institutions have made significant investments in student philanthropy programs and employed a comprehensive, year-around approach to educate and solicit students to make donations to the institutions' foundations. Institutions A and B have similar strategies with *Philanthropy Day* and *Tuition Runs Out*-type programming to capture students' attention while also promoting the generosity of a matching gift donor to motivate students to donate towards reaching the campaign goal. Unlike Institutions A and B, Institution C did not currently have a senior class giving or any type of student giving programs in place prior to 2006. By involving students, this allowed for a unique student philanthropy program to be developed for the specific needs of the student population.

Each institution invested financial and human resources and relied on a student volunteer committee to engage peers in education and participating in giving campaigns. Through the student philanthropy programs, efforts were taken for students to gain an awareness of the importance to giving to each institution's foundation and to teach students how private funds support their educational experience. Students were given the opportunity to express their gratitude for private support through programs such as *A Day of Giving Thanks* and giving selflessly to support need-based student aid.

The outcome of cultivating giving was measured by the donations received as a result of the campaign experience. Turning students into donors is a socialization process that involves orienting them to voluntary giving, actively engaging students in development activities, and strategically timing program initiatives (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993). Each of the three institutions engaged students in environments created by student philanthropy programs to educate students and encourage their participation in student giving.

Students Response to the Environments of Student Philanthropy Programs

that Impact Student Engagement

Astin's (1984) Input-Environment-Outcome Model was developed to assess success of a student's educational experience by examining a student's background and how that background interacts with the campus experience. The modified question set for this study allowed for participant responses of impact on student engagement to be categorized within the I-E-O Model in response to Research Question 2. Analysis of the *Inputs*, *Environment*, and *Outputs* are organized as such in this section.

*Inputs*

Astin (1984) described inputs as the background students bring to college. Though I was not able to identify the entering characteristics of student participants, characteristics of student donors and student philanthropy committee volunteers were explored by asking each interview participant at each institution their observation of the characteristics of student donors and of student volunteer participants in student philanthropy committees.

*Characteristics of Student Donors*

Respondents found it difficult to generalize the characteristics of student donors. Donations were received from students with various backgrounds and experiences and both Institution A and Institution C strategically sought prospective donors from various populations of students (band members, off-campus students, international students, scholarship recipients, etc.). Many respondents agreed student donors were invested in the success of their institution and were impacted by their experience. "I think that most student donors have been impacted by something here that makes them proud to be a student and they have an appreciation for giving back. I had a freshman give $100. You just never know" (Administrator, Institution A). An alumnae respondent stated, "Student donors were invested in their major, student government, club sports, a society, or something. They loved the Institution. They got it when we asked for money and they donated to their area of interest" (Alumnus, Institution B). "There was no common trait among student donors other than caring about other students at the Institution" (Student, Institution C).

The characteristics of prospective donors are not easily determined, yet respondents articulated engaged students are more likely to give. This proved to be consistent with the review of literature related to why alumni give (Ashcraft, 1995; McNulty, 1977; Minniear, 2006; Pumerantz, 2004; Sun, 2005; Weerts & Ronca, 2009). These studies highlight the student experience and active student involvement as being positively correlated with the decisions of alumni to give. Respondents of this study indicated the same is observed of student donors.

*Characteristics of Student Philanthropy Committee*

The inclination to give was also strengthened by the student's close engagement in the implementation of student philanthropy programs and involvement with the student philanthropy committee. Similar characteristics of student philanthropy volunteers were reported. The students had an interest in growing support for their institution, understood the importance of philanthropy, and were involved in many sub groups of the student body. "We have a lot of students that are interested in non-profit work; a lot interested in marketing. For the most part, they also have an understanding of philanthropy" (Administrator, Institution A). Institution A promoted the further development of knowledge and skills associated with fundraising, project management, presentations, marketing, and networking as part of their promotional material for philanthropy committee applicants. This further attracted students with background interest in those areas. A student respondent from Institution B described fellow committee members as being very involved on campus and represented a diverse student body. Institution C strategically sought the leadership and support of students from all facets of the study body in order to reach as many students possible with the campaign.

The students were intentional in making sure the committee was not just Student Government Association students or Greek leaders on campus. They truly wanted it to be a university wide, student body campaign. It would be very easy to reach the natural leaders on campus within Student Government or ambassadors. I feel they did a nice job of going beyond the easy connections and to attract student volunteers from all living groups, academic units, clubs and organizations (Administrator, Institution C).

In previous studies, both Conley (1999) and Friedman (2003) found significant difference in donor participation rates of student philanthropy committee members versus non members citing those students were well informed about the importance of giving and had developed a personal relationship with advancement staff.  Being more informed about the importance of giving and having a personal appreciation for advancement work was two observed characteristics of student philanthropy committee members found in this research.

*Environment*

Student philanthropy programs at each institution created environments to engage all students in giving.  Environmental characteristics identified in this study included education programs, cause relevant to students, relationship with annual giving staff, and the membership in the student philanthropy committee influenced the output of student giving expected by institutional administrators.  Each environmental characteristic is explored below.

*Education Programs*

Engaging students in *Tuition Runs Out*, *Philanthropy Day*, and other educational programs exposed students to the importance of giving to support the institution.  Prior to these experiences, students did not consider their institution as being a philanthropic area of consideration.  "Students do not realize you can give to the Institution and the Institution needs money" (Student, Institution B).  These programs were designed to educate a large number of students on campus by providing materials, creating opportunities for peer-to-peer interaction, and place student philanthropy committee members in comfortable settings to engage others in giving.  "Asking students to give

was difficult at first. I thought I would always get told 'no.' I was more confident though after talking to students at Philanthropy Day" (Student, Institution A). Institution C did not host formal *Philanthropy Day* or *Tuition Runs Out*-type programs. Students, instead, made presentations at student organization meetings throughout the academic year to share the importance of giving to support the need-based campaign.

