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ABSTRACT

Financial crunching has created a vacuum in the mission of community colleges, with specific focus paid to completion rates and degree attainment of students from low economic settings. This constraint on a profound national level has imposed a general concern to the American society, and many of our community colleges have aligned with global affordable technology, worldwide demand for accessible high quality education, and ever-increasing revenue that calls for a strategic path to fundraising.

In this study, resource dependence theory, highlights fundraising as a capacity-building management tool that leads educational leadership team down to varied ways of success. This theoretical framework was used for this study to explore the correlational impact prevailing between the strategies of fundraising, such as capital appropriation, endowment, charity gifts, and grants as independent variables and completion rates as dependent variables. As predictive research, this study is open to predicting the future status of the dependent or outcome variable on the basis of four attributes of the independent variable characterized as fundraising. The dependent variable of college completion rate is a key component of discussions about accountability in higher education, with a specific relationship in the 19 community colleges in New Jersey within four academic years.

This strategic alternative resource is the most descriptive means of using fundraising to meet state workforce, educational, and economic goals, as well as essentially enhancing the diverse array of community colleges to achieve the most successful return on student completion rate, which is the sole concern of college presidents in New Jersey who have limited staffing and budgets for fundraising.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Different organizational settings such as corporations, institutions of higher education, religious organizations, and firms—both public and private—engage in fundraising. Fundraising has experienced global recession in recent years. First, Edge (2013) asserted that the effect of the recession on fundraising has been profound. According to Edge (2013), people are still giving, but despite the gradual recovery that many economies are experiencing, giving is expected to continue to be relatively flat worldwide. Bob Carter (2013), president and CEO of the Bob Carter Companies and the chair of the Association of Fundraising Professionals, explained that the impact on individual giving principally will have the largest effect on fundraising. According to Pedley (2013), donor behavior is likely to follow consumer behavior more than economic trends, but donor behavior has been affected by economic trends. Pedley commented that organizations should concentrate on quality donor relationships as well as donor-centric communications, stewardship, and transparency.

Second, the global recession has created outstanding opportunities for private fundraising practices. Fundraising from private sources has become increasingly critical to the financial well-being of community colleges (Boyd, 2010). Private funding comes primarily from corporate entities and private endowments, particularly at the startup stage. In return, these contributions will receive good publicity and a significant tax deduction. Corporate support often takes the form of advertisements. This brings the donor valuable publicity and helps the organization secure much-needed help (Goettler, 2014). Community colleges have not received a proportional share of funding; in 2008, they received just 27% of the total federal, state, and local revenues
for public degree-granting institutions while serving 43% of the undergraduate students (Mullin, 2010). State funding for community colleges is gradually stabilizing, but concerns exist over recessions and reduction in support (Katsinas et al, 2007).

Community colleges now depend on fundraising to fill a growing gap between institutional needs and financial support from tuition and government taxes. Fundraising has become a critical component of fiscal leadership (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). Therefore, to ensure that fundraising is objectively implemented in New Jersey community colleges, this literature review will explore these fundraising attributes as independent variables: capital campaign, charity gifts, grants, and endowment, as it relates to completion rates. This study’s methodology was based on descriptive quantitative research. Data collection was obtained from (IPEDS), while analysis, results, discussion, and recommendations were articulated by the researcher.

**BACKGROUND**

Factors to consider include findings from a delta data update explaining that community colleges suffered the greatest financial hardships in 2010 and will continue struggling in the years ahead. As enrollment increased along with sharp losses in per-student revenues from state appropriations and meager increases in net tuition revenue, there were significant cuts to academic spending per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. Community colleges spent less per student than they had 10 years earlier.

A diverse variety of institutions spent less on their academic mission in 2010, but cuts in public 4-year institutions appeared more strategic than those in the private nonprofit sector. Education and related spending declined on average across all public and private institutions
from 2009 to 2010. But public 4-year institutions were largely able to preserve spending on institution and student services, while private institutions implemented extensive cuts.

Declines in state and local funding per FTE student could not be offset by increases in net tuition. Public funding per student for higher education reached a decade-long low in 2010. Sharp increases in net-tuition revenues were not sufficient to offset these losses, and for the first time, public research and master’s institutions generated more revenue from net tuition than from state and local appropriations.

Private institutions constrained education spending for the first time in a decade, even as their revenues continued to increase. Regardless of the strong rebound from sharp investment portfolio losses in 2009, private nonprofit institutions spent less on average education and related expenditures in 2010. Even well-funded private research universities, which historically have remained insulated from the economic realities affecting other institutions, were not immune from cutbacks in 2010.

Institutional subsidies reached a decade-long low across most types of institutions, and students covered a larger portion of educational costs. Students at public 4-year institutions paid roughly half the full cost of education. At private institutions, the student share of costs jumped sharply, in contrast to smaller annual increases across most of the decade. Colleges and universities did not increase degree productivity costs in 2010. Though degree productivity was flat or even declining in 2010, it has improved since the beginning of the decade at 4-year institutions; but so has the cost per degree (Delta Cost Project, 2015). New Jersey’s higher education funding fell from its peak of $2.33 billion in 2006 to $1.93 billion in 2013, a 17% decline (Smith & Helmsman, 2014).
According to Kohler (2012), a senior fiscal analyst, the cost of education at community colleges increased by 44.40% from 2006 to 2011. Rebasing the collection of evidence, each biennium has resulted in overall budget increases at community colleges. The implementation of the new formula has given birth to an estimated $3.0 million state general fund being appropriated for costs covered 100% by local levies. This is the prevailing community college funding formula designated with mandatory and permissive null levies for a particular concern (retirement levy) and an additional estimate of 50% by the state appropriation (Kohler, 2012).

Taking the same line of argument, information from the US Government Accountability Office (GAO), highlighted that from the fiscal year 2013 through 2014, the state funding to all public colleges decreased while tuition rose (GAO, 2014). State funding decreased by 12% overall, while median tuition rose to 55% across all public colleges (GAO, 2014). Tuition revenue for public colleges increased from 17% to 25%, surpassing state funding by fiscal year 2012. The average net tuition, which is the estimated tuition after grant aid is deducted, also increased by 19% (GAO, 2014). These increases have immensely contributed to the decline in college affordability as students and their families are bearing the cost of college as a larger portion of their total family budgets (GAO, 2014).

This spiraling cost of education has extended to total full-time equivalent enrollment at public 4-year institutions increase by 79% between 1993 and 2013. In the fall of 1993, New Jersey’s public 4-year colleges and universities enrolled a total of 103,462 full-time equivalent students. By the fall of 2013, the institutions enrolled a total of 185,242 full-time equivalent students (New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015). State appropriations per full-time equivalent student decreased 46% over 20 years.
Between 1993 and 2013, state appropriations per full-time equivalent student, adjusted for inflation, decreased by 46%. But New Jersey ranks 32nd in the US in educational appropriations per full-time equivalent student, at $5,520. The numbers likely sank again in fiscal year 2016, after appropriations to the senior public colleges and universities in New Jersey were cut $34.2 million, a reduction of 4.65% (New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015).

New Jersey’s declining state financial support for its public colleges and universities has translated into higher tuition and fees, making college increasingly unaffordable for the state’s students. In the last two decades, the average yearly tuition and fees at public 4-year institutions in New Jersey have risen by $6,814, a 136% increase (Smith & Huelsman, 2014). Tuition and fees have risen, at 2-year institutions, by 73%, or $1,589, over the same period. Tuition prices at both 4-year and 2-year institutions have been higher than the national average for the past two decades, a gap which has widened significantly over the past decade (Smith & Huelsman).

The economic flaws at the core of institutions in New Jersey is what Smith and Huelsman (2014) classified in the Demo report as “the great cost shift,” which explores how nationwide disinvestment in public higher education over the past two decades has shifted costs to students and their families. This shift has been magnified by rapidly rising enrollments, and its effects are felt particularly acutely as student bodies become more economically, racially, and ethnically diverse. “Students and their families now pay—or borrow—much more than they can afford to get a higher education, a trend which will have grave consequences for New Jersey’s future economy” (Smith & Huelsman, 2014, p.1).
Tuition have been rising far more rapidly than family incomes, causing the tuition costs to take an increasingly large bite out of family budgets. The increasing unaffordability of a college education in the state combined with the decreasing share of tuition covered by tuition aid grant (TAG) awards have forced New Jersey’s students to borrow more to pay for school. In 2000, average tuition and fees alone at the average public 4-year institution in New Jersey cost 10% of a median household’s income; by 2012 this share had reached 17%. (Smith & Huelsman, 2014).

Sixty-five% of students graduating from public 4-year colleges in New Jersey in 2012 left with some student debt, a rise from the 57% who left indebted in 2004. The average debt of indebted graduates has risen precipitously. Indebted students graduated with an average of $29,306 in debt in 2012, a 66% rise since 2004 (The Institute for College Access and Success, 2014, p.9). According to Demos’ report (2014), 64% of all jobs in New Jersey are projected to require some sort of postsecondary education by 2018, yet just 47% of young New Jersey students (ages 25-34) presently have an associate’s degree or higher. This share is not projected to improve much in the near future; by 2018, just 50% of New Jersey students are projected to hold a 2-year degree or higher, leaving the state with a significant skills gap in its labor market (The Lumina Foundation, 2014).

Fortunately, New Jersey can still close this projected gap by taking advantage of the state’s resources to focus on alternative revenue fundraising for the current and future generations of New Jersey students aspiring to realize the American dream through postsecondary education. But according to McMurtrie (2015), hundreds of colleges in the nation
live on the financial margins. Typically small and private, they struggle to pay bills, recruit students, and raise money, and a few fail.

It is interesting to note that their strategies of survival are staying out of debts and being adaptable (McMurtrie, 2015) and embracing what Mr. Warren denoted as the five M’s: mission, market, money, model, and media. They also focus on finding the right niche such as politics, bureaucracy, and tuition increases, which are the three top reasons why colleges remain open (McMurtrie, 2015). This strong phenomena at work had opened a wide path for private funding of our colleges (i.e., student tuition revenues, external fundraising, and entrepreneurial activities) separate from the public funding of colleges and universities (i.e., federal and state appropriations).

This shift is not without consequence, as the financing of any public enterprise, including higher education, is as much about societal values as it is about dollars and cents generating increasing demand for public higher education. In the 21st century, public colleges and universities were increasing economic reliance on knowledge and information that ushers in a significant increase in the demand for higher education. For more than two decades, enrollment at public 4-year colleges and universities has generally risen, and projections for the coming decade show the total climbing further (National Centre for Education Statistics, 1998).

Recent growth, however, has been uneven in areas of the West and Southwest. For example, demand is outstripping institutional capacity. Moreover, nearly all of the recent growth has been among historically underserved and underrepresented populations (racial/ethnic minorities, first-generation colleges students), which bring a number of different academic and co-curricular needs to the campus. The combination of these realities poses an array of daunting challenges to higher education.
The first challenge is state fiscal pressures and competition for resources. As the demand for public higher education has risen, states have been plagued with recession-induced budget shortfalls and rapidly growing demands from other services, particularly Medicare and elementary/secondary education. Actually, Medicaid surpassed higher education as the second-largest claimant on state general fund spending in fiscal year 1993, a change that has not been reversed (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1998). This situation owes to higher education’s status as the largest single discretionary item in states’ budgets.

As a result of an institution’s ability to tap alternative revenue sources (such as student tuition and fundraising), policy makers have tended to lavish spending on higher education in strong economic times and cut disproportionately in leaner times. This dynamic was coined the “balance wheel effect” by the late Hal Hovey, and has been borne out in both rudimentary and more rigorous correlation analyses of change in tuition and state appropriations levels (AASCU, 2000).

Developing market forces and philosophies are now a growing pattern in higher education. In recent times, this growth has been fueled by breathtaking developments in information technologies and in the proliferation of for-profit providers making use of them. As a result, the views of student as consumer and degree as commodity have become more prevalent. Higher education has become more like a business, with increasing emphasis on institution-private sector partnerships and entrepreneurial activity by institutions (Zesty & Robert, 1996).

There is a shift in public/private good emphasis with respect to higher education. There have been debates going on among scholars regarding whether the pursuit and attainment of a higher education is essentially a public good (benefitting the society as a whole) or a private
good (benefiting the student receiving the education). While some would dispute the proposition that a college degree generates public and individual benefits, some contend that the public benefit aspect of higher education is given short shrift, and cite a host of statistics on positive social correlates of education.

Others view the public good argument as a marginal consideration, and point to comparative employment and earnings data in arguing that the lion’s share of higher education’s benefit inures to the individual (Immerwahr, 1999). While the debate on this point will likely continue far into the future, there is a relatively clear sense within the higher education community that the private benefit perspective is ascendant. Zemsky (2000) aptly observes this, writing:

Whether it is deliberate or simply an accommodation to strained resources, the new message is that the primary return on investment in education is individual, rather than collective; that the public good is synonymous with the choices and well-being of those individuals; and that those who benefit directly should assume the greatest share of the cost (Zemsky, 2000, p.6).

Understanding the implication of this troubling face in our present day educational system, President Barack Obama in his augural speech on the economics of higher education said: “We can’t allow higher education to be a luxury in this country; it’s an economic imperative that every family in America has to be able to afford.” (Department of Education, 2012, p.1). Reacting positively to this recent shift in the educational system (rising student tuition costs), the Obama administration implemented several new policies to provide relief for students and their families. As part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), the maximum Pell grant increased from $4,731 in 2008 to $5,550 in 2010. ARRA also replaced
the Hope credit with the more generous American Opportunity Tax Credit (AOTC). Compared to the Hope Credit, the AOTC, has a higher credit amount (up to $2,500 compared to $1,800), is available for four years instead of two years, and is available to a broader range of families due to its partial refund ability and higher income limits. Recently, the reduced 3.4% interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans was extended for another year, rather than rising to 6.8% as scheduled under existing law.

Finally, starting in 2009, student borrowers participating in the direct loan program could opt for the income-based repayment (IBR) plan, which caps monthly student loan payments at 15% of discretionary income and forgives any remaining balance after 25 years in the program. In 2010 legislation, IBR was made more generous starting in 2014, with a lower maximum on payments (10% instead of 15%) and forgiveness after 20 years instead of 25 years (Clarke, 2014).

In the fall of 2011, the administration announced its new “pay as you earn” program that would provide similar benefits to new borrowers starting in 2012 (The Economics of Higher Education, 2012). Following the logistics of alternative revenue sources to preserve access to higher education for all colleges and universities, this dissertation succinctly explores resource-dependent theory (Brettel & Voss, 2013; Pfeiffer & Solanki, 1978; Wither & Collins, 2009) as a social constructive theoretical framework in conjunction with the strategies of fundraising. Such strategies may include capital campaigns, endowments, extensions, and philanthropic, structural, dialogic, and alumni relations as strategies with practice to provide the most successful return on student access, which is the sole concern of New Jersey community college presidents with limited staffing and budgets for fundraising (AASCU, 2014).
It is my goal to focus on community colleges because, being part and parcel of higher education, I realize that community colleges in America offer many advantages for students seeking flexibility and academic advancement (Campus Explorer, 2015).

- Community colleges create opportunities for students to save money because they are usually less expensive than 4-year schools. Students completing their associate’s degree at a community college save tuition costs by transferring their credits toward a bachelor’s degree. If students improve in their academic performance, there is the possibility that they will get scholarships, which they couldn’t get with their high school transcript.

- One of the benefits of attending a community college is finding a location closer to home. This can help cut down on travel distance or room and board costs.

- There is an increased flexibility in scheduling classes. Community colleges tend to offer evening and weekend courses to accommodate students with work or personal commitments that would prevent them from taking weekday classes.

- Community colleges are open to improving students’ grades so that they can transfer to a more competitive 4-year school. Some 4-year colleges may not require SAT or ACT scores from applicants who are applying with associate’s degrees from community colleges.

