Fall 2018

The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education

Volume 14 Issue 2

The Journal of Academic Administration In Higher Education

CONTENTS

Volume Fourteen Issue Two
Fall 2018

JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

JW PRESS

MARTIN, TENNESSEE

Published by

JW Press

P.O. Box 49

Martin, Tennessee 38237

Printed in the United States of America

Editor

Dr. Edd R. Joyner
EddJoyner@AWoIC.org

Board of Reviewers

Name	Affiliation	State/Provence/Etc	Country
Ali Ahmadi	Morehead State University	KY	United States
Ismet Anitsal	Tennessee Technological University	TN	United States
W. Kevin Barksdale	Grand Canyon University	TN	United States
Dustin Bessette	The National Graduate School	MA	United States
Thomas A. Buchman	University of Colorado at Boulder	CO	United States
Jodine M. Burchell	Walden University	Online	United States
Darrell Norman Burrell	The National Graduate School	MA	United States
Sharon L. Burton	The National Graduate School	DE	United States
Catherine Carey	Western Kentucky University	KY	United States
Macgorine Cassell	Fairmont State University	WV	United States
Jason G. Caudill	King University	TN	United States
SJ (Steve) Clayden	University of Phoenix	AZ	United States
Michelle Clément	Camosun College	BC	Canada
Howard Cochran	Belmont University	TN	United States
Ashley Courtney-Dattola	Capella University		United States
Mohamed El-Kaissy	University of Phoenix	AZ	United States
Noory Etezady	Nova Southeastern University	Ostan-e Tehran	Iran
Eveline M. Fallshaw	RMIT University		Australia
Carolyn J. Fausnaugh	Florida Institute of Technology	FL	United States
Greg Flanagan	University of Lethbridge	Alberta	Canada
Greg Fleet	University of New Brunswick in Saint John	New Brunswick	Canada
Denise Gates	Gates To Success Consulting Group	CO	United States
Nancy Gautier	University of Mobile	AL	United States
Daniel Gifondorwa	Eastern New Mexico University	NM	United States
Marilyn L. Grady	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	NE	United States
Brian C Grizzell	Walden University	Online	United States
Rajendra Gupta	Memorial University of Newfoundland	Newfoundland	Canada
Michael Hadani	Long Island University - C.W. Post Campus	NY	United States
Georgia Hale	University of Arkansas at Fort Smith	KS	United States
Mary Lewis Haley	Cumberland University	TN	United States
Betty S. Harper	Middle Tennessee State University	TN	United States
Brenda Harper	American Public University	WV	United States
Gy R. Hashim	Universiti Teknologi MARA	Selangor	Malaysia
Levon Hayrapetyan	Houston Baptist University	TX	United States
Brook Henderson	Colorado Technical University	CO	United States
Harry E. Hicks	Butler University	IN	United States

Iwu Hilary	Morehead State University	KY	United States
Ellen Hoadley	Loyola College in Maryland	MD	United States
Hilary O. Iwu	Morehead State University	KY	United States
Kalinga Jagoda	Mount Royal College	Alberta	Canada
Benton Cooper Johnson	University of Tennessee at Martin	TN	United States
Halil Kaya	Eastern Kentucky University	KY	United States
Annette Kluge	University of St. Gallen	St. Gallen	Switzerland
Leon Korte	University of South Dakota	SD	United States
Melinda L. Korzaan	Middle Tennessee State University	TN	United States
John Kuforiji	Tuskegee University	AL	United States
Ehsan Latif	University College of the Cariboo	British Columbia	Canada
Thomas A. Lechner	Tennessee State University	TN	United States
Christopher R. Leupold	Elon University	NC	United States
Chi Lo Lim	Northwest Missouri State University	MO	United States
Jamye Long	University of Tennessee at Martin	TN	United States
Greg Lowhorn	Pensacola Christian College	FL	United States
Nicholas Blessing Mavengere	University of Tampere		Finland
Rose McNeese	University of Southern Mississippi	MS	United States
Carmen I. Figueroa Medina	University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez	PR	Puerto Rico
Dan Meyer	Austin Peay State University	TN	United States
Kelly Mollica	The University of Memphis	TN	United States
Brian Motii	University of Montevallo	AL	United States
Peter Munger	University of Maryland University College	MD	United States
Anthony Negbenebor	Gardner-Webb University	NC	United States
Stephanie Newport	Austin Peay State University	TN	United States
Susanne Bruno Ninassi	Marymount University	VA	United States
Shirley Noseworthy	Memorial University of Newfoundland	Newfoundland	Canada
Collins E. Okafor	North Carolina A&T State University	TX	United States
Robert D. O'Keefe	DePaul University	IL	United States
W. Timothy O'Keefe	University of West Florida	FL	United States
Christie Onwujuba-Dike	University of Saint Francis	IN	United States
Leticia E. Peña	University of Wisconsin-La Crosse	WI	United States
Anthony Pittarese	East Tennessee State University	TN	United States
Paula Potter	Western Kentucky University	KY	United States
Richard Powers	Eastern Kentucky University	KY	United States
Leonard Presby	William Paterson University	NJ	United States
Arnold Redman	University of Tennessee at Martin	TN	United States
Elizabeth E. Regimbal	Cardinal Stritch University	WI	United States
Carolyn Reichert	The University of Texas at Dallas	TX	United States
Hong Rim	Shippensburg University	PA	United States
Ebrahim Roumi	University of New Brunswick	New Brunswick	Canada
Donna M. Schaeffer	Marymount University	VA	United States
Barbara Schuldt	Southeastern Louisiana University	LA	United States
Derek Sedlack	Nova Southeastern University	FL	United States
Patricia Selvy	Bellarmine University	KY	United States
Georgi Smatrakalev	Florida Atlantic University	FL	United States
Kathleen L. Sobieralski	University of Maryland University College	MD	United States
Amir H. Soheili-Mehr	University of Toronto	Ontario	Canada
Harriette Spiegel	University of Tennessee at Martin	TN	United States
Uma V. Sridharan	Columbus State University	SC	United States
Paul C. Stumb	Cumberland University	TN	United States
Beverly Ann Swisshelm	Cumberland University	TN	United States
Robert Terrell	Carson-Newman University	TN	United States
Jeffrey Totten	McNeese State University	LA	United States
Daniel L. Tracy	University of South Dakota	SD	United States
Sheila Marie Trzcinka	Indiana University Northwest	IN	United States
Julie Urda	Rhode Island College	RI	United States
Marie Louise van der Klooster	Deakin University	Victoria	Australia
Anthony Varnon	Southeast Missouri State University	MO	United States
Charles Vehorn	Radford University	VA	United States
Roger Alan Voss	Institute of Production Control	TX	United States
Kathryn H. Woods	Austin Peay State University	TN	United States
Michael J. Wright	Tarleton State University	TX	United States
Tao Zeng	Wilfrid Laurier University	Ontario	Canada

The JW Press Family of Academic Journals

Journal of Learning in Higher Education (JLHE)

ISSN: 1936-346X (print)

Every university and accrediting body says that teaching is at the forefront of their mission. Yet the attention given to discipline oriented research speaks otherwise. Devoted to establishing a platform for showcasing learning-centered articles, JLHE encourages the submission of manuscripts from all disciplines. The top learning-centered articles presented at ABWIC/ICLAHE conferences each year will be automatically published in the next issue of JLHE. JLHE is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Psychology and Administration, indexed by EBSCO,and ERIC and under consideration for indexing by Scopus, and Journal Seek.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to JLHE should review information at http://jwpress.com/JLHE/JLHE.htm.

Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education (JAAHE)

ISSN: 1936-3478 (print)

JAAHE is devoted to providing a platform for showcasing articles related to academic administration. JAAHE encourages the submission of manuscripts from all disciplines. The best articles presented at ABWIC/ICLAHE conferences each year, that deal with the subject of administration of academic units, will be automatically published in the next issue of JAAHE. JAAHE is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Educational Psychology and Administration, indexed by EBSCO, and ERIC and under consideration for indexing by Scopus, and Journal Seek.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to JAAHE should review information at http://jwpress.com/JAAHE/JAAHE.htm.

International Journal of the Academic Business World (IJABW)

ISSN 1942-6089 (print)
ISSN 1942-6097 (online)

IJABW was established for the distribution, discussion, and documentation of the art and science of business. A cornerstone of the philosophy that drives IJABW, is that we all can learn from the research, practices, and techniques found in disciplines other than our own. The Information Systems researcher can share with and learn from a researcher in the Finance Department or even the Psychology Department.

We actively seek the submission of manuscripts pertaining to any of the traditional areas of business (accounting, economics, finance, information systems, management, marketing, etc.) as well as any related disciplines. While we eagerly accept submissions in any of these disciplines, we give extra consideration to manuscripts that cross discipline boundaries or document the transfer of research findings from academe to business practice. International Journal of the Academic Business World is listed in Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Business, indexed by EBSCO, and under consideration for indexing by Scopus.

Individuals interested in submitting manuscripts directly to IJABW should review information at http://jwpress.com/IJABW/IJABW.htm

Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Student Retention and Graduation Rates at SACSCOC Level III Institutions

Kala J. Perkins-Holtsclaw
Assistant Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
Lincoln Memorial University
Harrogate, Tennessee

James Lampley
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee

ABSTRACT

As the United States struggles to be globally competitive with the number of students completing a college degree higher education leaders continue seeking answers to improving student retention and graduation rates. Decades of research has been conducted on investigating factors that impact student retention and graduation with the majority of that research being centered on student attributes and students' precollege characteristics. Research has been limited on institutional characteristics and their associations with student retention and graduation rates. Therefore the purpose of this study was to examine the extent that specific institutional characteristics predict first-year, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates and 6-year graduation rates.

The sample for this study consisted of 4-year institutions in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) region that have been granted Level III accreditation status and also report data annually to the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). All data used for this research were publicly available archival data available from IPEDS. Eight research questions were investigated about institutional student variables, environment variables, financial variables, and interaction variables. Multiple linear regressions were conducted for all research questions, representing the statistical method of analysis.

The findings showed that the most useful predictors for retention rates were students scoring at or above the 75th percentile ACT scores, expenditures for academic support, and tuition and required fees. When investigating to what extent institutional characteristics predict 6-year graduation rates the findings showed that 75th percentile ACT scores, expenditures for instruction, the percentage of full-time faculty, and cost were the most useful predictors. Findings also showed that student-faculty ratios and the percentage of full-time faculty were not significant predictors for student retention.

INTRODUCTION

The changing landscape of the American economy, increased competition in the job market, and employers' desire for knowledgeable, skilled workers has resulted in increased interest in higher education by American high school graduates over the last 50 years. The need for students to pursue postsecondary credentials has significantly grown during that time. With the demand for higher education on the rise, many students are pursuing higher education today that may not have considered it in the past. The influx in student enrollment has created many challenges for colleges and universities. One of the greatest challenges has been retaining students through completion of a degree program. Student retention has been and remains one of the most significant challenges facing institutions in American higher education (Jones & Braxton, 2009).

Despite over 75 years of empirical research devoted to identifying causes that lead to students dropping out and proposing ways to keep students persisting toward graduation, statistics indicate little progress has been made on student retention (Jones & Braxton, 2009). Over 56% of college students who drop out do so before the beginning

of their second year, and one fourth of all college students enrolled in 4-year institutions drop out by the end of their first year (Tinto, 1993, 1999). More than 47% of students who begin a degree program at a 4-year institution fail to earn a degree at that institution (Tinto, 1999). The United States has fallen from first to 16th in the world in the number of students completing college degrees (Joyce, 2010). Research has shown there is not a single reason for student attrition, and determining, as well as overcoming, the factors that lead to student attrition has proven to be difficult tasks for institutional leaders (Tinto, 1999).

A preponderance of research has focused on the association between student attributes and retention and graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities. However, recent research has been limited on the institutional characteristics of private 4-year colleges and universities and their associations with student retention and graduation rates. Many institutional leaders are eager to determine how well their specific institutional characteristics can be used to predict student retention and graduation rates. Therefore, the purpose of this nonexperimental, quantitative study was to examine the extent to which institutional characteristics predict first-year, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates and 6-year graduation rates for full-time undergraduate students at 4-year colleges and universities that have been granted Level III accreditation status by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The independent variables were institutional characteristics as defined by institutional student attributes, environment variables, financial variables, and student and faculty interaction variables. The dependent variables were first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates and 6-year graduation rates of full-time, undergraduate students.

RELATED LITERATURE

Between 1980 and 2011 enrollment in higher education more than doubled from 9 million students to 20 million students. Although the United States has been very successful in increasing access to higher education, there has been a gap in translating access to degree completion. Enrollment in higher education dramatically increased between 1980 and 2011. However, the completion rates have only slightly increased during that same period. Slightly over half of the students entering a 4-year institution during those years earned a bachelor's degree from that same institution. Some students took longer than 4 years to complete a degree while other students transferred to a different institution or completely withdrew from higher education (Tinto, 2012). As a result investigating ways to improve student retention and success have become higher institutional priorities. As graduation rates have declined in both public and private sectors student retention has become a primary concern for institutional leaders (Kalsbeek & Hossler, 2010). Theoretical models dating back to 1970 have been used as valuable tools for improving student retention and success (Kerby, 2015). However, research on student retention has become more important, as institutions compete for the best students and the highest graduation rates (Sandler, 2000).

CURRENT THEORIES AND MODELS OF STUDENT RETENTION

Current theories and models of student retention have moved beyond investigating the reasons for student departure to exploring reasons why students decide to continue enrollment. Past research assumed that knowing why students departed was equivalent to knowing why students decided to stay and succeed. Tinto (2012) proposed that knowing why students departed was not equivalent to knowing why students made the decision to continue enrollment. Tinto suggested that knowing why students left was not necessarily useful in determining ways to help students succeed. Tinto called for institutions to rethink student retention and to convert theoretically appealing concepts into defined institutional action.

Tinto (2012) developed a framework for institutional action to guide institutions through a process of improving institutional practices and behaviors designed to help students succeed. Tinto placed the responsibility more on the institution than on the student. The researcher wrote that once an institution admitted a student, the institutional leaders had accepted responsibility for providing that student with the services and resources needed for success. Tinto developed the framework by investigating research that highlighted institutional conditions shown to increase student success and retention. The review of literature converged on four conditions: expectations, support, assessment and feedback, and engagement (Tinto, 2012).

Pascarella, Seifert, and Whitt (2008) stressed the importance of organized and clear classroom instruction and its impact on student retention. Historically research on student perceptions of teaching was limited to specific course achievement. However, new evidence has suggested that instructional organization and clarity may have impacts on more general academic competencies and success, such as student retention and graduation. Primary theories of student retention have been based on sociology, with the majority of student retention pioneers being sociologists. However, some researchers have taken a different approach to student retention research by investigating the developmental aspects of student retention and success. Demetriou and Powell (2014) proposed that a developmental perspective on student retention would appreciate

the changing nature of traditional college students, and would attempt to explain the positive outcomes associated with successful transition from high school to college, college retention, and college graduation. Theories and models of student retention have evolved and increasingly changed over the past 50 years. Early theories focused on social isolation and the lack of student ability to academically and socially integrate on campus. Many theories focused on student attributes and how student's precollege characteristics could be used to predict collegiate success. More emphasis has been placed on institutional action in recent years and what institutions can do to improve student success and retention.

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS IMPACTING STUDENT RETENTION

Higher education institutional leaders have strived to better understand how specific college characteristics and behaviors impact students, student success, and student retention. Academics have argued that institutional characteristics should have an impact on the different aspects of student success. However, there is little empirical evidence to guide campus leaders on how to implement changes to institutional characteristics and behaviors when attempting to increase student retention and graduation rates (Toutkoushian & Smart, 2001). A variety of student factors have been well documented in the literature. However, institutional factors have not been widely considered in research (Marsh, 2014). Although more conclusive empirical research is warranted, some research has been presented on the impacts of institutional culture, institutional control, faculty-student interaction, institutional expenditures, and academic libraries on student retention and graduation.

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY

Pascarella and Terenzini (2005) examined the impact of institutional quality on student retention and graduation rates. Institutional quality was commonly gauged by an institution's admissions selectivity. Studies showed that the institutions with higher student retention and graduation rates had higher admissions requirements. Similarly, institutions with lower admissions standards often yielded lower student retention and graduation rates. Specifically, admissions selectivity was shown to be a positive predictor of 6-year graduation rates. Although higher admissions selectivity was shown to provide an advantage to institutions when examining student retention and graduation rates, other research suggested additional institutional characteristics as being more powerful in predicting student success. Pascarella and Terenzini identified those other institutional characteristics as faculty quality, academic expenditures, and faculty-student ratios.

FACULTY-STUDENT INTERACTIONS

Based on previous research highlighting the importance of academic and social integration, Schmitt and Duggan (2011) stressed the importance of faculty-student interactions. Positive interactions between faculty and students have been known to increase the probability of student retention and student success. Academic advising has been noted as one such positive interaction. According to Drake (2011) students have greatly benefited from engaging in academic advising. Academic advising has given students the opportunity to build relationships with faculty. In many instances faculty advisors have been given the responsibility of identifying areas where students have disconnected with the institution and helping them reconnect.

EXPENDITURES

Some researchers have examined the impact of allocating institutional expenditures to academic and support activities on student retention and graduation. Many institutional initiatives that have been developed to improve student retention require the recruitment and participation of students. Gansemer-Topf and Schuh (2003) investigated how well allocating expenditures for instruction, academic support, and institutional support influenced student retention rates. The results of their study showed that increasing expenditures on instruction, academic support, and institutional support had positive impacts on student retention. The additional funds supported students' ability to academically and socially integrate with the campus environment.

Although higher education leaders and student retention theorists have considered institutional characteristics to play an important role in understanding and improving student retention, a gap in literature exists to conclusively support those claims. More research is warranted on how institutional characteristics can positively impact student retention and graduation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research questions of this study were to determine the extent to which specific institutional characteristics predict first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates and 6-year graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions. More specifically, the following research questions were investigated:

1. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional predictor variables (25th percentile ACT scores, 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of men to women, and the percentage of students receiving financial aid in the forms of grants/scholarships, Pell grants, and federal student loans) and the criterion variable (first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
2. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional environment predictor variables (size, institution type, and cost) and the criterion variable (first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
3. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional finance predictor variables (expenditures for instruction, expenditures for student services, expenditures for institutional support, and expenditures for academic support) and the criterion variable (first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
4. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional interaction predictor variables (student-faculty ratio and percentage of full-time faculty) and the criterion variable (first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
5. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional predictor variables (25th percentile ACT scores, 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of men to women, and the percentage of students receiving financial aid in the forms of grants/scholarships, Pell grants, and federal student loans) and the criterion variable (6-year graduation rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
6. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional environment predictor variables (size, institution type, and cost) and the criterion variable (6-year graduation rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
7. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional finance predictor variables (expenditures for instruction, expenditures for student services, expenditures for institutional support, and expenditures for academic support) and the criterion variable (6-year graduation rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?
8. Is there a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional interaction predictor variables (student-faculty ratio and percentage of full-time faculty) and the criterion variable (6-year graduation rates) at 4-year colleges and universities that are categorized as Level III SACSCOC institutions?

SAMPLE

The sample for this study consisted of 124 4-year colleges and universities in the SACSCOC region that have been granted Level III accreditation status and also report to IPEDS. These institutions were selected because SACSCOC accredited institutions are required to show evidence of student achievement annually and provide more in-depth documented evidence on both 5- and 10-year cycles.

INSTRUMENTATION

The data used for this research were publicly available archival data from the National Center for Educational Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). This method of instrumentation was chosen because these data have been annually reported to IPEDS by participating institutions. All postsecondary institutions that have a Program Participation Agreement with the Office of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education are required to report data to the IPEDS web-based data collection system each year. The annual reporting cycle consists of fall, winter, and spring data collection periods. Each IPEDS data report contains explicit instructions and definitions that institutions must follow to ensure the reliability and validity of the database.

DATA COLLECTION

The data were collected from the IPEDS database and housed in Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. All data in the IPEDS database were provided by the National Center for Educational Statistics for public access and availability.

RESULTS

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of predictor variables upon the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates. The predictors were 25th percentile and 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of males to females, and the percent of students receiving financial aid disaggregated by grants and scholarships, Pell grants, and federal student loans. The criterion variable was first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates at 4-year colleges and universities with Level III SACSCOC accreditation status. As part of the initial analysis the intercorrelations among the predictor variables were assessed for multicollinearity. The assessment indicated a strong intercorrelation with the predictor variable of 25th percentile ACT. That predictor variable produced a VIF value greater than 10 and was removed from the analysis.

The linear combination of the predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates, $F(5, 86) = 9.39$, $p < .001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .59, indicating that approximately 35% of the variance of the first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates = -.01 Gender Ratio Males to Females–.05 Percent of Students Receiving Grant or Scholarship Aid + .04 Percent of Students Receiving Pell Grant–.01 Percent of Students Receiving Federal Student Loans + .02 75th Percentile ACT Scores + .26.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional student variables of 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of men to women, and the percentage of students receiving financial aid in the forms of grants/scholarships, Pell grants, and federal student loans and first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates at 4-year colleges and universities with Level III SACSCOC accreditation status. The 75th percentile ACT scores appeared to have the greatest influence. Institutions with higher 75th percentile ACT scores appeared to have higher student retention rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 35% of the variance of first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates. The predictors were institution enrollment size, institution type, and cost from tuition and required fees, while the criterion variable was first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates, $F(3, 109) = 10.84$, $p < .001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .48, indicating that approximately 23% of the variance of the first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates= -2.68×10^{-6} Enrollment Size + 6.50×10^{-6} Cost–.17 Institution Type + .68.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional environment variables of enrollment size, cost from tuition and required fees, institution type, and first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. Cost from tuition and required fees and institution type appeared to have the greatest influences. The higher the cost of an institution resulted in higher student retention rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 23% of variance of the first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates. The predictors were expenditures for instruction, expenditures for student services, expenditures for institutional support, and expenditures for academic support. The criterion variable was first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of the predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates, $F(4, 108) = 8.26$, $p < .001$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .48, indicating approximately 23% of the variance of first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates

= 8.27 x 10^{-6} Expenditures for Instruction + 7.34 x 10^{-7} Expenditures for Student Services – 1.21 x 10^{-5} Expenditures for Institutional Support + 3.31 x 10^{-5} Expenditures for Academic Support + .62.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional finance variables of expenditures for instruction, student services, institutional support, academic support, and first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. Expenditures for instruction, institutional support, and academic support appeared to have the greatest influences. The higher the expenditures in each area resulted in higher student retention rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 23% of variance of first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates. The predictors were student-faculty ratio and the percentage of full-time faculty, while the criterion variable was first-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of the predictor variables was not significantly related to the criterion variable, first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates, F(2, 110) = 2.38, p = .098. From the data presented there appeared to be no correlation between using institutional interaction variables of student-faculty ratio and the percentage of full-time faculty to predict first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of predictor variables upon the criterion variable, 6-year graduation rates. The predictors were 25th percentile and 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of males to females, and the percent of students receiving financial aid disaggregated by grants and scholarships, Pell grant, and federal student loans. The criterion variable was 6-year graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities with Level III SACSCOC accreditation status. As part of the initial analysis the intercorrelations among the predictor variables were assessed for multicollinearity. The assessment indicated a strong intercorrelation with the predictor variable of 25th percentile ACT. That predictor variable produced a VIF value greater than 10 and was removed from the analysis.

The linear combination of the predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, 6-year graduation rates, F(5, 86) = 30.50, p < .001. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .80, indicating that approximately 64% of the variance of 6-year graduation rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted 6-year graduation rates = .03 Gender Ratio Males to Females + .01 Percent of Students Receiving Grant or Scholarship Aid–.25 Percent of Students Receiving Pell Grant + .17 Percent of Students Receiving Federal Student Loans + .03 75th Percentile ACT Scores–.33.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional student variables of 75th percentile ACT scores, gender ratio of men to women, and the percentage of students receiving financial aid in the forms of grants/scholarships, Pell grants, and federal student loans and 6-year graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities with Level III SACSCOC accreditation status. The 75th percentile ACT scores appeared to have the greatest influence. The higher the institution's 75th percentile ACT scores resulted in higher graduation rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 64% of the variance of 6-year graduation rates.