*Cause Relevant to Students*

For Institutions A and B, a matching donor gift assisted administrators and student volunteers to create an environment where student giving was support by an outside donor doubling the impact of the student contribution. "Basically if I give $1 it becomes $2 for my institution" (Student, Institution A). Institution A capitalized on the matching gift donor's willingness to publically challenge the students to participate in student giving by having him star in a video targeted at the student audience. The donor took photos, which were later enhanced to portray him as a cartoon super hero of philanthropy to the institution. The video emphasized his wealth as being a result of his successful experience from the institution and displayed his cartoon likeness counting gold coins, sailing on a yacht, and riding a limousine through campus.

> If you had pulled me aside two years ago and said we were going to create a video
> with a major donor showcasing his success and lavish lifestyle I would have said
> NO. But it worked! It inspired students to give and also to be successful with
> your degree (Administrator, Institution A).

Institution B did not market the matching gift donor in the same way. The matching gifts of both institutions; however, did give student volunteers a cause to associate giving to the institution. "We could tell students to help us reach our goal so

this donor would also give" (Student, Institution B). Students at Institution C found the need-based support for other students to be the relevant cause worth asking others to support. "We know other students and know why they love the Institution. I can ask many of them to give to this and they will" (Institution C). Tying fundraising efforts to a cause at all Institutions appeared to be an important factor.

*Relationship with Annual Giving Staff*

At each of the three institutions a common underlying theme began to develop through conversations with interview participants. The annual giving staff person directly working with student philanthropy programs continued to be praised for their enthusiasm, willingness to champion student ideas, and their passion in ensuring student philanthropy programs were to be a success at the institution. Astin (1984) suggested student personnel workers would probably occupy a more important role in institutional operations because student personnel workers frequently operate on an intimate basis with students. They are in a unique position to monitor involvement and work with individuals in an attempt to increase involvement. I found that the depth of the relationship between the student volunteers and the annual giving staff person attributed to the student's willingness to give of their time and energy to solicit peers for contributions.

> She has been a role model to me in this process. Truthfully, she does so much of the work. I feel like we tell her what she is doing. She shows me that hard work and confidence can really pay off (Student, Institution B).

At the conclusion of my focus group with students at Institution A, two of the committee members followed me back to the annual giving staff person's office to see

how her day was going. Do to schedule delays, I had not gotten the chance to get to know the students personally but she immediately let me know that one of the students in our presence was from the same state as I reside. She then explained that was the reason he was an avid Atlanta Braves baseball fan. I observed her interactions with the philanthropy committee students and observed their appreciation for the time and attention she had invested in them personally. It was no surprise he turned to me with praise for how she is the best staff person on campus. The engagement of staff and students in this way contributed to the success and satisfaction of the student.

*Student Philanthropy Committee*

Being in the student philanthropy committee and the committee members' influenced on their peers are characteristics of the environment identified in this study that could also impact student engagement in student philanthropy programs. For students at Institution C, the student philanthropy committee maintained a high reputation as a significant student leadership experiences on the campus.

> I was not sure if I was going to be able to create my own identity here. After two years I got involved in a fraternity, student government, and the debate team. I also sought a position on the student philanthropy committee. The student philanthropy committee has been the most beneficial of all the things I have done. It has impacted me and I have impacted others (Student, Institution C).

Another student stated:

> The student philanthropy committee gave me the opportunity to lead. I'm not sure a lot of institutions give students the same opportunity. It has been a

wonderful journey for me to learn leadership skills and put leadership skills to

practice outside of the classroom (Student. Institution C).

Students at Institution A and B also valued their experience but accounted more from

respondents was their impact on other students to invoke giving. Demonstrated by two

students in the focus group at Institution A; "I am here because of him. I was walking by

the table one day and he reached out to me. I wondered why he was asking students to

give but he shared with me how we [students] can do more" (Student, Institution A). In

commenting on the influence of the committee on other students, one student respondent

stated, "It was positive. I think we spread the word about giving on campus. I'd say so

by the amount of money we raised" (Student, Institution A).

*Outcome*

In utilizing Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome model for this study, the

outcome explored was student giving. Pascarella (1985) theorized that student outcomes

are determined by the characteristic of the student and the experience he or she has on

campus. When examining the characteristics of student donors and student philanthropy

committee volunteers intermingled with the campus environments created through

student philanthropy programs, meaningful student giving was demonstrated. In each

case, administrators stated the student philanthropy programs met or exceeded the

financial goals at the institution. In the first year, students at Institution A were

motivated by the board members donor match of $25,000 and donated or pledged

$35,000 to funds supporting many programs on campus. The donor was so pleased that

he has agreed to provide another $25,000 matching gift for the upcoming 2011- 2012

academic year.

For Institution B, in 2007 the students exceed the Chancellor's participation goal of 25 percent by having 30.5 percent participation in the *Class Campaign*. Each year after, the graduating class has exceeded the previous percentage with the Class of 2011 contributing at 47 percent. The first student campaign at Institution C exceeded $35,000 in 2005 for need-based awards and in 2011 raised more than $117,000 from approximately 4000 students.