- They help students choose a major, especially those who are not sure what kind of degree to pursue. The courses students take for an associate’s degree can be used to explore different areas of study and enhance their understanding regarding their choice of major if they pursue a bachelor’s degree.
Community colleges are open to all kinds of students, both traditional and vocational. Some enroll right out of high school, and others may have spent a few years in the workforce before returning to get a degree. Americans of varying age return to community colleges to re-educate themselves, re-enter the work force, advance to a different position, increase salary level within their field, or refresh their skills in a particular field of interest.

Many community colleges offer online classes toward completion of an associate’s degree. Online courses offer increased flexibility because students can complete course work from home at their own pace and many of these courses are offered in the evening and on weekends to accommodate busy schedules (Campus Explorer, 2015).

Community college is an affordable and convenient form of higher education available to adults looking to further their education. New Jersey has 26 community colleges, 19 public schools and 7 private institutions, according to the New Jersey Council of County Colleges (Community College Review, 2015). According to Capped (2015), the Garden State has a number of fine institutions of higher learning. In fact, there are 62 colleges in New Jersey, 33 public and 29 private, offering a wide range of programs and majors.

New Jersey has both small schools (defined as fewer than 2000 students) and very large ones (10,000 or more students) and everything in between, including community colleges in urban and rural environments (Colleges in New Jersey, 2015). As the community colleges strove to fulfill their target of helping students realize the American dream, with open access, the national climate of declining public support creates an imbalance between increasing tuition and budget shortfalls, resulting in a decrease in enrollment (IPEDS, 2008).
From a general perspective, there are three levels of tuition-setting philosophies for public institutions: high tuition, high aid; moderate tuition, moderate aid; and low tuition, low aid. States that apply high tuition, high aid philosophy set tuition relatively high but utilize comparatively huge appropriations for need-based financial aid to balance the price (Adulator et al., 2008).

There are formal and informal approaches to this tuition-setting philosophy. First is the collaboration of the state constitution, state statute, or higher education board policy to formalize their tuition philosophy, which is obtainable in virtually half of the states in America. The second is generally three categories of state-level tuition-setting philosophies for public institutions: high tuition/high aid; moderate tuition/moderate aid; and low tuition/low aid. The high tuition/high aid philosophy is practiced in Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

These states set tuition levels relatively high but utilize comparatively large appropriations for need-based financial aid to balance the price. Proponents of this method generally argue that providing large state subsidies for higher education to offset low tuition price tags is inefficient for fostering increased student access, as it indirectly subsidizes high- and middle-income students who would enroll in college anyway but who end up paying less for higher education than they can afford.

This method negatively impacts low-income students, as less state money is available to support their college participation and success. High tuition combined with high financial aid levels could increase access, as those individuals who can afford all or most of the price are not subsidized by state government, which frees additional state funds to provide assistance to students who would not be able to enroll otherwise (Adulator, 2008).
The moderate tuition/moderate aid philosophy is obtainable in states such as Connecticut, Iowa, and Oregon, which are designated to be close to the national average. These states modify their tuition policies to be competitive with other states. This approach is open to the tuition policy that promotes a balance between the state’s and the student’s share of educational costs. Tuition levels should be high enough to support quality, but at a level that still supports student access and success (Adulator, 2008).

Low tuition/low aid states, on the other hand, provide large subsidies for higher education to help keep tuitions lower than the national average, but they also have modest financial aid programs. States that have adopted this philosophy include Arizona, Tennessee, and Maine. Supporters generally believe that high tuition, even coupled with high financial aid, produces a large pool of potential students that believe college is simply unaffordable. Keeping tuition levels as low as possible contributes to student access and success by keeping tuition affordable for most students, which encourages broad participation. For those for whom the price is still out of reach, there are some financial aid options, though limited ones (Adulator, 2008).

According to Adulator, a combination of the three philosophical structures is a closely coordinated approach to designing finance policy as the careful interaction of appropriations, tuition, and financial aid, along with federal higher education policy. The financial balance among the partners must be carefully maintained to reduce extra strain on one or more of the partners.

The state must decide how much the student should be reasonably expected to contribute through tuition, how much the state should reasonably supplement that amount with through appropriations and financial aid, and how all three of these expenditures interact with substantial federal aid through Pell Grants and tuition tax credits. An uncoordinated approach can lead to
some students being unnecessarily burdened with student loan debt or the state paying more than is necessary in the form of institutional subsidies student financial assistance, or both parties not taking full advantage of federal tax credits, which leaves federal benefit monies on the table (Badolato, 2008).

This funding philosophy of high tuition/high financial aid is obtainable in New Jersey. Hence, there is a balance between budget and access legislated into existence by the County College Act of 1962 (Nespoli, 2013). Adulator, Vincent, and Sticker Shock (2008) argued that providing large state subsidies for higher education to offset low tuition price tags is inefficient for fostering increased student access, as it indirectly subsidizes high- and middle-income students who would enroll in college anyway, but who end up paying less for higher education than they could afford. This in turn impacts low-income students, as less state money is available to support their college participation and success.

The combination of high tuition with high financial aid creates increased access to students who can afford all or most of the price without the state subsidy. This approach inversely frees additional state funds to provide help to students who would not be able to afford to enroll otherwise. The nascent philosophical stand of the state and local government was that students would pay a minimal amount toward education by low-cost tuition and fees. With time, this funding approach came to be known as the 1/3rd state, 1/3rd county, 1/3rd tuition and fees balanced model. Actually, the state of New Jersey has never provided the legislated level of direct funding, and county direct support has varied widely. In fiscal year 2007 (FY07), student tuition and fees consisted of well over half of all revenues for New Jersey Community Colleges (Parrish, 2009).
Apart from direct operational support based on a full-time–equivalency funding formula, the state of New Jersey gives new indirect aid to community colleges, such as contributions to an alternative employee benefit program, supplements and Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) payments to the college’s teachers’ pension and annuity fund, and some additional health benefits premium payments. From FY02 to FY07, these supports increased by $34.2 million (Parrish, 2009). The majority of increases in this supplemental and indirect support can be traced backed to the rising costs of the new health benefits.

New Jersey gives a revolving bond pool allocation to community colleges for capital purposes. This allocation is not subject to citizen votes in local or state wide elections. The funds available change annually with a recent low of $9.3 million in FY98 to a high of just under $192 million in FY08 and zero appropriations in FY96 and FY06 (Parrish, 2009). In 2012, New Jersey community colleges received $150 million in the Building Our Future Bond Act approved by the governor and the voters. Of this account, $123 million was dispensed to community colleges considering the list of projects transmitted by the Secretary of Higher Education to the legislature on April 29, 2013. Colleges were given detailed information to submit only shovel-ready projects.

Colleges without such projects were informed to wait until the anticipated second round of bond funding. With these state directives, four community colleges did receive minimal funding. Since all of the community colleges actively participated in the advocacy campaign to help secure voters’ approval of the bond, all had hoped to receive at least some funding through the bond (Nespoli, 2015, p.4).

The state and county government equally share the debt service for a community college’s allocation from this capital fund. In recent times, enrollment in New Jersey community
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colleges has been encouraging. In FY06, 56% of all undergraduate students enrolled in state public institutions enrolled in county community colleges (New Jersey Council of County Colleges [NJCCC], 2008). From 2001 to 2006, total enrollments in the state’s 19 public 2-year comprehensive colleges grew by 18.6%, while mean tuition and fees grew by 29.9% (Parrish, 2007).

Figure 1 shows the total student enrollment from 2001-2006 for all 19 community colleges in the state. The figure demonstrates the annual growth in total student enrollment each fall semester at the official 10-day count. The 10-day count is not inclusive of early withdrawals that meet tuition and fee refund criteria and provide the state-required unduplicated enrollment number for appropriation funding distribution.

![Figure 1. New Jersey community college fall semester total student enrollment at 10-day count](image)

Enrollment rose 6% from 129,919 to 138,914 between 2001 and 2002—the largest increase in the decade. In the fall of 2003, enrollment was 145,850 and increased by 5% to 151,058. The number rose by 3.6% in fall 2004, to 151,885, then by 0.6% in fall 2005, ending with a 1.5% increase to154, and 085 by 2006. As enrollment increased, the mean tuition and fees were also on the rise (Parrish, 2007, p.8).
Figure 2 depicts a steady but accelerating growth pattern.

Figure 2. New Jersey community colleges’ mean annual tuition and required fees

The increasing pattern of New Jersey mean tuition and fees were $2,399 to $2,524 (5%) from fall 2001 to fall 2002. In 2003, the figure rose from $2,637 (4.6%) to $2,773 (4.6%) in 2004, and to $2,934 (5.5%) in fall 2005, closing with $3,115 (5.8%) in 2006 (Parrish, 2007). From 2001 to 2006, total New Jersey direct support in absolute dollars increased by 19.1% while county support grew by 14.5%. As a result, the state of total revenue declined by 3.2% (Parrish 2007). In 2006, New Jersey’s support level of 24.4% compared unfavorably to the mean national state funding level of 37% (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2007). From 2001 to 2006, New Jersey county share dropped by 5.6% (Parrish, 2007).

Figure 3 shows proportionate shares over the period.
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Figure 3. New Jersey community college total revenue by major category

As shown in Figure 3, there was a steady decline in both state and county direct operational support as a proportion of overall revenue and the resulting steady shift in the burden of community college costs from public funding to students in the form of tuition and fees. At this time, New Jersey community colleges took steps to control internal operating costs. From fiscal years 2001 to 2006, although the total number of full-time faculty increased 9.6%, full-time tenured faculty dropped by 1.3% while the number of those in the pipeline to become tenured dropped 10% (Parrish, 2007).

In 2008, the state met with fiscal crisis and New Jersey Governor Jon Corzine proposed a $76 million decrease in FY 09 for higher education institutions, which translated to a 10% cut in direct appropriations to the 19 public community colleges (Chen, 2008). This reduction threatened the impact of accelerating increases in tuition and fees for those families with incomes at or above the national average. With the high cost of living and high property tax in New Jersey (Woolsey, 2009), families in lower than average income brackets were increasingly faced with financial disadvantages. This is the current financial situation of community colleges in New Jersey.
According to Rochelle, Hendricks (2013), higher education and college officials have complained for years that New Jersey’s funding system is outdated and illogical. Instead of awarding money based on how many students a college enrolls, state funding is divided up among New Jersey’s colleges based largely on how much the schools have received in the past, resulting to uneven condition of the New Jersey State community college financial logistics. This study strives to bridge the gap by determining the relationship between fundraising and access for students’ success. The urgency of this research has grown steadily with the shift in statistical data of the state of New Jersey, with 26 community colleges (20 public colleges and 6 private colleges) serving 172,563 students. Minority enrollment is 44% (with the majority being Hispanic and African American), which is more than the national average of 43%. They have a student: teacher ratio of 36:1, which is higher than the 22:1 national average (New Jersey Community College Review, 2015).

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Using resource dependence theory (Brettel & Voss, 2013, p.4), which is open to an “entrepreneurial attempt to harness alternative funding resource” (AACC, 2006, p. 4), this study embraces alternative funding sources as part of resource management for educational leadership teams. One such significant attempt is establishing meaningful plans for fundraising as an alternative revenue source for students’ access to community colleges, with a specific focus on completion rates.

With this in mind, community college leaders are placing more focus on fundraising (Gentile, 2009). Pfeiffer and Salancik (2003) explained that the actions of an organization could be influenced by the need for resources (Pfeiffer and Salancik, p.5). Mitchell (1977) noted that
changes in the flow of resources can create implicit demand for changes within the organization (p. 268). The changes that organizations undergo as a path to embracing alternative revenue sources are classified as resource dependence theory, which ultimately has distinct implications in this study.

**Resource dependence theory** (Brettel & Voss, 2013), is based on the following principles:

- Organizations are assumed to be comprised of the internal and external coalitions which emerge from the social exchanges that are formed to influence and control behavior (Kings et al., 2002).

- The environment is assumed to contain limited resources essential for organizational survival. As such, the environment poses the problem of the organization facing uncertainty in resource acquisition (Pfeiffer & Salancik, 2003).

- Organizations are assumed to work toward two related motifs—acquiring control over resources that minimize their dependence on other organizations, and control over resources that maximize the dependence of other organizations on them.

Implementing resource dependence theory makes community colleges open to negotiations, interacting with an intermediary, yet brings about a multitude of competing interests (Kings et al., 2002).

The work of Pfeiffer and Solancik (2003), which is the basis for resource dependent theory, suggests that organizations will place an emphasis on developing or prioritizing the activities that generate revenue for them (Pfeiffer and Solancik, 2003, p.4). As this theory informs practice, community colleges will change in some way to pursue alternative revenue sources more effectively. The theory also demonstrates that as community colleges advance
toward external resources, they are bound to be open to the demands of the external bodies providing the resources.

As community colleges experience a decrease in funding from traditional sources, there is urgent need for presidents to seek out alternative revenue sources. While some institutions of higher education may simply raise tuition or increase research activities, community colleges are different (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p.6). With a quality administrative setting, “all colleges have at least some capacity to secure private funds. Success depends on the extent to which fundraising is viewed as part of the institution’s overall community tasks are assigned and coordinated, and the strategies used to ensure returns on investments in fundraising campaigns” (Ryan & Palmer, 2005, p. 43).

This resource dependence theoretical framework shapes how financial decisions are made and how we assess the financial risks to the fund. Each year, community colleges ought to update their strategies for funding with the latest financial information and up-to-date consideration of the risks to their objectives. We need to ensure that the funding strategy objective itself remains appropriate and fit for purpose. According to Clarke (2014), “During the past year, the board conducted a review of funding objective which has resulted in the incorporation of a new risk (operational risk) within the margin. Meanwhile, our overall margins remain at 10%, and our funding horizon is still 2030, we note that planned developments in our investment strategy will need to be incorporated as part of our next review” (p. 1). This theoretical guide also provides a way for fundraisers to assess the possible impact of expected or unexpected changes on the community college’s overall mission, which is open door access, with a specific focus on completion rates.
By analyzing the impact of a change by reference to our funding objective, we can decide how serious a potential risk is and be guided as to what an appropriate mitigation strategy might be. According to Brette and Voss (2013), resource dependence theory as defined by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) marks the beginning of this theoretical paradigm. Its original assumption is that organizations are not self-sufficient, but depend on resources provided by their environment to achieve organizational targets (Hillman, Withers, & Collins, 2009).

Therefore, the need of applying resource dependence theory on fundraising as an alternative revenue source for student access is fundamentally based on capacity building, a popular term in today’s higher educational setting (McPhee & Bare, 2001). Capacity building means much to administrators who make decisions about programs, and access with particular attention to completion rates as well as funding strategies. Hence, capacity building is the ability of nonprofit organizations to fulfill their missions in an effective manner (McPhee & Bare, 2001). There must be an understanding that most community colleges are small and possess limited resources, particularly when measured against the challenges and critical issues that they address.

The push to link indicators of capacity such as the strategies of fundraising to overall performance is critical to strengthening the college. Capacity building traditionally takes place primarily at the organizational level including community colleges, where it is possible to get assistance to develop sound financial management practices or to improve fundraising capabilities. Ultimately the goal of capacity building is to create safe and productive communities where people can work and students can have access to quality education as well as develop their potentials (De Vita & Fleming, 2014).
Tong Xu Ping (2014), used resource dependence theory and agency theory. It is interesting seeing how the two theories interact in the fundraising process. For example, both are theories that share the idea that inter-organizational relationships are founded on opportunism and bounded rationality, and organizations should control the critical aspects of their business network interactions in order to pursue their goals (Tong Xu Ping, 2014).