RESEARCH QUESTION 6

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable, 6-year graduation rates. The predictors were institution enrollment size, institution type, and cost of tuition and required fees, while the criterion variable was 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, 6-year graduation rates, F(3, 109) = 13.80, p < .001. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .53, indicating that approximately 28% of the variance of the 6-year graduation rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted 6-year graduation rates = -3.50 x 10^{-6} Enrollment Size + 9.97 x 10^{-6} Cost–.13 Institution Type + .36.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional environment variables of enrollment size, cost from tuition and required fees, institution type, and 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. Cost from tuition and required fees and institution type appeared to have the greatest influences on graduation rates. Higher institutional costs and attendance at private institutions resulted in higher graduation rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 28% of variance of the 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

RESEARCH QUESTION 7

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable 6-year graduation rates. The predictors were expenditures for instruction, expenditures for student services, expenditures for institutional support, and expenditures for academic support. The criterion variable was 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of the predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable 6-year graduation rates, F(4, 108) = 7.69, p < .001. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .47, indicating approximately 22% of the variance of 6-year graduation rates in the sample can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted 6-year graduation rates = 1.30 x 10^{-5} Expenditures for Instruction + 1.35 x 10^{-5} Expenditures for Student Services – 4.60 x 10^{-6} Expenditures for Institutional Support + 1.24 x 10^{-5} Expenditures for Academic Support + .30.

It appears there was a relationship between institutional finance variables of expenditures for instruction, student services, institutional support, academic support, and 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. Expenditures for instruction appeared to have the greatest influence. Higher expenditures for instruction resulted in higher graduation rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 22% of variance of first-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates.

RESEARCH QUESTION 8

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the effect of the predictor variables upon the criterion variable 6-year graduation rates. The predictors were student-faculty ratio and the percentage of full-time faculty, while the criterion variable was 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

The linear combination of predictor variables was significantly related to the criterion variable, 6-year graduation rates, F(2, 110) = 7.27, p = .001. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .34, indicating that approximately 12% of the variance of 6-year graduation rates can be accounted for by the linear combination of strength measures. The regression equation is as follows: Predicted 6-year graduation rates= -.01 Student-Faculty Ratio + .15 Percentage of Full-Time Faculty + .27.

It appears that there is a relationship between institutional interaction variables of student-faculty ratio and the percentage of full-time faculty and 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. The percentage of full-time faculty appeared to have the greatest influence on the graduation rates. Higher percentages of full-time faculty resulted in higher graduation rates. It should be noted, however, that the model only accounted for 12% of variance of 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate if there was a significant relationship between a linear combination of institutional characteristics and first-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates and 6-year graduation rates at SACSCOC Level III institutions. The researchers specifically analyzed institutional student variables, environment variables, finance variables, and interaction variables to determine to what extent those variables predicted first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates and 6-year graduation rates at 4-year colleges and universities with Level III SACSCOC accreditation status. The following conclusions were made based on the findings from the data in this study.

The most useful predictors when investigating the extent that institutional characteristics predict first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate retention rates were the 75th percentile ACT scores, expenditures for academic support, and cost defined as tuition and required fees.

When investigating to what extent institutional characteristics predict first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention rates, institutional interaction variables were not significantly related.

When investigating to what extent institutional characteristics predict 6-year graduation rates the most useful predictors were 75th percentile ACT scores, expenditures for instruction, the percentage of full-time faculty, and cost, as defined by tuition and required fees.

When investigating to what extent institutional characteristics predict 6-year graduation rates findings showed that student-faculty ratios were significant predictors.

The institutional characteristics that represent the most useful predictors for first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates may not always be the same most useful predictors for 6-year graduation rates. This study showed some institutional characteristics as good predictors for both criterion variables. However, expenditures for academic support only showed as a good predictor for first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall retention rates. Similarly, expendi-

tures for instruction and the percentage of full-time faculty only showed as good predictors for 6-year graduation rates. Institutional leaders should consider investigating ways to improve student retention and graduation rates separately, rather than assuming good practices for one will also positively impact the other. Student interaction variables such as increased student-faculty interaction and low student-to-faculty ratios may not always result in increased student success. This study showed both as having little or no significance when predicting retention and graduation rates. Institutional leaders should investigate the quality of those student-faculty interactions and understand that frequent interaction does not necessarily mean positive interaction. After decades of research on precollege student characteristics and admissions selectivity, the 75th percentile ACT score showed as the overall most significant predictor of first-time, full-time, fall-to-fall undergraduate student retention and 6-year graduation rates. While many institutions are considering a "test optional" admissions criteria, institutional leaders should not ignore prior research on the extent to which higher admissions selectivity translates to student success.

REFERENCES

Demetriou, C., & Powell, C. (2014). Positive youth development and undergraduate student retention. Journal of College Student Retention, 16(3), 419-444. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/CS.16.3.f

Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. About College, 8-12. doi:10.1002/abc.20062

Gansemer-Topf, A. M., & Schuh, J. H. (2003). Instruction and academic support expenditures: An investment in retention and graduation. Journal of College Student Retention, 5(2), 135-145. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.iris.etsu.edu:2048/doi/abs/10.2190/ LX9Y-3R2A-EV4T-TFXP

Jones, W. A., & Braxton, J. M. (2009). Cataloging and comparing institutional efforts to increase student retention rates. Journal of College Student Retention, 11(1), 123-139. doi:10.2190/CS.11.1.g

Joyce, J. (2010). Nation's governors tackle college-completion rates. Diverse: Issues in Higher Education, 27(12), 1–8. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.iris.etsu.edu:2048/ps/ i.do?&id=GALE|A234712510&v=2.1&u=t el_a_etsul&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&authCount=1#

Kalsbeek, D. H., & Hossler, D. (2010). Enrollment management: Perspectives on student retention. College and University, 85(3), 2-11. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.iris.etsu.edu:3443/docview/225608438?OpenUrlRefId=info:xri/sid:primo&accountid=10771

Kerby, M. B. (2015). Toward a new predictive model of student retention in higher education: An application of classical sociological theory. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory, & Practice, 17(2), 138-161. doi:10.1177/1521025115578229

Marsh, G. (2014). Institutional characteristics and student retention in public 4-year colleges and universities. Journal of College Student Retention, 16(1), 127-151. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2190/CS.16.1.g

Pascarella, E. T., Seifert, T. A., & Whitt, E. J. (2008). Effective instruction and college student persistence: Some new evidence. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 115(1), 55- 69. doi:10.1002/tl.325

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). How college affects students (Vol. 2, pp. 373-445). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sandler, M. E. (2000). Career decision-making self-efficacy, perceived stress, and an integrated model of student persistence: A structural model of finances, attitudes, behavior, and career development. Research in Higher Education, 41(5), 537-580. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.iris.etsu.edu:3443/ocview/763669213?OpenUrlRefId =info:xri/sid:primo&accountid=10771

Schmitt, M. A., & Duggan, M. H. (2011). Exploring the impact of classified staff interactions on student retention: A multiple case study approach. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 35(3), 179-190. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2011.525 191

Tinto, V. (2012). Completing college rethinking institutional change (pp. 1-155). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1999). Taking retention seriously: Rethinking the first year of college. National Academic Advising Association Journal, 19(2), 5-9. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.12930/0271- 9517-19.2.5

Toutkoushian, R. K., & Smart, J. C. (2001). Do institutional characteristics affect student gains from college? The Review of Higher Education, 25(1), 39-61. doi: https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2001.0017

University Liability for Internship Activities: A Proposal for a Balanced Assessment of Fault

Chase Edwards
Assistant Professor of Law
B.I. Moody, III College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Lafayette, Louisiana

Geoff Stewart
Professor of Marketing
B.I. Moody, III College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Lafayette, Louisiana

Patricia Lanier
Professor of Management
B.I. Moody, III College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Lafayette, Louisiana

Gwen Fontenot
Associate Professor of Marketing
B.I. Moody, III College of Business Administration
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Lafayette, Louisiana

ABSTRACT

The current body of law that governs institutional liability for students participating in off-campus internship or service-learning activities does not adequately reflect the role of the modern university. At the same time that courts were moving away from the doctrine of in loco parentis—wherein the university took on many duties of the parents, such as providing safe shelter—American higher education was moving out of the classroom and into countless factories, offices, and retail spaces. In cases where students are injured during these activities, particularly when they are encouraged or required by their institution to participate, the university's role in the arrangement, its knowledge of the inherent danger, and other factors should determine its culpability. We propose a balancing test for jurists and risk managers to assess the extent of a university's duty to protect its students while in the workplace.

Introduction

Universities of every size endeavor to do more than offer traditional classroom lectures and recitations. Today's universities offer both academic and non-academic development outside of the classroom, both on and off campus. Non-academic development, independent of the student's academic program, may include the provision by the university of diverse opportunities outside the classroom for student exposure to, or participation in, activities such as student government, health and fitness, religious, sporting, international, societal, artistic, or scientific clubs. Off-campus activities might include local or distant trips to governmental bodies, musical presentations, athletic events, foreign countries, museums or fundraising "runs." Academic programs may allow or require activities outside the classroom to provide practical experience in the student's field of academic study as part of a course or degree plan.1 Examples of

1 Jane A. Dall, *Determining Duty in Collegiate Tort Litigation: Shifting Paradigms of the College-Student Relationship,* 29 J.C. & U.L. 485, 519 (2003); Beckham, *Negligent Liability Issues Involving colleges and Students:*

off-campus academic activities include field trips, where Art or Architectural students examine art, buildings, or structures off-campus; course work or internships, where Nursing students work in a hospital or community clinic; courses wherein Hospitality Management majors work in hotels and restaurants, or Business or Engineering students work in industry for academic credit. The question must arise: What is the university's liability for injury to these students while they are engaged in academic or non-academic, out-of-the-classroom, off-campus activities? If the activity, either academic or non-academic, causes injury to a student on campus, the university liability insurance policy and the campus risk management office or general counsel will obviously come into play. However, if the activity takes place off campus, is the university at risk?

Today, many accrediting bodies, such as the AACSB[1], look favorably upon service learning and other off-campus experiential activities in colleges and schools of Business. In Marketing classes in particular, experiential activities could include service learning, internship/co-op agreements with businesses, field trips to visit businesses or special events, student group activities such as fundraising or traveling to conferences or competitions, primary data collection for marketing research, extra point projects such as visiting the Chamber of Commerce or promoting the university at local high schools, or study abroad in locations that range from the rainforests of Costa Rica to the arrondissements of Paris. This paper will briefly investigate the case history of university liability for student injuries in general, and then attempt to articulate a particular regime of legal analysis to aid courts in determining university liability in tort cases that arise out of off-campus activities, optional or required, as part of the student's academic program. The conclusions will aid universities in planning for and mitigating their risk in this area.

Background of University Liability

If a student is injured in an academic, off-campus activity, under what theories of law may suit be brought and defended? There exists an ample body of literature up until the 1990s that analyzes the case law dealing with this question and setting out the various theories of law pled by both plaintiffs and defendant universities.[2] Some of the theories used by plaintiffs include negligent tort or breach of contract; those used by universities to defend themselves include sovereign immunity, contributory or comparative negligence, or lack of one or more of the elements needed to prove that a tort has been committed or that a contract has been breached.

The theory used most often by plaintiffs to bring suit for injury against a defendant is tort (an intentional or unintentional injury by one person to another person or the other person's property).[3] In order for a person to be held liable for a negligent tort, the following must be proven in court: 1) that the defendant had a duty of care to the plaintiff; 2) that the defendant breached that duty; 3) that the breach of the duty was the proximate cause of the injury; and 4) that the plaintiff actually suffered an injury to his/her person or his/her property.[4] The first question in the collegiate context, then, is, "When does a defendant university have a duty of care to the student?"

"An actor ordinarily has a duty to exercise reasonable care when the actor's conduct creates a risk of physical harm."[5] For example, a driver has the duty to use reasonable care in obeying the rules of the road while driving because it is foreseeable that, if he does not exercise such care, he could cause an injury. If a driver runs through a stop sign and hits a jogger, he has not used reasonable care; he has breached his duty; and will be liable for the injury if his breach caused the particular injury. However, if a driver is sitting at a stop sign and sees another car backing out of a driveway into the path of an oncoming jogger, he has no obligation to try to prevent the other car from hitting the jogger. "His own driving did not present a danger to the jogger. Someone else's driving did. This driver [*at the stop sign*] is guilty only of nonfeasance, a failure to take affirmative action that might have helped the plaintiff; suit against this driver would fail for lack of duty."[1] "An actor whose conduct has not created a risk of physical harm to another has no duty of care to the other..."[2]

This rule of law of nonfeasance, however, has several exceptions where the law would actually call for the driver sitting at the stop sign to act, where the law imposes an affirmative duty on the actor to prevent harm.[3] The affirmative duties that may cause an actor to become liable are: (1) an affirmative duty is created by statute; (2) an affirmative duty based on prior conduct creating a risk of physical harm; (3) an affirmative duty based on a "special relationship," such as "a custodial relationship" between the actor and the one harmed; (4) an affirmative duty based on a "special relationship" between the actor and the person posing the risk; (5) an affirmative duty based on the actor "voluntarily undertaking a duty to act with care he did not have in the first place; or (6) an affirmative duty based on taking charge of the other.[4] In these exceptional situations, the actor, who would ordinarily have had no duty to intervene and prevent harm in the first place, would have a duty to act, and failure to do so would result in tort liability.

In the "special relationships" mentioned above, for instance, the plaintiff has a reasonable expectation of protection from a defendant who holds some form of power over the plaintiff's welfare, and, usually, has received some monetary benefit from the relationship.[5] Legally, "special relationships" are found to exist "between a common carrier and its passengers, an innkeeper and its guests, a landlord and his tenant, a landowner and his invitee, and a custodian his ward."[6] Courts have also found that a "special relationship" exists between primary and secondary students and their schools, between spouses, between parents and their children, and between employers and employees. However, courts have not settled on a "special relationship" *per se* between universities and their students.[7]

Even when there is no *per se* duty of care, a "voluntarily undertaken duty" to act is usually established when a defendant, who originally had no duty, begins performance of an act or makes a promise to act that implies an undertaking of a duty to the plaintiff, and, the plaintiff, relying on this implied assumption, acts in a way that increases the plaintiff's risk. Therefore, if a defendant voluntarily assumes a duty, he can be liable if he performs that duty without reasonable care, or stops performing prematurely, causing injury.[8]

The problem that has arisen in the university context is whether or not the university had an affirmative duty to the student which it did not perform or whether the university was in a nonfeasance position with the student.[9] Did the university put itself in a "special relationship" with the student or voluntarily assume a duty to the student?[10] The courts' findings on these questions have changed over the years and, even within a particular period, have not been entirely consistent.[11] These case results have led to confusion on the part of university administration in dealing with its risk management. After analyzing these inconsistencies and identifying certain trends, this paper proposes a new analytical framework for courts to use when determining liability of universities for injuries to students participating in holistic learning activities such as internships.

Incongruity of Millennial Expectations & Juridical Sympathy

Universities in the late 1990s and into the new millennium welcomed students with a new mindset. The millennial student has been sheltered and carefully guided through

Does a Holistic Learning environment Heighten Institutional Liability?, 175 Ed. Law Rep. 379, 395-96 (2003).

1 The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business was founded in 1916 to accredit schools of business. The current mission is to advance quality management education worldwide through accreditation, thought leadership, and value-added services. It is regarded as the benchmark for business school quality among the academic community.

2 *Id*; Tia Miyamoto, *Liability of Colleges and Universities for Injuries During Extracurricular Activities*, 15 J.C. & U.L. 149 (1988); Robert D. Bickel, Peter F. Lake, *The Emergence of New Paradigms in Student-University Relations: From 'In Loco Parentis' to Bystander to Facilitator*, 23 J.C. & U.L. 755 (1997); Robert D. Bickel and Peter F, Lake, The rights and Responsibilities of the Modern University (1999); William P. Hoye, *What a Difference a Millennium Makes: Tort Litigation in Higher Education , Circa Y2K,* 147 Ed. Law Rep. 767 (2000); Kathleen Connolly Butler, *Shared Responsibility: The Duty to Legal Externs*, 106 W. Va. L. Rev. 51 (2003); Peter F. Lake, *Private Law Continues to Come to Campus: Rights and Responsibilities Revisited*, 31 J.C. & U.L. 621 (2005); Kristen Peters, *Protecting the Millennial College Student*, 16 S. Cal. Rev. L. & Soc. Just. 431 (2007).

3 White, G.E., 2003. *Tort law in America: an intellectual history*. Oxford University Press, USA.

4 Restatement (Third) of Torts, General Principles of Negligence Liability for Physical Harm § 3.

5 Restatement (Third) of Torts, General Principles of Negligence Liability for Physical Harm § 3. Comment d; Butler, at 63.

1 *Id*.

2 Butler at n. 79 (citing Dan B. Dobbs, the Law of Torts 269 at 853, 855-56 (2000)).

3 "[U]nless a court determines that one of the affirmative duties provided in §§ 38 – 44 is applicable." Restatement (Third) of Torts, Affirmative Duties § 37.

4 Restatement (Third) of Torts, Affirmative Duties § 37; Butler, at 63.

5 Butler, at 64.

6 Restatement (Third) of Torts, Affirmative Duties § 40; Butler, at 63.

7 Restatement (Third) of Torts, Affirmative Duties § 40, Comment l; Butler, at 64.

8 Restatement (Third) of Torts, Affirmative Duties § 42.

9 *See* Carlisle, B.A., 2017. The Evolution of in loco parentis Plus. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *49*(1), pp.48-53.

10 *See generally* Newcomer, L.A.S., 2017. Institutional Liability for Rape on College Campuses: Reviewing the Options. *Ohio St. LJ*, *78*, p.503.

11 *See* Griffin, O.R., 2015. A View of Campus Safety Law in Higher Education and the Merits of Enterprise Risk Management. *Wayne L. Rev.*, *61*, p.379.

their educational journey by their parents.[1] Baby-boomers grew up to become "helicopter" parents who hovered protectively over their children, and access to new technology enabled these parents to keep in close contact with their children, making the children more apt to look back home for guidance.[2] Cases brought by these students against their universities dealt with new types of injuries along with the typical premises liability claims.[3] Suicide, anxiety, stress, binge drinking, and substance abuse[4] increased litigation involving universities and their governing bodies. Media coverage of incidents on campus, especially hazing, brought public attention to the question of whether the university should be liable for student injury.[5]

Courts often found that the university had a reasonable duty of care, but the basis of liability was inconsistent. Few courts have returned to the holding in *Bradshaw* that the college is but a bystander and has no duty to the student. However, courts have continued to find the university in a position of nonfeasance. Resisting a finding that the relationship between student and university was a "special relationship" *per se*, but continuing to find that such a relationship exists in the particular circumstances in front of it, including when the college is in a business-invitee or landlord-tenant relationship. Likewise, based on a finding of university nonfeasance, some courts have found that the university had voluntarily assumed a duty of care by or through certain actions. Once a court has found a duty of care owed by the university, the questions of foreseeability of the danger and causation could still prevent college liability.[6] These varying bases of liability have led to inconsistent decisions and confusion of university administrators in their management of risk.[7]

In *Bradshaw* the court declared that its '"beginning point" in analyzing the case was "a recognition that the modern American college is not an insurer of the safety of its students."[8] "Today . . . fewer courts rely on the *Bradshaw* rationale that adult students are on their own and have to fend for themselves."[9] However, *Bradshaw* is still routinely cited by defendant universities.[10] In *Rigdon v. Kappa Alpha Fraternity*,[11] the court found that the college owed no duty to a student attacked at a fraternity party on campus because the attack was not within the list of foreseeable risks that the university could act to prevent. In *Robertson v. State,*[12] the court cited *Bradshaw* in ruling in favor of Louisiana Tech on summary judgment after an intoxicated student fell from a college-owned rooftop. "The duty of Tech to provide a safe campus and not to act unreasonably with regard to its students did not extend to protect [the student] from his deliberate act of recklessness."[13]

Courts that do not follow *Bradshaw* may still find in their analysis of university liability that a university starts with no affirmative duty, but increases its chances of being found liable if it has created a "special relationship" with the student by assuming a duty it did not have in the first place. Several cases have found that such a "special relationship" was created by the university. In *Davidson v. Univ. of N.C. at Chapel Hill*,[14] the court found that the college student relationship was not special *per se*, but the college was found to have established a "special relationship" with its cheerleaders by controlling the administration of the program and by receiving benefits from the program. In *Schieszler v. Ferrum College*,[1] the court found that sufficient facts were alleged to support a claim of a "special relationship" between a student who committed suicide and his college when the college had notice of the student's unstable mental condition. In *Gonzalez v. Univ. Sys. of N.H.*,[2] the cumulation of the college's control, funding, provision of college space, requirement of minimum GPA, and provision of an advisor established a special relationship its cheerleaders. However, the analytical method in this line of cases has not been universally adopted. By contrast, the court in *Geiersbach v. Frieje*, found no "special relationship" stating that it was "reluctant to characterize the basic college-student relationship as 'special' so as to invoke a duty on behalf of the college."[3]

Some courts have found a different route to the same conclusion by finding that a "special relationship" exists between the university and the student because the university is in the position of a landowner to its invitees or a landlord to its tenants.[4] In *Knoll v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Nebraska*, which involved an intoxicated student hazing incident, the college had a "landowner-invitee duty to students to take reasonable steps to protect against foreseeable acts of hazing, including student abduction on the University's property and the harm that naturally flows therefrom".[5] In *Sharkey v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Neb.*,[6] the court found the university had a duty as a landlord to its tenant.[7] A seminal precedent came from the Florida Supreme Court in a 2000 case involving an intern who was attacked at her worksite. In *Gross v. Family Services Agency and Nova Southeastern University*,[8] discussed in depth hereinbelow, the student was abducted in the parking lot, robbed and sexually assaulted while leaving the off-campus internship site. The Florida Supreme Court acknowledged that normally the university and the student do not stand in a special relationship, but such a relationship may exist where the student is assigned to a mandatory and approved internship program.

Courts have also found that a university has voluntarily assumed a duty to students through various actions.[9] In *Coughan v. Beta Theta Pi Fraternity*[10], the court said there was no special relationship, but there was an assumption of duty in relation to an underage student who was injured when she fell from a sorority house fire escape after she became intoxicated at a series of fraternity parties that were allowed on campus. In *Stanton v. Univ. of Me. Sys.,* the court found "that a sexual assault could occur in a dormitory room on a college campus is foreseeable and that fact is evidenced in part by the security measures that the University had implemented."[11] The adoption of the security measures indicated that the college was assuming a duty to protect the student. In *McClure v. Fairfield Univ.*,[12] the court found an assumed duty on the part of the university to a student who had an alcohol-related vehicular accident after sanctioned on campus activities.

Notwithstanding the issue of nonfeasance, some courts have held that universities can only be treated as having a duty when it could foresee a potential harm that would result in injury. In *Agnes Scott Coll., Inc. v. Clark*, the court held that an attack on a student was "unforeseeable as a matter of law."[13] Likewise, in *Kleisch v. Cleveland State Univ.*,[14] the court held that the college did have a duty of care owed to its students, but did not breach that duty in failing to prevent an attack that was unforeseeable. Again, in *Rigdon v. Kappa Alpha Fraternity*,[15] the university was found not liable for an attack on an invitee to a fraternity party because the invitee could not show that the attack by another invitee was foreseeable by the university. However, in *Stanton* the court concluded that "foreseeability is not

1 Much, K., Wagener, A. M., Breitkreutz, H. L., & Hellenbrand, M. (2014). Working with the millennial generation: Challenges facing 21st-century students from the perspective of university staff. *Journal of College Counseling*, *17*(1), 37-47.

2 Workman, J. L. (2015). Parental influence on exploratory students' college choice, major, and career decision making. *College Student Journal*, *49*(1), 23-30.

3 Dimas v. Texas State University System , 201 S.W.3d 260 (Tex. App. 2006) (holding that the sexual assault of a student on a university campus in a dark stairwell was not proximately caused by, among other things, the university's negligent implementation of safety policies or failure to use ordinary care to keep the campus safe, properly lit, and free from criminal trespassers.)

4 Christophel v. N.Y.-Presbyterian/Weil Med. Coll. 2018 NY Slip Op 30109(U) (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 2018) (holding that a medical school was not liable for the failure to adequately assess and treat a medical student who was diagnosed with substance abuse issues secondary to work-induced stress that resulted in death).

5 Beckman, *supra* note 1, at 395.

6 Peters, *supra* note 3, at 448.

7 Dall, *supra* note 1, at 485.

8 Butler, *supra* note 3, at 70 (citing *Bradshaw,* 612 F.2d, at 138.)

9 Peters, *supra* note 3, at 455 (citing Lake, *supra* note 3, at 695).

10 Butler, *supra* note 3, at 94 (citing *Gross*, 758 So.2d, at 88).

11 *Rigdon v. Kappa Alpha Fraternity* (consolidated with *Rigdon v. Corporation of Mercer University*), 568 S.E.2d 790 (Ga. Ct. App. 2002).

12 *Robertson v. Louisiana Tech, et al.,* 747 So. 2d 1276, 1285 (La. Ct. App. 1999).

13 Peters, *supra* note 3, at n. 167 (citing *Robertson v. Louisiana Tech, et al.,* 747 So. 2d 1276, 1285 (La. Ct. App. 1999).

14 *Davidson v. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*, 543 S.E.2d 920 (N.C. Ct, App. 2001).