<div align="center">Benefits and/or Limitations for Institutional Administrators</div>

Information received for this study confirmed that engaging students in student philanthropy programs encouraged greater student giving. Student respondents reported having an overall positive experience enhanced by their involvement in student philanthropy, which influenced their decision to give. I also discovered a potential limitation due to the expense of operating student philanthropy programs. Though none of the participants stated the costs associated with student philanthropy programs outweighed the value of the program, the expense of staff salaries dedicated to these programs was not considered. Administrators however stated the purpose is to educate students. Education was considered by all to be a beneficial expense.

<div align="center">*Benefits of Engagement*</div>

The interview questions prompted by ideas gleaned from the National Survey of Student Engagement instrument provoked responses of students and alumni on how student philanthropy programs affected their overall student experience. Though no administrator nor student reported considering NSSE findings to estimate program success, and this data is not intended to infer a cause and effect related to donor giving, my analysis of each institution's NSSE scores (see Table 3) suggest a large percent of

students are likely to identify their campus experience as being positive. Interview participants confirmed this notion by identifying the characteristics of student donors to have a love for the Institution. Participants were also asked after participating in student philanthropy programs how likely are they to donate again to the institution.

When asked specifically how involvement in the student giving campaigns affected their college experience responses were targeted toward a stronger appreciation of how private support impacts the campus. "It impacted my view of how Institution A is run. I did not know that the institution depended on donations to run the school" (Student, Institution A). Students at Institution A wanted to be part of giving back. "I enjoyed my institution so much that I wanted to be part of promoting giving to the institution" (Alumnus, Institution A). An alumnus at Institution B also stated having a deeper feeling of want to give back. "Knowing I was giving money to the Institution and making that investment really tied me to the institution. I remember trying to encourage my friends to give and that experience changed how I looked at the institution" (Alumnus, Institution B). Students found their experience to have a purpose.

Out of all my experiences, there is a purpose that is undeniable. At the time of making a donation, it is absolutely worthwhile and you do not really question it. At least, I never questioned it. (Alumnus, Institution C).

When making contributions, student and alumni participants admitted to giving more than they thought they would have as a result of their experience with student philanthropy programs. For a student at Institution B, she stated she actually sat down and carefully considered which designations she would direct her gift towards. Students who reported how much they donated stated varying ranges from $25 to $100 each year.

Alumni participants also reported continuous giving after graduation and all giving at larger amounts than they expected. "As a result of my experience I do not want to just give a little. I want to give as much as I can. I know that giving a little bit more can make more impact" (Alumnus, Institution C).

Student philanthropy committee volunteers were exposed to advancement and alumni relation's staff and gained direct experience working with the foundation to raise money for the institution. As institutions continue to implement capital campaigns, groups of alumni campaign volunteers are being developed in the cultivation and solicitation process and have seen the direct impact private giving has on their alma mater. These programs have also exposed students to career opportunities in non-profit fields and two of the institutions studied have benefited by hiring student philanthropy committee members upon graduation to fill new or vacant positions in annual giving and alumni relations.

*Financial Limitation*

Unexpected findings suggest institutions were spending more financial resources than the amount of return. Administrators at Institutions A and B stated budgets for student philanthropy programs in the range of $10,000 to $15,000 and each had full-time staff persons and part-time student support dedicated to the delivery of the programs. The combined budget amounts and staff salaries, though not stated, must exceed the $25,000 to $35,000 raised by each institution. Salaries were also not shared for Institution C and a sponsor underwrote the campaign budget of $35,000. The scale of the campaign at Institution C though, required more staff time allocated to the process in addition a full-time staff and student employees working with student philanthropy

programs.  It was reported by an administrator at Institution C that the Annual Giving staff and the majority of the foundation business staff dedicated 100% of their time during the last four weeks of the student campaign.

An institution considering implementing student philanthropy programs should also consider the financial and non-financial commitment associated with the program. Administrators should realize the expense associated with student philanthropy programs are toward educating students and involving them in the gift giving process.  The financial return on student philanthropy programs are not likely to exist until several years later; however, every administrator interviewed convincingly believed student philanthropy programs will have a return on the investment for the institution.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As state allocations to higher education continue to decrease, public institutions have a growing need for private support (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). In addition, alumni contributions are considered by *US News and World Report* to be a reflection of the quality of the educational experience. The need for private support and the desire to increase institutional rank are two significant factors motivating institutions to increase alumni giving. While we know alumni donors attribute the student experience as being a key motivator in their decision to give, there is very little information on how current college students begin thinking about giving. This research was intended to assess the effects of student engagement in student philanthropy programs at three public, research universities and determine the impact on future giving.

Qualitative interviews with key staff members, students, and alumni at three public research universities sought to extend Astin's Input-Environment-Outcome Model (I-E-O Model) and situate giving as an outcome based on student engagement utilizing the interview protocol from Kuh et al. *Involving Colleges* study to identify out-of-class learning environments associated with student philanthropy programs. Exploring the varied differences of student philanthropy programs at each institution, I was able to document strategies of education and fundraising campaigns implemented to involve undergraduate students in giving.

For Institutions A and B, re-evaluation of the established senior class gift programs and the desire to engage all students led to changes in how student philanthropy programs were implemented.  Tasked to a student intern, conducting research on other student giving programs at private institutions led to the proposal of a more comprehensive process presented to senior administrators and board of trustees.  Senior gift campaigns were shifted away from supporting a single campus project and now towards students making a contribution to any existing fund supporting the many areas of campus.  This alleviated the historical problem of maintaining class accounts with a balance less than the expense of the proposed project and not all students being motivated to support the initiative.  Changes were also made to solicit seniors for a certain minimum gift amount as their suggested class contribution but to also solicit all undergraduate students to participate in giving to the student annual campaign.  Additionally, the use of programs such as *Tuition Runs Out* and *Philanthropy Day* helped students understand the value of private giving.