With agency theory, organizations are driven by the need for aligning the behaviors or outcomes of the other parties to expectations, while resource dependence theory compels organizations to be driven by the need to control the resources that are critical to them (Rossignoli, 2015, p.7). In the first case, the unit of analysis is the contract; in the second case, the unit of analysis is the organization. Just as fundraising demonstrates a contractual relationship with community colleges, access with a specific focus on completion in community colleges fulfills the unique mission of community colleges to society (Rossignoli, 2015, p.7).

Understanding the various perspectives related to resource dependence theory, Pfeiffer and Salancik (1978), along with Hillman, Withers and Collins (2009), focused directly on the organizational setting (p.4). Wijbenga et al. (2007) and Ambos and Schlegelmilch (2007) made a shift from the original setting by extending their findings with agency theory and contingent theory, respectively. These interactions are based on a relational structure similar to resource dependence theory. It is significant to note that resource dependence theory as a social science framework prevails as a long-term, collaborative inter-organizational relationship based on joint venture alliances or long-term resourcing agreements, such as fundraising existing between community colleges and strong foundations designated for financial support (Riccardi, 2014).

If an organization succeeds in achieving favorable or at least sustainable interaction conditions, the resource dependence theory predicts that the relations will be stable and result in
higher efficiency and more reliable risk management; this assumption is implicit in the stream of students dedicated to inter-college process integration and supply chain management, where IT-based solutions play an important role (Lambert & Cooper, 2000).

**THE PROBLEM STATEMENT**

Community colleges today serve 11 million students, 44% of the country’s disadvantaged population that are drastically underfunded (Baum & Kurose, 2013) This challenge has created a vacuum in the mission of community colleges with specific focus on access and degree attainment by students from low economic settings. This problem on a more profound national level has imposed a general concern to the American society, and many of our community colleges have aligned with global-affordable technology, worldwide demand for accessible high quality education, and ever-increasing revenue that calls for a strategic path to fundraising.

In the past, graduate students have researched fundraising as an alternative source of revenue for the accomplishment of the American dream at New Jersey community colleges, the implication of fundraising for higher education research fundraising effectiveness at Pennsylvania University, and the influence of organizational climate on fundraising. However, there is a significant lack of research about scientific approaches to enhance fundraising in our educational system to ensure student success.

Presently, the cost of education is high and many families cannot afford to send their children to school. For example, the spiraling cost of education extended to a 79% increase in total full-time equivalent enrollment at public 4-year institutions increase between 1993 and 2013. In the fall of 1993, New Jersey’s public 4-year colleges and universities enrolled a total of 103,462 full-time equivalent students. By the fall of 2013, the institutions enrolled a total of
185,242 full-time equivalent students (New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015). State appropriations per full-time equivalent student decreased 46% over 20 years. Between 1993 and 2013, state appropriations per full-time equivalent student, adjusted for inflation, decreased by 46%. These statistics sank again in Fiscal Year 2016, after appropriations to the senior public colleges and universities in New Jersey were cut $34.2 million, a reduction of 4.65% (New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015).

Fundraising from private sources has become increasingly critical to the financial wellbeing of community colleges (Boyd, 2010). Funding has shifted from federal and state control to community colleges, giving vent to the financial difficulties of not meeting the demands of access and affordability (Jones, 2010). Community colleges have not received a proportional share of funding. Between 2007 and 2008, they received only 27% of the total federal, state, and local revenues for public degree-granting institutions while serving 43% of undergraduate students (Mullin, 2010). State funding for community colleges is stable, but concerns exist over recessions and reduction in support (Hardy et al., 2007).

Community colleges now depend on fundraising to fill a growing gap between institutional needs and financial support from tuition and government taxes, since fundraising has become a critical component of fiscal leadership (Ryan & Calmer, 2005). Decision-making about funding in the global educational environment is not made in isolation; rather, decisions are influenced by other related factors such as access and affordability to higher education, Medicaid, income tax structures, public pensions, and public employee compensation (AASCU, 2014). This problem on a more profound national level has imposed a general concern to the American society. According to Julie Dee (2013, p.5), many of our community colleges have
gone to global-affordable technology, worldwide demand for accessible, high quality education, and an ever-increasing need for revenue that calls for a strategic path to fundraising.

The height of this concern still persists, even after the Obama administration proposal for a new federal college ratings system which seeks to assess college access, affordability, completion rates, and outcomes. With the federal government’s attention to accountability, colleges are spurred to increase their central outcome measures of interest to students (AASCU, 2014). On a wider collegial perspective, it is interesting to note that governors had outlined initiatives for 2014 sessions to encourage commercialization of university research; attract leading scientists, researchers, and faculty; foster public-private partnership to resolve this constant tension existing between funding and access in higher education and enhance the ongoing knowledge-based economic structure in our nation.

**PURPOSE OF STUDY**

The purpose of this quantitative experimental study is to test how resource dependence theory (Brettel & Voss, 2013), relates and compares to an accurate description of the characteristics of our phenomenon of study, which is the effect of fundraising on completion rates in New Jersey community colleges. The independent variable of fundraising is categorically articulated to be capital appropriation, gifts, grants, and endowment. This study as predictive research is open to predicting the future status of one or more dependent or outcome variables on the basis of one or more independent or predictor variables, such as the characteristic strategies of fundraising.

The dependent variable is college completion rate, which is a key component of discussions about accountability in higher education. Federal graduation rates have been
calculated for more than a decade, but for most of that time no one paid much attention when the data was released. According to (Cook, 2011), that is no longer the case. Currently, graduation rates under the Commission on the Future of Higher Education, known as the Spellings Commission, which called for dramatic changes in higher education focused on the persistent gap between the college attendance and graduation rates of low-income Americans and their more affluent peers.

Hence, the purpose of this multiple case study was to use quantitative design to explain fundraising functions in the state of New Jersey, with a specific focus on the impact of fundraising on access at 19 community colleges. The first phase was a qualitative exploration of fundraising with informed literature. The second was a quantitative use of a research survey. Data was collected from interviews and surveys of participants at three community colleges. The reason for collecting qualitative data initially was with a constructivism kind of framework, where a qualitative design was turned into quantitative to enhance understanding multiple participants’ meanings, social history, and theory generation. Findings from qualitative research were used to test research questions or hypotheses. Fundraising was the independent variable and access, with specific focus completion rates as the dependent variable for 85 participants (sample of population) at 19 community colleges.

OVERARCHING RESEARCH QUESTION
How do fundraising strategies impact enrollment in the community colleges as a vehicle of access enhancement?

SUBSIDIARY QUESTIONS
What model of New Jersey community college represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance?

What is the relationship between capital campaign strategy and completion rates in community colleges?

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This study explores how financial officials and the governing administrative team are coping with financial constraints, utilizing funding streams as an economic changing tool for access growth and decision making in community college leadership. It is also helpful to determine student achievements in terms of GPA, graduation, and completion of classes.

According to the State of New Jersey’s information on eligibility (Chris Christie, 2017), 41 New Jersey community colleges and public and private 4-year colleges and universities participate in the state’s educational opportunity funds (EOF) program, which provides financial assistance and support services such as counselling, tutoring, and developmental course work to students of economically and disadvantaged backgrounds.

Undergraduate grants range from $200 annually to $2,500 annually, while graduate grants range from $200 annually to $4,350 annually, depending on the type of institution and financial needs. Incidentally, the actual number of available spaces at each college or university is limited. Because EOF is campus-based program, each campus is responsible for student recruitment, selection, program services, and its own specific criteria for EOF admission and program participation (Information about Eligibility, 2015). This methodological research will aid in refining, redefining, revising, and necessarily extending the existing knowledge and practice of this specific area of funding.
LIMITATION

To understand the word limitation in this study, it is proper to know the meaning of delimitation. According to Sampson (2012), delimitations in research refer to anticipated constraints of a study, whereas limitations refer to the unanticipated constraints of the study. Delimitations are boundaries put in place by the researcher and are relevant to the scope and generalizability of the study. As such, delimitations are predictable and help to bind the study and define what will not be examined.

One delimitation of this study points to the exclusive attention of community college presidents in New Jersey only; therefore, I cannot make generalizations as to perceptions, thoughts, ideas, and actions made by presidents of community colleges on a national level. Another delimitation is that this research is exclusive to New Jersey as a state with a particular concentration on size and region. Fundraising is uncertain, hence thinking too small or too big is a sure path to fundraising inefficacy (Summer, 2006).

Equity concern is a delimitation wherein faculty members in community colleges do not solicit money to increase their number of professorships or endowed chairs despite them being a supplement for salaries. Introversion as a parallel to the problem of identity is a research delimitation. Community colleges traditionally have yet to clearly articulate their mission. The small size of their development offices are matched by their external relations and alumni offices. With a spotlight between administration and faculty unions, it becomes almost too complex to focus on attracting external investments (Summer, 2006).

Limitations, in contrast, arise unexpectedly and can occur in sampling methods, data collection, or data analysis. There are limitations in the chosen methodology. One of the
Limitations of fundraising include the cost of fundraising. This limitation is seen in most community colleges because there are limits on the number of fundraisers the PTO can have within the school year where taxes are not paid. Therefore, fundraisers have to pay taxes, so this law limits fundraising. Another limitation is that there are variations in overhead and fundraising efficiency to measure the influence of size, age, and subsector of states involved.

Pressure exists for nonprofit organizations to conform to donor demands, systematic guidelines, and in some cases contractual requirements to maintain a certain level of financial efficiency, and little is known about the relative efficiencies of nonprofit organizations. People care about the ways nonprofit organizations spend their contributions (Greenlee & Brown, 1999; Parsons, 2001).

The collective pool of community college fundraising normally conflicts with building endowments. An endowment is normally a financial representation of a long-term commitment to an organization. An endowment takes time to build with donations and earnings. The limiting factor is that executives, board members, supporters, donors, and other constituents all tend to be impatient (List, 2012). They are more concerned with current tangible results than in slowly building for the future.

Another potential limitation is the interviewer bias. The data generated from the interviews may have been limited by the participant’s frankness and his or her ability to reflect on the phenomenon. Nonparticipant observation may also be limited by the observer’s biases and by the chasm from the phenomenon generated from nonparticipation.

Time gap within the process of finding is a limitation. Literature review unveils a paucity of scholarly studies on the central phenomenon in this study. As Jackson and Glass (2000)
explained, “research exploring trends and issues related to resources development and private fundraising at community is particularly limited” (Jackson and Glass, 2000, p.729). For example, because of the relatively new entrance of community colleges into alternative revenue generation strategies, fundraising suffers from a lower prestige as a field of expertise or research in the academe. Another limitation is the human memory of participants who were interviewed.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

According to Erin Stout of the *Chronicle Review*, fundraising is defined as “the most successful higher education funding enterprises that focus attention on major donors, have more staff support, and often receive performance-based incentive pay, among other attributes…” (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2007).

According to Shannon and Smith (date?), access could be defined as “the community colleges' proverbial open door” which ensures access for all who can benefit. This is the foundation on which all other community college operations rest. The open door concept influences admissions, enrollment processes, curricular structures, faculty hiring, the relationships between community colleges and 4-year institutions, advising, counseling activities, and colleges' responses to the needs of the K-12 sector, as well as those of the local economy. Indeed, the open door concept is critical to our understanding of the community college itself (New Directions for Community Colleges, 2006).

According to higher education authority (HEA), access data is defined as:

“All publicly higher education colleges’ additional data, as part of student registration, on the socio-economic, ethnic/cultural and disability background of new entrants to the sector. Collecting this information is vital both to higher education as a system and colleges as well. It advises needed
research and statistical analysis underpinning the provisions and funding of services and support for students—hence energizing colleges in realizing their core equality functions as set out in legislation” (HEA, 2014, p. 14.).

According to Para M. Jones (2010), access is a very familiar term in the community college sector that generally describes the degree to which higher education is accessed by as many people as possible (Jones, 2010). The term is used in the liberal sense, such as the physical ability to access higher education with college campuses or sites located close to target populations and with buildings, classrooms, and laboratories able to be utilized by all students, including those with disabilities (Jones, 2010).

The term is often used to capture a quantitative measure of the likelihood that a graduating high school senior or working-age adult enrolls in college. The term is also used in a pedagogical sense such as providing varying levels of curriculum (remedial, developmental, and honors level) so that people of varying intellectual abilities or skill levels could benefit from instruction (Jones, 2010).

The term community college refers to 2-year-comprehensive institutions that provide a general and liberal education, career and vocational education, and adult and continuing education programs (Guthrie, 2002). According to the AACC, each community college is a distinct educational institution, loosely linked to other community colleges by the shared goals of access and service. Open admissions and the tradition of charging low tuition are among the practices they have in common. But each community college has its own mission. Today there are 1,195 community colleges, of which 987 are considered public institutions, 177 are considered independent, and 31 are categorized as tribal organizations (AACC, 2008,).
This study refers to the 19 community colleges in New Jersey. These kinds of educational institutions are geared toward students seeking associate degrees. In many cases, students complete a 2-year degree at a community college in order to transfer those credits to a bachelor’s degree program at a 4-year college or university. Community colleges, also known as junior colleges, give students the opportunity to spend two years earning a degree, while saving money and improving their grades before beginning to pursue their bachelor’s degree (Campus Explorer, 2015).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community colleges definitely have grown faster than 4-year institutions, with the number of students they educate increasing at more than a sevenfold rate of growth since 1963. This growth is compared to a threefold growth rate at 4-year institutions, but funding for community colleges has actually declined over the last 20 years (Fitzpatrick, 2009). Community colleges are one of New Jersey’s greatest success stories. Created in the 1960s, New Jersey’s 19 community colleges now enroll nearly 400,000 students at over 70 campuses throughout the state (Fitzpatrick, 2009, p.14). Apparently, scholars could come up with different opinions on the vital contributions of community colleges to the Garden State, but the truth is that New Jersey would be a far different place to raise a family, make a living, and start a business had the state not created community colleges some 50 years ago (Napoli, 2010).
Community colleges commenced with legislative action. Three acts of the New Jersey legislature in particular were especially significant to the growth of New Jersey’s state-wide community college system. These acts are The New Jersey County College Act of 1962, The New Jersey Higher Education Act of 1967, and The New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994 (Nespoli, 2010). A profound public support for more affordable higher education opportunities motivated the state legislature to establish a community college system through the County College Act of 1962. With this act, the state enabled freeholders to establish community colleges and committed state funding to support these new institutions.

The first four community colleges—Atlantic, Cumberland, Middlesex, and Ocean—were established in 1966. Six more followed in 1968, seven more came in 1970s, and the last two, Sussex and Warren, opened in 1982, resulting in a total of 19 community colleges (Nespoli, 2010). The beginning of community colleges in New Jersey complied with state regulations and controls. But the inauguration of Higher Education Act of 1967 emerged with sweeping changes to the state higher education landscape. A separate Board of Higher Education, the Office of the Chancellor, and the Department of Higher Education were charged with overseeing and carrying out a plan for a comprehensive state higher education system that incorporated community colleges (Nespoli, 2010).

Community colleges were established with the leadership of local boards of trustees and their presidents working under a highly regulated system controlled by state officials (Nespoli, 2010, p.1). With the Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994, change became reality in the community college administrative setting. According to Nespoli, no other single event comes close to this radical change in terms of immediate, statewide, and lasting impact on New Jersey’s
community colleges. Boards of trustees were granted the local autonomy to govern their colleges (Nespoli, 2010).

With the mandate of local autonomy, the Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994 also recognized the need for continued statewide coordination among the 19 community colleges. To this point, the legislation assigned the New Jersey Council of County Colleges, a nongovernmental state association, many of the responsibilities previously carried out by the state. For instance, the council works with its member trustees and presidents, submits an annual state budget request for the sector, coordinates capital funding to the colleges, and reviews courses to determine their eligibility for state aid.

The council accomplishes these statutorily assigned state coordinating responsibilities while still focusing primarily on its advocacy efforts on behalf of the community colleges in the State House (Nespoli, 2010). Currently there are 26 community colleges located throughout New Jersey, which implies new presidents, more students, and more resources and funding (Community College Review, 2015). Community colleges have traditionally relied on funding sources: state appropriations, local taxes, and tuition. Each source supplied approximately one-third of the school’s total budget.