1 *Schieszler v. Ferrum College, et al.,* 236 F.Supp. 2d 602 (W.D. Va. July 15, 2002).

2 *Gonzalez v. University System of New Hampshire,* 38 Conn. L. Rep. 673 (Conn. Super. Ct. 2005).

3 *Geiersbach v. Frieje*, 807 N.E.2d 114 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004).

4 *Butler*, *supra* note 3, at 100.

5 *Knoll v. Board of Regents of Univ. of Neb.*, 601 N.W.2d 757, 258 Neb. 1 (1999).

6 *Sharkey v. Board of Regents*, 615 N.W.2d 889, 260 Neb. 166 (2000).

7 *Peters*, *supra* note 3 at 6.

8 *Gross v. Family Services Agency, Inc.*, 716 So. 2d 337 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1998).

9 *Butler*, *supra* note 3, at 104.

10 *Coghlan v. Beta Theta Pi Fraternity*, 987 P.2d 300, 133 Idaho 388, 133 Id. 388 (1999).

11 *Stanton v. University of Maine System*, 773 A.2d 1045, 2001 M.E. 96 (Me. 2001).

12 *McClure v. Fairfield Univ.*, 35 Conn. L. Rep. 169 (2003).

13 *Agnes Scott College, Inc. v. Clark*, 616 S.E.2d 468, 273 Ga. App. 619 (Ct. App. 2005).

14 *Kleisch v. Cleveland State Univ.*, 2005 Ohio 1285 (Ct. Cl. 2005).

15 *Rigdon v. Kappa Alpha Fraternity*, 568 S.E.2d 790, 256 Ga. App. 499 (Ct. App. 2002).

dependent on prior similar acts" and reasoned that "the concentration of young people, [...] on a college campus, creates a favorable opportunity for criminal behavior ... [and] the threat of criminal behavior is self-evident.'"[1]

Other courts found that, while the university had a duty of reasonable care to the student, which it may have breached, the breach was not the cause of the injury and, therefore, the university was not liable. In *Rogers v. Del. State Univ.*,[2] the court found no liability because any number of patrols could not have prevented an attack that was preplanned and based on a personal vendetta. The university's action or inaction did not cause the injury. In *Fuch v. University of Akron*,[3] the court found that the student failed to produce evidence to prove that his injury and the related medical expenses and work loss was caused by a negligent act or omission on part of the university's staff. In *Peterson v. Fordham University*,[4] the court found that, despite the fact that the university did not prevent all students in attendance from bringing alcohol to its alcohol-free annual barbeque and failed to police a large crowd at the casual event, this was insufficient to establish causation for a student's injuries from a fight that ensued at the event. Even in more serious cases, such as *Colarossi v. University of Rochester*, [5] the court found that the university was not liable for injuries sustained when the plaintiff was shot on campus by a non-student, given that there was no evidence that inadequate security was the proximate cause of the injury.

A Closer Analysis of *Gross*: Internships in Particular

Gross v. Family Services Agency and Nova Southeastern University (hereinafter Gross),[6] was a significant case dealing specifically with an off-campus internship. Bethany Gross, a twenty-three-year-old Psychology doctoral student, was required by the Nova Southeastern University to complete an eleven-month practicum. The university provided a list of approved sites and each student could choose six sites from this list and rank them by preference, much like the national matching program used in medical school.[7] The university then assigned the student to one of the six sites. Gross was assigned to Family Services Agency, Inc., which was about fifteen minutes from the university. The university was unaware, at the time it made this assignment, of any criminal incidents at or near the site.

While leaving the Family Services Agency site, Gross was abducted from the parking lot, robbed, and sexually assaulted. Family Services Agency, the host employer, settled with Gross before trial, but the university chose to litigate. The district court, basing its reasoning on premises liability, found that the university had no duty to Ms. Gross because it did not own, operate, or have any control over the practicum site.

When Gross appealed, the court of appeal certified a question to the Supreme Court of Florida, asking it to rule on this question: "[w]hether a university may be found liable in tort where it assigns a student to an internship site which it knows to be unreasonably dangerous but gives no warning or inadequate warning, to the student, and the student is subsequently injured while participating in the internship."[8] The Florida Supreme Court answered that, while the university and student do not ordinarily stand in a "special relationship" that imposes a duty on the university, such a relationship may exist *when the student is mandated to attend an approved internship*. The court found that the university not only had a duty to warn of foreseeable dangers, but also should not have placed students with an employer where the student was likely to be harmed.[9]

In ascertaining the impact of *Gross*, it is important to note that not every university internship program is mandated and appointed. Commentators, Susan Brown Foster and Anita M. Moorman, have identified three different types of internships and included the following educational experiences within the term internship for purposes of their analysis: field experience, service learning, practica, externships, and apprenticeships. The three types are: (1) internships that are optional and involve no supervision by the university other than helping some students locate and identify potential internship sites; (2) internships that are a required component of the academic program, but it is the responsibility of the student to identify, locate, and secure an in internship; and (3) internships that are a required academic component and the university assigns the student intern to a specific site. Internships may be on campus, or any distance from the university, including those in foreign countries.[1]

Gross makes it clear that the extent to which the university exerts control over the internship is directly related to university liability: when the university controls the selection of the site and mandates that a student work at that site in order to gain academic credit in that internship to graduate from the program, it creates a "special relationship" with the student. The university becomes liable for its negligence in selection of the site, and responsible for warning the student of foreseeable dangers. If the university does not require an internship, does not give academic credit for it, and does not choose the internship site or assign the student to a particular site, it would be reasonable to assume under *Gross* that it does not create a "special relationship" with the student and would not be liable for failure to use reasonable care in warning the student of foreseeable danger.

There are, of course, seemingly infinite combinations of circumstances not mentioned in the Foster and Moorman analysis, however, between these two ends of the spectrum where it is unclear whether a "special relationship" has been created. Most universities, for instance, do not require an internship for graduation in most programs, but they do give academic credit for it. Even if the student chooses the internship site completely on her own, the university may still be liable for the simple reason that the university incentivized the student by awarding academic credit and awarding a grade, usually only after approving the internship at a particular workplace. The university must correspond in some fashion with the supervisor of the intern at the work site in order to set out the academic requirements and have an evaluation of the student by the work site supervisor, as well as an evaluation of the work site by the student and the professor.

It would seem then that, if academic credit is given, it is almost impossible for the university to keep its distance from the student and the work site, regardless of whether the student has chosen the site, or if the school suggested the site, or if the school mandated the site. As much of a burden as it would seem to impose upon the university, it must direct its internship advisors acquaint themselves with the internship work site of each student before agreeing to award academic credit for the student's work there. When a university approves the site for academic credit, without further orientation or warning of dangers, is not the university impliedly telling the student that the work site is safe? When the university requires approval of the site and the content of the work at that site for academic credit, has not the university put itself in control of the student's internship choice?

The Educational Mission Paradigm

In 2003, another paradigm was suggested in light of the expanding nature of higher education.[2] This "Educational Mission Paradigm" calls for the courts to view the university's liability in terms of the university's "own educational mission."[3] In this way, the court can more accurately assess how the university sees itself in relation to the student. The author notes that a university's mission is, in large part, a product of its size and its own assumptions about the maturity of its student body. If a university, however, had notice of a particular risk, its responsibility would be greater. The extent of the duty and causation would have to be a fact-intensive inquiry conducted in every case based on the particulars of both the student plaintiff and university defendant. Dall suggests that the existence of a duty in these cases is a policy decision that should be resolved clearly in order to enable universities to manage their risks.

A Proposed Guide for Judicial Application

Although the "Educational Mission Paradigm" provides an effective tool for helping determine university liability, it does not go far enough to give courts the guidance needed to reach consistent decisions. Commentators agree that during the American university's transition from stationary ivory tower of learning to dynamic provider of education online, off-site, and otherwise, two conflicting lines of case law continue to surface. First, that the university should not be looked upon as the absolute insurer of the student[4] because the student is at the university specifically to take responsibility for him/herself as an adult; and second, that it cannot be denied that the university does accept students into its academic programs and campus life, both on and off campus, with a certain care-taking attitude implied.[5] Perhaps,

1 *Peters*, *supra* note 41, at n.139 (citing *Stanton*, 773 A.2d at 1050)

2 *Rogers v. Delaware State University*, 905 A.2d 747 (Del. 2006).

3 Name 2002 WL 31955468, 2002 – Ohio- 5396, Ohio Ct.Cl., October 2002 (No. 2202-05867 – AD).

4 *Peterson v. Fordham University*, 306 A.D.2d 29, 761 N.Y.S.2d 33 (App. Div. 2003).

5 *Colarossi v. University of Rochester*, 2 A.D.3d 1272, 770 N.Y.S.2d 237 (App. Div. 2003).

6 *Gross v. Family Services Agency, Inc. and Nova Southeastern University*, 716 So. 2d 337 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1998).

7 Congress, S. T. N. (1994). National Resident Matching Program. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, *169*, 712.

8 *Id* at 340.

9 *Nova Southeastern University, Inc. v. Gross*, 758 So. 2d 86, 90 (Fla. 2000).

1 Susan Brown Foster, Anita M. Moorman, *Gross Family Services Agency, Inc.: The Internship as a Special Relationship in Creating Negligence Liability*, 11 J.Legal Aspects Sport 245, at 255.

2 Dall, *supra* note 1.

3 Dall, *supra* note 1, at 520.

4 Peters, *supra* note 3, at 443 (citing *Bradshaw*, 612 F.2d at 138.)

5 Peters, *supra* note 3, at 431.

this unresolved dichotomy is partially to blame for the rendering of inconsistent decisions.[1]

The crux of the problem may be that many students of the current generation, despite their voting age, are not fully adults attending the university with their own resources, but with the total or partial help of their parents. They are not adults, completely *out of the control* of their parents, nor are they children *under the control* of their parents. Most students are, thus, "in between" childhood and adulthood.[2] All universities spend large amounts of time, energy, and money accommodating this unique transitional condition in both academic and non-academic circumstances. Orientation and "First Year Experience" programs are present on virtually every campus in America.[3] This accommodation may continue, not just during the first few days on campus, with the most comprehensive programs continuing through graduation.[4] From orientation and course placement for first year students to help with job interviewing and placement in the fourth year, students are guided along the process of moving into the adult world.

How much accommodation is provided depends to a very great extent on the kind of university analyzed. These accommodations, helping hands, and guidance are advertised by the university in an effort to attract top students. However, the university also advertises and organizes itself to, in the end, send these students out into the marketplace capable of competing and succeeding in an adult world. This necessarily implies that the university reasonably expects the student to incrementally begin to take control of and accept responsibility for his/her own life over the course of their time at the institution, so that, by the end of four years, the student is an independent adult. Depending on the type of university and its level of investment in these programs, each university expresses its own attitude toward student growth and when it will treat the student as an adult.[5] If the university is a small, private institution that implies in its advertising that it will "be there" for the student, watch over the student, be hands-on with the student, it would seem the university has more of a duty to the student. In the alternative, a large state university, where students have opportunities of all kinds, but neither the parents nor the students have an expectation of "hands-on oversight," it would seem the duty would be less.

Likewise, with the activity at issue, whether it is on or off campus, the question should be "What is the level of risk reasonably expected by the student and by the university?" With every sanctioned activity, regardless of the type of university, there should be a duty on the university to carry out a due diligence investigation and to make sure the student is informed of the risks that are identified. Then, the question of whether the university has a duty to train or advise the student as to how to avoid an injury, or prevent the student from participating would seem to go back to the question of which type of university the student is attending.

Therefore, there are several factors at issue in the proposed expanded analysis of the "Educational Mission Paradigm": the transitional nature of the student, the type of university, and the risk of the activity. Trying to analyze the question of duty under tort law without recognition of these unique circumstances has led courts to render decisions that have been reached through contrived avenues, bending and twisting theories pulled from various areas of the law in an attempt to reach a reasonable decision.[6] We propose the following individualized, fact-intensive analysis:

Factors that should be considered to decide the **scope of the duty** are:

- What type of university is in question?
- At what stage of the transition from child to independent adult is the student?
- How does the university advertise itself in its recruitment efforts with regard to its accommodation of this transition?
- How fully are these accommodations implemented?

Factors that should be considered in deciding whether the duty was breached are:

- What is the level of risk of injury to the student from this activity?
- Was the student informed of the risk in the activity?
- What are the resources of the university involved?
- Did that type of university do what could reasonably be expected of such a university to train and warn the student to avoid the injury, or to prevent the student from engaging in that activity?

Factors to be considered in deciding **causation** are:

- Was the lack of information about the risk in the activity the proximate cause of the injury?
- Was the lack of training, advice, or prevention (considering the resources of the university) the proximate cause of the injury?
- Was the inaction of the university in regard to established policies and procedures that were in place to protect the student the proximate cause of the injury?
- Regardless of the avenue used to arrive at a duty, the courts have defined the scope of the duty to the student based on whether the university knew or should have known of that particular risk of injury. In other words, was the risk foreseeable and reasonably anticipated by that particular university?[1]

Recommendations for University Risk Managers

The decision in *Gross* implies that the Internship Advisor should avoid mandating a specific internship site because such action indicates control over the student and the site by the university and will probably result in the creation of a "special relationship" between the university and the student. The "special relationship" carries with it the imposition of duty on the university to investigate the site, become aware of any dangers, and orientate the student accordingly. It would seem that even the approval of an internship for academic credit, with the corresponding communication between the site employer and the internship advisor would necessitate the advisor know where the site is, what would be necessary for the student to get to the site, and who the employer is. This approval or denial of approval denotes some control over the situation. However, there is no indication that mere coordination between the Internship Advisor and several companies who desire to host a university's students would create such a "special relationship". It is only an arrangement where the university limits students to a certain employer or approved list of employers that would bring about the *Gross* standard of due diligence on the part of the university.

Regardless of the location, however, seminars or orientations should be held for all student interns to prepare them for their workplace experience, including instruction to the student on the recognition and assessment of danger to personal safety.[2] There should be a reporting mechanism in the student evaluation of the internship where the student can report any information she has learned regarding safety and dangerous conditions. Students and site employers should be instructed on the laws of discrimination and sexual harassment.[3] Most importantly, students must be told early and repeatedly that they should immediately contact university officials at the very first indication of trouble and assured that no negative consequences will befall them for not continuing an internship in a dangerous or inappropriate workplace.

Some commentators recommend that, in addition to the implementation of policies such as these, site visits should be made and even requests made to law enforcement officials at the remote sites for information regarding the safety of the internship site location in order to comply with the Cleary Act.[4] Students and faculty should be educated in the policies of the university when a dangerous situation arises.

Some universities require employers to include paid interns under their insurance coverage, or, if unpaid, make sure the student is covered by the university's insurance.[5] In other universities, the student must show proof of his or her own insurance coverage, either private or through the university.[6] University risk managers and internship advisors would be prudent to review university policies relative to internship programs to determine, based on

1 Peters, *supra* note 3, at 432.

2 Bickel & Lake, *supra* note 3, at 787.

3 *See generally* Young, D. G., & Keup, J. R. (2016). Using Hybridization and Specialization to Enhance the First- Year Experience in Community Colleges: A National Picture of High-Impact Practices in First-Year Seminars. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2016*(175), 57-69. *See also* Bers, T., & Younger, D. (2014). The First-Year Experience in Community Colleges. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2013*(160), 77-93.

4 Padgett, R. D., Keup, J. R., & Pascarella, E. T. (2013). The impact of first-year seminars on college students' life- long learning orientations. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *50*(2), 133-151.

5 Dall, *supra* note 1, at 520.

6 *See* Miyamoto, *supra* note 3, at 175.

1 Miyamoto at 150. (The court cited *Mintz v. State*, 362 N.Y.S.2d 619 (1975) holding that sometimes foreseeability is also used to decide proximate cause).

2 Lori Miller, Paul Anderson, Ted Ayres, *The Internship Agreement: Recommendations and Realities,* 12 J. Legal Aspects Sports 37, at 308-309 (Winter 2002).

3 *Id* at 309. Foster and Moorman, *supra* note 50.

4 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f)

5 *Kinder v. INDUSTRIAL CLAIM APPEALS OFF.*, 976 P.2d 295 (Colo. App. 1998). (overturning a decision by the lower court that the unpaid intern was not entitled to Worker's Compensation benefits).

6 Miller, Anderson, Ayres, *supra* note 62, at 308-309; Cathy Swift, Russell Kent, *Business School Internships: Legal Concerns*, 75(1) J. of Education for Business 23-26 (1999).

existing case law in their jurisdiction and the details of their own insurance policies, the degree of risk associated with the university's current internship policies and to revise or establish policies and procedures to minimize such risks by ensuring that all interns are covered for injuries sustained during the internship, thus mitigating the need for litigation to cover a student's losses in the event of an injury during the internship.

Conclusion

Holistic learning will continue to gain traction as the push for "soft skills" and "real world experience" continues to be a primary demand from employers and students, respectively. The off-campus internship remains the most common method for gaining these skills for American students. As universities push for more of this type of experiential learning, the institutions must perform a comprehensive organizational risk management assessment to determine their potential exposure to liability and have plans in place for when, not if, one of their students is harassed or harmed in the workplace.

Perceptions of Students Regarding Carrying of Concealed Handguns on College and University Campuses in Texas

Brandy Sandersen
Educator, Seguin Independent School District
Seguin, Texas

Lori P. Kupczynski
Professor, University of Saint Augustine for Health Sciences
St. Augustine, Florida

Marie-Anne Mundy
Associate Professor, Texas A&M University–Kingsville
Kingsville, Texas

Angela M. Gibson
Associate Director, Curriculum Innovation
Colorado State University–Global Campus
Greenwood Village, Colorado

ABSTRACT

At the end of the 84th Legislative session, Texas joined seven other states in giving individuals the right to carry a concealed handgun on campuses of higher education. With guns being allowed at post-secondary institutions, little is known about the perceptions of the students whom attend these colleges and universities. Politicians make the laws, though students who are directly affected by the change have little say in the matter. This study shares the students' perceptions regarding the carrying of concealed handguns on college and university campuses in Texas. Findings may provide insight to higher education administrators and state legislators in determining proactive and reactive policies and programs on safety, well-being, and awareness connected to college and university concealed carry laws.

From the Columbine High School massacre to the Virginia Tech shootings, the aftermath has been the same; the lives of innocent students have been lost to gun violence. In the wake of the many tragedies involving armed shooters on school campuses, there are states which are currently considering new legislation in the hopes of mitigating these threats (Arnold, 2015; National Conference of State Legislatures, 2015). The legislation proposed varies from state legislature to state legislature as different states examine a multitude of strategies to keep their students safe (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2015). In Texas, Governor Gregg Abbot, enacted Senate Bill 11 (Tex. Penal Code § 46.03(a); Tex. Penal Code § 46.03(f), 2015, pp. 328-330) which allows, on all public and some private university campuses in Texas, licensed individuals to carry concealed firearms, effective August 1, 2016 (Arnold, 2016). With the implementation of concealed carry on college campuses, Texas joined nine other states: Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Oregon, Utah, and Wisconsin, which also allow the concealed carry of a weapon on a university campus (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2017; Armed Campuses, 2015).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Over the last few decades there has been an increasing concern for the safety of students in an educational setting. The National Center for Education Statistics (2017) compiled a list of health-risk behaviors that contribute to death and disability among the youth of America. One of the biggest concerns is unintentional injuries and violence related to weapons at school.

The idea that individuals feel safe while in a school environment has become a false idealization when viewed through the lens of these tragic events. At the end of the 84th Legislative session, the Texas legislature passed a bill allowing for the carry of a concealed weapon on

university campuses, affective August 1, 2016 (S. 11, 2015). This amendment to the Texas Penal Code, allows qualified individuals to legally carry a concealed weapon within various university buildings (Tex. Penal Code § 46.03(a); Tex. Penal Code § 46.03(f), 2015, pp. 328-330). The passing of the new law has raised concerns regarding students' attitudes and perceptions of the legalization of concealed carry of a firearm on university campuses.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this quantitative study was to use a quasi-experimental alternative treatment post-test only with non-equivalent groups or a static group comparison design by using a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to determine if the perceptions of students concerning the concealed carry of handguns on college and university campuses differs based on the variables of gender, age, academic rank, and relationship to violence.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the University of Texas, clock tower sniper shooting in 1966, the fear of someone committing an act of violence on a Texas school campus with a firearm has been a major concern when dictating safety policy in all educational institutions. One of the ways state legislatures are trying to effect safety within schools is by allowing individuals to carry a firearm on school property. Specifically, at the higher education level, state legislators are pushing change by enacting policy and laws which allows concealed firearms on campuses.

HISTORY OF CAMPUS CARRY

The introduction of concealed carry on campus started in 2003 when the state of Colorado passed a law allowing for the carry of concealed handguns in public places except public K-12 schools, public official buildings, or on a private property where concealed carry is not allowed. In 2006, the law was extended including universities and community colleges in the locations where the carry of concealed weapons (Abernethy, 2010).

The conversation surrounding concealed carry on campuses shifted after the massacre of students and faculty in 2007 at Virginia Tech University. Previously licensed Concealed Carry permit holders were not allowed to carry concealed firearms on university campuses. During this time, the activist organization called Students for Concealed Carry wanted to create change in federal, state, and local policies (Students for Concealed Carry, n.d; Kopel, 2009). Students for Concealed Carry on Campus, a national, non-partisan organization with a membership of over 43,000 college students, professors, college employees, parents of college students, and citizens, were demanding state legislatures to grant the right for private citizens to be able to carry a licensed concealed handgun on a college or university campus, just as they might do in other public locations (Students for Concealed Carry, n.d).

The expansion of carrying a concealed handgun on campus began in earnest in 2013 when 19 states brought proposed bills on this topic to their state legislature's attention and in 2014, when 14 other states introduced comparable legislation. Currently, 23 states allow individual college or university campuses to dictate concealed Campus Carry policy: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and West Virginia (Armed Campuses, 2015; National Conference of State Legislatures, 2015). And, as previously stated, by 2017 ten states, including the state of Texas, mandate the carrying of concealed handguns on campus at the university level with regulation controlled by the college or university. Each state's concealed campus carry legislation contains state specific provisions. As of this writing, the following 16 states completely ban the carry of concealed handguns on campus: California, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, and Wyoming (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2017; Armed Campuses, 2015).

PERCEPTIONS OF OWNING A FIREARM AND CONCEALED CARRY

Since the law allowing the concealed carry of fire arms on the campuses of Texas institutions of higher education did not officially go into effect until August 2016, it was hard to determine the attitudes of the stakeholders affected by the passing of this new law. Previous studies had asked different university populations about their perceived feelings towards the idea of individuals carrying concealed weapons around college campuses. One study, conducted by Thompson et al. (2013), revealed that 78% of the 1,649 participants would not support the concealed handgun law on their school campus and 78% said they would not obtain a Handgun License if it were legal to carry on their university campus.

In 2013, Ryan Patten, an Associate Professor and Criminal Justice Coordinator at California State University, along with Matthew O. Thomas and Paul Viotti, completed

a study on attitudes regarding concealed weapons and female perceptions of safety on college campuses. The intention of the study was to understand women's attitudes concerning more concealed weapons on college campuses. Seven hundred and ninety-four females participated in the study and over 80% of the sample participants did not want qualified individuals to carry on campus. Participants also stated they would not be safer with more concealed guns on campus and they did not think more guns would create a safer atmosphere. This study, and several others, included findings indicating the idea of carrying guns not being acceptable on college campuses.

A 2013 study conducted by Patten, Thomas, and Wada focused on two college campuses: California State University and Chadron State College. Seventy-three percent of the students, faculty, and staff did not want qualified individuals to be able to carry weapons on campus. Seventy percent of those surveyed did not feel safer with more concealed weapons on campus and, 72% felt that having armed students, faculty, and staff on campus would not create a safer environment. Further studies conducted by Bennett, Kraft, and Grubb (2012) and Cavanaugh, Bouffard, Wells, and Nobles, (2012) all had the same results; faculty staff and students felt that they would not feel safe with guns being allowed on college campuses.

A study conducted by Miller, Hemenway, and Wechsler (1999) was done to determine the percentage of on-campus handgun possession at some accredited four-year higher education institutions, by using a national sample of students. The survey was sent out to 140 participating higher education institutions and almost 30,000 students received the study, and there was a 58% return. The participating schools were in 38 states and the District of Columbia. Sample selection was based on the probability proportionate to enrollment size sampling. All fulltime undergraduate students at a university were eligible for this study. The questionnaire asked students if they had a working firearm with them at college and were given three possible response options: no; yes (specifically a handgun); or yes (specifically a semiautomatic) According to the study, 3.5% of the students reported possessing a working firearm with them at college: "Among the 53% of students living off campus, 5.3% had guns, compared with 1.3% of the students who lived on campus" (Miller et al., 1999, p. 8). Of the 3.5% of the students reported possessing a working firearm with them at college, 6% identified themselves as male and 1.5% identified themselves as female. The remainder of the study reported data where students felt actions they took (i.e. binge drinking, drinking and driving) put themselves and others in positions that could cause harm. A majority of the students (36%) were White males, who were members of a fraternity, lived off campus, and participated in alcohol related activities (i.e. binge drinking, drinking and driving) which could lead to severe injury (Miller et al., 1999).