For Institutions A and B, matching donor gift challenges also played a role in motivating students to give.  Students expressed an appreciation for another donor making such a large investment in their college experience.  Efforts were taken to market the matching gift and to educate students on how the matching gift doubled the impact of their contribution.  The matching gift amount also set a financial or participation goal for student fundraising causing annual giving staff to reallocate resources to ensure the goal was met.  For institutions that do not have a strong history of donor support and are looking to change through starting a similar campaign, finding a matching gift donor may be difficult to obtain.  What is also unknown is the success rate of both Institution A and

B without the matching gifts. The matching gift donor for Institution A also had an expectation of raising $25,000 for the foundation before he would make his contribution whereas Institution B focused on supporting a percent of participation among students before making his gift. College students may not have the financial wherewithal to exceed a dollar amount goal and may be setting the campaign for failure.

Institution C's strategy focused on securing student financial support for a single fund to support other students at the institution. Key staff members and student philanthropy committee members focused on a year-around campaign solicitation to gain momentum of student support during the final week of the campaign. Student donors believed in the cause they were supporting but also valued their participation in the overall experience of the campaign. Student volunteers were considered prestigious members of the student community and the excitement surrounding the culminating event drew people to participate. The use of a campaign t-shirt and the emphasis placed on wearing that t-shirt to a specific basketball game was viewed by students to be a valuable recognition for their contribution.

For those students and alumni interviewed who worked closely with the institution's student philanthropy committees and student giving campaigns all reported difficulties in getting peers to make a donation. From simply having the confidence to make "the ask" to dealing with multiple rejections from their peers, they faced challenges in getting students to understand the importance of giving to the institution as a student. Even though *Tuition Runs Out* and *Philanthropy Day* educational programs at Institutions A and B were focused on making students aware of the percent of tuition and fees that

contributes to the institution's overall budget, student philanthropy committee volunteers still cite having paid tuition and fees as being a tough rejection to overcome.

Not to be overlooked, though, were the engagement of students through student philanthropy programs and the experience of the student philanthropy committee. Each one of the students and alumni respondents reported having been donors themselves and articulated their commitment to advocating for the support of their institution's foundation. They each found value and purpose in what they were trying to achieve for the institution and felt more educated as a result of their participation.

> When I initially got involved with the student-giving program I did not know a whole lot about it. I did not know a whole lot about giving to the Institution other than volunteering my time and service as opposed to money. But the more I learned about it, the more I respected Institution B. It really taught me that the institution cared about the future of its students and the sustainability of the University and the giving program. I think it made me care even more to see that they are thinking ahead in that way and they were not just doing what they thought was best in that moment (Alumnus, Institution B).

The use of student philanthropy committees at each institution to implement programs and make personal solicitation of peers was found to be important. Student philanthropy committee members engaged with advancement staff to enhance skills associated with fundraising, project management, presentations, marketing, and networking, all of which enhanced their personal success in college. In spite of some rejections from peers, student philanthropy committee members were influential in educating other students on the importance of giving to the foundation and in getting their peers to make

contributions.  At all three institutions, student and alumni respondents stated that their participation in student philanthropy programs was an opportunity to support the institution they felt personally invested in.  Institution C reported having the largest number of opportunities for students to be involved in the overall campaign and reported having the most student donors of the three institutions studied.  Institution C appeared to have impacted the campus culture and to have built a reputation on campus as being a successful annual fundraiser to support students at the institution.

Each of the three institutions also had dedicated staff and paid student support to implement student philanthropy programs.  The reprioritization of resources that had taken place at each institution may not be possible for another trying to recreate the same level of success.  Unexpected findings suggest institutions were spending more financial resources than the amount of financial return.  Each institution had dedicated staff and students but the salaries of these individuals were not expressed when discussing budget allocations to direct student philanthropy programs.  My findings suggest salaries and program budgets exceed the revenue generated through student giving.

This was not expressed as a limitation for institution administrators; rather their focus was on educating students on the importance of giving.  Each institution's administrator stated their commitment to educate students on the importance of giving back in an effort to establish future alumni donors.  This was viewed as an educational expense to increase student's engagement with the campaign process and was supported by senior campus leaders and the boards of trustees.  The responses from members of the institutions studied were still in favor of increased efforts toward student philanthropy programs and cited the efforts as an investment in the future development efforts of the

foundation. Institutional administrators also suggest they have seen an increase in young alumni giving and have plans to evaluate the probable connection to student philanthropy programs.

The dichotomy between dollars raised and percent participation was a debated outcome at each institution. In analyzing participants' interview data, the amount of money raised seemed to overshadow statements of consideration towards the percent of student participation. Institution B set participation goals tied to a matching gift donation, but Institution's A and C admitted to the amount of money raised in the campaign to be the priority. Institution A had intentions of measuring percent of student participation but was quickly redirected as a result of the financial goal required of the matching gift donor. Based on the information I received through interviews, meeting a financial goal does not suggest a significant level of student engagement. Amongst the reported success, opportunity still exists at all three institutions to increase the number of student participants in giving to the institution. For Institution A, only 1.9 percent of the student body participated in the institution's first campaign and there are nearly 20,000 students at Institution C who did not made a contribution during 2011. Institutions could focus on getting just $1.00 from every graduate to improve donor percentages but administrators interviewed at each institution would argue this strategy does not lead to long-term meaningful giving. Each institution took careful consideration in involving all students in giving whether the overall goal was financial or percentage of student donors.