Over the years, these funding sources have declined radically, particularly in the area of state appropriations (Madonna, 2008). As states struggle to create balanced budgets, many are choosing to accomplish their goals by severely reducing funding for institutions of higher education. This trend has led college presidents to believe that higher educational has shifted from a public-assisted status to a public-supported structure due to declining financial support from traditional state and local sources (Million, de los Santos, & Browning, 2003). As the issues create access closure for students, it is even surprising that many vibrant colleges are beginning
to experience image problems since 2012. A Pew Research Center study (2012) found that only 60% of Americans believe that colleges have a positive effect on society, while 26% said that colleges have a negative effect (Million, de los Santos, & Browning, 2003).

**PRESIDENTIAL INVOLVEMENT**

Harvard historian Samuel Eliot wrote in 1848 that the American college had become an Ivory Tower “from which the president emerged as a figure of tremendous power. This power he did not always use well, but power that was nonetheless his by virtue of it not belonging to anyone else” (Rudolph, 1991, p. 167). With construct of possession of power by college presidents, the resultant effect is that the role of college president took on a different meaning depending on the organizational setting of the institution.

The role of Graham Spanner, president of Pennsylvania State University, is very different from that of Lawrence Mazzini, president of Algeria College, which is different from Madeline Wing Adler, president of West Chester University. These differences became real from the perspective of college type, size, demographic factor to geographic location, administrative structure, control, and the nature of the student body (Rile, 2001).

According to Rile, the economic and social changes to the United States in the mid to the late 1980s forced change in higher education and the role of president. The Industrial Revolution forced many smaller colleges to close (Rudolph, 1990), but also provided revitalization to others who could adjust their philosophy of education to meet the needs of the new economy. The job of the president now included more complex issues as the institution itself grew and became more complex (Schmidt, 1930). The president began to get involved in the recruitment of students and the formal establishment of different curricula and raising funds for the library (Rile, 2001).
The 1960s brought turbulent times to the colleges and universities in the United States. This period was not an easy epoch for the person having the position of a college president. The financial crunch of decreasing tuition revenue and increasing costs of the 1970s and 1980s did not make the job any easier (Nason, 1980). Demographic changes in the typical college age population presented their own challenges to colleges and universities in the 1990s. As the population of the country becomes more diverse and the cost of higher education continues to rise, institutions are faced with smaller pools of traditional students who can afford higher education and seek to enroll in college (Bryant, 2000).

Twenty years ago, college presidents tended to rise through the ranks of academia and focused primarily on fundraising and faculty relations (Bryant, 2000). Today, boards have expanded their success criteria and are looking at potential presidents with experience in business, strategic planning, international educational programs, and strategic partnerships with for-profit institutions (The State of Higher Education, 2013).

College and university presidents’ chief concerns are financial, according to the national survey by Inside Higher education (2013). Federal student aid was the leading worry, followed by budget shortfalls, declining state support, and rising tuition affordability (2012). Unlike leaders of major research universities, community college presidents must be able to articulate the institutional mission to attract immense financial support (Anderson, 2008). According to Freeman and Koch, (2015), the role of the university president is changing, and ideas may be changing the knowledge, academics, and outcome as they serve in their presidential roles, making it increasingly important to identify for entry-level administrators in this position to assure their future success.
More than half of the presidents shared that an aspiring president needs to be competent at fundraising. This corresponds with the 2012 ACE study, which listed fundraising as a competency area. Nelson (2009) stated, “College president must raise money and campaigns (p.26).” Likewise, Ekman (2010) found that “most presidents engage—have influential external personalities and to persuade those outsiders to become equally involved in fundraising campaign usually match with a rewarding experience (p.63).” Presidents such as Jessica Elliot expressed the importance of presidents retaining a global marketing skill by assisting administrators with cultivating fundraising opportunities (Freeman & Koch 2015).

Above of all, the college president as the chief executive officer for fundraising in the institution is central to college leadership. Leadership in higher education is characterized by a focus on the values and purposes, as an affirmation of its existence and as a mandate for change (Freeman & Koch, 2015). Erickson (2013.p.1), the President of Pennsylvania State University, reflecting on his personal experience and involvement with fundraising, briefly disclosed that he has a legacy and support of more than 193,000 donors, the largest number in the history of the university. These donors made gifts to the university in 2012-2013 and alumni giving rose by 23% over the preceding year. Erickson (2013) further informed higher education in his report on philanthropy and endowments that many of his fundraising supporters were motivated by the students of THON.

THON is a student-run philanthropy committed to enhancing the lives of children and families impacted by childhood cancer. Their mission is to provide emotional and financial support, spread awareness, and ensure funding for critical research, all in pursuit of a cure. These students broke their own record and raised $ 124 million for pediatric cancer research and patient care at Penn State Milton S. Hershey medical center. Others found their philanthropic purpose in
the future campaign’s focus on student support and pushed the trustee matching scholarship program past its original $100 million target (Erickson (2013).

**FUNDRAISING STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES**

This Literature review explores how funding is allocated, provided, and implemented through the state budget process as well as the implementation outcomes in community colleges based on fundraising strategic attributes, such as capital campaign (Anne Arundel County, 2004), charitable gift funds (Erickson, 2013), endowments fundraising (1982), successful strategy management (Chaffer, 2007), fundraising development certificates (U.C. San Diego, 2010), visions of capital campaign (John, 2011), with dialogic and alumina relations strategies as independent variables. These strategic attributes point to the most touted means of meeting state workforce, educational, and economic goals, as well as essentially incentivizing the diverse array of community colleges to achieve significant access to higher education for students (AASCU, 2014).

According to List (2012), fundraising is the life blood of the nonprofit world. With competition for dollars always fierce and more intense now than ever before, given the nation’s continuing economic doldrums; nonprofits know that they must do everything possible to give themselves an edge. The striking point is that many nonprofits are forgetting about the need to build an effective strategic approach to fundraising. After all, fundraising is either all about the here and now, or tied to balancing the organization’s budget, growing the services they offer and the number of people they serve, and accomplishing certain goals set by the board of directors and trustees (List, 2012).
Looking at fundraising logistics from the practical perspective, fundraising could generate enabling means of keeping good employees in organizations by offering them pay increases, bonuses, and other perks. It creates an environment where boards of directors and trustees having a deep sense of focus and direction accomplish specific goals and objectives, with a feeling of personal obligation to donors, and constituents creative the paths to significant access to students (List, 2012).

**CAPITAL CAMPAIGN FUNDRAISING**

Capital campaign funding could also be classified as capital appropriation because it embraces new construction addition, renovation or replacement of existing facilities, as well as major maintenance, renovation, or repair of deferred maintenance equipment in community colleges.

According to Wells (2002), a capital fundraising campaign could be described as a process of raising significant funds for the vital asset building needs of an organization. It is typically short, intensive, focused, and volunteer-driven. Projects which make the best capital campaigns are urgent, relevant to the organizational mission, and importantly distinguished from other operational and minor capital needs. This means that campaigns run for endowments needs, debt repayment, and augmentation of annual funds are by definition extremely difficult to incorporate in a capital campaign.
Beginning with a capital fundraising campaign, Lisa Wells (2002), re-echoing Plato’s solid expression in his text ‘The Republic’, explained that the beginning is most important aspect of any accomplishment. This is never truer than with a capital fundraising campaign. Sound planning will translate to a successful campaign. It will ensure that all needed resources are met, not excluding contributors, staff, volunteers, and leaders, all waiting to be activated (Wells, 2002). According to Mole (2015), capital campaign practice is best approached from five perspectives.

First, the strength behind a successful capital campaign is the dynamic volunteer leadership. This must be open to strategic planning, cultivating engaged and committed followers, and driving action. Therefore, the presence of influential and respected leaders is evaluated as a key motivator of the campaign.

Second, the campaign team must be ready with a strong argument for the campaign. There must be an emotionally compelling and persuasive explication of the campaign motif, with convincing unique qualities of the organization. People take a fundraising effort seriously when they are convinced the need is valid, urgent, and compelling.

Third, there must be sufficient contributable dollars. This entails that the number of prospects needed to raise the required funds must be assessed, as to ensure that the proper proportion of prospects relative to fundraising capacity is realized. Interviews with proactive donors are conducted to ensure that campaign targets are met with respect to the donor’s interest.

Fourth, provision for adequate resources must be made. Cole (2015) explained that to have a successful campaign, professionals must verify adequate internal resources needed for fundraising. This will help them to allocate sufficient resources to a key strategic initiative for
meaningful accomplishment. These resources include staff skills, structure, systems and processes and even volunteer support.

Fifth, a strong organizational campaign setting must be established. According to Cole, beyond recruiting strong volunteer leadership, the manner in which leadership members are identified, enlisted, expanded, and managed is vital to success.

Ketchum (2015) argued that capital campaign fundraising must have the face of the 21st century dialogic assessment. The key to success requires personalized one-to-one multichannel communication to thousands. Again, developing behavioral interest profiles based on how donors interact with leaders will help an organization develop the right quest for the right donor at the proper time. Ketchum attested that the 21st century campaign initiative must be open to utilizing and leveraging all communication channels in an integrated strategy.

This will help to resolve the tension arising from the fact that technological enhancement has increased opportunities to communicate with donors. Organizations are beginning to realize that less attention has been given to how best to leverage all communication channels for donor cultivation, solicitation, and recognition, as well as how to measure return on investment to ensure good stewardship of organizational resources. Finally, Ketchum encouraged fundraisers to identify and acquire new donors and future leaders. As capital campaigns grow in a demographic setting, so too does the need for future supporters and organizational leadership.

Ignoring donor acquisition and leadership development as a significant component of any campaign strategy suggests an imbalanced focus on institutional needs versus societal impact (Ketchum, 2015). Today, feasibility studies should include an assessment of both the availability and interest of those capable of making pacesetting leadership gifts, and the availability of
midlevel donors. Such a comprehensive step embraces the qualitative assessment of the past, and the quantitative empirical review of the entire donor base as critical.

Of all recent capital fundraising campaigns, Harvard University is outstanding in their school’s global presence by having an ongoing project to develop a center in Shanghai for conferences and research (Ketchum, 2015). This specific capital campaign fundraising commenced in 2013. The key motif of the campaign was to target major renovations of the university’s undergraduate housing and increase its study of new learning and teaching strategies (Lindsay, 2015). According to Harvard President Drew Gilpin Faust (2015), this campaign will help the school meet the world’s increasingly complex and pressing needs by reaffirming what makes Harvard, and universities in general, such essential and irreplaceable contributors to the pursuit of knowledge and welfare (Ketchum, 2015). The school aims to reach its $6.5 billion goal by 2018, thereby surpassing Stanford University that ended their 5-year capital campaign last year with $6.2 billion. Yale University and University of Pennsylvania completed multiyear fundraising campaigns that netted $3.9 billion and $3.5 billion respectively (Jay Lindsay, 2015).

Harvard’s endowment at the end of the last fiscal year was $30.7 billion (Lindsay, 2015). According to Harvard Provost Alan Garber (2015), the school has a history of helping solve the world’s problems, and donors believe Harvard can do uniquely well, ranging from educational innovation to scientific breakthroughs that has changed the world. Their priority for the campaign includes the expansion of Harvard’s growing school of Engineering and Applied Sciences, which became its own school in 2009. Their focus expands beyond buildings into what Harvard officials have defined as the school’s greatest needs. Of the money raised, 45% would support teaching and research, 25% would go to financial aid and student services, 20% would
go to capital improvements and 10% would foster collaboration and other initiatives (Jay Lindsay, 2015).

ENDOWMENTS FUNDRAISING

Endowments have recovered somewhat from where they were in 2008, a disastrous year for most. In 2011, however, many endowments were still struggling (McDonald, 2012). Moreover, endowment returns also continued to be squeezed in fiscal 2012 (Martin, 2012). According to Bloomberg’s ranking of college endowment returns from 2008 to 2011, the largest endowments did not fare well compared with smaller endowments. Princeton ranked 20th, Stanford, 47th, Harvard, 68th and Yale, 70th (Martin, 2012).

According to Joe Garett (2013), an endowment is a pool of funds raised by a nonprofit organization which is then invested, and which provides returns or ongoing income to the nonprofits, either for a designated purpose or for general operating support. There are three basics of endowment fundraising campaign. First, true endowment normally holds in perpetuity, meaning it may not be tapped. Typically, 4-6% of the earnings are used annually for restricted and unrestricted intentions, depending on the agreement with the donor. The rest is reinvested in the principal. For instance, the former board chair of Essex County College gives an endowment gift $100,000 to support enhancing financial aid. The fund ($100,000) is to be permanently endowed, as invested, and roughly $4,000–$6,000 is used for financial aid in any year.

The second basic component of endowment fundraising is second, board-designated funds. This structure focuses on the board rather than donors, on how unrestricted assets into funds will be applied for certain programs or for the future. This includes quasi-endowment funds. Quasi-
endowment funds function as permanently restricted funds from which income is available for general operations or specific purposes (Dehoney, 2013, p.2). But the board can decide to spend the principal of quasi-endowment funds according to an established axiom. For instance, a foundation with a $100,000 matching gift challenge can build a $200,000 reserve fund. The board develops guidelines for use of the reserves, including specifying how and when a portion of the invested principal may be used (Dehoney, 2013).

Third, the term endowment is similar to a true endowment, but a gap lies in two factors; after the given period of time, considering the donor’s intention, the principal may be used for different purposes. An example is that normally through a bequest, a donor gives a $1 million endowment gift, with the requirement that it fund the coordinator’s position for 10 years. After that time, the principal may be added to the general endowment or board-restricted funds (Dehoney, 2013).

According to Dehoney (2013), it is revealing and significant to note that for strong organizations that are not ready for drastic change, an endowment provides a marvelous way to help donors share their values and safeguard the organizations they support for future generations. But as the recession indicated, endowments do not actually bring financial stability (Dehoney, 2013). This is why it is of an added importance that organizations ready for successful endowment fundraising must put key attributes of practice into perspective. First, there should be an articulate and succinct approach focused on a clear mission and shared understanding of how to make the case for seeking endowed funds and how the funds will be processed once they are raised. There must be a systematic alliance between the current operational expenses and the vision and programs far into the future (Dehoney, 2013),
Second, there must be an organized functioning board with stable leadership. There must be an understanding that endowment funds are characterized by ongoing operations, long-term stability, and an enduring legacy. Organizations intending to maintain the track must avoid the leadership transition, because when a beloved long-time conductor leaves, it can present an opportunity for endowing a fund in his or her name. Third, an endowment fundraising campaign must be open to sufficient operating reserves. Operating reserves provide a critical cushion for the financial flaws that may arise unexpectedly. This affects long-term stability and overall health, and reserves reinforce the concept of endowment giving. Fourth, the system must embrace a loyal donor base that is likely to continue growing. Endowment fundraising is like a pyramid; gifts typically come from those at the middle or top of the pyramid. New donors must continually be added into a broader base of supporters (Dehoney, 2013).

Next, before setting out for an endowment campaign, there must be a committee charged with offering guidance and developing a written endowment policy, and choruses must strive to consult an experienced accountant or financial advisor (Dehoney, 2017 p.4) sixth, there must be a working written endowment policy adopted by the board. The endowment policy addresses issues such as who is responsible for endowment oversight and investment, how the funds will be invested and disbursed, and what portion of an undesignated gift can be allocated to an endowment funds according to best practices. The board should also specify their policy on naming funds and the amount of earnings that will be available annually to fund the specific program they wish to embark on (Dehoney, 2017, p.4).