In 2002, Miller, Hemenway, and Wechsler conducted a follow up survey with 120 of the original participating higher education institutions with more than 20,000 of the original students responded. The study was conducted to investigate the nonfatal weapon victimization at a higher education institution and the differences between students that had weapons for protection and those that had a weapon for a different reason. For this study, 10,000 of the surveys that were returned (50%) were usable. The results from the study showed that 4.3% of students possessed a firearm while attending college, a 0.8% increase from the original study. Of the 4.3% of students who owned a gun, not quite half (47%) of them responded the reasons for owning the gun was for protection (Miller et al., 2002). These respondents who claimed it was for protection were more likely to be African American women who attended college in an urban area and were more likely to use cocaine than to binge drink. This study also revealed similar results to the first study; student gun owners were more likely to be White males who were members of a fraternity, lived off campus, and participated in alcohol related activities (i.e. binge drinking, drinking and driving) which may lead to severe injury. One similar findings between the research conducted by Miller et al. (1999) and Miller et al. (2002) is that alcohol was a contributing factor for the violent behavior observed and reported (Miller et al., 1999; Miller et al., 2002).

METHODOLOGY

The research for this study was conducted from a sample of undergraduate students attending universities and community colleges in the State of Texas during the fall of 2016 and Spring of 2017 semesters. Data were analyzed through a quantitative approach. Independent variables used in testing included: gender and victimization of violent crimes. The dependent variables employed were the perceived support for concealed handgun carry on college campuses, and perceived advantages and disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses.

INSTRUMENTATION

For the study the researchers applied an instrument that was developed by Thompson et al. to measure students' perceptions and behaviors regarding the presence of concealed handguns on campus, with modifications. The instrument consists of 43 questions and was used in this study to help understand the perceptions of

students regarding carrying of concealed handguns on higher education campuses. According to Thompson et al., a review completed by a panel of experts (n = 6) in firearms and survey research established validity for this instrument (2013).

PROCEDURES

Fifteen university research and development departments around the State of Texas were initially contacted for this study. Four out of the 15 universities agreed to release the emails of the student population for students enrolled in the Fall 2016 and the Spring of 2017 semesters once provided the IRB approval letter from Texas A&M University-Kingsville. These four universities released over 56,000 student emails to be used in this study. Students enrolled at those four Texas universities were then contacted by email three different times, one initial email and two follow up reminder emails.

Data received from the complete surveys was used to determine if there was any significant difference between the participant's gender and whether they were a victim of gun violence on their perceived support for the concealed carry of handguns on college campuses and the perceived advantages and disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. Multiple tests were performed, such as the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA), using SPSS to obtain proportions and frequencies to describe the data. Means and standard deviations were calculated for each dependent variable. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there are any differences in perceptions of students concerning the concealed carry of handguns based on the variables of gender and relationship to violence at college and university campuses.

DATA ANALYSIS

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The survey was provided via email to approximately 56,000 students with only 1054 surveys completed (n = 1054). The following demographic information for the sample was obtained from the 1054 returned surveys: Male 42.79%, Female 57.21%.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

GENDER

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if gender influenced students' perceived level of support for campus carry and perceived level of advantages and disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. The independent variable was the students' gender and the dependent variables were the students' perceived level of support for campus carry, perceived level of advantages and perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was no homogeneity of variance-covariance, as assessed by Box's test of equality (F = 2.17, p = .043) however, the sample approached normal variance (Males = 410, Females = 565); and the MANOVA test was a robust test, therefore, analysis was continued. There was a statistically significant difference overall between males and females on students' perceived level of support for campus carry and perceived level of advantages and disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses, Wilks' Lambda F(3, 974) = 7.829, p < .001; Wilks' **Λ** = .976; partial η^2 = .024.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if gender affected a students' perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses.

There was statistically significant difference between students' gender on the perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses, F(1,973) = 18.68, p = .000, ηp^2 = .02 (see Table 1). The hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship between gender and perceived support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was small, with gender counting for 2% of the variance of the dependent variable. Males scored higher in their perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses (M = 13.77, SD = 3.58, respectively) than Females (M = 12.82, SD = 3.18, respectively) (see Table 2).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if gender had an effect on students' perceived level of advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was a statistically significant difference between students' gender on the perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university

Table 1
Univariate Analysis for Gender on Campus Carry

	d_f	F	Sig.	ηp^2
Support	1	18.675	.000	.019
Advantage	1	9.066	.003	.009
Disadvantage	1	21.176	.000	.021

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Gender on Campus Carry

	Gender	Mean	SD	N
Support	**Male**	13.77	3.58	410
	Female	12.82	3.18	565
Advantage	**Male**	9.46	3.34	410
	Female	10.08	3.05	565
Disadvantage	**Male**	10.51	3.41	410
	Female	9.56	3.00	565

campuses, F(1,973) = 9.07, p = .003, ηp^2 = .01 (see Table 1). The strength of the relationship between gender and perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was negligible, with gender counting for 1% of the variance of the dependent variable. The hypothesis was rejected. Females scored higher in their perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses (M = 10.08, SD = 3.05, respectively) than Males (M = 9.46, SD = 3.34, respectively) (see Table 2).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if gender influenced students' perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was statistically significant difference between students' gender on the perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses, F(1,973) = 21.18, p = .000, ηp^2 = .02 . The strength of the relationship between gender and perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was small, with gender counting for 2% of the variance of the dependent variable. The hypothesis was rejected Males scored higher disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses (M = 10.51, SD = 3.41, respectively) than females (M = 9.56, SD = 3.00, respectively).

VICTIMIZATION

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if the student had been a victim of violence had an effect on students' perceived level of support for campus carry, perceived level of advantages and perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. The independent variable was if they were a victim of violence and the dependent variable was the students' perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was no homogeneity of variance-covariance, as assessed by Box's test of equality of covariance matrices (F = 2.193, p = .041). The sample approached normal variance (victimized = 510, not victimized = 466); and because the MANOVA test is considered robust, the test was carried out. There was a statistically significant difference between students who said they were victims of violence and students who reported they were not a victim of violence on students' perceived level of support for campus carry, perceived level of advantages and perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. Wilks' Lambda, F(4, 970) =5.856, p < .001; Wilks' Λ = .976; partial η^2 = .019.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the student had been a victim of violence affected students' perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was statistically significant difference between the student's identification of victimization on the perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses, F(1,999) = 16.72, p =.000 ηp^2 = .017 (see Table 3). The strength of the relationship between victimization and perceived support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was small, with victimization counting for 2% of the variance of the dependent variable. The hypothesis was rejected. Students who said they were a victim of a violence scored significantly higher in their perceived level of support for carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses (M = 13.68, SD = 3.32) than students who were not a victim of violence (M = 12.80, SD = 3.40) (see Table 4).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether or not the student had been a victim of violence had an effect on students' perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was statistically significant difference between the student's identification of victimization on the perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college, F(1,1003) = 8.57, p = .003, ηp^2 = .009 (see Table3). The

Table 3
Univariate Analysis for Students Identification of Victimization on Campus Carry

	d_f	F	Sig.	ηp^2
Support	1	16.72	.000	.017
Advantage	1	8.57	.003	.009
Disadvantage	1	6.18	.013	.006

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for *Students* Identification of Victimization on Campus Carry

	Victim	Mean	SD	N
Support	**No**	12.80	3.395	510
	Yes	13.68	3.322	466
Advantage	**No**	10.11	3.234	510
	Yes	9.51	3.103	466
Disadvantage	**No**	9.72	3.186	510
	Yes	10.23	3.219	466

strength of the relationship between victimization and perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was negligible, with victimization counting for less than 1% of the variance of the dependent variable. The hypothesis was rejected. Students who said they were a victim of violence scored the perceived advantage of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses significantly lower (M = 9.51, SD = 3.10) than students who were not victim of violence (M = 10.11, SD = 3.23) (see Table 4).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the student had been a victim of violence had an effect on students' perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. There was statistically significant difference between the student's identification of victimization on the perceived advantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses $F(1,993) = 6.18$, $p = .013$, $\eta p^2 = .006$. The strength of the relationship between victimization and perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses as assessed by partial eta squared was negligible, with victimization counting for less than 1% of the variance of the dependent variable. The hypothesis was rejected. Students stating they were a victim of violence perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses significantly higher (M = 10.23, SD = 3.22) than students who were not victims of violence (M = 9.72, SD = 3.19).

DISCUSSION

Knowledge of students' attitudes and perceptions on the issue of the conceal carry of handguns on college and university campus' will allow the state legislature and university employees to better create conditions for and foster a n environment where students feel safe. There are various aspects of a student's life which can impact their feelings towards the Campus Carry law. These may include students' experiences at the college level, students' involvement in extracurricular programs such as Greek life and sport clubs, as well as their relationships with their peers and with faculty and staff. Students may not fully be aware of what college life is like prior to stepping foot on campus (Pedrelli, Nyer, Yeung, Zulauf, & Wilens, 2015). Higher education institutions are looking at factors which influence a students' emotional status to ensure there is adequate support for these individuals as well as to prevent them from turning to violence against others or harming themselves (Neumann et al., 2015). Of those states which now permit concealed carry on the campuses of higher education institutions, this study provides insight into the perceptions of the law from a portion of the population of recently enrolled college students in the state of Texas.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

This study is a replication of the study originally conducted by Thompson et.al (2013) in the five Great Lakes States and a secondary study conducted by Spratt (2015) in the State of Indiana. The results supported the findings Patten's 2013 study in California, Thompson et al.'s study, and Spratt's study. The Patten study determined that over 80% of female participants did not support concealed carry on campuses nor did they feel safe with individuals carrying on campus (2013). In this current study, females had a stronger perception of the advantages of concealed carry on college and university campuses more so than males who had a stronger perception of the disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on campuses. This new data needs to be assessed further focusing on why individuals do not want concealed carry at colleges and universities.

The final section of the study, focused on the students' relationship to violence and how it effects the students' perceived support, advantages and disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses. Students who said they were a victim of violence scored higher in their perceived level of support and the perceived disadvantages of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses than students who were not victims of violence. Students who said they were a victim of violence scored the perceived advantage of carrying concealed handguns on college and university campuses lower than students who were not victim of violence. This may be related to their own interactions with violence. (Cook et al., 2017; Kinniburgh, Blaustein, Spinazzola, & Van der Kolk, 2017) Students who have been a victim of violence might be weary of the violence

reoccurring (Kliewer, Lepore, Oskin, & Johnson, 1998; Garbarino, Bradshaw, & Vorrasi, 2002).

CONCLUSION

Universities and community colleges in the state of Texas can utilize the results of this study to determine how students will be affect by the concealed carry law at college and university campuses and make strategic and administrative decisions based on the findings. Higher educational institution administration leaders can determine what proactive and reactive measures need to be put into place for the health, wellness, and safety, as well as awareness, of their student populations based on the concealed carry on campus legislation. Insights from the study can help academic leaders develop an environment where all students feel safe through the careful development of concealed campus carry rules, regulations, and provisions.

This study is important to the field of education as it will provide necessary information regarding students' perceptions of concealed carry on campus with regards to safety. Knowledge of students' attitudes and perceptions will allow the state legislature and college and university employees to better foster a campus environment where students feel safe. As determined by the findings from the study, students felt safe with their peers, faculty, and staff concealed carrying on campus, but they did not feel safe when random visitors could carry on campus. This is information that can help the Texas legislature, legislators in other states, and administrators at institutions of higher education develop effective and directed plans to help their students feel safe and allow for possible revisions to laws and policies in subsequent legislative sessions.

REFERENCES

Abernethy, S. (2010). Colorado State rescinds gun ban after court ruling. *Denver Post*. Retrieved from http://www.denverpost.com/breakingnews/ci_15024058

Armed Campuses. (2015). *Guns on campus' laws for public colleges and universities: A guide for students and parents*. Retrieved from http://www.armedcampuses.org/

Arnold, G. (2015). Arming the good guys: School zones and the Second Amendment. *Brigham Young University Education & Law Journal*, 481-506.

Bennett, K., Kraft, J., & Grubb, D. (2012). University faculty attitudes towards guns on campus. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 23*(3), 336-355. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10511253.2011.590515

Bouffard, J. A., Nobles, M. R., Wells, W., & Cavanaugh, M. R. (2012). How many more guns?: Estimating the effect of allowing licensed concealed handguns on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(2), 316-343. doi: 10.1177/0886260511416778

Cook, A., Spinazzola, J., Ford, J., Lanktree, C., Blaustein, M., Cloitre, M., ... & Mallah, K. (2017). Complex trauma in children and adolescents. *Psychiatric Annals*, *35*(5), 390-398.

Garbarino, J., Bradshaw, C. P., & Vorrasi, J. A. (2002). Mitigating the effects of gun violence on children and youth. *The Future of Children*, 73-85.

Kliewer, W., Lepore, S. J., Oskin, D., & Johnson, P. D. (1998). The role of social and cognitive processes in children's adjustment to community violence. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *66*(1), 199.

Kinniburgh, K. J., Blaustein, M., Spinazzola, J., & Van der Kolk, B. A. (2017). Attachment, Self-Regulation, and Competency: A comprehensive intervention framework for children with complex trauma. *Psychiatric Annals*, *35*(5), 424-430.

Kopel, D. B. (2009). Pretend 'gun-free' school zones: A deadly legal fiction. *Connecticut Law Review , 42*(2), 515-584.

Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Wechsler, H. (1999). Guns at college. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(1), 7-12. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/07448489909595666

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Indicators of school crime and safety*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/index.asp

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2017). *Guns on campus: Overview*. Retrieved from http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/guns-on-campus-overview.aspx

Neumann, Y., Assaf, D., Cohen, Y., & Knoll, J. L. (2015). Profiling school shooters: automatic text-based analysis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *6*, 86.

Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Viotti, P. (2013). Sweating bullets: Female attitudes regarding concealed weapons and the perceptions of safety on college campuses. *Race, Gender & Class, 20*(3/4), 269-290.

Patten, R., Thomas, M. O., & Wada, J. (2013). Packing heat: Attitudes regarding concealed weapons on college campuses. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4). doi: 10.1007/s12103-012-9191-1

Pedrelli, P., Nyer, M., Yeung, A., Zulauf, C., & Wilens, T. (2015). College students: Mental health problems and treatment considerations. *Academic Psychiatry, 39*(5), 503-511. doi: 10.1007/s40596-014-0205-9

Spratt, J. T. (2015). *Revealing the concealed: An examination of college students' perceptions of personal and campus safety regarding concealed handguns on campus* (Order No. 3700681). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1678904779). Retrieved from http://0-search.proquest.com.oasis.lib.tamuk.edu/docview/1678904779?accountid = 7086

Students for Concealed Carry. (n.d). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from http://concealedcampus.org/faq/

Tex. Penal Code § 46.03 (2015)

Texas Department of Public Safety. (2015). *New laws for Texas Conceal Handgun Texas Concealed Handgun License (CHL) program*. Retrieved from http://txdps.state.tx.us/RSD/CHL/Legal/newlegislation.htm

Thompson, A., Price, J. H., Dake, J. A., Teeple, K., Bassler, S., Khubchandani, J., & ... Stratton, C. (2013). Student perceptions and practices regarding carrying concealed handguns on university campuses. *Journal of American College Health*, *61*(5), 243-253.

Current State of The Institutional Research Office in Higher Education: Focus on the Leader and Staff

Youngsik Hwang
Ph.D Candidate,Higher Education & Student Affairs (HESA)
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this analysis is to show information about the structure of institutional research (IR) offices in four-year postsecondary institutions. This paper shows the general information of each IR office by the backgrounds of IR offices, members of IR offices, and other indicators. While prior research just shows general descriptions of IR offices, studies about the contemporary figures of IR office based on detailed categories are rare. The investigation of IR leaders is important to understanding their output on campus because the leaders who provide IR services greatly impact institutional decisions. This research describes current IR office structure and the background of the office leaders by specific category. This information provides several policy implications for the environments of institutional research offices in the long run.

Introduction

Higher Education institutions are providing educational services to their students and meeting their institutional goals. The collaborative works between sub-stems of functions at institution meet each campus members' needs and enable the institutional core to head to the right direction, which is toward better institutional outcomes in the current competitive higher education market. Among the sub-system of the institutional structure, the institutional research (IR) office has a role to provide reliable information to other sub-organizations and helps institutional make decisions. While prior research emphasizes several statistical results and trends of several indicators to explain IR fields, there are rare studies to show the IR office directly. Even though there are many studies about multidimensional aspects of institutional research, those focusing on IR offices are rare. Some of them are strongly dependent on the results of individual interviews (Delaney, 1997; Knight, 2010), and their interpretation is limited to the interpretations of the specific situation. Culture and norms on campus have more significance compared to nonacademic organizations (Dooris, 2002), and understanding IR offices is the starting point to how we evaluate institutional characteristics. Many staff members in IR offices have specific roles, and this study describes the current figures of IR offices with empirical evidence. While the statistical results exist as visible figures for interpretation, the overview of IR members provides an intangible assessment of the results. A main priority of institutional researchers in higher education consists of data submission and reporting accountability requirements traditionally (Chirikov, 2013). However the new IR role should have broad boundaries in order to meet flexible environmental education and fulfilling institutional missions. IR is becoming a necessary component in important institutional decision-making processes on campus (Calderon & Mathies, 2013). The multidimensional aspects of IR contribute to determine campus resources, administrative services, and other important institutional behaviors. Directions of institutional research can be different from one another, according to staff characteristics or managers' attitudes. In this aspect, this study discusses the construction of IR offices and it generates several policy implications for IR professionals.

Literature review

Prios studies have investigated how institution deal in the institutional research as one of administrative structures. Kezar (2005) show that the office of institutional research can create better institutional outcome and it should be understood under organizational lens. Some studies overview the IR under the organizational system since institutional research provides empirical evidences that support institutional behavior. Tolbert (1985) provides concept of resource dependence and institutionalizations

to explain organizational behavior and structure. His result shows that dependence on nontraditional source of support differentiate their pattern of administrative offices in institutions. The high level of institutionalization can organise the rule of collaborations between administrative offices (Corley, Boardman, & Bozeman, 2006) and although the importance of IR office is still remarkable between scholars, the practical funding or support for the office is still weak (Morest & Jenkins, 2007). One of the main responsibilities in IR office is knowledge management for institution. Their cumulative knowledge for aligned organization help institutional survival and contribute to enforce their position in the competitive higher education market (Serban, 2002). Institutions use the IR support when they are facing on the institutional changes or external uncertainty and the IR may show a set of new directions to make a progress at the point (Tina, Goodstein, & Richard, 2002).

With the organizational lens for institutional research, some studies examine how the institutional research is defined. While Fincher (1985) focuses more on the interpretation of institutional records and data, Peterson (1985) also defines IR as a "critical intermediary function that links the educational, managerial, and information functions of higher education institutions and systems." This indicates that IR is the comprehensive strategy to combine available information in the territory of higher education system. Institutional research staffs face flexible environments with factors such as demographic change of students, limited budget resources, and different styles of institutional leaders. Institutional leaders need to have proper information in order to meet external needs and improve performance, as well as diverse outputs after college such as alumni data and employments (Gagliardi, & Wellman, J., 2014). While large schools use institutional information from sufficient professionals in IR offices, the offices in small institutions are under the pressure of diverse institutional needs, with similar expectations of output. With this institutional size, the consideration of cross-cultural influences is an important factor in evaluating given institutional data in IR offices because the environmental interdependence has an important role in constructing the data (Nedwek & Neal, 1994).

Conceptual framework

Prior studies have shown how institution considers the institutional research in terms of organizational framework. Institutional research is intended to help the leader's decision making on campus, and the different organizational lens provide future direction of institutional research. Saupe (1990) acknowledges that various administrative units are doing the role of institutional research, regardless of institutional type and the office of institutional research have a responsibility to manage the information on academic purposes, programs, policy. IR officers do academic planning, budgeting, and other supportive role to the institutional leader. The institutional leaders include diverse administrators such as deans, chancellor, and faculty committees who have a responsibility to make a decision on campus. Institutions give responsible IR members the research role under the well-organised setting such as proper methods, knowledge and understanding of reality and institutional leader choose the analyzing methods under the given data (Hathaway, 1995).

IR offices consist of various professionals, and they have their own role in producing meaningful results. Their responsibilities include policy analysis, applied research projects, and technological support for decision makers. The ability to manage changing technological advances is a prerequisite of effective IR workers, and those hybrid skills broaden the possibility of accurate institutional decision-making (Wells, Silk, & Torres, 1999). The majority of institutional mission statements tend to come from the content analysis of IR information (Huntington & Clagett, 1991). The function of IR offices is related to institutional planning and important assessments of effective institutional performance. More and more institutions are trying to make evidence-based decisions (Seymour, Kelley, & Jasinski, 2004), and the importance of IR offices has increased over time. Calderon and Mathies (2013) recognize that IR office should respond forthcoming institutional needs under the complex external challenges such as shrinking resources, global competition, and increasing variety of societal needs. They need to fulfill the institutional mission and create new values to promise future institutional success in the competitive higher education market (Taylor, Hanlon, & Yorke, 2013). The location of the IR office in the institution varies. According to the prior 1999 survey of association of institutional research (AIR), the 38percent of the IR offices in the sample is located under academic affairs/provost, while 26percent is under president/chancellor and 8percent under business services. Others are located under student affairs or development offices (Volkswein, 1999). While the IR office has their own administrative responsibility for institution, upper-level of supervising units may affect the direction of their research. Following Figure 1 shows the general structure of IR office in institution.

While many prior studies emphasize the role of IR offices in institutional effectiveness, studies on IR office members are uncommon. In order to interpret the outcomes from IR offices, general understanding of the office members is necessary. The average staff size at four-year institutions is bigger than at community colleges, and more than five years of experience is generally required to be a director of an IR office (Lindquist, 1999). Some schools have only one staff member to do IR research, which makes it difficult for institutional leaders to assess the right decision-making direction. Additionally, Teodorescu (2006) explains that IR officers need to balance between two important skills: hard and soft skills. He argues that IR officers do quantitative data analysis or web development as a hard skills and translate it into a story-telling or qualitative approach as a soft skills. In order to accomplish these comprehensive goals, the IR office requires varied backgrounds of research members within the organization. The main purpose of educational organization is directly related to improve student learning outcomes and the assessment of these outcomes demonstrate institutional effectiveness (Volkwein, 2011). In this aspect, the IR office members have a responsibility to provide varied organizational characteristics and potential institutional policy directions for better institutional performance. While the many institutional leaders acknowledge that the information from institutional research is accurate and believable for their decision-making, they still want IR office to do clearer analysis and statistical interpretations (Harrington, Christie, & Chen, 1996). The leaders' expectation for IR service is sometimes too high to fulfill their own standards for institutional policy direction (Okigbo, 2008).

Continuous pressure for downsizing and changes in the ability to manage the data and flexible institutional needs are challenges for IR office members (Leimer, 2011) and the more responsibility and skills are required for them. IR staffs also do the collaborative tasks for better outcomes because their data is deeply engaged in various sector of different internal structures such as enrollment, academic affairs, and other administrative parts. The productive interpersonal relationships with other institutional staffs allows them to access more sufficient statistical evidences for better decision making (Kroc, 2015). The cooperative working atmosphere moderate the cognitive gaps between staff members for data management and buffer the potential risks to be biased toward facing institutional issues. Recent study indicates that the women staff in IR office has drastically increased from 25percent to 62percent over prior 30 years and the increase in for-profit institution is still behind of average growth (Caruth, 2015). As Figure 1 showed, the fundamental role of institutional research include gathering, examining, and handling data for planning, institutional policy, and decision-making is still consistent. In addition, the proportion of female workers is higher than the proportion of male worker. Knight and Leimer (2010) examine how IR staff considers their job experiences at the office. From the national survey of IR-related workers, interestingly, the result shows that the direct effect of job satisfaction to quit is very weak. But the workers who have lack of required skills or experience to meet needs tend to easy to leave at the office or turnover to the other workplace within five years (Lindquist, 1999). Mismatching between required skills and rewards are one of the important factor to affect negatively to the frequent turnover for IR staff members (Knight & Leimer, 2010) and one of the IR office leaders' responsibility is to buffer the IR offer staffs from expected hardships such as balance between family-work, burnout, re-educational training for new technology.

Data collection and Methodology

This paper overviews the current structure of IR office by various institutional indicators. In order to meet the research purpose, this research focuses on two approaches: descriptive analysis and simple comparison between institutions. While descriptive information provides general picture of current IR office status, this study will also focus on differences and similarities between public and private sector by some IR office indicators for simple comparison. If an institution has several branches, the only IR offices exist in representative campuses for simplicity and the collected data provides descriptive information for all IR offices of samples. The institutions are categorized by several indicators such as region (northeast, midwest, south, west), office structure (OIR/OIA or others), and staff's demographic factors (race, gender, leader's information). With the general description of IR offices, this study also shows information about characteristics of representative IR offices. Through the analysis of variance (ANOVA), this study investigates how the IR office is different by institutional characteristics.