Astin's (1984) I-E-O Model provided a framework to explore how students are responding to the institution's efforts. Looking at the characteristics of student donors and student philanthropy committee volunteers intermingled with the campus

environments created through student philanthropy programs showed the outcome

demonstrated by the institutions studied was student giving. Pascarella (1985) theorized

that student outcomes are determined by the characteristic of the student and the

experience he or she has on campus. What cannot be fully determined from the study is

its impact on alumni giving. Though alumni participants suggested they did donate to the

institution and at greater amounts than they expected, this study did not measure

longitudinal giving of participants over time to validate that theory.

Administrators were committed to educating students on the importance of giving

back and express the return on investment will happen long after the student graduates.

Administrators must acknowledge there will likely be a lag between starting student

giving programs and the impact those programs will have on alumni giving. Evidence of

this for the institutions is in the overall increase in student donor participation that has

been demonstrated in a short time.

> If you look at the timeline of student giving you can see the changes and it's
>
> growing. I think students are now realizing their dollars can go towards things
>
> that matter to them. I think students are more likely to give and its becoming part
>
> of the culture (Student, Institution B).

Additionally, students are donating to support areas of campus with an expressed need

that benefit from private contributions. Each of the institutions assisted students in

identifying campus needs, whether departments or need-based aid, and encouraged

students to begin their philanthropic support of these areas. Interviewees also indicated

that students were more philanthropic and service orientated than students in the past;

students though have never viewed their institution as a non-profit organization needing

donor support. Challenge exists in expanding the philanthropic interest of students to include their own institution.

Regardless of the study, we will not know the overall effect student philanthropy programs have on the entire development process and return on investment for the institution for decades. Even then, similar individual characteristics affecting why people give will still impact the measure of success. In order to make lasting impact on engagement through student philanthropy programs time for the further development of the institutional environment and its impact on student inputs is likely needed.

Student input and the influence of the environment is complex and dependent upon multiple variables, some not controlled by the institution. Even though existing research does not reflect quantitative measures of increased alumni support, qualitative data from this study suggests that institutions that invest financial and human resources in student philanthropy programs should anticipate an increase in future giving.

Recommendations for Further Research

In general, very little research has been conducted on student philanthropy programs, and even less on engaging students to impact future alumni giving. This study sought to contribute to that body of literature, but more can be done to better understand efforts taken to engage students in giving and the potential long-term impact of such engagement. A comparative quantitative study on participation rates and dollars given of young alumni donor who did or did not participate in student philanthropy programs would prove valuable. Alumni respondents of this study suggest they give more as a result of their participation and statistical data could enrich that proposition.

Further research on the long-term impact of alumni giving as a result of student philanthropy programs could solidify this fundraising strategy as an annual giving process for many institutions. A longitudinal exploration of student philanthropy participants' donor behavior extended over time to five and ten years beyond graduation might prove greater donor affinity and larger gifts as a result of students being taught the benefit of supporting their institution.

The practice of having students give to support any area of campus mirrors the annual giving strategy of many institutions. However, a campaign similar to Institution C, which supports one identified area of student need on campus may have the potential to create loyal future alumni donors to that same expressed campus fund versus supporting other areas of the institution. Future research might identify strategies institutions must take, if necessary, to redirect alumni giving interest to other areas of support.

Lastly, the institutions studied suggest some student groups had their own interests in raising money for other outside causes that might compete for the limited funds students had to offer to the institution foundation. With an increased emphasis on student giving campaigns led by the foundation, discussions around policy development were in process at each institution. These discussions appeared to be very complex as some institutions have on-campus banking for student organizations and additional policies on how those funds can be obtained and distributed and policies governing student organizations. Student Affairs, Legal Counsel, and Advancement appeared to all be represented in the policy discussions. No developed policies were available at the time of the interviews for inclusion in this study but discussion topics included:

competing interest with institution priorities; amount required for gift credit to donor; legal misrepresentation of the foundation by student groups; misleading donors and quid pro quo; solicitation of institution major gift prospects; holding small amount of funds for an organizations use; staff resources to support student fundraising and to hold others accountable to policies; and any cause a student group supports the institution is also providing support for that cause in some way. A study of how an institution implements or adapts policy to balance investments in student philanthropy programs will be beneficial.

REFERENCES

Ashcraft, R. (1995). An alaysis of alumni donation and non-donation related to selected personal, involvement and outcome factors. Arizona State University. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 297-308.

Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review, 15* (1), 75-81.

Baldwin, K. M. (2008). How reciprocity influences alumni giving: A qualitative study. The University of Alabama. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC. (UMI# 3334601).

Bureau of the Census. (1994). More Earnings Means Higher Career Earnings. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census.

Center on Philanthropy Panel Study. (2009). *Findings: Giving to education*. Retrieved 2011, 14-January from The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University: http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/research/copps/docs/2007COPPS_Education.pdf

Cheslock, J. J., & Gianneschi, M. (2008). Replacing State Appropriations with Alternative Revenue Sources: The Case of Voluntary Support. *Journal Of Higher Education*, 79(2), 208-229.

Conley, A. T. (1999). Student organization membership and alumni giving at a public research I university. Indiana University, School of Education. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC. (UMI# 9944044).