Community colleges need endowment money to support the institutions in perpetuity. Many state-supported institutions used to operate with the axiom that their permanent capital is provided by state taxpayers, and therefore endowment fundraising was not a priority. Now things
have changed, and endowment fundraising has gone from being a nice thing to do if a donor is interested to being critical to the future health of the campus (Logue, 2015). Logue insisted that the heart of the university is becoming the students and alumni, and the soul is the faculty, but the bones are the funds that support them (p. 1). Money is required to operate a university now and in the future.

A permanent endowment capital helps keep the campus experience consistent through generations, support growth and serves as a source of funds should the institution become stressed (Carmichael, 2015, p.1). These permanent funds have growing importance in every college. Cuts in state aid and difficulties in raising tuition mean that institutions need to raise endowment funds. The Tulane College endowment of $1.184 billion lacks in comparison to that of peer institutions such as Emory University, Washington University in St. Louis, and Duke University, all of which have endowments of around $6 billion. A large endowment gives a university more money to spend on each student, which means more financial aid, more access to resources, and more freedom for the university to improve itself in ways that benefit the student body (Carmichael, 2015).

According to Spence (2015), endowment funds face the challenge of ensuring that spending policies meets with the budget to avoid overspending especially when investment returns are actually huge. For 2011, the Nacubo Common Fund Study of endowments reported that the average campus spent 4.6% of its net assets, a slight increase from 4.5% in 2010 (Carmichael, 2015). Over the last decade, the rate has fluctuated from a high of 5.1% in 2003 (when the average endowment returned 3.2 %) to a low of 4.3% in fiscal 2008 (with an average return of 3.0 %). Therefore Carmichael, revisiting Swenson’s send own strategy (1985), outlined three effective windows of practice consideration:
• An endowment is in place for perpetuity, so very long-term investments are appropriate.

• Diversification increases risk-adjusted returns, so the more diversification into exotic assets, the better the endowment should be positioned for long-term performance.

• Endowments receive ongoing cash inflow from new donations, so cash needs don’t need to be met from investments (Carmichael, 2015).

Pennsylvania State University has a specific approach to endowment processing. They created a forum in which donors can make annual gifts at every level to have an immediate impact, as funds are typically expended in the same year in which they are received. Endowments, which require a minimum gift of $20,000 or more depending upon type, generate income that supports the donors’ goals in perpetuity, and they can often be funded over a period of five years. Therefore, Penn State’s development staff uses a combination of annual gifts and endowed funds to fulfil philanthropic goals (Erickson, 2013).

Focusing on endowment fundraising findings on colleges in the State of New Jersey, Princeton University with an $18.2 billion endowment is currently the topmost school in New Jersey and the fifth richest college in the nation. This Ivy League school, whose 60% of alumni sent donations to, often has an endowment bigger than the gross national product of many small nations, including Cambodia, Iceland, Jamaica, and Honduras (Heyboer & Sherman, 2014).

CHARITABLE GIFT FUND

A charitable gift fund is an extended tax-free retirement account distribution to public charities. On the bright side, the funding extended through Dec. 31, 2013, the provision allowing tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts to public charities for individuals age
70 or older, and up to a maximum of $100,000 per year. Transition relief allowed taxpayers to characterize a distribution made in January 2013 as a 2012 gift, and allowed distributions made in December 2012 to be treated as direct charitable distributions if transferred to a charity before Feb. 1, 2013 (The State of Higher Education, 2013).

Pennsylvania State University has an option for alumni and donors who want to have a cost-effective means to maximize the impact and tax benefits of their philanthropy as a unique approach to charitable funding. Using a donor-advised fund, they allow their donors to invest their charitable dollars and direct contributions to both the university and other nonprofit organizations (President’s Report on Fundraising, 2013). According to Michael Degenhart, executive director of gift planning (2013,p.21), gifts to the fund can be made when they will be most financially advantageous for the donor while allowing for tremendous flexibility in the timing and targeting of charitable support.

By partnering with one of the leading DAF technology solutions in the industry, Penn State strives to offer supporters a unique range of online tools that make giving easier, simpler, and more gratifying than ever. Rodney P. Kirsch, senior vice president for development and alumni relations, in his keynote statement on Pennsylvania State University charitable gift fund; disclosed that “Pennsylvania State University’s charitable gift fund was created to help generous supporters and their families to manage and simplify their philanthropic activities. This fund comes after years of research and preparation, and we are proud to be offering our supporters one of the most innovative approaches to giving available today” (2013, p.21).

According to Tombros (2013), charitable gift funding is open to the Penn State University Charitable Gift Fund (PSUCGF). This is purposefully designed for donors to make gifts of cash, appreciated assets such as securities or real estate, and other resources to a fund that
is invested and administered on their behalf by the university partners, investment firm Keswick & Company, and DAF technology and services provider crown philanthropic solutions. An account can be established with a gift of $25,000, and it can be increased with additional contributions that each meet a $1,000 minimum. Donors may choose to have their gifts invested in one of eight opinions, much like mutual funds, that reflect different growth and income strategies (Tombros, 2013).

Gifts can be counted as tax-deductible with commitment to the fund. This allows donors to manage the impact of significant events. Donors may wait to direct their support until they have defined their philanthropic priorities, but at least 50% of the distribution from each donor’s account must ultimately come to the University (Tombros, 2013). Donors who create an account through the PSUCGF will have access to a donor-first dashboard environment, a secure, web-based system that makes it possible for them to track contributions and distributions, research and receive content about both Penn State and external grantees, and direct their support, 24 hours a day, from any location. Finally, donors can invite other family members or friends to use the dashboard to communicate and share ideas about their involvement with family philanthropy (Tombros, 2013).

GRANTS

Grants impact higher education from two perspectives. First, land grants are associated with the Morrill Act of 1862, signed by Abraham Lincoln, which opened the new age and enhancement of American universities, both public and private. Land grants were established in response to the aggressive industrial and agricultural development nurtured from a German model, but reformulated into a new American university model as multiversity (Kerr, 2001).
Second, support of scientific research began during World War II, when wartime laboratories were utilized by the federal government as financed research centers for higher education, including Lincoln Laboratory in Massachusetts, Institute of Technology, Argonne, in Chicago, and Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in California (Kerr, 2001). Grants that are specifically used for scientific research stimulated different highly decentralized institutions with fidelity and zeal in response to national needs that emerged as a very productive union.

According to Kerr (2001), it is interesting to note that higher education in 1960 received about $1.5 billion from the federal government, a hundred fold increase in 20 years. About one-third of this $1.5 billion was for university affiliated research centers, about one-third for project research within the universities, and one-third for other things such as residence hall loans, scholarships, and teaching programs (p.40).

The impact of grants on higher education remains incomplete without reference to fundraising, because the U.S. Department of Education provides grants to students in need. Their mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access. Highlighting the role of grants in the New Jersey, it is imperative to note that institutions like Princeton and Rutgers are emblematic of the state’s rich academic tradition, which includes more than 60 private, public, and community colleges (College Scholarships, n.d.).

New Jersey universities grant campus-specific financial aid, and private benefactors fund education initiatives that provide aid for diverse student groups studying at all levels (College Scholarships, n.d.). There are varieties of grants designated for higher education, but for the scope of this dissertation, I first researched New Jersey’s Tuition Aid Grant Program (TAG). This is formulated for undergraduate students in any field of study in the community colleges. In
2011, needs-based TAG programs provided over 71,000 awards totaling almost $282 million. The award limits vary according to the type of school and can run anywhere from $2,318 to $10,468. Although TAG was intended mainly for low and middle income students, nearly one in three full-time New Jersey students are eligible for it.

Second was the New Jersey Gear Up, which strives to increase access to higher education for minority and low income students. Funded by the United States Department of Education and administered by New Jersey Higher Education, the program provides tutoring, mentoring, and counseling for students who are working toward college enrollment. Gear Up issues its own scholarships to program participants annually (College Scholarships, n.d.).

Lastly, I researched the Educational Opportunity Fund, which benefits low income applicants within the state, who receive grants designed to increase access to higher education among economically disadvantaged groups. Grants are valued between $200 and $2,500 each, based on the specific costs of attendance and household income parameters. Eligibility reflects TAG requirements, with additional financial needs present (College Scholarships, n.d.).

OPEN DOOR ACCESS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A MISSION

According to Shannon and Smith (2006), it is of added importance to note that of all the developments in American higher education, few have had a greater impact than the creation of the egalitarian mission of community colleges. These institutions share commitment to access as strongly as Americans believe in the Declaration of Independence.

Community colleges are open-door orientated, which implies access to all who can benefit as the foundational on which all community colleges operate. According to the American Association of Community Colleges,(AACC), nationally, community colleges enroll 47% black
undergraduates students, 56% are Hispanic undergraduates, 48% are Asian/Pacific Islanders and 58% are native American students (AACC, 2006, p.16).

Since the majority of these college students come from low socioeconomic settings, one would infer that without the open door, few would be able to attend an institution of higher education. The dynamics of access to community colleges is imperative to American higher education. According to Hussar (2006, p. 7), the numerical strength of high school graduates in the United States has increased greatly over the past 20 years. Many community college students are adults. The AACC explained that the average age of community college students was 29 but Adelman (2004, p. 5), indicated that the median age is closer to 24.

The median age is still higher than that of students at many 4-year institutions, which are much more likely to enroll recent high school graduates. Preserving the open door is essential for these older students who require flexibility in course offerings, low cost, and proximity to their work and home. Many community college students are entering the higher education community for the first time, often at a later time in life than the traditional college freshman and in many cases as first-generation college students (Adelman, 2004).

According to the AACC (2011), the average age of a community college student is 29. Due to these factors, many students are in need of personal attention if they are to have a significant possibility of becoming successful participants in higher education. Shannon and Smith (2006) supported Bergmann’s (1996) observations about the helpfulness of community college faculty, as compared to faculty at senior institutions (AACC, 2011). Shannon and Smith stated, “community college faculty are not judged by their research or publishing, but on the strength of their ability to help students learn and to engage students with different backgrounds, ethnicities, and aspirations” (p.15).
Characterizing community colleges as being open doors to the gateways of higher education for many Americans, this mission is more important now than ever before. We live today in an age in which the key strategic resource for success is knowledge. As Friedman (2005) contends, societies that extend knowledge to all segments of the population will become the new world leaders (p. 12). Therefore, community colleges strive to retain and strengthen their mission of inclusion in order to prepare more knowledgeable citizens.

**CHALLENGES TO OPEN ACCESS MISSION**

The challenge facing community college policy makers is remaining true to the open access mission while maintaining academic standards and a viable budget. According to Lapovsky (1999), justification for discounted tuitions and merit aid reflected an acceptance of the practice by the academic community. The community college is therefore vulnerable to accepting these practices into its culture. Even though financial aid packages at the community college are generally limited to federal student aid, there is potential in community colleges for abusing enrollment management practices. Retention continues to be a problem for the community college, and administrators can now impose admission standards via selective recruiting in order to matriculate students with a statistical propensity for success (Morris, 2012).

Boggs (2004) described open access mission challenges to include: dislocated workers, older workers, demographic shifts, fiscal constraints, and myriad economic, social, and political challenges that community college leaders must confront and overcome—threats he called the perfect storm (p.8). Boggs further stated that, despite such highly visible public support, the nation’s community colleges now face unprecedented challenges. Students’ enrollment pressure has escalated and college leaders have struggled to meet demand in the face of steep budget cuts,
limited facilities, faculty turnover, rising technology costs, and increasing numbers of students who need remedial work before they can take college-level classes (Boggs, 2004). The majority of the dislocated workers with their challenges rest their hope of continual education in the open door mission perspective of community colleges.

Researchers from the Heldrich center for workforce development found that among dislocated workers who were reemployed, roughly half (48%) were forced to take a pay cut, with nearly 60% earning at least 20% less than they been earning previously (Godowsky, Van Horn, & Zukin, 2010). According to Headlamp and Mabel, many older dislocated workers with disabilities experience community colleges as a point of hope, particularly those who have previously worked in physically demanding jobs, and some who have developed age-related chronic health conditions such as cardiac or respiratory disease, arthritis, diabetes, and hearing difficulties. Even some of them with long-term unemployment and other health issues who turn to social security disability insurance attain to attend community colleges (Author & Duggan, 2003; Orissa, 2010).

Combining open door mission with severe economic, personal, and societal consequences makes dislocated workers critical to higher education. With the post-great recession economy, older workers pose a challenge to the open door mission of community colleges. Bringing demographic, economic, health and labor market trends into a combined frame, older workers make up an increasingly significant portion of the workforce and have proven vulnerable to unemployment and especially to long-term unemployment. As of April 2012, approximately 2 million of the 12.5 million unemployed Americans were 55 and older (Rix, 2012).

Unemployed older workers were the most likely of any age group to have been without a job for a year or more (The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2012). According to the Bureau of Labor
Statistics (2010), the reemployment rate for older displaced workers ages 55 to 64 was just 39%, and for those job seekers 65 and over, the rate was a dismal 23%, in contrast to significantly higher reemployment rates for younger displaced workers—55% for those ages 20 to 24, and 53% for those ages 25 to 54. This category of people needs community colleges to survive (Headlamp, Mabel & DeGraaf, 2012).

Prior research explains that when they do participate in education and training, older workers have employment outcomes that are comparable and in some cases better than those of their younger counterparts. Community colleges are an important resource for helping both dislocated workers of all ages and older workers gain the skills and credentials needed to transition into new jobs and careers. Among students 40 years of age or older enrolled in post-secondary education, 42% are enrolled in community colleges based on data from the integrated post-secondary education data system, and community colleges are noted as being key institutions in the retaining of dislocated workers (Jacobson, Alone & Sullivan, 2011).

Previous research on dislocated workers has noted that an academic year of community college training can increase the earnings of dislocated workers by about $4,000 if the training is in high-return courses such as health-related fields and technical trades (Jacobson, Alone, & Sullivan, 2011). According to Baima, (2011,p.3), looking at the community colleges from the window of economic challenge, there is an economic downturn, and the nation's community colleges have experienced extraordinary growth under duress.

From 2007-2010, more than 1.4 million additional Americans turned to community colleges to help them realize their educational aspirations or acquire the skills to hang onto a job, enriching community colleges in the fall of 2011 with total enrollments of 8.2 million (Delta Cost Project, 2011, ). At this period, community colleges endured brutal cuts in the state and
local support that accounted for 55% of their revenue (Delta Cost Project, 2011, p.4). Their per-student spending shrank from 2008 to 2009 by 3.4%, more than any other higher education sectors, according to a Delta Cost Project report on college spending trends showing that community colleges bore the brunt of cuts in support to higher education. This challenge resulted in institutional triaging where direct expenditures for classroom instruction were given priority over virtually every other campus function.

The impact was disheartening due to the reduction in academic counseling, closing of childcare centers, terminations of programs for high-school students, the shedding of institutional researchers, and the loss of many other essential activities (Commentary on Chronicles of Education, 2011). Analyzing community college challenges from an economic perspective, campuses and facilities vary greatly. Many have utilitarian and functional structure of the 1960s architectural setting, while other occupy graceful former United States mint buildings, 19th century military structures, or elegant but abandoned university structures. Given this fiscal situation, it is interesting to note that community colleges have as much as $100 billion of infrastructure needs ‘including new construction, renovation and heavy equipment (Commentary on Chronicles of Education, 2011, p.2).

This colossal and abstract financial figure translates into thousands of students either not receiving an education or settling for subpar learning environments, since there is a link between space and the scope, quality, and character of instruction. That is particularly the case as technology infuses all aspects of higher education, and e-learning, wherever it may take place, becomes the axiom. This challenge also touches on energy efficiency, community engagement, and student access. Given this situation, community college campuses are enormously appreciative of President Obama's proposed $5 billion for their modernization as part of his
American Jobs Acts (Chronicles of Education, 2012). The proposal represents the administration's continued commitment to community colleges, following earlier presidential efforts such as Bill Clinton's Hope Scholarship tax credit and George W. Bush's community-based job training grants (Baima, 2011).