For the purpose of this research, the list of institutions in this study comes from the Carnegie Classifications online listings as of September 2016. It provides selected additional variables from Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS), and all-inclusive classifications are based on institutional behaviors and attributes from 2013 and 2014. Even though the individual classifications are not more recently updated, it is sufficient to categorize the groups by institutional type. The resources of studies include open information on each institutional website, individual cover letters, bibliography, and professional networking services based on several websites such as LinkedIn. Through the data source, this study collects considered information and clarifies the data's credibility through the cross checking. The total number of institutions in this study is 957, all of which are four-year institutions. The institution include four-year public and non-profit institution excluding for-profit institutions

because there are few data of the institutional type. The considered institutions are only for the university which have IR-related offices or part. Compared to private sector, public institutions have relatively common institutional missions and structures for public values, and they share similar internal roles. The data provides the detailed information about specific IR offices at each institution and categorizes the IR office leaders by specific types, such as their degree, race, position, and majors.

Results

Table 1 shows the general information of an IR office on the dataset. About 37 percent of campuses are located in the south region (n=355) of U.S territory, and most of them are named for 'Office of Institutional Research (OIR)' or 'Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE)' as an office name (91percent). While most institutions in the sample have an independent IR office on campus (93percent), some are under the sub-part of other offices, such as academic affairs or the provost's office. Interestingly, About 40 percent of IR offices only have one administrative manager who have IR tasks on campus. The IR offices that have student assistant are extremely rare and it indicates that many offices have still lack of office workers who deal in IR tasks even though the size of employment in the office tends to depend on the size of the entire campus. As Figure 1 showed, while several research analysts handle the IR data under one supervisor in general, current figure of IR office do not meet minimum requirement of IR professional recruitment. While the IR workers, supportive administrative officers also essential to provide administrative services for a common goal.

Level of educational attainment for all IR leaders have a bachelor's degree or above (Table 2). Over sixty percent of the cohort have a general doctoral degree (Ph.D) or Doctorate of Education (Ed.D). Compared to public institution, the ratio of Ph.D holder in private institution (60.1percent) is a little lower and the cohorts indicates more proportion of MA/MBA holders (33percent).

Most leaders are White, regardless of institutional type (public: 84.6percent, private: 87.8percent), and small portion of staff members for technical analysis are Asian (public: 7.5percent, private: 6percent). Their working specialty tends to be involved practical data handling and collection, based on their academic backgrounds. While the majority of those in leading positions for institutional research on each campus are white, specific colleges that focus more on different races and genders have diverse staff members as IR leaders such as minority-served institution. While 65percent of IR office leaders have a title of 'director' in public institution, the ratios in private institution is a little lower (56.9percent). Our results indicate that general IR leaders are executing their tasks as a 'director' in OIR or OIA. Some of them are the director of the office, as well as having an administrative title such as vice provost or vice president. When the IR offices have different names as a part of an administrative office including academic affairs or the provost's office, the title of IR leader is normally named for the non-IR administrative position. Interestingly, the IR office of private institution has more specific titles for the office leader (29.2percent) which pursuit different office mission and specialized tasks. The specific titles include data manager, accountability, budget planning, and analytics. Regardless of institutional type, more than one third of the cohort holds an education-related major (public: 38.5percent, private: 34.8percent). The following majors are business/economics and STEM fields, such as mathematics or engineering. In terms of IR functions for campus, these results are consistent with their own role. IR officers have a responsibility to manage the institutional

Table 1. General overview of institutional research office (n=957)

IR office location	Northeast: 227, Midwest:218, South: 355, West: 152
IR office sector	Public: 614, Private: 343
IR office structure	OIR/OIA: 874, Other: 75
IR office name	Independent: 896, Subordinate: 53
IR office members	<Staff> mean: 3.15 1(40%), 2-3(27%), 4-5(13%), 6-10(13%), more than 10 (4%) <Student assistant> mean: 0.18 0(95%), 1-2 (3%), 3-5(2%)

Table 2. Characteristics of IR office leader

	Public	Private
Degree		
BA	8.2%	6.9%
MA/MBA	26.8%	33.0%
Ph.D/Ed.D	65.0%	60.1%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	84.6%	87.8%
Asian	7.5%	6.0%
African-American	3.3%	3.0%
Hispanic	3.1%	2.7%
Other	1.5%	0.6%
Position		
Director	65.4%	56.9%
Dean	1.3%	1.2%
Provost/Vice Provost	13.0%	4.4%
President/Vice President	13.2%	8.5%
Other	7.2%	29.2%
Major		
Education	38.5%	34.8%
Business/Economics	16.2%	11.5%
STEM fields	16.8%	16.2%
Public administration/politics	7.9%	9.1%
Sociology	6.3%	6.4%
Philosophy	8.4%	12.2%
Other	6.0%	9.8%

data and interpret it for institutional improvement, which requires a balanced view between an educational lens and technical support. The more interesting point is that a significant number of cohorts were sociology and philosophy majors in this analysis. Compared to the directors of OIR/OIA, more administrative leaders, such as vice provosts and deans tend to have these majors. In sum, the most IR offices are OIR or OIA, and the leader is most likely to be a white. Generally, the representative leader has doctoral degree with an education or science background, and the culture of the office can be a white-dominated according to leader's perspective. The product of professional reports or output reflects the producer's views based on statistical evidence and other academic backgrounds of leader affect the research outcomes as well. When the number of staff is limited, the phenomena can be enforced. The output of IR offices may support the organizational leader's policy direction positively, sometimes their statistical evidence encourage the leader to change existing policy. In this aspect, IR outcomes should

be neutral, regardless of researcher's background and institutional research shares both approaches, qualitative and quantitative interpretation. The understanding of IR staff backgrounds allow the potential customer who use specific output of institutional research to interpret the individual IR results more carefully.

Table 3 shows the result of ANOVA test for several demographic characteristics of IR office by institutional type. The number of total IR office members in public institutions are significantly higher than the private institution's number, and both have more female workers in IR office. Over 60percent of IR office leaders are female (public: 62percent, private: 68percent), and over half of office members are the same gender, as well (public: 54percent, private: 56percent). The other interesting point is that while the IR office leader is likely to be White (Table 2), its staff is more diverse. Both institutions only have around 30percent of White staff members. It implies that there are following discussions to explain this phenomena later which is related to organizational structure or race-related theoretical perspectives in the following section.

Discussion

The importance of IR office have grown over time and the institutional leaders consider proper statistical supports to make an important institutional decision under flexible external challenges in the higher education market. The rationale behind this research starts from the current statement, and this paper provides general structure of IR office by institutional type and suggests further directions for development of IR office. The result shows that most IR offices are doing their responsibility as an independent administrative organizations within the institution, and sometimes their number of staffs are not sufficient to do their diverse roles. Typical IR leaders tend to be White, hold doctoral degree and received degrees in the education field. While single staff covers their IR role alone, their multiple backgrounds such as STEM, business may play a role to meet IR needs in different ways. While the IR staffs share similar backgrounds, regardless of institutional type, the staffs in private institution is more likely to be diverse in terms of their major, structural role. Institutional research provides knowledge networks to support institutional decision on campus (Chirikov, 2013), and IR offices hold the responsibility to show credible evidences on how institutions make decisions. The result indicates that public institution have more staff members and more experienced office leaders, compared to private institution. Under the female-dominated working environment, the IR office are managing their own role at daily campus life. The integration of insights from diverse backgrounds are essential to balance between staff members and create a deep understanding of large-scale research collaboration (Corley et al, 2006). Institutional design and continuous development of their particular research environment can be the basic disciplines for better IR office outcome (Bozeman & Boardman, 2003). In this aspect, the finding of this study also gives institutional researcher how IR office is structured by each type and help the general understanding of their future direction for better performance.

	Public	Private
Total members	3.80(4.21)	1.98(2.81) ***
Student assistant	0.09(0.44)	0.05(0.34)
Employment experience	7.03(7.72)	5.97(6.68)
Female % of IR office leader	0.62(0.32)	0.68(0.47) ***
White % of IR staffs	0.29(0.78)	0.30(0.86)
Gender ratio of IR staffs	0.46(0.50)	0.44(0.50)

*Reference group: public institutions (*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001).

References

Antons, C. M., & Maltz, E. N. (2006). Expanding the role of institutional research at small private universities: A case study in enrollment management using data mining. *New directions for institutional research*, *2006*(131), 69-81.

Bozeman, B., & Boardman, P. C. (2003). Managing the New Multipurpose, Multidiscipline University Research. *IBM Center for the Business of Government*.

Calderon, A., & Mathies, C. (2013). Institutional research in the future: Challenges within higher education and the need for excellence in professional practice. New Directions for institutional research, 2013(157), 77-90.

Caruth, G. D. (2015). The Status of Institutional Research: For Women But Not For-Profits?. *International Women Online Journal Of Distance Education*, *4*(3).

Chirikov, I. (2013). Research universities as knowledge networks: the role of institutional research. Studies in Higher Education, 38(3), 456-469.

Corley, E. A., Boardman, P. C., & Bozeman, B. (2006). Design and the management of multi-institutional research collaborations: Theoretical implications from two case studies. *Research policy*, *35*(7), 975-993.

Delaney, A. M. (1997). The role of institutional research in higher education: Enabling researchers to meet new challenges. *Research in Higher Education*, *38*(1), 1-16.

Dodd, A. H. (2004). Accreditation as a catalyst for institutional effectiveness. *New directions for institutional research*, *2004*(123), 13-25.

Dooris, M. J. (2002). Institutional research to enhance faculty performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2002*(114), 85-96.

Fincher, C. (1985). The art and science of institutional research. New directions for institutional research, 1985(46), 17-37.

Harrington, C. F., Christie, R. L., & Chen, H. Y. (1996). Does Institutional Research Really Contribute to Institutional Effectiveness. In *Perceptions of Institutional Research Effectiveness As Held by College and University Presidents. AIR 1996 Annual Forum Paper*.

Hathaway, R. S. (1995). Assumptions underlying quantitative and qualitative research: Implications for institutional research. *Research in higher education*, *36*(5), 535-562.

Huntington, R. B., & Clagett, C. A. (1991). Increasing Institutional Research Effectiveness and Productivity: Findings from a National Survey.

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (2016). Carnegie Classifications 2015 public data file, http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/downloads/CCIHE2015-PublicDataFile.xlsx

Kezar, A. (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the developmental process. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(7), 831-860.

Knight, W. E. (2010). In their own words: Effectiveness in institutional research. AIR Professional File, 115.

Lindquist, S. B. (1999). A profile of institutional researchers from AIR national membership surveys. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1999(104), 41-50.

Morest, V. S., & Jenkins, D. (2007). Institutional Research and the Culture of Evidence at Community Colleges. Report No. 1 in the Culture of Evidence Series. *Community College Research Center, Columbia University*.

Nedwek, B. P., & Neal, J. E. (1994). Informational cultures: Facing challenges of institutional research within cross-continental settings. Research in Higher Education, 35(4), 429-442.

Okigbo, C. (2008, May). Adapting to meet new challenges: Moving institutional research forward. Paper presented at the 48th AIR Annual Forum, Seattle, WA.

Peterson, M. W. (1985). Institutional research: An evolutionary perspective. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1985(46), 5-15.

Saupe, J. L. (1990). The functions of institutional research.

Serban, A. M. (2002). Knowledge management: The "fifth face" of institutional research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2002*(113), 105-112.

Seymour, D., Kelley, J. M., & Jasinski, J. (2004). Linking planning, quality improvement, and institutional research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2004*(123), 49-56.

Taylor, J., Hanlon, M., & Yorke, M. (2013). The evolution and practice of institutional research. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2013*(157), 59-75.

Teodorescu, D. (2006). Institutional researchers as knowledge managers in universities: Envisioning new roles for the IR profession.

Terenzini, P. T. (2013). "On the Nature of Institutional Research" Revisited: Plus ça Change...?. Research in Higher Education, 54(2), 137-148.

Tina Dacin, M., Goodstein, J., & Richard Scott, W. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of management journal*, *45*(1), 45-56.

Tolbert, P. S. (1985). Institutional environments and resource dependence: Sources of administrative structure in institutions of higher education. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-13.

Volkwein, J. F. (2011). Gaining ground: The role of institutional research in assessing student outcomes and demonstrating institutional effectiveness. *NILOA Occasional Paper*, (11).

Wells, J., Silk, E., & Torres, D. (1999). Accountability, technology, and external access to information: Implications for IR. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *1999*(103), 23-39.

Leadership Believability and Higher Education Fundraising

Rikki Abzug
Ramapo College of New Jersey
Mahwah, New Jersey

Natalie J. Webb
Defense Resources Management Institute
Naval Postgraduate School
699 Dyer Rd. Bldg. 234
Monterey CA 93943

Jody Abzug
Senior Director of Fund for Sarah Lawrence
Sarah Lawrence College
1 Mead Way
Bronxville, NY

ABSTRACT

Stakeholders of American colleges like to know that their leadership "gets it." Believability and credibility are often hallmarks of effective leadership. But do these leadership characteristics correlate to effective fundraising in the nonprofit higher education sector? In this study we explore the relationship between the believability and credibility characteristics of presidents of top small liberal arts colleges with their ability to head effective institutional advancement endeavors. We test models of alumni giving, in both percentage and absolute dollar measures, by including the research literature's most dependable predictor—alumni financial wherewithal--and we still find support for the significance of leadership believability in fundraising effectiveness.

Introduction

A literature at the intersection of higher education and philanthropic studies posits the college or university president as "fundraiser-in-chief" (see for example: Satterwhite and Cedja, 2005; Goddard, 2009 and Hodson, 2010). Yet there has been very little work that has explored the particular leadership characteristics that correlate with success in the higher educational institutional advancement endeavor. Inspired by studies of organizational excellence, this research explores the particular predictive power of leadership "believability" or credibility as a correlate to fundraising effectiveness. This paper sits at the juncture of the scholarly literatures on the role of leadership in fundraising and the specific exigencies of fundraising for higher education in the United States. Per the former, the nonprofit fundraising literature is replete with admonishments that successful fundraising efforts stem from committed organizational leadership (see for example: Nanus and Dobbs, 1999; King, 2004; and Ritchie, Kolodinsky, and Eastwood, 2007). Per the latter, parallel literatures have developed within both nonprofit fundraising studies and higher education studies to explore the specific case of fundraising in higher education (see for example: Rooney, 1999; Schneider, 2000; and Clotfelter, 2001). We bring both of these literatures together with a broader leadership literature to question what it is about leadership that might impact fundraising. In consideration of the unique qualities of higher education fundraising, we resurrect the concept of leadership believability as a potentially fruitful avenue of inquiry. We begin with a review of the concept of leadership believability, positing its potential correlation with organizational fundraising outcomes. We next briefly review the extant literature on correlates of alumni giving. We then introduce our research model and hypotheses, describe our population and methods, present our findings and, finally provide conclusions.

Leadership Believability:

The relatively under-researched notion of leadership "believability" derives from the 1982 best-selling *In Search*

of Excellence by Peters and Waterman, although the concept is at least as old (and debated) as Socrates. The McKinsey consultants, Peters and Waterman, expanded upon James MacGregor Burn's (1978) transforming leadership concept by identifying the transformational leadership attributes of believability and excitement. For Peters and Waterman, believability was present when value-infused, top performing companies are led by those who grew up with the core of the business: the authors invoked electrical engineers at HP and mechanical engineers at Fluor. A transformational leader was believable to the extent that he or she came up through the ranks—a concept as ancient as Socrates' debate with Nicomachides about the existence of generic management skills. According to Xenophon, Nicomachides, who was a true believer in "believability," was aghast that the Athenians would choose a merchant over an exalted captain and centurion to be a general. Socrates, disagreeing, argued that coming up through the ranks may not be as important as generic delegating and management skills (Xenophon, 1869/2015). Of course, the debate was not settled.

Given the ancient pedigree of the believability construct, we were interested in exploring its resonance in the field of contemporary higher education. Indeed, as noted above, a literature exists at the intersection of higher education and philanthropic studies positing a college president's role as "fundraiser-in-chief." (See for example: Fisher, 1985; Flawn, 1990; Essex and Ansbach, 1993; Eckert and Pollack, 2000; Glier, 2004; Kaufman, 2004; and Hodson, 2010). Further, there is at least one book devoted to the believability hypothesis in successful higher education leadership writ large: as Amanda Goodall (2009) makes the case, following one line of Ancient Greek argument, that research universities should be led by top scholars. Such a plea is a direct response to concerns about the continued mission-effectiveness of higher education raised by the substantial literature on the commercialization of the university (see for example: Bok, 2003; Kirp, 2003, Stein, 2004, Geiger, 2004, and He and Callahan, III, 2017) and the rise of the MBA college president (Ginsberg, 2016).

More specifically focused on fundraising, we have set out to explore what leadership characteristics are consonant with success in the college fundraising endeavor. We specifically seek to explore the role of "believability" as defined by "growing up with the core" of the organization in effectively championing higher education advancement. "Growing up with the core" of the organization, in higher education terms, immediately implicates the role of alumni presidents, or, at least, presidents with pedigrees from, or insider experience at, very similar types of institutions.

Researched Correlates of Alumni Giving to Higher Education:

A recent review of correlates of alumni giving by Freeland, Spenner, and McCalmon (2015), divides studies of determinants of alumni donations into three main categories: 1) sociodemographic characteristics (of givers), 2) financial aid offered to future givers, and 3) the college experience of givers. Leadership believability would fall under the third category.

In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, the findings are quite consistent: the best predictors of alumni donations are alumni income and wealth (Bruggnick & Siddiqui, 1995; Taylor & Martin, 1995; Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Clotfelter, 2003; Monks, 2003; and Freeland, et. al., 2015). The role of financial aid on alumni giving is not as clear cut. As Freeland, et. al., (2015) explain, it is the type of aid, rather than the amount of support that better predicts the level of alumni giving. Perhaps, not surprisingly, "free money" in the form of grants and scholarships has been shown to be correlated with increased giving, while money with strings--in the form of student loans--has not (Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2002 and Marr, Mullin, and Siegfried, 2005).

Freeland, et. al.,'s (2015) last category of determinants is the one that most concerns us in this study: college experience (and for us, college leadership experience as contemporaneous with giving). Drawing on work by Clotfelter, 2003 Monks, 2003, Marr, et al., 2005, and Gaier, 2005, Freeland, et al. (2015:759), summarize that "the affective quality of student experiences" remains a strong predictor of alumni giving. Using a multivariate causal model that analyzed data from a two-year alumni survey, Sun, Hoffman, and Grady (2007), also implicated a comprehensive communication strategy to reach alumni; providing quality educational experiences to students; and, importantly for us, encouraging and supporting relationship building between faculty and current students and graduates. We extrapolate from student experience on campus (including voluntary fundraising experience, per Abzug and Abzug, 2003) plus relationship building between alumni and faculty to continued alumni experience with college leadership. Specifically, and putting theories of leadership believability together with findings on alumni donations to colleges, we would expect that college presidents who are also alumni of small liberal arts colleges will have greater fundraising success than non-alumni counterparts. It is also possible that leadership believability might not come out of exact alumni experiences so much as perceived familiarity with like-institutions. We would therefore expect that college presidents who are alumni of similar institutions—in this case, also small liberal arts colleges--to the focal institution

will be more successful fundraisers than presidents whose alma maters were not small liberal arts colleges.

From this model of alumni giving affected by perceived leadership believability ("does our present College President "get us" ?"), we derive the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are alumni of the college, then greater percentages of alumni donate.

Hypothesis 2: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are alumni of the college, then the higher the value of the three largest individual gifts, in a given year.

Hypothesis 3: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are alumni of other small liberal arts colleges, then a greater percentage of alumni donate.

Hypothesis 4: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are alumni of other small liberal arts colleges, then the higher the value of the three largest individual gifts, in a given year.

Leadership believability, defined as "growing up in the business" may not necessarily be a function strictly of a leader experiencing the same or similar undergraduate experience as the target donating audience. Perhaps, alumni perceive as believable those leaders who have been at the helm for as long as they can remember. To that end, we suggest:

Hypothesis 5: The longer the reign of presidents of small liberal arts colleges, the greater percentage of alumni who will donate.

Hypothesis 6: The longer the reign of presidents of small liberal arts colleges, the higher the value of the three largest individual gifts, in a given year.

Although our primary goal was to explore the fundraising impact of leadership believability in the liberal arts college setting, we were also curious about the correlation of other leader characteristics on donor behavior. Again, given recent concerns about the commercialization of higher education and the fear of the MBA college president, we were curious as to whether leader gender, academic training or credentials would be correlated with percent of alumni giving or the value of the largest gifts. Expecting that academic tradition might be a proxy for believability we wondered whether more academically traditional college presidents (male, PhD, disciples of the humanities) would engender more donations. To that end, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 7: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are men, the greater percentage of alumni donate, and the higher the value of the three largest individual gifts, in a given year.

Hypothesis 8: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges are PhDs, then a greater percentage of alumni donate, and the higher the value of the three largest individual gifts, in a given year.

Hypothesis 9: If presidents of small liberal arts colleges come from humanities disciplines, then the percentage of alumni donating and the value of the three largest individual gifts to the college, in a given year might be higher.

Finally, we were curious to explore the effect of these leadership characteristics in the context of the reigning model that suggests that alumni giving is most highly correlated with alumni financial wherewithal (Bruggnick & Siddiqui, 1995; Taylor & Martin, 1995; Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Clotfelter, 2003; Monks, 2003; and Freeland, et. al., 2015).

Research Question 1: What is the relative predictive power of college leadership characteristics compared with alumni income in terms of percent of alumni giving and the value of the three largest gifts to the college?

Data and Methods

To examine the relationship between personal characteristics of college presidents, alumni income, and fundraising effectiveness, we compiled a dataset comprising the leaders of the population of ranked national small liberal arts college by *US News & World Report*, 2014. (170 unique colleges are listed/ranked, but we have only included, in our hypothesis and research question testing, the 150 with requisite fundraising data.) We also included biographical data, including undergraduate alma maters, disciplinary backgrounds, degrees earned, tenure as president; and demographic data on each of the 170 presidents serving through July 2014. The 2014 Voluntary Support of Education CAE report (Kaplan, 2014) provided fundraising effectiveness data, and we drew alumni income

data from the 2013-2014 PayScale College Salary Report (PayScale.com, 2014).

Independent Variables

For each college president, we determined undergraduate alma mater, which provided us with information on which presidents were alumni, which graduated from similar small liberal arts colleges, and which graduated from other schools. We also collected data on the years of service or tenure as president, gender, highest degree obtained, and disciplinary background. Twenty-three (23) of our colleges had alumni serving as president in 2014 representing 13.7% of the population, while 71 (41.7%) of the total (including the 23 with alumni) had college presidents who were alumni of one of the other 169 colleges on the list. Forty-seven (47), or 27.2%, of college presidents were female, and the college presidents on our list had an average tenure of 6.3 years as president of the focal college. Fourteen presidents (8.2%) held a terminal JD degree, five held the highest degree of Master of Arts, two held a Masters of Divinity degree and only one held a terminal MBA. The vast majority (146, or 85.7%) held earned doctorates with 138 (80%) of the total college presidents earning PhDs. Of the doctorates, 39.7% were in the humanities, 40.4% were social scientists (including those with degrees in higher education and business disciplines), and only 13.7% had STEM degrees.

We collected alumni income data using the PayScale College Salary Report list of "Liberal Arts Colleges by Salary Potential." The figures represent the mid-career median salary for bachelor's graduates without higher degrees and with fifteen years of experience.

Dependent Variables

To represent fundraising success in a given year, we chose the two dependent variables of percent of alumni donating in 2014 and the value of the three largest individual gifts in 2014 as reported in the VSE: 2014 Voluntary Support of Education. The average percentage of alumni participation in donating for our 150 colleges with data was 25.9%. The percent of alumni donating ranged from a low of 8.4% in 2014 to Doane College to a high of 57.9% as reported by Bowdoin College. The average sum of the three largest individual gifts to the college in 2014 was $3.315 million, with a low of $179,000 at Illinois College and a high of $108.4 million at Colby College. Table 1 presents a list of summary descriptive statistics.

Table 1
Summary Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Tenure in years	169	6.30	5.09	1	40
Mid-career salary 2013-2014	115	$81,703	$14,068	$52,800	$143,000
Dummy Variables:					
Female	169	27.2%	44.6%	0	1
Alumnus	168	13.7%	34.5%	0	1
Alum of small liberal arts college	168	41.7%	49.4%	0	1
PhD	168	85.7%	35.1%	0	1
Humanities	146	39.7%	49.1%	0	1
Social Sciences	146	40.4%	49.2%	0	1
STEM	146	13.7%	34.5%	0	1
Giving Variables:					
Percent of alumni who donate	150	25.9%	11.5%	8.4%	57.9%
Sum of three largest gifts (in 000s)	150	$3,315	$9,300	$179	$108,401

*There are 169 observations for 170 schools because Erskine College was undergoing a leadership transition during the study year.