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (Third Edition ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Pulications, Inc.

Council for Advancement in Support of Education. (2010). *People and Communitites: CASE ASAP*. Retrieved from Council for Advancement in Support of Education Website: http://www.case.org/People_and_Communities/CASE_ASAP.html

Council for Aid to Education. (2011). Contributions to colleges and universities down 11.9 percent to $27.85 billion. Greatest decline ever recorded. Retrieved 2010, 28-December from http://www.cae.org: http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/VSE_2009_Press_Relsease.pdf

Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. (2002). The Determinants of Donative Revenue Flows from Alumni in Higher Education. *The Journal of Human Resources , XXXVII* (3), 540-569.

Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education.* Rahway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Ezarik, M. (2010, March). Cultivating a Culture of Giving Back - Starting Freshman Year. *University Business* .

Friedmann, A. S. (2003). Building communities of participation through student advancment programs: A first step toward relationship fund raising. College of William and Mary, School of Education. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC. (UMI# 3081201).

Gumport, P. J. (1999, 2005). Graduate Education and Research: Interdependence and Strain. In P. G. Althach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Bumport, *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (pp. 425-461). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Harper, S.R., & Quaye, S.J., (2009). Beyond sameness, with engagement and outcomes for all: An Introduction. In S.R. Harper & S.J. Quaye (Eds.), *Student engagement in higher* (pp. 1-15). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Maximizing what students get out of college: testing a learning productivity model. *Journal of College Student Development 44*(2), p. 185-203.

Hurvitz, L. A. (2010). Building a culture of student philanthropy: A study of the Ivy-plus institutions' philanthropy education initiatives. University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC. (UMI# 3410478).

Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1998). *Reaping the benefits: Defining the public and private value of going to college.* Washing DC: Institute of Higher Education Policy.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters in student learning. *Change*. May/June. Vol. 33, Issue 3.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates, a. (1991). *Involving Colleges: Succesful Approaches to Fostering Learning and Development Outside the Classroom* (First Edition ed.). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Inc.

Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor Behavior and Voluntary Support for Higher Education Institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education , 59* (2), 115-132.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research* (Fifth Edition ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Masterson, K. (2010). Appeals to College Loyalty Are Not Enough to Engage Younger Alumni. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* .

McNulty, J. W. (1977). Alumni and giving: A study of student personnel services and alumni philanthropy. Doctoral dissertation. Loyola Univesity of Chicago.

Minniear, C. R. (2006). Donor motivations in higher education: The impact of incentives, involvement and opportunity of alumni giving. University of Louisville. Ann Arbor: ProQuest.

Nayman, R. L., Gianneschi, H. R., & Mandel, J. M. (1993). Turning Students into Alumni Donors. (M. C. Terrell, & J. A. Gold, Eds.) *New Directions for Student Services: New Roles for Educational Fundraising and Institutional Advancement , 63*, 85-94.

Nishi, M. N. (2010). Student Philanthropy: Fighting the Fundraising Crisi. *AI Customized*. Academic Impressions.

Pascarella, E. T. (1985). College environmental influences on learning and cognitive development: A critical review and synthesis. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 1). New York: Agathon.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How College Affects Students* (First Edition ed., Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass .

-Porter, K. (2002). The Value of a College Degree. *Eric Digest* . Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Pumerantz, R. K. (2004). Alumni-in-training: Institutional factors associated with greater alumni giving at public comprehensive colleges and universities. Claremont Graduate University. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC. (UMI# 3133230).

Reichley, R. A. (1977). The Alumni Movement: An Overview. In W. A. Rowland, *Handbook of Institutional Advancement* (pp. 275-285). San Fancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schmidt, P. (2010, 29-April). *Pumping Up Alumni Giving at Public Colleges: Studies Find Surprising Trade-Offs.* Retrieved 2010, 9-June from The Chronicle of Higher Education: http://chronicle.com/article/Pumping-Up-Alumni-Giving-at/65319

Schroeder, C. (2003). How are we engaging students? Charles Shroeder talks to George Kuh, *About Campus*. March.

Sheridan, H. A. (2006). Cultivating a donor base: How colleges and universities use public relations techniques to influence undergraduate students to become donors. Rowan University, The Graduate School.

Simone, A. S. (2010). *Examining the Influence of Selectivity on Alumni Giving at Public Universities: A Dynamic Panel Modeling Approach.* University of Maryland, Department of Education Leadership, Higher Education, and International Education . Ann Arbor: ProQuest.

Sun, X. (2005). *A Multivariate Casual Model of Alumni Giving at a Midwest, Public University.* The University of Nebraska - Lincoln. Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC.

The University of Cincinnati. (2011, September). *Proudly Pennies* Retrieved 2011, 14-September from University of Cincinnati: http://www.uc.edu/foundation/about_the_campaign/proudly_pennies.html

The University of Alabama. (2008, 2-May). *University of Alabama News>> UA Announces Winners of Student Funded SGA S.P.I.R.I.T. Scholarships*. Retrieved 2010, 3-June from University of Alabama: http://uanews.ua.edu/2008/05/ua-announces-winners-of-student-funded-sga-spirit-scholarship

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. (2010, 22-February). *Heelraisers Council: Thanks to Carolina!* Retrieved 2010, 6-June from Office of University Advancement: http://giving.unc.edu

Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A History of American Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press .

Weerts, D. J., & Ronca, J. M. (2009). Using Classification Trees to Predict Alumni Giving for Higher Education. *Education Economics , 17* (1), 95-122.