Community colleges do not take this sustained recognition and support for granted. They have been blessed by strong bipartisan backing, as evidenced by robust bipartisan community college caucuses in both the House and the Senate (Bairne, 2011). Educationalists who see a continued role for the federal government in catalyzing economic activity urge immediate action such as fundraising, which community colleges are ready and eager to take on if they are provided with substantial funds for their facilities. As a routine matter, the colleges develop master facilities plans, often in concert with local and state entities, so they are ready to move quickly when capital becomes available. The default mode for community colleges should be one of growth.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMPLETION RATES AND FUNDRAISING

American higher education designated community colleges with the purpose of providing a wide range of opportunities and experiences for our citizens, regardless of age, race and gender (AACC, 2015). Community colleges are mostly articulated as democratic colleges, as well as prided as open access institutions, providing opportunity for any student who desires to attend. Funding models were built on the number of students served, and entrance requirements allowed all who had a high school diploma or the equivalent to enroll for classes (Eckel, 2004).

In 2014, the 21st Century Commission on the Future of Community Colleges reaffirmed the importance of colleges committing to the completion agenda. The commission, staffed by
community college thought leaders, recommended that colleges increase completion rates (not the number of credentials) by 50%. This call to increase completion rates recognizes the importance of serving all students, and the importance of “eradicating attainment gaps associated with income, race, ethnicity, and gender (AACC, 2015, p.3).

Out of this increased attention on completion rates, six national community college organizations were established: The American Association of Community Colleges, The Association of Community College Trustees, National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development, League for Innovation in the Community College, Phi Theta Kappa, and The Center for Community College Student Engagement). These determined that bold action must be put into place to move the community colleges toward increasing the number of students who successfully complete credentials of value (AACC, 2015).

The leaders of each of the six national organizations signed a pledge to increase the number of students with credentials of value by 50% by the year 2020. Each of the organizations, as part of the pledge, indicated that they would dedicate efforts to help colleges and students toward completing this goal (AACC, 2015). This educational mission is far-fetched without corresponding funding.

According to Ramaley, on Sept 19th, Obama declared that “our schools fail too many” (Chronicles of Higher Education, 2017). Few would not agree with the fundamental premise that we must promote greater educational attainment for everyone if we are to meet the challenges of the current global setting. America once led the world in the percentage of young adults with college degrees, but in recent years, 15 other nations have surpassed us in that measure (CHE, 2017, p. 2). To meet contemporary needs, our community colleges must not only graduate a higher proportion of students but also educate them in new ways. Attention should be given to
skills that students need to thrive in the 21st century, as individuals and as contributors to the future of our society.

This strategy is only possible when there is a relationship between educational opportunity and the economy, which explains the relationship between funding and completion rates. For instance, New Jersey has long been devoted to higher education completion rates, affordability, and choice for students. The state is consistently among the leaders in the nation that provides need-based student financial assistance, academic assistance, and counseling assistance to students who may not have had the same secondary educational opportunities as their peers.

This devotion to assistance is shown with the primary student assistance programs, tuition aid grants (TAG) and the educational opportunity fund (EOF), which are given primary consideration in the state. Statistical data coming from the New Jersey commission for higher education explained that in fiscal year 2010, the commission recommended that the state maintain the one-year lag in TAG award values for students demonstrating the highest need and initiate efforts to move other eligible students closer to the one-year lag level (Eckel, 2004).

This economic downturn has generated a growing demand for completion rates to higher education; therefore, provisions for an increased number of awards are encouraged. One cannot talk of completion rates without adequate funding. Endowment fundraising campaigns are essential and create room for completion rates. In 2001, Princeton officials eliminated loans from their financial aid awards and replaced them with grants that students were not required to pay back. The Ivy League school was also able to make the costly “no loan” promise to its students largely because it had a multibillion dollar endowment to cover the costs (Heyboer & Sherman).
Between 2006 and 2013, Montclair State University increased its endowment from $30 million to $56 million, an 87% increase despite the recession (Heyboer & Sherman).

Shannon, the director of the endowment fundraising campaign, emphasized the great impact prevailing between fundraising strategy and completion rates by explaining that Montclair State University gave out money to students by boosting its spend rate from its endowment from 3% to 4.25%, to provide more financial aid and make up for some of the state funding cuts that have cut into the budgets at all of New Jersey’s colleges in recent years (Heyboer & Sherman). There is therefore a need to set up educational implications of fundraising as it impacts completion rates to higher education, especially for disadvantaged students in our community.

These implications are theoretical and operational levels. In fiscal year 2006, total voluntary support to U.S. higher education reached $28 billion Fundraising contributes nearly 10% of higher education expenditures (Virtual Stock Exchange, 2006). With government support as a percentage of institutional budgets decreasing, national trends indicate greater institutional reliance on revenue sources other than tuition and fees (Knapp, 2000). As the voluntary support gradually increases the fiscal dynamics of colleges and universities, there arises an increased need to understand how fundraising functions (Britt Ingham and Pozzuoli, 1990).

Another theoretical implication is that fundraising is assuming a definitive design across colleges and universities. Educators with additional tools are currently being drawn from a knowledge base which informs the practice of generating voluntary support for their institutions.

According to Mutimba (2012), operational level implications entail setting up an interactive database that goes beyond merely listing address and phone number. This should aid
the provision of decision support such as maintaining contact details of alumni and updating new addresses without losing old ones, as well as having dates and main discussion points of each interaction in form of a call report. This will usher in the previous history of commitment and involvement in fundraising activities. The database should contain detailed reports for the entire community, each class of alumni, subclass and individuals, and demographic data including age, history, and contact with the college.

With this design, the current total number of alumni in the university will not be left out. Also, we should have a facility for web-based updates of certain fields like contact details and addresses without compromising the confidentiality of other information, so as to disseminate the roles of the department and ask for more support from authorities for it to take off. The design should indicate what other colleges are doing to get their development offices off the ground, and engage a focus group of committed volunteers who can help drive the cause for fundraising and also act as a sounding board for various initiatives and provide vital feedback.

CHAPTER THREE

QUANTITATIVE-METHODOLOGY

PREAMBLE

This study examined how fundraising strategies impact access at New Jersey community colleges in the United States. This study was designed to ascertain if fundraising strategies with a significant yield relate to student enrollments that inform access as the key mission of community colleges for dispensing knowledge in America.
OVERARCHING RESEARCH QUESTION

How do fundraising strategies impact completion rate in the community colleges as a vehicle of access enhancement?

SUBSIDIARY QUESTIONS

Understanding fundraising as an alternative revenue strategy, how does the yield support scholarships to undergraduate students, especially from low socioeconomic settings?

What module of New Jersey Community College represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance?
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RESEARCH DESIGN

Figure 1. Research model for the categorical independent variables of fundraising as it impacts access with specific focus on completion rates to New Jersey community colleges.
This study was a quantitative research study using data from the integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS). IPEDS’s primary purpose was to provide comprehensive data on the access and its components. These are enrollment, retention, completion and graduation designs of community college students accounting for levels of intellectual engagement and social integration, while controlling for preexisting background fundraising such as capital appropriation fundraising, charity gifts fundraising, and grants. The questionnaire included Likert-scale questions. Subsequently, four follow up surveys spanned the spring of 2010 to 2015. The first section of this chapter discusses the research methods and the IPEDS survey design including institutional sample, student sample, and data collection. The second section discusses the factor scale of the dependent variable and a set of independent variables. The final section describes the analyses of the study by reviewing the statistical procedures employed in the hierarchical logistic regression analyses, and other analytical limitations of this study.

**SAMPLE POPULATION**

Authors’ calculations based on the IPEDS winter 2011-12 and spring 2012, finance component. The number of community colleges reported here includes 1,081 categorized by sector as 2-year public institutions. About 50 community colleges that also offer bachelor’s degrees and are classified by sector as 4-year public institutions (and as associate’s public 4-year primarily associate colleges in the Carnegie classification system) are not included in this count. The total number of community colleges, including those awarding bachelor’s degrees, is 1,132 according to the AACC, based on 2012 data. This total includes 986 public colleges, 115 independent colleges, and 31 tribal colleges (AACC, 2015).
STUDENT SAMPLE

Using the IPEDS DATA Feedback report and based on the custom comparison, student samples were drawn from 19 New Jersey community colleges in the United States, of all students enrolled by race/ethnicity in three community colleges:

Community College A has an institutional total of 1433 students enrolled, a grand total of 533m 900, gifts of $71804), capital appropriation of $2500000, and grants in the amount of $1870. Community college B has an institutional total of 1306 students enrolled, a grand total of $481825), no gifts, no capital appropriation, and grants in the amount of $3,933,942. Community College C has an institutional total of 1833 students enrolled, a grand total of 778, no gifts, no capital appropriation, and grants in the amount of $7,633,090.

This type of research usually involves three stages: data collection, data analysis, and interpretation. Using the existing research questions helped me construct meaningful survey questionnaires that were sent out to research participants along with a series of interviews for focus groups. Data was collected from quantitative designs, and then I conducted initial data analysis and selection of samples. Finally, I incorporated educational interpretation of inference and findings with a specific focus on statistical analysis (correlation) which led me into developing a scientific report of my research.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

With the existing knowledge of financial constraints at community colleges in New Jersey and with fundraising as an independent variable and how its effective strategies impact a resourceful relationship to access as a dependent variable, then the theoretical framework of resource dependence theory can be implemented. If these programs are implemented
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successfully, then community colleges will meet their prime educational mission (AACC, 2011) and they will experience increased financial security, develop an increased sense of independence, and exercise their unique role of affordability, access, student achievement, and class completion rates (AACC, 2011).

PARTICIPANTS

With this quantitative research, my aim was to determine the relationship between fundraising and completion as an outcome variable in a given population. The number and percentage distribution of the Title IV institutions were identified for participation in the 2014-15 IPEDS survey by control of institution, level of institution, and the region where the institution is located. The actual number of institutions and administrative offices required to complete individual components of IPEDS varied based on the characteristics of the individual entities and was provided in the First Look report that described data from that component.

One hundred thirty postsecondary institutions included in prior IPEDS data collections were outside the scope of IPEDS in 2014-15 because they were closed, merged with another institution, or no longer offered postsecondary programs. Additionally, 427 postsecondary institutions were reported exclusively by a parent institution and are not included in the universe counts. On the other hand, a review of PEPS added 173 postsecondary institutions and one administrative office to the universe.

Table 2 highlights changes to the IPEDS universe between 2013-14 and 2014-15 by displaying the count of Title IV institutions, those changing Title IV status from 2013-14 to 2014-15, those changing level or control of institution from 2013-14 to 2014-15, and the percentage change, disaggregated by level and control of institution. Institutions included in the
Number changing Title IV status in 2014-15 column of Table 2 are those that participated in Title IV programs during 2013-14, but whose status changed in 2014-15. Reasons for changing Title IV status include, but are not limited to, closure, loss of eligibility to provide federally funded financial assistance, and combining or merging with another institution. Institutions included in the Number changing Title IV status since 2013-14 column of Table 2 are those that participated in Title IV programs during 2014-15, but were not participants in 2013-14. These institutions may be new, may have begun offering Title IV aid for the first time, or may have regained eligibility to offer federally funded financial assistance later.

**SAMPLING PROCEDURE**

Using Fundraising as a categorical independent variable and Access as a quantitative dependent variable, I examined the relationship between Fundraising and Access performance, on the average in the community colleges mentioned. I compared the groups as individual community colleges to see whether the groups differed on the dependent variable (Access). I used a statistical test to determine whether the relationship between the independent and dependent variables were statistically significant. I specifically used either a test or ANOVA to determine whether the difference between the two group means were statistically significant.

Statistical significance means that the difference between the groups means are greater than what you would expect to see by chance alone. Group means that are very different are usually statistically significant. This implies that real relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The second sample procedure in an experimental quantitative research study employs one quantitative independent variable and one quantitative dependent variable.
For instance, examining the relationship between capital campaign and access as it impacts positively on community colleges (Johnson & Christensen, 2014 p.389), I plotted the data to determine whether the relationship was linear or curvilinear. Linear relationship follows a straight line pattern, and a curvilinear relationship follows a curved-line pattern. With linear relationship, I computed the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient. This is explained by $R^2$, Pearson’s $r$ is the positive square $R^2$ when the relationship as indicated by the “b” coefficient is positive and negative square root when the relationship is negative. $P$ value is significant at .000; at the rejection of the null hypothesis, with the formula as $Y = b(X) + a$. I further conducted a statistical test to determine whether the correlation was statistically significant.

This statistical test was designated as $F$. $F$ is a test for statistical significance of the regression equation as a whole. It is obtained by dividing the explained variance by the unexplained variance. If $F$ was significant, then the regression equation helps us to understand the relationship between $X$ and $Y$. If the significance was .000, then the regression model was significant. It was possible that both steps could generate a flaw if we made a casual attribution that Fundraising causes access increase or that capital campaign causes access improvement. There may have been other uncontrolled extraneous variables that might have been the reason for the observed relationship (Johnson & Christensen, 2014 p.389 p.390).

**INSTRUMENTATION**

The primary purpose of the IPEDS GR200 survey component was to collect more extensive data on graduation rates as required by the Higher Education Act, as amended. The necessary data was collected to calculate graduation rates at 200% of normal time to complete all
requirements of their program of study for the cohort of full-time, first-time bachelor's, or equivalent degree-seeking students at 4-year institutions, and for all full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students at less than 4-year institutions.

This survey component collected data on the cohort of full-time, first-time bachelor's, or equivalent degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled at institutions either (1) as of October 15, 2007 (or the institution's official fall reporting date) for institutions that offer a predominant number of programs based on standard academic terms (e.g., semesters, trimesters, quarters, or 4-1-4 plan); or (2) during the period between September 1, 2007, and August 31, 2008, for institutions that do not offer a predominant number of programs based on standard academic terms. Institutions were to report the status of these students as of August 31, 2015.

The status of this cohort of students (the 2007 Completion cohort) within 150% of normal time to completion was previously reported on the 2013-14 IPEDS Completion survey component. The GR200 component further tracked the status of these students at 200% of normal time to completion. Instrumentation of IPEDS covers, data on the cohort of full-time, first-time bachelor's, or equivalent degree-seeking undergraduate students in an institution's 2007 Graduation Rates cohort, previously reported on the 2013-14 IPEDS Graduation Rates survey component, were preloaded into the GR 200 survey.

**MODAL SPECIFICATION OF VARIABLES**

**(INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT).**

Variables were identified in this study either by observation or by experimental designs. These two dimensions were classified as independent and dependent variables. In this study,
Fundraising was a categorical independent variable. This categorical independent variable had four attribute-independent variables: capital appropriation, endowments, charitable gifts, and grants. Completion rate in the community colleges is the dependent variable, whose levels are quantitative. Independent variables and the dependent variable are categorically and numerically quantitative data respectively designed.

For example, if an academic organization is raising money for a new elephant exhibit via a brick-buying campaign, while we are offered engraved bricks at $100, $250 and $500, the reality is that not everyone can afford a $100 brick. Therefore, the question should be how many volunteers, members, and visitors could raise $10 from 10 family members and friends to buy a $100 brick? How many could raise $25 from 20 family members and friends to buy a $500 brick? Most likely, many cannot, but some can afford it. What the academic organization has to do is give them opportunity and support to fundraise for the cause. Therefore, we can increase revenue without increasing costs.