Analyses

In our first analyses, we focus on fundraising outcomes as represented by the percent of alumni donating and the sum of the largest three gifts for each college. Our first four "leadership believability" Hypotheses (1-4) suggest (using an "eyeball" test) that having an alumnus for president, or at least, an alumnus from a similar national small liberal arts college, yields at least some dividends in the form of greater alumni donor percent rates, and larger alumni gifts. Table 2 summarizes our findings:

Table 2 suggests a slight fundraising dividend to having a college president who is either an alumnus of the college, or an alumnus of a similar national small liberal arts college. The value for a small liberal arts college choosing an alumnus for president shows up in the slightly higher percentage of alumni who donate (27.9%) to the college. This percent of alumni donating is only marginally larger than the 27.3% of alumni who donate at colleges where the president is a graduate of a small liberal arts college and higher than the percent donating to colleges with

Table 2
Leadership Believability and Fundraising Outcomes, 2014

	Average % of Alumni Donating	Average Size of Largest Three Gifts from Individuals Combined (000s)
All College Presidents	25.9%	$3315
College Presidents with Small Liberal Arts College Alma Maters (on list of ranked schools)	27.3%	$4941
College President NOT alumni of Small Liberal Arts Colleges	24.9%	$2137

Table 3
Leadership Believability and Fundraising Outcomes, 2014, Percent of Alumni Donating

Two-Sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitnet) test

onlist	obs	rank sum	expected
0	87	6134	6568.5
1	63	5191	4756.5
combined	150	11325	11325

unadjusted variance 68969.25
adjusted for ties -4.54
adjusted variances 68964.71

Ho: vse(onlist==0) = vse(onlist==1)
z = -1.655
Prob > |z| = 0.0980

Table 4
Leadership Believability and Fundraising Outcomes, 2014, Sum of Three Largest Gifts

Two-Sample Wilcoxon rank-sum (Mann-Whitnet) test

onlist	obs	rank sum	expected
0	87	5964	6568.5
1	63	5361	4756.5
combined	150	11325	11325

unadjusted variance 68969.25
adjusted for ties 0.00
adjusted variances 68969.25

Ho: vse(onlist==0) = vse(onlist==1)
z = -2.302
Prob > |z| = 0.0213

Table 5
Correlations among Variables

		% Alumni donating	Sum of 3 largest gifts	Alumnus	Outlist	Tenure in years	Female president	PhD president	Humanities	Social Sciences	STEM	Mid-career salary 13-14
% Alumni donating	correlation	1										
	sig											
	N	150										
Sum of 3 largest gifts	correlation	0.3193***	1									
	sig	0.0001										
	N	150	150									
Alumnus	correlation	0.0614	0.0183	1								
	sig	0.4552	0.8238									
	N	150	150	168								
Alumnus of small liberal arts college (Outlist)	correlation	0.1053	**0.1493***	**0.4712*****	1							
	sig	0.1997	0.0682	0.0000								
	N	150	150	168	168							
President's tenure in years	correlation	-0.0061	-0.0673	0.1098	-0.0126	1						
	sig	0.9407	0.4129	0.1565	0.8710							
	N	150	150	168	168	169						
Female president	correlation	**0.141***	0.0004	-0.0501	0.0496	-0.0549	1					
	sig	0.0853	0.9958	0.5165	0.5228	0.4857						
	N	150	150	168	168	169	169					
PhD president	correlation	-0.0192	0.0537	-0.0839	0.0718	-0.0818	0.0599	1				
	sig	0.8154	0.5137	0.2808	0.3601	0.2921	0.4402					
	N	150	150	167	167	168	168	168				
Humanities	correlation	0.0755	-0.0237	**0.1418***	0.0626	**0.137***	-0.0521	-0.0011	1			
	sig	0.3933	0.7889	0.0888	0.4544	0.0992	0.5323	0.9899				
	N	130	130	145	145	146	146	146	146			
Social Sciences	correlation	**0.1940****	-0.1276	-0.0668	-0.0797	-0.0891	0.0625	-0.0752	**0.6686*****	1		
	sig	0.0270	0.1479	0.4250	0.3408	0.2848	0.4535	0.3672	0.0000			
	N	130	130	145	145	146	146	146	146	145		
STEM	correlation	0.0923	-0.0079	-0.0368	0.0181	-0.0858	0.0109	0.0750	**-0.3254*****	**-0.3281*****	1	
	sig	0.2960	0.9293	0.6604	0.8287	0.3029	0.8966	0.3681	0.0001	0.0001		
	N	130	130	145	145	146	146	146	146	146	146	
Mid-career salary 2013-14	correlation	**0.5524*****	**0.2111****	0.0184	-0.0179	-0.0370	0.0878	-0.0186	-0.0936	-0.1007	**0.2809*****	1
	sig	0.0000	0.0291	0.8456	0.8490	0.6945	0.3506	0.8437	0.3519	0.3161	0.0044	
	N	107	107	115	115	115	115	115	101	101	101	115

$^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{***}p < 0.001$

presidents who did not have a small liberal arts education (24.9%). Using a Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, in Table 3 we demonstrate the positive but weak statistical significance (p<10%) of higher giving by alumni when the president is a graduate of a small liberal arts college. While not a huge dividend, we do observe a greater percent of alumni donating when a college president is a school alumnus or graduate of a similar college.

Leadership believability may also be a factor in determining the relative average amount of the three largest individual gifts to the college in a given year. In this case, colleges where the president is an alumnus of a similar small liberal arts college reap the biggest absolute dollar donation reward. The numbers here are more striking: while presidents who are not alumni of small liberal arts colleges averaged about $2,137,000 in the three combined largest gifts to the college in 2014, college alumni college presidents averaged about $3,807,000, while small liberal arts college (not from the focal, but rather, from similar colleges) presidents averaged the largest combined gift total of about $4,941,000. Of course, this particular finding was likely skewed by the huge gifts to Colby College (the three largest gifts totaled $108,401,000) that year under President David Greene, himself an alumnus of Hamilton College.

To test the statistical significance of these observations, we again used a Wilcoxon Rank Sum test. Table 4 shows that at colleges where the president is not an alumnus of a small liberal arts college, the sum of the largest three gifts is statistically below (at the 5% level) colleges where the president is an alumnus. Our data demonstrate that leadership believability may, indeed, be a viable factor in college fundraising success.

Table 6
Leadership Characteristics and Fundraising Outcomes, 2014

College Presidents	Average % of Alumni Donating	Average of Largest Three Individual Gifts (000s)
Female College Presidents	27.2%	$3322
Male College Presidents	24.9%	$3313
College Presidents with Doctorates	25.8%	$3522
College Presidents WITHOUT Doctorates	26.4%	$2113
College Presidents in the Humanities	26.6%	$3194
College Presidents in Social Sciences	22.7%	$1854
College Presidents in STEM	28%	$3299

We next widen our perspective to consider the independent variables shown in the literature to matter in college fundraising. Although we have been able to gather data on a population, we use inferential statistical modeling here to enable significant comparisons by invoking Gelman's (2009) claim that an "entire population" such as our ranked liberal arts colleges may be conceived as a sample from a larger population, potentially including future cases. Thus we can run statistical analyses, seeking significance, as we would for a sample. We include a pairwise correlation matrix as Table 5, and a simple analysis examining the average percentage of alumni donating and the average size of the largest three gifts for our independent variables in Table 6.

For Hypotheses 5 and 6, we find no statistically significant correlation between college president longevity and giving (and in fact find a slightly negative relationship). Table 5 demonstrates this lack of a relationship with either giving variable: While "new blood" does not seem to have an effect on greater alumni participation whether measured by percent of alumni who donate or the sum of the three largest gifts (despite the large Colby College outlier), neither does familiarity over time.

Table 6 shows that female college presidents had more success getting a higher percentage (27.2%) of alumni to donate than had male college presidents (24.9%), and Table 5 also shows weakly significant (p<10%) correlation between percent of alumni donating and female presidencies. These data may suggest that female presidents garner a greater percentage of donors rather than men as asked in our Hypothesis 7. While Table 6 shows that female presidents secured a few dollars more in terms of the average dollar amount from the three largest individual gifts to the college relative to male presidents, Table 5 shows no statistical correlation between female presidents and the sum of the largest three gifts. Thus, the statistics suggest a possible positive relationship between female presidents and the percent of alumni donating but do not support a difference between men and women presidents and their ability to secure large gifts.

College presidents without earned doctorates garnered (in Table 6) a greater percentage of alumni donating (26.4%) than their counterparts with doctorates (25.8%). However, presidents with doctorates were able to procure, on average, about $1,400,000 more, in 2014, in their three largest gifts than their counterparts without doctorates (Table 6). Table 5, however, answers our Hypothesis 8 in that neither of these findings is statistically significant; having a PhD (or not) does not appear to have a significant effect on a president's ability to fundraise.

Finally, in Table 6, we note that college presidents in the STEM fields were associated with greater success in the percent of alumni donating (28.0%) compared with 26.6% for those with humanities degrees, and 22.7% for those with degrees in the social sciences. Similarly, the social scientist college presidents reaped lower averages (about $1.85M) for the three largest individual gifts compared to their humanities (about $3.2M) and STEM (about $3.3M) peers. Interestingly, Table 5 demonstrates a negative and statistically significant correlation (p<.05) for the relationship between presidents with a terminal degree in social sciences and the percent of alumni who donate. Given that social sciences, in this dataset, includes those with terminal degrees in business, it may be surpris-

ing to suggest that having a college president with a PhD in a STEM or humanities field may result in a greater percentage of alumni donating. On the other hand, Table 5 is consistent with Hypothesis 9 stating that presidents of small liberal arts colleges with humanities degrees will be related to a higher percentage of alumni donating. We note, however, that Table 5 also shows no statistical correlation between any field variable and the sum of the three largest gifts.

Our final analysis models from Tables 5 and 6 examine the relative predictability of leadership characteristics compared with the literature's dominant correlate of alumni giving, alumni financial wherewithal, represented by mid-career median pay. Table 5 demonstrates that mid-career income is strongly correlated to fundraising: the percent of alumni who give and the sum of the largest three gifts are both statistically significant at the 1% and 5% levels, respectively.

Lastly, to consider the relative impact of the leadership characteristics and alumni income variables on the percent of alumni giving and the sum of the three largest gifts to the college, we ran regression models. The more difficult models are those using the percent of alumni donating as the dependent variable. As Long (1997) noted, when the dependent variable in a regression model is a percentage, it can be difficult to model appropriately. Given that linear regression analysis can predict values below 0 or above 1, and percentage or proportional dependent variables may have a sigmoidal rather than linear relationship, using ordinary least squares to model the problem may be inappropriate. However, Long suggests that using a linear regression may be the simplest approach if justified. One of the means to justify the approach includes observing

Table 7
Regressions on Leadership Believability

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Percent of alumni who donate	**Sum of Three Largest Gifts (ln)**	**Percent of alumni who donate**	**Sum of Three Largest Gifts (ln)**
Alumnus	0.0159	0.366		
	(0.48)	(1.10)		
Tenure in years	-0.00178	0.0135	-0.00172	0.0135
	(-0.64)	(0.48)	(-0.62)	(0.51)
Female	0.0330	0.354	0.0331	0.260
	(1.38)	(1.47)	(1.38)	(1.12)
PhD	0.0456	0.167	0.0507	-0.0976
	(0.74)	(0.27)	(0.81)	(-0.16)
Social Sciences	-0.0317	-0.764**	-0.0323	-0.795***
	(-1.34)	(-3.21)	(-1.37)	(-3.48)
STEM	-0.0128	-0.423	-0.0138	-0.489
	(-0.40)	(-1.31)	(-0.43)	(-1.58)
Mid-career Salary 2013-14 (ln)	0.364***	2.913***	0.365***	3.089***
	(5.61)	(4.47)	(5.65)	(4.95)
Alum of small liberal arts college			-0.00781	0.603**
			(-0.36)	(2.92)
Constant	-3.873***	-25.42***	-3.890***	-27.34***
	(-5.31)	(-3.47)	(-5.34)	(-3.89)
Observations	94	94	94	94

t **statistics in parentheses**
* ***p* < 0.05**, ** ***p* < 0.01**, *** ***p* < 0.001**

that most all data fall in the middle of the curve – the linear section. Given that our data for percent of alumni who donate range from over 8% to about 58%, this may be reasonable. Another justification is that applying a more complicated model is much harder, and linear regression may produce acceptable results.[1] We use an ordinary least squares regression (OLS) including either the alumnus variable (alum, regression 1) or the alumnus of a small liberal arts college (onlist, regression 3), but not both as they are highly correlated. In both cases, we drop the humanities dummy variable.

The more straightforward models are those for the sum of the three largest gifts in which a linear model using either the alumnus variable (alum, regression 2) or the alumnus of a small liberal arts college (onlist, regression 4) mirrors the analyses for the percent of alumni donating models. As above, we drop the humanities dummy variable. The results of the analyses are reported in Tables 7.

Note that we transform the sum of the largest three gifts and mid-career salary variables. As Flom notes, this transformation makes sense as the variables involve money, "because we tend to think about money in multiplicative terms rather than additive ones, for example, a $2,000 per year raise feels very different if your salary is $20,000 than if it is $200,000.[2]" Stated differently, if the real effect of a change in dollar units is closer to being constant in percent terms, rather than dollars (or unit terms), a linear functional form will generate a specification error.

Our models combining the alumni status of college leadership with college alumni financial wherewithal are significant for predicting both the percent of alumni donating and the sum of the three largest gifts to the college in 2014. As expected, the effect of (the log of) midcareer salary is a positive and significant predictor in all models (1-4).

In models 1 and 2, which use the alumnus variable (the president is an alumnus of the college), the only other variable of significance is the social sciences dummy variable, which is negative and significant at the 5% level for the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts.

In models 3 and 4, in which we include the alumnus variable for having a president who is an alumnus of another (like) college, we find that presidents who graduated from the like colleges are positively and significantly (at the 5% level) related to the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts, and the social sciences dummy variable is again negative and significant at 5% for the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts.

For the percent of alumni donating (regressions 1 and 3), the significance of alumni mid-career median salary dwarves all of our leadership characteristics.

For the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts (regressions 2 and 4), two independent variables demonstrate that leadership believability could be based on presidents' alma maters and disciplines. In both the model including the alumnus variable (regression 2) and the alumnus of a small liberal arts college (regression 4), presidents who have social science degrees have significantly lower effects (at the 5% and 1% levels, respectively) on fundraising as measured by the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts than their counterparts in humanities or STEM fields. Further, those presidents who graduated from small liberal arts colleges are much more likely (statistically significant at the 5% level) to generate larger donations, as measured by the (log of the) sum of the three largest gifts than their counterparts who did not graduate from like colleges.

Conclusions

Our excitement about the potential predictability of leadership believability as a factor in successful fundraising in the small liberal arts college arena was confirmed, albeit, statistically significantly only for the sum of three largest gifts in a given year measure. As such, we were able to demonstrate, that in 2014, small liberal arts college presidents who were either alumni or shared small liberal arts college experiences, were slightly better fundraisers-in-chief than small liberal arts college presidents who attended public or private research universities for their undergraduate studies. Likewise, female small liberal arts college presidents demonstrated slight (though statistically insignificant) advantages in our fundraising metrics in the 2014 fiscal year. Longevity (tenure) of the small liberal arts college president was disconnected from fundraising outcomes and the terminal degrees of small liberal arts college presidents were not consistent predictors across fundraising outcomes—lawyer presidents had high rates of alumni participation but raised lower dollar values of large gifts and the opposite was true of social scientist (including business fields) small liberal arts college presidents. However, college presidents with social science degrees, including those in business disciplines, were statistically less likely to garner larger dollar value gifts. Perhaps, if higher education boards of trustees understood that humanities and STEM PhD small liberal arts college presidents were more highly

1 We note that our dependent variable is not a binary response and could not be characterized as a censored continuous variable. Either of these cases would allow us to explore different regression modeling techniques.

2 Flom, Peter, 4 Apr 2017

effective fundraisers than their social science/business discipline counterparts, commentators would have less fear about a coming stampede MBA college presidents.

Still, the rather small differences in fundraising outcomes that we charted for differences in leader characteristics suggested that other factors might well be at play. Indeed, once we included an alumni financial wherewithal variable—our mid-career median salary figure—we were able to dwarf most of our leadership variables. If we were next to hypothesize then, what else, besides alumni financial wherewithal and the leadership characteristics we studied, accounts for variability in fundraising at these schools, we would still have a wide variety of options. Fundraising professionals might be quick to point out that, more important than a college leader's believability, might be the Director of Development's or the Board of Trustees' provenance—given that the ask often begins there. Future study could certainly ascertain the alumni status of the Board and/or chief development/advancement office to perhaps identify a correlation between that and successful college fundraising.

We can also go back to the rest of the literature on fundraising in small colleges and suggest that our study does not threaten findings that student/alumni socio-demographics and financial wherewithal are most predictive of college giving. Even the college experience thread is not directly challenged by our findings, as it is also possible that schools (especially top-ranked ones) cultivate "cultures of giving" which are, themselves, somewhat impervious to, for instance, longevity of leadership.

Finally, although we found some support for leadership believability impacting alumni donations, we also wonder whether leadership believability has other consequences for small liberal arts colleges, and nonprofits writ large. We look forward to further exploration.

References

Abzug, J., & Abzug, R. 2003. "The Old College Try: Volunteers in Fundraising Efforts for Small Liberal Arts Colleges." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising,* 39: 105-118.

Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. 1996. "What Determines Alumni Generosity?" *Economics of Education Review*, 15(1): 75-81.

Bok, D. 2003. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bruggink, T. H., & Siddiqui, K. 1995. "An Econometric Model of Alumni Giving: A Case Study for a Liberal Arts College." *The American Economist*, 39 (2): 53-60.

Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper.

Clotfelter, C. T. 2001. "Who Are the Alumni Donors? Giving by Two Generations of Alumni from Selective Colleges." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*. 12 (2): Winter: 119–138.

Clotfelter, C. T. 2003. "Alumni Giving to Elite Private Colleges and Universities." *Economics of Education Review*, 22 (2): 109-120.

Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. 2002. "The Determinants of Donative Revenue Flows from Alumni of Higher Education: An Empirical Inquiry". *Journal of Human Resources*, 37 (3): 540-569.

Eckert, G., and Pollack R. 2000. "Sowing the Seeds of Philanthropy." *Currents*, Sept., 26 (7): 46–49.

Essex, G. L. and Ansbach, C. 1993. "Fundraising in a Changing Economy: Notes for Presidents and Trustees." *Foundation Development Abstracts*, 3 (2): 2.

Fisher, J. L. 1985. "Role of the Public College or University President in Fund Raising." In *Public College and University Development*, edited by_M. J. Worth. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education, pp. 49–56.

Flawn, P. T. 1990. *A Primer for University Presidents: Managing the Modern University*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Flom, Peter. 4 Apr 2017. https://www.quora.com/Why-do-we-log-variables-in-regression-model

Freeland, R.E., Spenner, K.I., and McCalmon, G. 2015. "I Gave at the Campus: Student Giving and its Link to Young Alumni Donations After Graduation." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 44(4): 755-774.

Gaier, S. 2005. "Alumni Satisfaction With their Undergraduate Academic Experience and the Impact on Alumni Giving and Participation." *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 5(4): 279-288.

Geiger, R. L. 2004. "The Commercialization of the University." *American Journal of Education* 110 (4): 389-399.

Gelman, A. 2009. "How Does Statistical Analysis Differ when Analyzing the Entire Population Rather Than a Sample?" Statistical Modeling, Causal Inference, and Social Science. http://andrewgelman.com/2009/07/03/how_does_statis/

Ginsberg, B. 2016. "College Presidents Should Come from Academia." *The New York Times*. March 3.

Glier, J. 2004. *Higher Education Leadership and Fundraising. Remarks to the Council for Industry and Higher Education*. CIHE Council meeting, London, England, May 13.

Goddard, C. 2009. *Presidential Fundraising at Independent Colleges in the Midwest: A Case Study*. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska.

Goodall, A.H. 2009. *Socrates in the Boardroom: Why Research Universities Should Be Led by Top Scholars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

He, L. and Callahan, III, C. 2017. "Presidential Compensation in Public Higher Education Institutions: Is There Pay for Performance?" *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education,* 13 (1):47-56.

Hodson, J. B. 2010. "Leading the Way: The Role of Presidents and Academic Deans in Fundraising." *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(149), 39-49.

Kaplan, A. E., 2014. *Voluntary Support of Education*. New York, NY: The Council for Aid to Education (CAE).

Kaufman, B. 2004. "Juggling Act: Today's College or University President Must Be a Champion Fundraiser and a Strong Internal Leader." *University Business*, July 7(7), pp. 50–52.

King, N. K. 2004. "Social Capital and Nonprofit Leaders." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 14(4), 471-486.

Kirp, D. L. 2003. *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Long, J.S. 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Siegfried, J. J. 2005. "Undergraduate Financial Aid and Subsequent Alumni Giving Behavior." *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 45(1), 123-143.

Monks, J. 2003. "Patterns of Giving to One's Alma Mater Among Young Graduates from Selective Institutions." *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 121-130.

Nanus, B., & Dobbs, S. M. 1999. *Leaders Who Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

PayScale.com. 2014. "2013-2014 PayScale College Salary Report." Retrieved January 1, 2015: http://www.payscale.com/college-salary-report-2014.

Peter, T., & Waterman, R. 1982. *In search of excellence. Lessons from Americans Best Running Companies*. New York: Harper & Row.

Ritchie, W.J., Kolodinsky, R. W., and Eastwood, K. 2007. "Does Executive Intuition Matter? An Empirical Analysis of Its Relationship with Nonprofit Organization Financial Performance." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1):140-155.

Rooney, P.M. 1999. "A Better Method for Analyzing the Costs and Benefits of Fundraising at Universities." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 10 (1), Autumn (Fall):39–56.

Satterwhite, C. R, and Cedja, B. 2005. "Higher Education Fund Raising: What is the President to Do?" *International Journal of Educational Advancement* (5) 4: 333-342.

Schneider, J.C. 2000. "Universities and Foundation Support: Working with Faculty and Administrators." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 28, Summer: 97–110.

Stein, D. G. (ed.) 2004. *Buying In or Selling Out? The Commercialization of the American University*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Sun, X., Hoffman, S.C., and Grady, M.L. 2007. "A Multivariate Causal Model of Alumni Giving: Implications for Alumni Fundraisers." *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 7, 307–332.

Taylor, A. L., & Martin Jr, J. C. 1995. "Characteristics of Alumni Donors and Non-donors at a Research I, Public University." *Research in Higher Education*, 36(3), 283-302.

Xenophon, 1869/2015. "Socrates Discovers Generic Management." As cited in Shafritz, J. M., Ott. , J. S., & Jang, Y. S. *Classics of Organization Theory*. Cengage Learning.

This page is intentionally blank.

Assessing Higher Education Assessment Policies and Processes: A Critical Policy Analysis Approach

Jana J Burch
Tarleton State University

John H. Batchelor & Eric Bostwick
University of West Florida

Shanan Gibson & Gerald F. Burch
Texas A&M Commerce

Kristie Abston
Middle Tennessee State University

George Ellenberg
University of West Florida

Acknowledgements: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

In recent years, the nature and number of administrative reporting requirements have increased substantially for most universities. As a result, faculty find themselves devoting increasingly large amounts of time to these needs (Gardiner, 2002) often at the expense of time devoted to teaching, scholarship, and service. One major driver for administrative reporting is embedded in the assessment of learning process. This paper uses Critical Policy Analysis to examine assessment policies and processes at four universities through the viewpoints of the authors who serve in the roles of administrators, faculty, and students to determine policy "winners" and "losers." In this process we identify why many faculty resist the assessment process and make recommendations on how universities can develop assessment policies and processes that meet the real requirements for assessment of learning while meeting the demands of all stakeholders.

INTRODUCTION

The landscape of higher education has changed. Today's academic world is characterized by tight budgets, increasing regulation, heightened legislative and media scrutiny, and an expectation to produce "work-ready" graduates. This "ever-shifting policy landscape" (Godfrey, 2014, p. 302) has resulted in university administrators experiencing significant pressure from policy-makers, the public, and accreditors to be accountable for the productivity and workload of faculty (Thuermer, 2006) and for their role as the university's managers of successful learning and teaching (Hodgson & Whalley, 2007). As might be expected, a trickle-down effect is that the "job" of the average university professor has evolved as well.