Weerts, D. J., Sanford, T., & Glushko, O. (2010, May 2). Explaining differences in alumni giving participation rates at flagship universities. Roundtable paper presentation, American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO.

Worth, M. J., & Asp II, J. W. (1994). The deveopment officer in higher education: Toward an understanding of the role. The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development. Washington D.C.: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (Fourth Edition ed., Vol. 5). (L. Bickman, & D. J. Rog, Eds.) Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INQUIRY

## Vincent A. Miller

1614 Harvest Way | Statesboro, GA 30458

millerv@uga.edu                          (318) 614-1300                          Fax: (912) 478-0694

---

October 26, 2011


[ADDRESSEE]


Mr./Dr. ?;

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Georgia conducting a qualitative research study of student philanthropy programs at public institutions. The purpose of this study is to determine how student philanthropy programs assist the student experience to impact future alumni giving. Given the brief history I have learned regarding the efforts of the [PROGRAM NAME], I believe the [INSTITUTION] will be a good fit as a case site location. I am looking to interview a select group of students, staff, and alumni who can speak to the student giving experience as part of the overall [INSTITUTION] college experience.

As for details regarding the process, I would come to campus to interview staff in their offices and students in a focus group format. I would also ask your assistance in providing directory contact information for undergraduate students and alumni graduates who have participated in student giving by making a donation while enrolled. Any additional information you can provide such as program participation and giving statistics and marketing material would be welcomed.

I do not anticipate any controversial material associated with the topic of this study that will damage the reputation of the interviewees or the reputation of the institution. To discuss further, please feel free to contact me at 318-614-1300 or by email at millerv@uga.edu.

If [INSTITUTION] is willing to participate, please by mail or email no than Friday, May 13 2011.

Sincerely,



Vince Miller
millerv@uga.edu
Doctoral Candidate
University of Georgia

cc: Dr. Charles Knapp

APPENDIX B

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS - ADMINISTRATORS

1. What is the guiding institutional philosophy or ideology expressed by institutional leaders and others concerning student philanthropy programs?

    a. How does the president, as symbolic leader of the institution, communicate the importance of student philanthropy programs to faculty, staff and students?

    b. How is the commitment of student philanthropy programs demonstrated by the chief development officer, chief student affairs officer, faculty leaders, etc.?

2. What types of student philanthropy programs are offered?

    a. Is emphasis on one large program or multiple programs?

    b. Who is targeted for involvement in programs?

    c. How are these programs coordinated?

    d. How are students recognized for their participation?

    e. What types of leadership roles and other opportunities for involvement exist for students?

3. What are the characteristics of students who participate in student philanthropy programs?

    a. To what degree are they actively involved in education and giving programs?

    b. What overall percent/number of students participate in programs? Participate in giving?

    c.   What portion of freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors are participating in the programs?

4. Do faculty and staff outside the development/alumni office play a significant role in student involvement with student philanthropy programs?

    a.   In what ways are faculty and staff interactions with students facilitated through student philanthropy programs?

    b.   What areas provide the most support? The most resistance?

5. What resources are allocated to student philanthropy programs?

    a.   What are the sources and amount of financial support?

    b.   How are the resources allocated? Who participates in the allocation process?

6. What institutional policies exist related to student philanthropy programs?

    a.   What is the nature of these policies? Why do they exist?

    b.   How are policies developed?

    c.   Who is responsible for monitoring the policy?

    d.   How are the policies communicated?

7. What expectations are set for student philanthropy programs?

    a.   How are the expectations communicated to participants (faculty, students, staff)?

    b.   For each program, what is considered a success?

    c.   How do you measure and assess student involvement in the programs?

8. What other factors related to student involvement in student philanthropy programs exist that I may not have inquired about?

APPENDIX C

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS – STUDENT

1. How would you describe your overall student experience?

    a. How likely are you to choose your institution again for your undergraduate experience?

    b. How have student philanthropy programs impacted your overall student experience?

    c. How do students react to the idea of donating the institution while enrolled as undergraduates?

2. What is the guiding institutional philosophy or ideology expressed by institutional leaders and others concerning student philanthropy programs?

    a. How does the president, as symbolic leader of the institution, communicate the importance of student philanthropy programs to faculty, staff and students?

    b. How is the commitment of student philanthropy programs demonstrated by the chief development officer, chief student affairs officer, faculty leaders, etc.?

3. What types of student philanthropy programs are offered?

    a. Is emphasis on one large program or multiple programs?

    b. Who is targeted for involvement in programs?

    c. How are these programs coordinated?

    d. How are students recognized for their participation?

    e. What types of leadership roles and other opportunities for involvement exist for students?

4. What are the characteristics of students who participate in student philanthropy programs?

    a. To what degree are they actively involved in education and giving programs?

    b. What overall percent/number of students participate in programs? Participate in giving?

    c. What portion of freshman, sophomores, juniors, and seniors are participating in the programs?

5. Do faculty and staff outside the development/alumni office play a significant role in student involvement with student philanthropy programs?

    a. In what ways are faculty and staff interactions with students facilitated through student philanthropy programs?

    b. What areas provide the most support? The most resistance?

6. What expectations are set for student philanthropy programs?

    a. How are the expectations communicated to participants (faculty, students, staff)?

    b. For each program, what is considered a success?

7. How likely are you to continue contributing to the institution once you graduate due to your participation in student philanthropy programs?

    a. How likely would you have donated to your institution had you not participated in student philanthropy programs?

    b. Are you likely to donate larger dollar amounts due to your participation in student philanthropy programs?