**DATA COLLECTION**

Data was collected through the instrumentality of IPEDS as preexisting data. Since there was a decline in endowments, the need arose to examine the past data for me to be current with the financial situation. The winter 2014-15 collection was entirely web-based; data was collected between December 10, 2014, and February 24, 2016. Data was provided by “key holders,” institutional representatives appointed by campus chief executives, who were responsible for ensuring that survey data submitted by the institution was correct and complete. No problems were noted during the winter 2014-15 data collection. During the collection period, the IPEDS Help Desk was available to assist respondents with reporting the necessary data. Data for this study was sent by Paulette Sears, a national representative of IPEDS TOOLS Help Desk.
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STATISTICAL TREATMENT

Using multiple regression statistics, this study employed four structural steps. First, synthesis, involved offering propositions such as constructing tables, diagrams and arranging them in order, in terms of multiple regression perspectives to explore fundraising performance and corresponding impacts on access with specific focus on completion rates. Second, classification entailed grouping the data into categories, themes, and meaning in the data, noting the significance and value of F. Third, perusal, called for getting an overall sense of the data, jotting down preliminary interpretations. Fourth, organization, required filing, creating a computer database, breaking large units into smaller units, and thereby realizing a unified set of raw data.

SUMMARY

The omission of a variable from an equation will cause bias in the estimates of the remaining coefficients to the extent that the omitted variable is correlated with included variables. The bias to be expected from leaving a variable out of an equation, which equals the coefficient of the excluded variable times a function of the simple correlation coefficient between the excluded variable and the included variable in question. Including a variable in an equation in which it is actually irrelevant does not cause bias, but it will usually increase the variances of the included variables’ estimated coefficients, thus lowering their t-values and lowering f-values. Four useful criteria for the inclusion of a variable in an equation are theory, t-Test, R2, and bias. Theory, not statistical fit, should be the most important criterion for the inclusion of a variable in a regression equation. To do otherwise runs the risk of producing incorrect or disbelieved results. For example, stepwise regression routines will generally give
biased estimates and will almost always have test statistics that will not follow the distribution required to use standard t-tables.

CHAPTER FOUR
THE RESULT

Preamble
Data analysis opened the door to the result of this study. Students in these community colleges were freshmen and sophomores. To appreciate an educational understanding of this study, a demographic socioeconomic location of urban and rural regions of community colleges in New Jersey was succinctly articulated. Both urban and rural designations have two definitions. Census-defined urbanized areas require a central place and adjacent territory with a population density of 1,000 people per square mile or more and a minimum population total of 50,000 people. Alternatively, urban clusters are densely populated areas with a total population between 2,500 and 50,000 people. Rural areas are classified as either farm areas or Northern areas. This study initially centered on three community colleges (Mobility Study, 2016), but as the study process unfolded, it became statistically obvious that the scientific investigation was good but narrow.

Therefore, we shifted to using 19 community colleges to gain a better understanding of the relationship between completion and fundraising with a specific focus on capital appropriation, gifts, grants, and endowment at New Jersey community colleges. In order to fully investigate the variables, multiple procedural regressions were conducted. The study compared differences in total degrees and certificates of the representative sample community colleges with

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The three specific research questions guiding this study were:

1. How does fundraising impact completion in community colleges as a vehicle of access enhancement?

2. Understanding fundraising as an alternative revenue strategy, how does its yield support scholarships to undergraduate students, especially those from low socioeconomic settings?

3. Which of the community colleges’ models represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance?

**DEMOGRAPHIC MAKEUP OF PARTICIPANTS**

Multiple regression is a detailed extension of *simple linear regression*. In this study, it was used to predict the value of a variable (completion), based on the value of two or more other variables, such as capital appropriation, grants, gifts, and endowments. The researcher wants to predict the dependent variable (or sometimes, the outcome target or criterion variable). This scientific investigation is descriptively articulated within the context of multiple modeling regression analysis, as a statistical process for estimating the relationship among variables.

This approach includes many techniques for modeling and analyzing several variables, when the focus is on the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

Consequently, in this multiple statistical regression of 4-year models, each model has three
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tables: a regression statistics table, an ANOVA table and a coefficient table. The first is the year 2010 model, the second is the year 2011 model, the third is the year 2012 model, and the fourth is the year 2013 model, of the 19 New Jersey community colleges in America.

2010 MODEL
SUMMARY OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.409093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.167357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-0.07054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>607.9942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$ Stat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$-value</td>
<td>Lower 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1071.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOW</td>
<td>0.006809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTS</td>
<td>0.000266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPIT -APP</td>
<td>9.58E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS</td>
<td>-4.3E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result is descriptive of 4-year models (2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013). Each of the models has three tables: Table 1 demonstrates the content of regression statistics; Table 2 shows the ANOVA table, and Table 3 is the coefficient table.

### 2011 MODEL

#### SUMMARY OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.332969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.110868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-0.14317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>589.7797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$SS$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>607223.7</td>
<td>151805.9</td>
<td>0.436424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4869761</td>
<td>347840.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5476985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Lower 95%</th>
<th>Upper 95%</th>
<th>Lower 95.0%</th>
<th>Upper 95.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>935.3478</td>
<td>211.9244</td>
<td>4.413592</td>
<td>0.000589</td>
<td>480.815164</td>
<td>1389.88</td>
<td>1389.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOW</td>
<td>0.000494</td>
<td>0.004352</td>
<td>0.113513</td>
<td>0.911236</td>
<td>-0.00884</td>
<td>0.009828</td>
<td>-0.00884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTS</td>
<td>0.000185</td>
<td>0.000183</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td>0.330096</td>
<td>-0.0002083</td>
<td>0.000579</td>
<td>-0.0002083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPIT-APP</td>
<td>2.44E-05</td>
<td>6.01E-05</td>
<td>0.405579</td>
<td>0.691182</td>
<td>-0.0001044</td>
<td>0.000153</td>
<td>-0.0001044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS</td>
<td>4.61E-05</td>
<td>4.59E-05</td>
<td>1.005593</td>
<td>0.331676</td>
<td>-5.225E-05</td>
<td>0.000145</td>
<td>-5.225E-05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2012 MODEL
SUMMARY OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$SS$</th>
<th>$MS$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>116211.5</td>
<td>29052.87</td>
<td>0.23876188</td>
<td>0.911714276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1703539</td>
<td>121681.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1819751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COEFFICIENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>$t$ Stat</th>
<th>$P$-value</th>
<th>Lower 95% Upper 95% Lower 95.0% Upper 95.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>565.8397</td>
<td>154.4021</td>
<td>3.664714</td>
<td>0.00254942</td>
<td>234.6799941 896.999 234.67999 896.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOW</td>
<td>-0.00018</td>
<td>0.000656</td>
<td>-0.27567</td>
<td>0.78682858</td>
<td>0.001586818 0.00123 -0.001587 0.001225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTS</td>
<td>0.000329</td>
<td>0.000376</td>
<td>0.875495</td>
<td>0.39607712</td>
<td>0.000476738 0.00113 -0.000477 0.001134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPIT-APP</td>
<td>1.68E-05</td>
<td>2.88E-05</td>
<td>0.581577</td>
<td>0.57009771</td>
<td>-4.51E-05 7.9E-05 -4.51E-05 7.9E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS</td>
<td>2.63E-05</td>
<td>0.000109</td>
<td>0.241515</td>
<td>0.81265716</td>
<td>0.000207203 0.00026 -0.000207 0.00026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY OUTPUT**

YEAR 2013 MODULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regression Statistics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COEFFICIENT TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPIT-APP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple Regression (MR) is the absolute value of Pearson’s coefficient of correlation. This indicates that the correlation among the independent and dependent variables is positive (2010=41%; 2011=33%; 2012=25% and 2013=49%). $R^2$ is the coefficient of determination $r^2$. It expresses the proportion of the variation in $y$ which is explained by variation in $x$ in 2010, 17% of fundraising impacted completion rates and 83% was explained by other variables. In 2011, 11% of fundraising impacted completion rates and 89% was explained by other variables. In 2012, 6% of fundraising impacted completion rates and 94% was explained by other variables. In 2013, 24% of fundraising impacted completion rates and 76% was explained by other variables.

Standard error of the regression is the estimate of the variation of the observed fundraising, in dollar terms, about the regression line. Therefore, the estimated amount for fundraising in the 19 community colleges were: 2010=$6,079,942; 2011= $5,897,797; 2012=$3,488,286; and 2013=$2,912,777.

It is significant to note that an ANOVA table is not important in multiple regression since it duplicates other tests. In the coefficient Table 3 of the models reflected in Figure 2, the years 2010, 2011, and 2013 emerged with an insignificant relationship between fundraising and completion rates with a prevailing strong positive correlation. The 2012 model design emerged as significant with a weak positive relationship between the independent and dependent
variables, but without making meaningful contribution to the mission motif. This explains that the theoretical framework of this study is workable. Resource dependence Theory (Mutte Brettel & Uwe Voss, 2013) is open to an entrepreneurial attempt to harness an alternative funding resource. Community colleges are meeting their primary educational mission. Additionally, community colleges are experiencing financial security and an increased sense of dependence, and are able to exercise their unique role of affordability, access, and student achievement and completion rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODELS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Completion Rates</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>114292.7</td>
<td>4.77600</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>936139</td>
<td>4.413592</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>566293.7</td>
<td>3.6644</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>45395</td>
<td>4.5223</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Completion Rates

The coefficient table contains the two-tailed significance levels ($p<0.000$), which is the overall significance computed for the $t$-stat=4.5224. The $p<0.000$ of the hypothesis test $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$. Therefore, we reject the hypothesis and conclude that there is significant relationship between $x$ and $y$. Note that it is also the $p$-value of the test for the correlation coefficient $H_0: \rho = 0$. This explains the size of the effect the independent variables are having on dependent variable $Y$, and $A$ is the value $Y$ is predicted to have when all the independent variables are equal to zero. Finding the $T$-statistic: the $T$-statistic is 4.5224. This $t$ statistic is the coefficient divided by its standard error ($453.3095/100.237$). The standard error is an estimate of the standard deviation of the coefficient, and the amount varies across cases. It can be thought of as a measure of the precision
with which the regression coefficient is measured. If a coefficient is large compared to its
class standard error, then it is probably different from 0. We therefore fail to reject the null
hypothesis; since our calculated value ($t = 4.5224$) falls within the 95% confidence interval of the
difference. Since the interval does include 0, we reject the null hypothesis.

The standard error is an estimate of the standard deviation of the coefficient shown in
Table 3, and the amount varies across cases. It can be thought of as a measure of the precision
with which the regression coefficient is measured. If a coefficient is large compared to its
standard error, then it is probably different from 0. We therefore fail to reject the null
hypothesis, since our calculated value ($t = 4.5224$) it falls within the 95% confidence interval of the
difference. Since the interval does include 0, ($p < 0.000$), we reject the null hypothesis. These
numbers are the limits of a confidence interval for the slope of the regression line; we are 95%
confident that $238.3225 \leq \beta_1 \leq 668.2965$. This implies that there is a difference in the lower and
upper causes (668.2965 and 238.3225). The sample $t$ ratio is 4.5224. Close attention to the
confidence interval of the difference indicates that the given numbers do contain zero, but we
have struck through the line of information for intercept to emphasize that these numbers are
rarely of interest in themselves. Although the intercept is used as $b_0$ in the regression equation
and in making predictions, we do not usually test $H_0: b_0 = 0$. Therefore, the test is statistically
insignificant.

In Models 1, 2, & 4, the $p$-value=0.000, and the $p$-value of the hypothesis test $H_0: \beta_1 = 0$. Therefore, we reject the hypothesis to conclude that there is significant relationship between $x$ and $y$. $T$-test values are not significant. This $t$ statistic is the coefficient divided by its standard
error; close attention to the confidence interval of the difference indicates that the given numbers
do contain zero, but we have struck through the line of information for intercept to emphasize that these numbers are rarely of interest in themselves. Although the intercept is used as \( b_0 \) in the regression equation and in making predictions, we do not usually test \( H_0: b_0 = 0 \). Therefore the test is statistically insignificant.

**SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS**

Considering the value of the \( R^2 \) as the proportion of the variance that is explained by the linear relationship between fundraising and completion (2010, 16%; 2011, 11%; 2012, 6%; and 2013, 23%), the standard error of the regression for the four models are $6,079,942, $5,897,797, $3,488,286, and $2,912,777, respectively. These point to the estimate of the variation of the observed fundraising, in dollar terms, about the regression line. It is interesting to note that the 19 community colleges exhibited the following overall significance of multiple regression equation from the coefficient shown in Table 3. This is the \( p \)-value of the hypothesis test \( H_0: \beta_1 = 0 \). To reject it is to conclude that there is an insignificant relationship between \( x \) and \( y \). These years, especially 2010, 2011, and 2013, emerged with a strong relationship between fundraising and completion rates with prevailing strong positive magnitude, but the 2012 model design is insignificant at \( (p<0.003) \), with a weak positive relationship between the independent and dependent variable, without making meaningful contribution to the mission motif. An attentive observation of the coefficient tables in the four models indicated that they are statistically insignificant. A close attention at the confidence interval of the difference indicates that the given numbers contain zero, therefore the test is statistically insignificant under approximation of a \( (p<0.000) \). We have struck through the line of information for intercept to emphasize that these numbers are rarely of interest in themselves. Although the intercept is used
as $b_0$ in the regression equation and in making predictions, we do not usually test $H_0: B_0 = 0$. Therefore, the test is statistically insignificant.

Although there has been previous research on the relationship between fundraising and access (Keith, 2011; Clayton, 2010; Tindal & Waters, 2010), scientific investigations on the relationship between fundraising and its correlation to completion within New Jersey community colleges has been limited. Therefore, it is my hope that the findings of this dissertation will help in filling a portion of this gap in research since there is a significant correlation, but unfortunately the model is not making significant contribution to completion rates and for future research, we invite other scholars to explore it.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Preamble

This quantitative designed study provided a detailed description of what maximal variation purposeful sampling of the 19 community college presidents in New Jersey were thinking and doing with fundraising to preserve access during a time of financial exigencies (2010-2013), with a specific focus on students’ completion rates. Many researchers in higher education understood the need for effective fundraising and brought its relevant constructs to community colleges with particular attention to the relationship between fundraising and access as it impacts students’ completion rates (Erwin, 2010; Caroni, 2007; Gentile, 2001). Apparently, these empirical studies that focus on the impact of fundraising on access in the New Jersey community colleges are limited. Considering this constraint, this study’s target aimed at generating information that may fill a portion of this research gap. This chapter discusses the
current research results including a summary of key findings, interpretation of results, implication of the practice, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

**SUMMARY OF THE KEY FINDINGS**

Our working hypothesis articulated the financial challenges of New Jersey community colleges and employed the strategic use of fundraising as a categorical independent tool. Factors such as capital appropriation, gifts, grants, and endowments were considered as alternative revenue resources that impact completion with a guiding theoretical framework. Implementing these strategies of fundraising properly in our community colleges will yield the following surprises. First, the years 2010, 2011, and 2013 emerged with an insignificant relationship between fundraising and completion rates, indicating that these years have a prevailing strong positive magnitude. However, the 2012 model design emerged insignificant with a weak positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

This result buttresses the principle of using “resource dependence theory (Brettel & Voss, 2013), which is open to entrepreneurial attempts to harness alternative funding resources. This study embraces alternative funding sources as a part of resource management that leads an educational leadership team down to various ways of success. One such significant attempt is establishing meaningful plans for fundraising as an alternative revenue source of students’ completion rates at community colleges. Second, community colleges are meeting their primary educational mission. Third, community colleges are experiencing financial security, realizing an increased sense of dependence, and exercising their unique role of affordability, access, student achievement, and completion rates.
RESEARCH QUESTION 1

How do fundraising strategies impact completion rates in the community colleges as a vehicle of access enhancement? Results from testing the outlined hypothesis revealed the following findings. First, it is interesting to note that there were prevailing uses of statistical data on capital appropriation, endowment, gifts, and grants of the 19 community colleges used as samples in this study. For instance, in 2010, there is a record of 6809 students from endowment, 266 students from gifts, 10 students from capital appropriation, and 43 students from grants.