This paper focuses specifically on the assessment policies and processes that have been created by this "audit culture" (Cheng, 2010) and have made the faculty job more onerous and less enjoyable. To analyze this phenomenon, we perform a Critical Policy Analysis of current assessment policies and processes at four different universities from the viewpoints of the student, junior faculty, tenured faculty, junior administrator, and senior administrator. The student perspective is provided by a doctoral student at a regional public university in the southwestern United States. The junior faculty perspectives and tenured faculty perspective are provided by faculty members at a regional

public university in the southwestern United States and at a regional public university in the southeastern United States. The junior administrator perspective is provided by an author at a regional public university in the southwestern United States. The senior administrator perspective is provided by an administrator at a regional public university in the southwestern United States.

The premise for this paper stems from conversations the authors found themselves having repeatedly. The authors are not currently serving at the same university, but have, during the course of their academic careers, worked with one another. While all authors agreed that providing a quality education to students was paramount, we quickly realized that our different roles significantly impacted our perspectives of the issues surrounding assessment of learning and the accreditation process. This study provides insight into an ongoing discussion and will hopefully provide the reader with food for thought as they address these concerns at their institutions. The results of our qualitative study provide new insights into assessment policies and practices and guide recommendations for improvements that may better serve administrators, faculty, and students.

BACKGROUND

Higher education is currently in a unique position. On one hand, demand for higher education is at an all-time high. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that 69.2% of 2015 U. S. high school graduates enrolled in colleges or universities (BLS, 2016), and during the following fall of 2016, 20.5 million students attended American colleges and universities. This is an increase of approximately 5.2 million students since fall 2000 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Therefore, demand is increasing and so are the concerns regarding the value of higher education in light of rising fees and increasing student debt. Goldman Sachs (2015) recently reported that the economic return on college is slowing, and the Gallup-Purdue Index Report (2015) found that only half of U.S. alumni strongly agree that their education was worth the cost. As a result, educational consumers, the media, and state and federal governments are placing increasing pressure on universities to demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations.

One example of such pressure is performance-based funding models which are becoming increasingly popular in higher education, especially among public institutions. Another example is assurance of learning activities required to meet state (Andrade, 2011) and federal goals. Both of these accountability mechanisms require the documentation and demonstration of certain outcomes, whether they be externally assigned or internally selected. When students are the focus of these measures, faculty are often believed to be in the best position to provide information since they are closest to the data. However, the administrative tasks associated with this data collection have diverted academic resources towards administrative jobs (Cheng, 2010) and may undermine the quality of teaching and learning (Morley, 2003; Newton, 2000; Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003).

The effect is that many university professors are finding their jobs to be more administrative and less enjoyable. The job of a university professor is called a privilege (Anding, 2005; Brower, 2013). Many enter this profession because it is their calling: the "work that a person perceives as his purpose in life" (Hall & Chandler, 2005, p. 160). However, a traditional faculty position can be stressful (Eagen et al., 2014; Kroll, 2013), and it requires the ability to balance various activities that compete for the professor's time, energy, and attention.

Teaching, research, and service are well known as the primary work activities of professors at colleges and universities (Bland, Center, Finstad, Risbey, & Staples, 2006; Terpstra & Honoree, 2008). Academicians enter the professor ranks knowing that research is expected, having been trained how to conduct research during their graduate programs. Some even prefer the scholarship aspects of the job over teaching. Creating new knowledge is often more rewarding than anything else the job offers, and professors fulfill this need through rigorous research programs. They feel compelled to participate in the conversations that involve the theories and concepts that drive their passions. Consequently, they feel bound to share what they learn with those who have entrusted their college educations to them: their students.

Conversely, some professors, and some argue institutions (O'Keefe, Hamer, & Kemp, 2015), prefer teaching more than research and scholarly activities. These professors are interested in influencing the next generation and making a lasting impact on society. They "esteem the privilege to speak into the lives of [their] students" (Brower, 2013, p. 537). Some faculty are skilled at and enjoy both teaching and research, and they are able to blend their own scholarship and that of others into their teaching.

Service to students, the institution, the profession, and the community is the third focus of professors. Serving students may include providing advice regarding careers and/or graduate school, reviewing resumes, writing letters of recommendation, and acting as the faculty advisor for a student organization. Service to the institution may include working on committees at various levels across the college or university or attending important functions such as commencement. Service to the profession may include reviewing research manuscripts for conferences and/or journals, serving on editorial boards for journals, or taking on leadership roles in academic organizations. Finally, serving the community may involve volunteering to serve on the boards of local organizations or partnering with organizations for experiential student projects and internships.

The weighting of these three activities varies based on different factors including the institution's Carnegie research classification, the program or discipline (e.g., physical sciences, education, business), and the type of appointment (e.g., tenure track, non-tenure track, no tenure system). For example, faculty in tenure-track positions at Carnegie research and doctoral institutions reported spending 45.4% of their time on teaching and 26.7% on research compared to 55.5% teaching and 17.6% research, respectively, for all Carnegie classifications combined (Bland et al., 2006). When looking across all appointment types and Carnegie classifications, time devoted to faculty activities was broken down as follows: teaching accounted for 40.4 to 67.9% (54.9% overall), research accounted for 4.4 to 26.7% (16.1% overall), and service accounted for 3.1 to 12.5% (6.7% overall) (Bland et al., 2006). Faculty reported working an average of 52.8 total hours per week with 3.7 hours per week being spent on service (Bland et al., 2006).

One critical missing component of the triumvirate is administration. In particular, the growing level of administrative tasks that are assigned to faculty to meet assessment objectives. Pringle and Michel (2007) discussed the growing amount of time required for faculty to complete assessment tasks. This increased level of time commitment has caused faculty to resist participation in assessment programs (Rexeisen & Garrison, 2013; Garrison & Rexeisen, 2014). In the following section we will discuss the theory associated with some of this resistance and discuss the tenets of Critical Policy Analysis which we will use to analyze assessment policies and processes.

Theory

Garrison and Rexeisen (2014, p. 84) stated that assessment "measures often impose an additional requirement on some but not all faculty, who may then resent the interference with their courses and the burden of implementation." To explore this comment further, we define three components: administrative burden, psychological contracts, and equity theory and discuss how each of these serve to potentially strengthen and/or undermine job performance, job satisfaction, and quality of education.

The implementation of policy requires individuals within the system to perform welcome or unwelcome tasks (Burden, Canon, Mayor, & Mohnihan, 2012). Those policies, or tasks, that are seen as burdensome require high levels of resources from their members and result in administrative burden, this drain of resources raises efficiency concerns (Arnold, Tanes, & King, 2010). We adopt Burden, Canon, Mayer, and Moynihan's (2012, p. 741) definition of administrative burden: "an individual's experience of policy implementation as onerous." The reporting requirements placed on faculty in higher education can be considered onerous and, therefore, may be labeled as potential administrative burdens. Cheng (2010) identified administrative tasks as being the third strongest contributor to faculty members' perceived workload behind research and teaching, respectively, stating "...nearly one-third of interviewees expressed dissatisfaction with administrative burdens, which increased their workload" (p. 267).

As of July 2015, 32 states in the USA had implemented some type of performance-based funding model with five other states in the process of doing so (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2015). Similarly, the Education Reform Act of 1988 in the UK had the goal of increasing autonomy in schools while also utilizing a rigorous accountability framework (Bush, 2013; Glatter, 2012). When metrics are included in these funding models or accountability frameworks, universities naturally focus significant attention on those measures (e.g., percentage of bachelor's graduates employed or in graduate school, median wages of bachelor's graduates, six-year graduation rates) (State University System of Florida, 2016). This focus naturally results in the desire for more information and more frequent information updates about student-related factors that impact those metrics. As applied to faculty, the 'administrative burden" most frequently encompasses the documentation and reporting associated with the aforementioned performance metrics, accreditation standards, assurances of learning, governmental compliance reports, student outcomes, and individual performance reporting.

The additional work required of some may also constitute a violation of the professor's psychological contract. Psychological contracts are an unwritten set of expectations understood at the time of hiring that are not part of a contract per se (Rousseau, 1989). While many employment contracts include the clause "and other duties as assigned", it is questionable whether a significant increase in administrative workload would reasonably fall under this description. The psychological contract is critical to the employer-employee relationship and violations in a psychological contract impact job commitment. In academia, a perceived breach of the faculty's psychological contract could lead to employee disengagement and reduced productivity which potentially affects the quality of student learning.

A third consideration for assessment policies and processes is that not all faculty members carry the same administrative burden. Equity theory (Adams, 1963) states that individuals compare what is required of them to what is required of their peers. When equity between the two groups is high, motivation is also high. However, the inverse is also true. As inequity increases, so too does demotivation. Based on equity theory, professors who are responsible for accreditation reporting will be become demotivated if they believe they carry a heavier administrative burden than their peers. The resulting commitment to both the accreditation process and work engagement in general will be negatively impacted, possibly lowering the quality of student education.

The effects of assessment policies have been studied from many different perspectives. Many traditional policy analysis frameworks view policy making as a deliberate process where policy makers use reason and research to ensure the best policy outcomes possible (Rist, 1994). However, over the last thirty years a growing number of researchers have shifted from traditional approaches to include both the beliefs and practices associated with the policy (McDonnell, 2009: Young & Diem, 2017). One such approach is Critical Policy Analysis which focuses policy analysis around five critical concerns:

1. Concern regarding the difference between policy rhetoric and practiced reality,
2. Concern regarding the policy, its roots, and its development,
3. Concern with the distribution of power, resources, and knowledge as well as the creation of policy "winners" and "losers,"
4. Concern regarding social stratification and the broader effect a given policy has on relationships of inequality and privilege, and
5. Concern regarding the nature of resistance to or engagement in policy by members of nondominant groups (Diem et al. 2014).

Based on the success of other studies that have used Critical Policy Analysis, we believe that analyzing assessment policies and processes using the Critical Policy Analysis approach may reveal ideas that may not have been discussed in previous assessment review studies.

METHOD

In order to better understand the impact of reporting requirements associated with assurances of learning on students, junior and tenured faculty members, and junior and senior administrators, a qualitative study was performed using Critical Policy Analysis (CPA). To begin data collection, we took a grounded theory approach (Locke, 2001) where each of the four authors wrote their evaluation of the assessment process at their university and from other universities where they had served.

Each member was asked to write their perspectives, based on their current roles, of the assessment policy, addressing each of the five critical concerns found in Critical Policy Analysis, if applicable. The authors were asked to include as much data as could be collected and to include any feelings that were associated with the process and outcomes. As such, five viewpoints were collected from the four authors: senior administrator, junior administrator, tenured faculty member, junior faculty member, and student. The authors then evaluated each of the written viewpoints using the five critical concerns of Critical Policy Analysis (Diem, et al., 2014). These five concerns were then shared back with each of the authors to ensure their viewpoints were accurately included in the analysis.

The five critical concerns associated with Critical Policy Analysis (Diem, et al, 2014) served as themes in this research. "A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned responses or meaning within the data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). Using the constant comparison model (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and Spradley's (1979) ethnographic interview technique, the responses of each author were analyzed and compared while noting the author's current role. As recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (1982), all responses were read multiple times in order to compare and contrast the comments of the authors. A summary of these responses organized under each of the Critical Policy Analysis critical concern is presented in tables. Critical concerns three and four were consolidated due to the similarity of the responses.

FINDINGS

For the sake of starting at what we perceived was the beginning of the process we began our analysis by looking at the assessment policy, its roots, and its development (Critical Policy Analysis critical concern #2). We will use the multiple viewpoints to address each of the CPA critical concerns in the sections below. However, it is important to note that these viewpoints are limited to four institutions and four individuals. These perspectives may or may not be representative of conversations taking place in other institutions.

Policy Roots and Development

From the student's viewpoint, it can easily be stated that accreditation serves as an assurance that the student will receive a quality education if they pay their tuition, put forth effort in their coursework, and complete all required courses. From this viewpoint an education from an accredited school is more valuable to the student than an unaccredited school since they will be better prepared to perform tasks required of them as a business professional.

The question therefore falls on someone, or some agency, to ensure that the student is receiving a quality education. The task of accreditation therefore seems to immediately be on a collision course with academic freedom since someone outside the professor's classroom potentially has a say on what goes on in the classroom.

According to a statement by the First Annual Global Colloquium of University Presidents, academic freedom pertains to the "preserving, pursuing, disseminating, and creating knowledge and understanding" and is a necessary condition at universities. Academic freedom provides faculty and students the autonomy needed to both learn and participate in the "performance of scholars' professional duties" (2005). The United States Supreme Court has provided the needed judicial recognition of academic freedom as an extension of the right to freedom of speech. In doing so, universities are able to establish environments where "the conditions for creativity and discovery" are present (Gajda, 2009, p. 10). Two court cases provide the basis for this approach. In Lovelace v. Southeastern Massachusetts University (1986), the 1st Circuit Court ruled that universities had the freedom to determine course content. In Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System v. Southworth (2000), Justice Souter wrote in his concurring opinion that universities had the freedom to determine content and pedagogy.

Based on these court rulings a virtual iron curtain has been erected where academic freedom is protected from outside sources. Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) stated that academic freedom was a right jealously guarded and one that created a culture of individual autonomy which served to impede efforts at improving university education and associated processes. The result is that the faculty viewpoint is to support and defend academic freedom, the court viewpoint is that the government will not directly enforce what universities teach and how they teach. However, from the government viewpoint, the fact remains that some agency must ensure the student receives a quality education. This situation contributes to the complexity of the current academic environment (Caudill, 2016).

The solution therefore comes from the Department of Education (DoE) requirement that institutions of higher learning be accredited in order to participate in federal student aid programs, previously known as Title IV, Higher Education Act programs. The DoE requires accreditation as a condition for federal funds in order to ensure that the "education provided by that institution or program is a worthy investment of taxpayer dollars" (DoE, 2017). Due to rulings on academic freedom, the DoE does not participate in the accreditation of the universities; instead, it relies on third-party agencies to determine the quality of education and accredits the accreditors.

Quality in higher education has not been defined nor has it been sufficiently addressed (Lagrosen, Seyyed-Hashemi, & Leitner, 2004; Srikanthan & Dalrymple, 2003). Therefore, accreditation agencies focus, not on content, but on learning outcomes selected by the university to determine if there is a process improvement plan and whether progress occurs using rubrics or other measures developed by the university. Perhaps the most prestigious accreditation sought by businesses schools is through the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Founded in 1916, AACSB is the largest business school accreditation agency and has accredited more than 785 business schools worldwide. According to their website, AACSB provides "quality assurance" (AACSB, 2017). In this capacity, AACSB requires business schools to report on accreditation standards and the school's strategic mission, participate in a review process, and to represent and report findings accurately. Because the authors are affiliated with business schools and involved in the AACSB process, AACSB stands as a shared point of reference and is used accordingly in this paper.

In summary, the Supreme Court upholds the academic freedom of university faculty to determine what is taught and how it is taught. The Department of Education does not attempt to determine quality of education, but does provide a modicum of oversight by requiring accreditation as a condition for participation in the federal student aid program by regulating the accrediting bodies instead of the universities. Accrediting agencies do not dictate what is to be taught or how it is taught, but requires each individual institution to have a process to measure, monitor, and improve university-selected outcomes. Students value the assurance that the education they are receiving is of quality and students often equate accreditation with quality. Quality is therefore determined at the institution level and the policies and processes are reviewed by accrediting bodies like the AACSB. Most universities are willing to relinquish a modicum of control to accrediting bodies in order to earn accreditation and with it, be a financial aid eligible institution. A summary of the perspectives of student, junior and tenured faculty, as well as junior and senior administration are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Author Perspectives on Policy Roots and Development

Policy Roots and Development	Student	Positive	Accreditation ensure quality education. Accreditation tied to financial aid.
		Negative	Accreditation not based on content but institution-selected learning outcomes.
	Junior and Tenured Faculty	Positive	Accredited institutions seen as more prestigious.
		Negative	Infringement upon academic freedom. Required to create rubrics and assessments for learning objectives not part of their curriculum. Burdensome reporting requirements.
	Junior and Senior Administrator	Positive	Administration selects learning objectives and self-report progress.
		Negative	Must develop processes to measure, improve, and report progress.

Difference Between Policy and Reality

As stated above, each institution is required to develop and implement assessment policies that ensure they meet the requirements of the chosen accrediting body. For the sake of discussion, we will focus on the AACSB standards which most directly contribute to our discussion as they most strongly impact student, faculty, and administrator dissatisfaction. The 2017 AACSB revised Standards of Accreditation (AACSB, 2017) lists four major areas of consideration for accrediting business institutions: Strategic Management and Innovation, Participants – students, faculty, and professional staff, Learning and Teaching, and Academic and Professional Engagement. The focus of our discussion was predominantly on the Learning and Teaching area since this has the most impact on faculty. This section is further broken down into five standards. Standard 8 looks at curricula management and assessment of learning (a major concern for this study). Standard 9 evaluates curriculum and content (another major concern). The three remaining Standards in this section (Student faculty interaction, degree program education level, and teaching effectiveness) are not as relevant to this discussion.

The following statements summarize the senior administrator viewpoints of developing and implementing these assessment policies. Given the legislative and media scrutiny facing higher education, the need to meet the standards of performance-based funding, and the requirements of the various accrediting bodies, measurement and documentation of performance outcomes is a requirement at all levels within the academic enterprise. Administrators do not want to create a "compliance culture" or to impede faculty productivity; however, the metrics and expectations used to evaluate educational institutions are closely related to faculty activities and the outcomes from their work. AACSB requires member institutions to set instructional goals to measure.

The AACSB Basis for Judgment of Standard 9: Curriculum content is appropriate to general expectations for the degree program type and learning goals offers the following general skill areas: written and oral communication, ethical understanding and reasoning, analytical thinking, information technology, interpersonal relations and teamwork, diverse and multicultural work environments, reflective thinking, and application of knowledge. Therefore, the institutions we evaluated had learning goals for written and oral communication, ethics, critical thinking, information technology, and global awareness to closely align with AACSB standards. Each learning goal has rubrics developed for them by the university.

The viewpoint of the junior administrator is that senior administrators selected these assessment of learning goals and assigned a committee made up of faculty and junior administrators tasked with filling out the details on how each learning goal was to be evaluated. A rubric was developed for each learning goal and these rubrics were presented to the entire business faculty for approval. The senior administrators and the assurance of learning committee then determined which courses would measure the outcomes of the learning goals and therefore assigned each to a particular course. In theory, this policy now demonstrates to the accrediting body that the faculty chose which learning objectives to measure and then collected the data so that they could improve areas of weakness. However, the faculty viewpoints and student viewpoints indicate the reality of the process.

From the faculty perspective, assurance of learning (AoLs) rubrics are not measured in every course or section since each school selects specific courses and sometimes specific instructors to complete rubrics. During 2012/2013, one faculty member reported having only one course with an embedded course activity, so reporting was relatively simple and not overly time-consuming. Results were reported separately for students on the main campus and for students on a satellite campus. By 2015/2016, the assessment for this faculty member had doubled in size to require two reports for each campus and became an administrative burden. The 2015/2016 reports also required significantly more detail and were cumbersome to complete. Further, by 2015/2016 the faculty member was required to create a new assessment tool each year and to meet with an administrator to discuss the reporting process. By the end of 2015/2016, the faculty member was also asked to provide written explanations of student performance for every satellite campus student.

In addition, in 2015/2016, an assessment activity was added to a second of the faculty member's courses which consisted of a standardized final exam with three, distinct, multiple-choice sections that required separate grading. Thus, the faculty member had to choose between administering the standardized final exam in place of the previously developed final exam and giving two final exams in the course. Preferring his existing final exam, the professor administered two different exams comprised of four separate documents and four separate scoring sheets. The professor was further required to submit a detailed report for each portion of the standardized final, and to address the frustration and confusion expressed by the students in the class.

In response to the faculty member's frustration, the senior administrator argued that including faculty members in reporting is both more effective and efficient than excluding faculty from this process and that the person closest to the information should be the one responsible for documenting and summarizing the information. Similarly, efficiency is increased when those most familiar with the information are the ones asked to provide the information. In many cases, faculty are in the best position to most efficiently and effectively provide the information needed for educational reporting. For example, faculty know the most about their own activities and have the most to gain from accurate reporting of their accomplishments.

This examination of the way the policy is implemented shows how the implementation can be frustrating for administrators, faculty, and students. It also illustrates that the learning goals are more closely aligned with what the institution thinks the accrediting body wants to see and less with what the faculty believes the students need to know when they graduate so they can be successful business people.

A second observation comes from the student viewpoint where every course and section is not evaluated. In essence, the university is telling students that they are learning nothing of importance in these classes. This is certainly not the case, but it is the message that is sent. An unintentional mitigation of this policy is that many universities do not tell the students why they are being assessed or even the purpose of the assessment for accreditation reasons. The student is therefore left without a list of what they are supposed to learn during the course of their degree and do not receive feedback on how they did on the items that the institutions thought were the most important for them to learn in order to be successful in the business world. Table 2 presents a summary of author perspectives for this critical concern.

Inequality and Privilege that Leads to Winners and Losers

From the junior faculty viewpoint, the job expectations of an assistant professor at a regional comprehensive university can be daunting. Fresh out of one's doctoral program, they are expected to prepare and teach brand new courses (sometimes several different courses) and to achieve positive student evaluations while effectively transforming students through actual learning. Concurrently, they are required to establish a stream of research by developing and testing theories, analyzing and writing up results, and seeking publication among peer-reviewed scholarly outlets. Finally, they are expected to serve their institution, profession, and community by contributing to various committees and professional organizations.

Many of these tasks are expected, but the administrative burden associated with assessment reporting usually is not. Appendix 1 is a detailed log of the time spent on administrative reporting tasks during the 2012/2013 and 2015/2016 academic years for one junior faculty member. During this time, the junior faculty member experienced a 432% increase in time spent on administrative reporting activities (from seven hours in 2012/2013 to 37.5 hours in 2015/2016), and the number of reporting tasks increased from seven in 2012/2013 to 23 in 2015/2016. Much of the additional time spent resulted from the assessment activities in one class that increased from one hour in 2012/2013 to 12.5 hours by 2015/2016 and the addition of six new assessment activities resulting in an increase of 16.25 hour from 2012/2013 to 2015/2016. Undoubtedly,

Table 2
Author Perspectives on the Difference Between Policy and Reality

Perspective	Impact	Overview
Student	Negative	Assessment appears to be random and confusing. Little to no feedback from instructors.
Junior and Tenured Faculty	Negative	Workload inequitably distributed. Course content and exam format mandated. Administrative burden perceived as significant.
Tenured Faculty	Positive	Tenure status may provide the opportunity to opt out of being in the assessment process.
Junior and Senior Administrator	Positive	Media and legislative scrutiny addressed by accreditation. Administration selects learning outcomes and measurements.
	Negative	Requirements may create "compliance culture" or impede productivity of faculty.
Senior Administrator	Positive	Faculty reporting data is more effective and efficient.

this could be viewed by many faculty as a violation of their psychological contract which could lower their commitment to the organization.

From the faculty viewpoint, none of these administrative tasks, individually, is excessive or unreasonable; it is their synergistic effect that becomes overwhelming. Recent research has cautioned how interruptions and multitasking can be detrimental to productivity (Colbert, Lee, & George, 2016; Foroughi, Werner, Nelson, & Boehm-Davis, 2014; Sykes, 2011), and it is difficult to quantify the disruption and loss of momentum caused by constantly switching from research or course preparation activities to administrative reporting duties. Furthermore, when these activities are perceived as redundant, poorly conceived, and unsystematic, faculty job satisfaction is likely to suffer. In practice, the faculty becomes the "loser" in this policy.

A second problem arises since the individual college determines what is measured, how it is measured, and in which courses it will be measured. The institutions therefore control which professors will carry the burden of accreditation reporting for the college. Faculty that carry more than their expected share of the administrative burden are subject to feelings of inequity. Equity theory (Adams, 1963) states that these members are likely to lose their motivation and be less engaged. Based on this inequity and feelings of a violation of psychological contracts, these faculty members may choose to reallocate time originally designed for research, teaching, or service.

Research requires evidence in the form of publications. Similarly, service is measured by committee work and attendance at meetings. Both research and service components are easily measured. However, teaching is more difficult to measure in that it includes efforts beyond classroom time, requiring preparation, grading, and office hours. From the student's viewpoint, it is likely that teaching quality may suffer since the faculty may take time from the area where there is the least amount of accountability – teaching.

Students may also become "losers" in the accreditation process as they have less control and insight and are impacted throughout their time at university. While students may not see the administrative burden under which some of their professors struggle, they may notice a lack of preparation and feedback or a disjointedness in the curriculum and assessment process. Students had negative responses when assurances of learning assessments did not take place in the courses where they were introduced or taught. This perceived disconnect between curriculum and assessment left students with a feeling of confusion over what is truly important in the business curriculum as some of it is assessed, some of it is not, and some of it is assessed after the fact in an unrelated course. In addition, faculty members also reported that students often vocalized these feelings of unhappiness by way of negative faculty evaluations.