8. What other factors related to student involvement in student philanthropy programs exist that I may not have inquired about?

APPENDIX D

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS - ALUMNI

1. How would you describe your overall student experience?

    a. How likely are you to choose your institution again for your undergraduate experience?

    b. How have student philanthropy programs impacted your overall student experience?

    c. How did you react to the idea of donating the institution while enrolled as undergraduate?

2. What is the guiding institutional philosophy or ideology expressed by institutional leaders and others concerning student philanthropy programs?

    a. How does the president, as symbolic leader of the institution, communicate the importance of student philanthropy programs to faculty, staff and students?

    b. How is the commitment of student philanthropy programs demonstrated by the chief development officer, chief student affairs officer, faculty leaders, etc.?

3. What types of student philanthropy programs were offered?

    a. Is emphasis on one large program or multiple programs?

    b. Who is targeted for involvement in programs?

    c. How are these programs coordinated?

    d. How are students recognized for their participation?

    e. What types of leadership roles and other opportunities for involvement exist for students?

4. What are the characteristics of students who participate in student

   philanthropy programs?

   a. To what degree are they actively involved in education and giving

      programs?

   b. What overall percent/number of students participate in programs?

      Participate in giving?

   c. What portion of freshman, sophomores, juniors and seniors are

      participating in the programs?

5. Do faculty and staff outside the development/alumni office play a significant

   role in student involvement with student philanthropy programs?

   a. In what ways are faculty and staff interactions with students

      facilitated through student philanthropy programs?

   b. What areas provide the most support? The most resistance?

6. What expectations are set for student philanthropy programs?

   a. How are the expectations communicated to participants (faculty,

      students, staff)?

   b. For each program, what is considered a success?

7. Have you to continued to contribute to the institution once you graduated

   due to your participation in student philanthropy programs?

   a. How likely would you have donated to your institution had you not

      participated in student philanthropy programs?

   b. Do you feel you are donating at larger dollar amounts due to your

      participation in student philanthropy programs?

8. What other factors related to student involvement in student philanthropy

   programs exist that I may not have inquired about?

# APPENDIX E
# INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

**INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM**

I, _____, agree to participate in a research study titled "HOW STUDENT PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS ASSIST THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE TO IMPACT FUTURE ALUMNI GIVING" conducted by Vince Miller, doctoral candidate within the Institute at Higher Education at the University of Georgia (318-614-1300) under the direction of Drs. Libby Morris and Charles Knapp, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia (706-542-3464). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for this study is to determine how student philanthropy programs (student giving education and student giving campaigns) assist the student experience to impact future alumni giving. If I volunteer to take part in this study, I am aware of the following things:

1)     I will answer questions about my knowledge and participation with Student Philanthropy Programs which will take approximately 60 minutes
2)     The interview will be audio recorded and transcribed. My information will be kept for the period of time required to complete the reporting of this study.
3)     All and/or part of this research study will be publicly accessible as part of dissertation process or use in future articles or journals. _____ *Initials*
4)     The unique name or campus jargon (if any) of student philanthropy programs may be used in the study as a means of saying something about the expectations or outcome of the program.
5)     Someone from the study may call me to clarify my information.

The benefit for me is that access to the final report of this study may further inform my understanding of student philanthropy programs at my institution. The researcher also hopes to inform practice for public institutions when working with student philanthropy programs. I will not receive any compensation for my participation in this study.

RISK: The researcher does not anticipate any controversial material associated with the topic of this study that will damage my reputation or the reputation of the institution.

CONFIDENTIALITY: All information collected for this study will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. Whatever personal information gathered during the interviews will be deleted when the study is presented and/or its results published. The recorded files will be kept in a password protected secured online archive for three months while being transcribed into text. The transcribed text will be saved in the researcher's personal computer protected by both a computer log-in password and a document security password.

The investigator will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project.

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.


Vince Miller, Researcher        _____        _____
                                                    Signature                                              Date
Telephone: 318-614-1300         Email: millerv@uga.edu



_____        _____        _____
Name of Participant (Print)         Signature                                              Date


**Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.**

APPENDIX F

INFORMATIONAL AND CONSENT EMAIL

Subject: Your Participation in Research Study Needed

Dear          :

I am a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Charles Knapp in the Institute of Higher Education at The University of Georgia.  I invite you to participate in a research study entitled "ENGAGING STUDENTS IN STUDENT PHILANTHROPY PROGRAMS TO IMPACT FUTURE ALUMNI GIVING."  The purpose of this study is to determine how student philanthropy programs (student giving education and student giving campaigns) assist the student experience to impact future alumni giving.

Your participation will involve a telephone interview and should only take about 60 minutes at your convenience. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.  I do not anticipate any controversial material associated with the topic of this study that will damage your reputation or the reputation of the institution. **All information collected for this study will be audio recorded and remain confidential to the extent allowed by law. Whatever personal information gathered during the interviews will be deleted when the study presented and/or its results published.**

The findings from this project may further inform practice for public institutions when working with student philanthropy programs.  There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me at (318) 614-1300 or send an e-mail to millerv@uga.edu.  Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 612 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Please reply to me at millerv@uga.edu directly within **one week** with your acceptance or regrets to participate in this study. By replying with your acceptance to participate you are also agreeing to the consent participation in this study.  A date and time for the phone interview will be set-up at your convenience.

Thank you for your consideration!  Please keep this email for your records.

Sincerely,

Vince Miller