Student frustration and confusion has negative consequences such as a disengagement in their learning process, not understanding the "big picture" of a business

education, and enduring a lack of confidence attributed to not being included in the discussion of what constitutes a "quality business education" along with the steps their faculty is taking to ensure that quality.

In addition, faculty who are included in the assessment of learning process are also subject to specific instructions from administrators as to what content must be taught and included on final exams as well as how those exams are formatted. This is perceived by some as an encroachment on academic freedoms afforded to faculty members. Table 3 presents the conflicting perspectives of the authors in their roles.

Based on this discussion it is the faculty that emerge as the "losers" in the accreditation process. It could also be stated that since many assessment policies do not increase the likelihood that the student will graduate with all of the necessary skills, that the student and tax payers are potential "losers." Perhaps the only "winners" are the accrediting bodies themselves, which is certainly unfair since they merely present recommendations for universities to create assessment policies and processes.

Resistance to Policy

When many future administrators entered academia, it was out of a desire to help students learn and be successful. As such, they believe that assurance of learning is an essential component of every faculty member's job – or it should be. While many faculty like to describe their work via the "teaching, research, and service" triumvirate, the truth is that learning is the desired outcome in institutions, not teaching. Learning is the key to student success, and it is learning that is assumed by the employers that hire graduates, learning that is necessary for students to pass certifications/licensing exams, and learning that accrediting bodies demand evidence of. If universities cannot document that learning has occurred, there is no legitimacy in the diplomas they bestow.

Despite these viewpoints from administrators, many faculty resist participating in assurance of learning activities (Pringle & Michel, 2007) and see assessment as a waste of their time or as a violation of their academic freedom. Administrators feel that faculty are the ones closest to the assessment activity and in the best position to comprehensively assess students' learning outcomes. From the administrator's position, this degree of familiarity enhances the effectiveness and reliability of the assessment ratings which informs curriculum design at most universities, since it is a faculty-driven process. If administrators make curriculum modifications without due faculty involvement, insight, or input, faculty ownership of the curriculum is threatened since the faculty loses some part of their academic freedom. Administrators believe that having faculty involved throughout the assessment process improves the efficiency of communication and eliminates the need to have an "assessment group" coordinate with

Table 3
Author Perspectives on Inequality and Privilege that Leads to Winners and Losers

Student	Negative	New faculty appear too busy to provide feedback or prepare for class. Disconnect between what is taught and what is assessed. Classes with assessments perceived as more important than those without.
Junior and Tenured Faculty	Negative	Selection to participate in assessment process may be seen as unfair.
Junior Faculty	Negative	Administrative tasks interfere with research and class preparation. May negatively impact tenure if research is impeded and/or student reviews are negative.
Tenured Faculty	Negative	Participation in assessment process interferes with research. Assessment process infringes on academic freedom.
Junior and Tenured Faculty	Negative	Time wasted. Violation of academic freedom. Administration does not carefully consider data collection process, increasing the administrative burden of faculty.

the larger "faculty group" when curriculum changes are made.

A final viewpoint from the faculty is that administrators often do not consider the amount of data or the systems that are used to collect assessment data. Our analysis showed several common "friction factors" associated with collecting and reporting data that administrators demand for assessment. (1) The notion that more information is better than less information: this mindset violates efficiency by defining report value quantitatively rather than qualitatively and by asking for more information than is needed. (2) Reporting formats that do not align with the nature of the information being reported: for example, using of a word processing document to report hundreds of row and columns of numerical information. (3) Continuing to gather information that is no longer needed: examples include the continued use of old forms that no longer suit their original purpose or the use of duplicate systems to collect the same information. Sometimes this information continues to be collected "just in case" it is needed in the future; unless the information has value, it is both ineffective (in that it has no purpose) and an inefficient use of resources. (4) Poorly planned data requests: this friction factor is demonstrated when information is requested multiple times and/or in multiple formats. Instead, data collection should be designed with information reusability in mind. If a particular data element will be used to answer multiple questions, collect the information once in a format that can be easily and electronically repurposed to answer all questions. (5) Failing to integrate reporting platforms which results in the "human copying machine" phenomenon – information is "copied and pasted" from one report to another or from one system to another. (6) Adopting technology that duplicates current data collection platforms, but does not replace them. (7) Utilizing a system to collect information that it was not designed to collect: while this technique can sometimes prove effective (e.g., utilizing a learning management system to facilitate assessment data collection and reporting), it usually requires some degree of reverse engineering to make the data fit the technology rather than using technology that is appropriate for the data being collected. These concerns are presented in Table 4.

DISCUSSION

Critical Policy Analysis calls for problems to be examined by layers and by perspectives in order to determine effect and possible recommendations of policies being implemented (Young, 2017). As such, the discussion section presents the critical issues associated with the reporting requirements in the accreditation process and suggestions to minimize the discord between the groups involved.

The team that wrote this paper included administrators, faculty members, and students because as Lewin (1946) proposed, to improve relations between groups, all groups of interest must be studied. As was anticipated, all viewpoints did not always see things the same way. In some instances, the administrator felt that the faculty perspective sounded "whiny" and showed an unwillingness to accept the realities of academic life today, the faculty felt the administrator's section showed a cold detachment from the realities of being a professor, and the student felt like they had no voice in the process even though they were the product. Despite these differences in perspective and understanding the importance of all parties sharing a common vision (Woodell, 2009), several areas of agreement were identified that, if considered and acted upon, have the potential to negate the frustrations as exemplified by the faculty and students and to provide the high-quality data needed by administrators and accreditation bodies.

To develop effective assessment policies and practices we believe that all university members involved in the process should return to the purpose of having the system in the first place: students and taxpayers need to know that the student is learning the skills necessary to prepare them for successful careers. Business schools therefore need to

Table 4
Author Perspectives on Resistance to Policy

Junior and Tenured Faculty	Negative	Administration does not consider impact of assessment policies.
		Data collection may appear to be haphazard, overzealous.
		Data reporting software/methods cumbersome and/or duplicitous.
Junior Administrator	Positive	Faculty are best source for the required data.
	Negative	Making curriculum design changes without faculty input.
Senior Administrator	Positive	Faculty reporting lessens administrative burden for administrators.
		Faculty data collection is more efficient than other methods.
		Learning outcomes supported by data legitimize diplomas awarded.

determine which skills/knowledge students need to be successful in business, determine which class teaches each skill/knowledge, share this information with students and businesses, assess learning in the class where the topic was taught, and give feedback to students, businesses, and administrators so that students can make individual adjustments and so the university can make systemic changes. This may be the real way in which faculty can practice academic freedom, by teaching students what they believe will be important for them to be successful in their business careers.

Many universities could probably argue that they are doing this right now. However, based on the schools that we evaluated, more focus on assessment policy development was built around the accreditation standards instead of around what students need to know. This is evidenced by assessments not occurring in every class. There must be something being taught in each business course that is needed to help students be successful in the future. If this is true, then some knowledge/skill will be evidenced in each class and will need to be assessed. If not, then the class should be revised, replaced, or omitted. The same could be said for the faculty members that are not involved in assessment. If these faculty are not teaching something the students need to know, what is the value of the professor to the student, to the university, or to the taxpayer?

A second rebuttal to those that claim they are taking this new approach is that if assessing the program is being done with a focus on the student, then students should know what they will be assessed on, in which classes the assessment be given, and what the results of assessment of learning were. In essence the student should be able to track their progress and know that if they put in the appropriate amount of energy that they will successfully pass all required assessments and therefore be guaranteed they received a quality education.

Another important finding is that emphasis should be placed on maintaining some degree of consistency with learning objectives and rubrics. Faculty become frustrated with major changes since curricula and tests have to be changed. This also violates many beliefs in quality management where major changes significantly alter the assessment and require new baseline data to be collected. Minor changes are much preferred by the faculty and accrediting bodies.

One suggestion is that service credit should be given for time spent on assessments. At some universities, not all departments contribute equally to assurance of learning activities especially when a particular department provides a disproportionate share of "core" or "foundational" course where assessment activities are common. Consideration should be given to a faculty member's assessment activities, especially when reporting activities are not equally distributed. An open system where faculty understand the level of service necessary to make tenure and post-tenure review, perhaps based on a point system where activities are worth different points, would be easy to defend and would promote feelings of equity in the faculty.

If administrators are to overcome faculty objections to reporting, whether it be related to assurance of learning, annual evaluation, or some other job attribute, we must begin with an acknowledgement that the systems created for reporting have not always been intuitive, integrative, or even highly functional. Reducing a system to its basic elements, there are three critical components: the effort expended, the output produced, and the usefulness of the output. An optimal system, then, must be designed "backwards" by answering the following questions: what attributes will make the output "useful," what is the quality of output needed, and what is the minimum level of effort needed to achieve the desired level of output?

To put these recommendations into practice, whenever a university, department, school, divisions, etc., is evaluating their reporting practices, they should take a minimalistic approach to data collection. That is, no more "granular" data collection where data is collected for sake of collecting data or to store it for some future use that is yet to be determined. Rather, these units should look at the reason they are collecting data, the actual data requirements, and then work backwards from there (see Holmes, Wilking, & Zhang, 2013 for a discussion on custom reports and reporting). This type of practice will help to reduce the tension (see Price, Carroll, O'Donovan, & Rust, 2011 for discussion) and trust issues (see Carless, 2009 for discussion) associated with reporting perception discrepancies between faculty and administrators. Similarly, administration should realize and plan for the fact that these activities will take away from teaching, research, and service activities of their faculty. Second, if the needed data is available in the system already, efforts should first be made to retrieve and use the existing data. If this approach is truly unfeasible, the time demands of a new reporting system should be identified, communicated to all affected parties, and discussions on how to offset this time relative to other faculty job requirements should be considered. Communication and joint planning are essential in conveying respect between administration and faculty.

The points just presented follow the model by Herrenkohl, Judson, and Heffner (1999) on empowerment relevant to change: 1. shared vision, 2. organizational support, 3. knowledge and learning, 4. institutional recognition. In the specific case of administrative burden outlined herein, administrators should be sure to clearly share their vision of how the assessments will be beneficial to the university

with faculty. Further, they should provide support to faculty members to help work toward common goals. Training should be given when processes are changed. And finally institutions should recognize the efforts that faculty put into performing assessment activities (i.e. credit on annual evaluations). Finally, once assessment is completed administrators must show faculty evidence of the positive impact resulting from faculty effort (see Woodell, 2009 for discussion) and these results must be shared back with the student. After all, the entire assessment process was designed to ensure the student receives a quality education.

CONCLUSION

As administrators and faculty, we believe we are unified behind the common goal of student learning and that, according to the perspective of at least one student, current practices and policies designed to ensure and measure student learning may be hampering those efforts. We recognize the need to document the successes of higher education, including student learning and faculty productivity. What is needed is both understanding and clarity between faculty and administrators. Administrators need to design effective, efficient information gathering systems that not only document the performance of the organization but also clearly communicate the internal benefits to be obtained from data collection and use. Faculty need to understand the important role they play in the system, not only as creators of information, but also as users of that information and as those who provide feedback on the effectiveness and efficiency of the system. Thus, both would benefit from looking through the eyes of the other: administrators viewing the impact of policies, processes, and system on each individual and faculty recognizing the need to collect and report information beyond their own sphere of consciousness.

Given the efficiency and effectiveness that can be gained from having faculty report certain activities and the desire of faculty to be involved in certain reporting activities, it would seem that the reporting requirement itself is not the proximal cause of faculty frustration. Rather, faculty practicing academic freedom and teaching students what they think students need to know to be successful business people should be the bedrock of the assessment process. However, when policies and processes require faculty to assess knowledge that they do not believe is important, or in some cases knowledge that was not covered in their course, only serves to frustrate faculty and students. Similarly, when reporting systems use inefficient procedures and/or produce ineffective results, faculty become frustrated with the wasted time and effort involved. Administrators need to be vigilant in developing and implementing reporting procedures to ensure that faculty input is sought and included so systems are both efficient and effective.

In conclusion, we return to perhaps the greatest insight gathered in this Critical Policy Analysis: the purpose of the assessment process is to ensure students receive a quality education. Using this qualitative approach to policy analysis we showed that institutions may be missing this point completely and that assessment policies and processes are being developed with the main purpose of gaining and maintaining accreditation. It is a common case of the tail wagging the dog. Higher education institutions should therefore embrace the chance to practice academic freedom. Every faculty member should determine what they can, and should, teach students to make them successful business professionals. These items should be assessed and reported using efficient and effective systems and the results should be shared with other faculty, administrators, business partners, and the students. Ultimately accreditation standards should be seen as only recommendations. True accreditation can only be achieved when the institution can prove to the student that they are receiving a quality education.

FUNDING ACKNOLEDGEMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.

Anding, J. M. (2005). An interview with Robert E. Quinn, entering the fundamental state of leadership: Reflections on the path to transformational teaching. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 4*(4), 487-495.

Andrade, M. S. (2011). Managing change – Engaging faculty in assessment opportunities. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(4). 217-233.

Arnold, K.E. (2010). Administrative perceptions of data-mining software signals: Promoting student success and retention. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 6(2), 29-38.

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (2017). Retrieved from: http://www.aacsb.edu/about.

Bland, C. J., Center, B. A., Finstad, D. A., Risbey, K. R., & Staples, J. (2006). The Impact of appointment type on the productivity and commitment of full-time faculty in research and

doctoral institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(1), 89-123. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838733

Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System v. Southworth, 529 U.S. 217, 120 S. Ct. 1346 (2000).

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods,* 2nd ed., Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Brower, H. H. (2013). From the editors: Professor as a calling. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12*(4), 537–539. DOI:10.5465/amle.2013.0296.

Burden, B. C., Canon, D. T., Mayer, K. R., & Moynihan, D. P. (2012). The effect of administrative burden on bureaucratic perception of policies: Evidence from election administration. *Public Administration Review, 72*(5), 741-751.

Bush, T. (2013). Autonomy and accountability: Twin dimensions of the reform agenda. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 41*(6), 697-700.

Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *34*(1), 79-89.

Caudill, J.G. (2016). Building higher doctoral programs to drive faculty development: Concepts for integrating a European model in the U.S. higher education system. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 12(1), 23-26.

Cheng, M. (2010). Audit cultures and quality assurance mechanisms in England: A study of their perceived impact on the work of academics. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(3), 259-271.

Colbert, A., Yee, N., & George, G. (2016). The digital workforce and the workplace of the future. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(3), 731-739.

Department of Education (2017). Retreived from: https://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/faqs-accrediting-agencies.pdf), p. 1.

Diem, S., Young, M. D., Welton, A. D., Mansfield, K. C., & Lee, P. (2014). The intellectual landscape of critical policy analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(9), 1068-1090.

Eagen, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Lozano, J. B., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., Hurtado, S. (2013). Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013-2014 HERI faculty survey. Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, Retrieved from http://www.heri.ucla.edu/monographs/HERI-FAC2014-monograph.pdf. Accessed on December 20, 2016.

Foroughi, C. K, Werner, N. E., Nelson, E. T., & Boehm-Davis, D. A. (2014). Do interruptions affect quality of work? *Human Factors, 56*(7), 1262-1271.

Gajda, A. (2009). *The trials of academe: The new era of campus litigation 19*, p. 10.

Gardiner, L. F. (2002). Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(2), 203-305.

Garrison, M. J., & Rexeisen, R. J. (2014). Faculty ownership of the Assurance of Learning process: Determinants of faculty engagement and continuing challenges. *Journal of Education for Business, 89,* 84-89.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.* New York: Aldine.

Glatter, R. (2012). Persistent preoccupations: The rise and rise of school autonomy and accountability in England. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40*(5), 559-575.

Godfrey, D. (2016). Leadership of schools as research-led organisations in the English educational environment: Cultivating a research-engaged school culture. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 44*(2), 301-321.

Hall, D. T., and Chandler, D. E. (2005). Psychological success: When the career is a calling. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(2), 155-176.

Herrenkohl, R., Judson, G., & Heffner, J. (1999). Defining and measuring employee empowerment. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 373-389.

Hodgson, K., and Whalley, G. (2007). The effectiveness of a university's administration of its learning and teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(2), 275-279.

Holmes, A. F., Wilkins, M., & Zhand, S. (2013). Engagement, innovation, and impact: Tracking faculty activities under the 2013 AACSB standards. *Organizational Management Journal*, *14*(1), 22-33.

Kroll, D. (2013). Top 10 reasons being a university professor is a stressful job. *Forbes*. Retrieved from http://onforb.es/TDQgcB on December 20, 2016.

Lagrosen, S., Seyyed-Hashemi, R., & Leitner, M. (2004). Examination of the dimensions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 12*(2), 61-69.

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, *2*(4), 34-46.

Locke, K. (2001). *Grounded theory in management research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lovelace v. Southeastern Massachusetts University, 793 F.2d 419 (1st Cir. 1986).

McDonnell, L. M. (2009). A political science perspective in education policy analysis. In G. Sykes, B. Schniedier, & D. N. Plank (Eds.) *Handbook of education policy research,* pp. 57-70. New York: Routledge.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Maidenhead: SRHE & Open University.

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2015, July 31). Performance-based funding for higher education. http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/performance-funding.aspx. Accessed December 19, 2016.

Newton, J. (2002). Views from below: Academics coping with quality. *Quality in Higher Education, 8*(1), 39-63.

O'Keefe, R.D., Hamer, L.O., & Kemp, P.R. (2015). Characteristics of a "teaching institution": Administrative objectives, actions, activities, and assessment. *Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education*, 11(2), 69-78.

Price, M., Carroll, J., O'Donovan, B., & Rust, C. (2011). If I was going there I wouldn't start from here: A critical commentary on current assessment practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(4), 479-492.

Pringle, C., & Michel, M. (2007). Assessment practices in AACSB accredited business schools. *Journal of Education for Business, 82,* 202-211.

Rexeisen, R. J., & Garrison, M. (2013). Closing-the-loop in assurance of learning programs: Current practices and future challenges. *Journal of Education for Business, 88,* 280-285.

Rist, R. (1994). Influencing the policy process with qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research,* pp. 545-557. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*, *2*(2), 121-139.

Spradley, J. (1979). *The Ethnographic Interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Srikanthan, G. & Dalrymple, J. (2003). Developing alternative perspectives for quality in higher education, *International Journal of Education Management, 17*(3), 126-136.

State University System of Florida. (2016, March). Performance based funding overview. http://www.flbog.edu/about/budget/performance_funding.php. Accessed December 19, 2016.

Sykes, E. R. (2011). Interruptions in the workplace: A case study to reduce their effects. *International Journal of Information Management, 31*, 385-394.

Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A. L. (2009). The effects of different teaching, research, and service emphases on individual and organizational outcomes in higher education institutions. *Journal of Education for Business, 84*(3), 169-176.

Thomas, E., & Gillespie, D. (2008). Weaving together undergraduate research, mentoring of junior faculty, and assessment: The case of an interdisciplinary program. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33, 29-38. DOI: 10.1007/s10755-007-9060-x.

Thuermer, K. C. (2006, Jan 09). Research time vs. other academic pressures. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education, 16*, 14. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.jproxy.lib.ecu.edu/docview/219221525?accountid=10639.

Woodell, V. (2009). Employee empowerment, action research and organizational change: A case study. *Organization Management Journal*, 6, 13-20.

Young, M. D., & Diem, S. D. (2017). *Critical Approaches to Education Policy Analysis: Moving Beyond Tradition*. Cham, Switzerland: Springe

Appendix 1
Time Devoted to Administrative Reporting (in Hours)

	MAN4XX1 Assessment (once per year)	Approximate Time Spent 2015/2016	Comments on 2015/2016	Approximate Time Spent 2012/2013	Comments on 2012/2013
Satellite Campus					
	Business Admin.	1	More detailed than before	0.5	Single assessment for course
	General Business	1	New	0	Not required
Main Campus					
	Business Admin.	1	More detailed than before	0.5	Single assessment for course
	General Business	1	New	0	
Revised Assessment Tool					
	Business Admin.	1.5	Annual revision	0	Not required to revise tool each year
	General Business	1.5	Annual revision	0	Not required to revise tool each year
Other 4XX1 Assessment Tasks					
	Meeting with Chair/preparing for meeting	2	Annual revision	0	No meeting required
	Revised rubric second time (Second time in 2 years)	3	Annual revision	0	No additional revisions
	Required to send chair an email explaining the performance of each individual in satellite campus sections	0.5	New	0	No such email required
	MAN4XX1 TOTALS	**12.5**		**1**	

Appendix 1
Time Devoted to Administrative Reporting (in Hours) (continued)

		Approximate Time Spent 2015/2016	Comments on 2015/2016	Approximate Time Spent 2012/2013	Comments on 2012/2013
MAN4XX2 Assessment (usually once per year)					
	Three-part assessment	2.5	New	0	
	MAN4XX2 TOTALS	2.5		0	
Attendance Confirmation for Six Courses (three times per year/ every semester)					
	First day	3.75 (1.25*3)	New	0	Not required
	Follow-up 1	1.5 (0.5*3)	New	0	Not required
	Follow-up 2	1.5 (0.5*3)	New	0	Not required
	ATTENDANCE CONFIRMATION TOTALS	6.75		0	
Early Warning System (three times per year/every semester)					
	For athletes and freshmen	1.5 (0.5*3)	New	0	Not required
	EARLY WARNING TOTALS	1.5		0	
University database (three times per year/every semester)					
	First submission	3 (1*3)		3	
	Second submission	1.5 (0.5*3)	New	0	No revisions required
	CAERS TOTALS	4.5		3	

Appendix 1
Time Devoted to Administrative Reporting (in Hours) (continued)

		Approximate Time Spent 2015/2016	Comments on 2015/2016	Approximate Time Spent 2012/2013	Comments on 2012/2013
Emails for Graduate Students on Academic Probation (usually four times per year)					
	Emails to advisor(s)	1 (Ø.5*2)	New	Ø	Not required
	ACADEMIC PROBATION TOTALS	**1**		**Ø**	
College (once per year)					database
	Initial submission	2	New	Ø	Not Required
	Revision 1	1	New	Ø	Not Required
	Revision 2	Ø.5	New	Ø	Not Required
	SEDONA TOTALS	**3.5**		**Ø**	
Annual (once per year)					Evaluation
	Submission 1	3		3	
	ANNUAL EVALUTION TOTALS	**3**		**3**	
Early Grade Submission for MBA Students with Academic Holds (usually twice per year)					
	Submission	1 (Ø.5*2)	New	Ø	Not required
	EARLY GRADE SUBMISSION TOTALS	**1**		**Ø**	

Appendix 1
Time Devoted to Administrative Reporting (in Hours) (continued)

		Approximate Time Spent 2015/2016	Comments on 2015/2016	Approximate Time Spent 2012/2013	Comments on 2012/2013
Emails to Advisors of Master Degree/ROTC Students (usually twice per year)					
	Multiple emails	1 (Ø.5*2)	New	Ø	Not required
	ADVISOR EMAIL TOTALS	**1**		**Ø**	
	GRAND TOTALS	**37.25**		**7**	

This page intemionally blank.

JOINT CONFERENCE
2019
Nashville, Tennessee USA

Academic Business World International Conference (ABWIC.org)

The aim of Academic Business World is to promote inclusiveness in research by offering a forum for the discussion of research in early stages as well as research that may differ from 'traditional' paradigms. We wish our conferences to have a reputation for providing a peer-reviewed venue that is open to the full range of researchers in business as well as reference disciplines within the social sciences.

Business Disciplines

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts pertaining to any business or related discipline topic. We believe that all disciplines are interrelated and that looking at our disciplines and how they relate to each other is preferable to focusing only on our individual 'silos of knowledge'. The ideal presentation would cross discipline. borders so as to be more relevant than a topic only of interest to a small subset of a single discipline. Of course, single domain topics are needed as well.

International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education (ICLAHE.org)

All too often learning takes a back seat to discipline related research. The International Conference on Learning and Administration in Higher Education seeks to focus exclusively on all aspects of learning and administration in higher education. We wish to bring together, a wide variety of individuals from all countries and all disciplines, for the purpose of exchanging experiences, ideas, and research findings in the processes involved in learning and administration in the academic environment of higher education.

We encourage the submission of manuscripts, presentation outlines, and abstracts in either of the following areas:

Learning

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to pedagogical topics. We believe that much of the learning process is not discipline specific and that we can all benefit from looking at research and practices outside our own discipline. The ideal submission would take a general focus on learning rather than a discipline-specific perspective. For example, instead of focusing on "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Marketing Management", you might broaden the perspective to "Motivating Students in Group Projects in Upper Division Courses" or simply "Motivating Students in Group Projects" The objective here is to share your work with the larger audience.

Academic Administration

We encourage the submission of manuscripts pertaining to the administration of academic units in colleges and universities. We believe that many of the challenges facing academic departments are not discipline specific and that learning how different departments address these challenges will be beneficial. The ideal paper would provide information that many administrators would find useful, regardless of their own disciplines