Second, there is a prevailing impact of fundraising (capital appropriation, charity gifts, and grants) on completion rates. For instance, in 2011, fundraising impacted completion rates of 494 students from endowment, 185 students through gifts, 244 students from capital appropriation; and 461 students from grants. Third, there are significant differences in four models (Year 2010, Year 2011, Year 2012, and 2013); this is true with the overall impact.

The independent variable (endowment) registered 6809 completion rates in 2010, unlike Year 2011, when endowment had only 494 completion rates. In 2012, endowment only brought about 180 student completion rates, and eventually in 2013, the completion rates were reduced to 130 students. Again, we have a prevailing difference with specific focus on gifts. In 2013, 585 students were derived from gifts. In 2012, 329 students were brought in from gifts. In 2011, 185 students were enrolled through gifts, and in 2010, 266 students came from gift monies. These findings show that fundraising is a necessary tool for students’ completion in community colleges. There was generally a strong relationship between fundraising and completion from the 2010, 2011, and 2013 models, but the year 2012 module emerged as a weak model.
RESEARCH QUESTION 2

Understanding fundraising as an alternative revenue strategy, how does its yield support scholarships to undergraduate students, especially those from low socioeconomic settings?

The findings from the statistical data explain that the substantial size for scholarship is thin and negative, but of a huge financial need. It is vital to appreciate the differences in the individual community colleges. The result indicates a significant relationship between fundraising and completion rates which invariably reflects positively on students from low socioeconomic settings. Using a simple linear regression equation calculator, we can find the relationship between a dependent variable \( Y \) (completion rates) and independent variables \( X_i \) (endowment, gifts, capital appropriations, and grants).

\[
Y = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4 + \text{Coefficient}
\]

Completion rates in 2010:

\[
Y = 0.006809x + 0.000266x^2 + 0.00000958 + 0.000043x^4 + 1071.647.\]

This result explains that we have 6809 students from endowment, 266 students from gifts, 10 students from capital appropriation, and 43 students from grants. Therefore, the total completion rates impacted by fundraising were 114,292.7 students in 2010.

Completion rates in 2011:

\[
Y = 0.000494x + 0.00185x^2 + 0.0000244x^3 + 0.0000461x^4 + 935.3478.\]

This result explains that we had 494 students from endowment, 185 students from gifts, 24.4 students from capital appropriation, and 46.1 students from grants. Therefore, the total completion rates impacted by fundraising were 936,139 students in 2011.
The Impact of fundraising on completion rates

Completion rates in 2012:

\[ Y = -0.00018x + 0.000329x^2 + 0.000168x^3 + 0.0000263x^4 + 565.8397. \] This result explains that we had 180 students from endowment, 329 students from gifts, 17 students from capital appropriation, and 26 students from grants. Therefore, total completion rates impacted by fundraising were 566,293.7 students in 2012.

Completion rates in 2013:

\[ Y = 0.00013x + 0.0000585x^2 + 0.000094x^3 + 0.000156 + 453.3095. \] This result implies that we had 130 students from endowments, 585 students from gifts, 94 students from capital appropriation, and 156 students from grants. Therefore, total completion rates impacted by fundraising were 453,895 students in 2013.

**RESEARCH QUESTION 3**

What model of New Jersey community college represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance?

To find the best model, the Regression Statistics shown in Table 1 give us the Multiple R, which is the absolute value of the Pearson Coefficient of Correlation. In 2010 Model 1, Multiple \( R = 0.409093; \) Therefore, 41% of fundraising is successfully accounted by completion. In Year 2011, Multiple \( R = 0.332969; \) this implies that 33% of fundraising is successfully accounted for in completion rates. In the Year 2012 model, Multiple \( R = 0.252708; \) this implies that 25% of fundraising is successfully accounted for in completion rates. Finally, in the 2013 model, Multiple \( R = 0.488476; \) this implies that 49% of fundraising is successfully accounted for in completion rates. Again, \( R^2 \), which is the coefficient of determination \( r^2 \), informs us that 2013 has a 24% impact as the best of the four models.
It was statistically proven that the 2013 model represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance, because multiple regression because 49% of the fundraising impacted on completion rates as the best model. The coefficient of determination in MLR is denoted $R^2$. It is the proportion of variability in $Y$ explained by the linear relationship between $Y$ and all the independent variables (Note: $0 \leq R^2 \leq 1$.) The higher $R^2$, the better the linear model explains the variation in $Y$, and there is no exact definition of what a “good” $R^2$ is.

In 2010 model, $R^2 = 0.167357$. This number is the coefficient of determination $R^2$. The coefficient of determination $R^2$, is 17 %.This means that 17 % of the variation in the completion rate is explained by fundraising and 83% is explained by other variables. In the 2011 model, $R^2=0.110868$.This implies that 11% of the variation in the completion rate is explained by fundraising and 89% is explained by other variables. In the 2012 model, $R^2=0.63861$. This indicates that 6% of the variation in the completion rate is explained by fundraising and 94% is explained by other variables. Finally, in the 2013 model, $R^2=0.238609$.This implies that 24% of the variation in the completion rate is explained by fundraising and 76% is explained by other variables.

Therefore, it is statistically proven that the 2013 model represents the best linear combination predictors of fundraising performance, because $R^2$ is 24% of the fundraising impacted on completion as the best model. The 2013 model shows intercept of 453.3095; $t$-stat, 4.522376; Significance=0.000. Since $p$-value is 0.000, the $p$-value is statistically insignificant but it occupies a weak relational impact between fundraising and completion rates in the magnitude of 24 %, which tarries with theory in practice that community colleges as organizations need external help to enhance and carry out their missions by embracing the resource dependence
theory. There is a significant correlation, but unfortunately the model is not significantly useful. However, it provides a basis for future research, and we invite other scholars to explore it.

**INTERPRETATION**

Primarily, there is a prevailing relationship between fundraising (independent variables) and completion designated in this study as the dependent variable. Based on the statistical data outlined in our findings, the value of the multiple R is the absolute value of Pearson’s coefficient of correlation. Its sign will be same as that of the b1 coefficient. These models explain a strong positive linear relationship between completion and fundraising. The term “strong or weak” points to using Pearson’s correlation coefficient. Strength explains that the closer the $r$ value gets to either -1 or +1, the stronger the correlation between two variables. An $r$ value of 1.00 would indicate that every time one variable increased by one unit, the second variable increases by one unit. It is also the case that a value of 1.00 would indicate that each time a variable decreases by one unit, the second variable also decreases by one unit.

Again, “positive or negative” points to direction. When the variables change their values in the same direction, the $r$ is a positive correlation. Whenever the variables change in opposite direction the $r$ value is negative. Positive or negative does not mean “good” or “bad,” the terms simply indicate direction of change in both variables. Negative correlations are also called inverse correlations because one variable is going up as the other is going down in value (Abbott, 2011). The year 2012 model has a $P$-value of 0.003, which is insignificant with a weak, positive linear relationship between fundraising and completion.

It is imperative to note that we have indications of a strong positive linear relationship between fundraising and completion rates, indicating that we can reject the null hypothesis. Once the $p$-value has been determined, we know that the null hypothesis is rejected for any $p<-$value,
while the null hypothesis is not rejected with a $p$-value. The higher the $p$-value, the more confidence we can have in the null hypothesis. The use of the $p$-value turns hypothesis testing around. Thus, instead of fixing a priori the significance level, the $p$-value is calculated to allow us to determine the significance levels of those in which the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that fundraising has an insignificant high positive impact on completion rates in the 2010, 2011, and 2013 models. The Year 2012 model emerged with a low $p$-value as statistically insignificant with a weak positive magnitude.

Viewing this result from the perspective of resource dependence theory, this study embraces alternative funding sources as part of resource management that leads educational leadership team to varied ways of success. One such insignificant attempt is establishing meaningful plans for fundraising as an alternative revenue source of students’ completion rates in community colleges. With this in mind, community college leaders are placing more focus on fundraising (Gentile, 2009). Pfeiffer and Solanki (2003) explained that the actions of an organization could be influenced by the need for resources. Mitchell (1977) noted that changes in the flow of resources can create implicit demand for changes within the organization. The shifts that organizations undergo as a path to embracing alternative revenue sources are classified as resource dependence theory, which ultimately has distinct implications in this study.

The resource dependence theoretical framework informs practice, with specific connection to community colleges that ultimately change in some way to more effectively pursued alternative revenue sources. This theory also demonstrates that as community colleges advance towards external resources, they are bound to be open to the demands of the external bodies providing the resources. As community colleges experience a decrease in funding from traditional sources, there is urgent need for presidents to seek out alternative revenue sources.
While some institutions of higher education may simply raise tuition or increase research activities, community colleges are different (Cohen & Brawer, 2008), and with quality administrative settings, all colleges have at least some capacity to secure private funds. Completion rates and achievements depend on the extent to which fundraising is viewed as part of community colleges’ overall tasks and designated strategies to ensure returns on investments in fundraising campaigns (Ryan & Palmer, 2005).

In the global perspective, the resource dependence theoretical framework shapes how financial decisions are made and how we assess the financial risks to the funding process. Each year, community colleges should update their strategies for funding with the latest financial information and up-to-date consideration of the risks to their objectives. We should ensure that the funding strategy objective itself remains appropriate and fit for purpose. According to Clarke (2014), in 2015, the board conducted a review of funding objectives which resulted in the incorporation of a new risk (Operational Risk) within the margin. Currently, our overall margins remain at 10%, our funding horizon is still 2030, and we note that planned developments in our investment strategy will need to be incorporated as part of our next review.

Using resource dependence theory as a theoretical guide also provides a way for fundraisers to assess the possible impact of expected or unexpected changes on the community college’s overall mission, which is open door access. By analyzing the impact of a change to our funding objective, we can decide how serious a potential risk is and be guided as to what an appropriate mitigation strategy might be. According to Burette and Voss (2013), Resource dependence theory marks the commencement of this theoretical paradigm. Its original assumption is that organizations are not self-sufficient but depend on resources provided by their environment to achieve organizational targets (Hillman, Withers. & Collins, 2009).
Therefore, the need for applying resource dependence theory on fundraising as an alternative revenue source of student access is fundamentally based on capacity building, a popular term in our present day higher educational setting (McPhee & Bare, 2001). Capacity building means much to administrators who make decisions about programs, access, and funding strategies. Hence, capacity building is the ability of nonprofit organizations to fulfill their missions in an effective manner (McPhee & Bare, 2001). Most community colleges are small and possess limited resources, particularly when measured against the challenges and critical issues that they address. The push to link indicators of capacity, such as the strategies of fundraising, to overall performance is critical to strengthening the college.

Capacity building traditionally takes place primarily at the organizational level including community colleges, where it is possible to get assistance to develop sound financial management practices or to improve fundraising capabilities (De Vita & Fleming 2001). Ultimately, the goal of capacity building is to create safe and productive communities where people can work and students can have access to a quality education as well as develop their potentials (De Vita & Fleming 2001).

**IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE**

The implications from this study are applicable for both work research projects and fundraising in higher education in general. The result outlined a detailed illustration of a research project, measured and explained by the multiple regression statistics, to validate how fundraising impacts completion in New Jersey community colleges. This information is useful both in shaping funding designs and in meeting community colleges’ mission statements of providing access to education as indicated by the prevailing completion rates using a resource dependence theoretical framework (Brettel & Voss 2013).
In practice, community colleges now depend on fundraising to fill a growing gap between institutional needs and financial support from tuition and government taxes, as such fundraising has become a critical component of fiscal leadership (Ryan & Calmer, 2005). Decision making about fundraising in the global educational environment is not made in isolation; rather, decisions are influenced by other related factors such as access and affordability to higher education, Medicaid, income tax structures, public pensions, and public employee compensation (AASCU, 2014). The implication of this situation in our community colleges, on a more profound national level, has imposed a general concern to the American society. According to Dee (2013), many of our community colleges have gone into global-affordable technology, worldwide demand for completion rates, high quality education, and an ever-increasing need for revenue that calls for a strategic path to fundraising.

The height of this concern motivated the Obama administration into proposing a new federal college ratings system, which seeks to assess college completion rates, affordability, and outcomes. With the federal government’s attention to accountability, colleges are spurred to increase their central outcome measures of interest to students (AASCU, 2014). On a wider collegial perspective, it is interesting to note that governors had outlined initiatives for 2014 sessions to encourage commercialization of university research; attract leading scientists, researchers, and faculty; and foster public-private partnership to resolve the constant tension existing between funding and completion rates in higher education and to enhance the ongoing knowledge-based economic structure in our nation. This information is useful in both shaping funding designs and providing incentives for community colleges’ mission accomplishments.
LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

This study would be incomplete without actual limitations. First, the cost of fundraising is high. The estimate of the variation of the observed fundraising for the four schools was $6,079,942, $5,897,797, $3,488,286, and $2,912,777. Fundraisers pay tax, so this limits fundraising. The variations in overhead and fundraising efficiency measure completion rates within the influence of size, age, region, and subsector of students, and in the case of community colleges, a very small percentage of students are involved. Completion rates do not distinguish between types of community colleges. The idea of completion rates seems simple enough, but different definitions can change the rates and significantly alter college rankings. Both 4-year institutions and community colleges are required to report to the U.S. Department of Education completion rates based on the fact that the completion rate applies only to students who enroll in the fall, and are first-time degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates, as well as attend full time and complete within 150% of normal program completion time at the institution in which they first enrolled.

The majority of community college students attend part time. Many are not first-time students, nor do they first enroll in the fall. Some community college students are not degree- or certificate-seeking and many others intend to transfer to another institution to pursue their degree. These factors limit completion rates in community colleges.

Second, major challenges spring up in the process, such as lack of effective strategies, environmental factors, management skills, or human resources. Fundraising is uncertain. Thinking too small or too big is a sure path to fundraising inefficacy (Summer, 2006). Decisions about criteria for subject inclusion, procedures, measures, and design all go with some limitations as well as strengths. These vectors of inclusion, procedures, measures, and designs
generate the problem of identity; community colleges traditionally have yet to clearly articulate their mission. The small size of their development offices is matched by their external relations and alumni offices.

Commencing this discussion with the design of this study as it relates to internal validity, it is vital to note that there is a prevailing limitation because of the casual status to the independent variables. The primary independent variable is fundraising, which is categorized as capital appropriation, gifts, endowments, and grants, all of which can also be known as attributes of the independent variable. This is correct, but could generate potential confounding variables in the statistical outcome because internal validity could express limitation. It is imperative to note that the external validity—generalizing my findings to other populations or communities of learning; varying tasks, organizational structures, situations, or regions of focus; levels of independent variables; and designated experimental settings—observed the same pattern.

Third, there are limitations in the areas of statistical prediction made with an econometric model which will in general not coincide with the observed values due to the uncertainty surrounding economic phenomena. This limitation, expressed as uncertainty, explains that we cannot use the population regression function because we do not know the parameters. Instead, we have to use the sample regression function. The confidence interval for the expected value includes only this type of uncertainty. Furthermore, uncertainty as a limitation in an econometric model, coupled with systematic part, generates a disturbance which is not observable. The prediction interval for an individual value, \( I \) for \( y_0 \), includes both the uncertainty arising from the estimation as well as the disturbance term. It is also a revealing point of this study’s limitation that its uncertainty may come from the fact of not knowing exactly what values the explanatory variables will take for the prediction we want to manipulate.
Fourth, because of the preexisting data used, it is difficult to manipulate an independent variable; the design is a post facto comparative design. We had a sample group drawn from a larger population of data that we wished to compare to an estimated population mean to infer or determine whether the sample is likely to come from the population. Therefore, we cannot make casual conclusions with the design, because there is the limitation of not meeting the conditions of randomness that matches with experimental design. This is an important assumption because it assures the researcher that there are no built in linkages between fundraising and completion. The power of randomization will result in the comparability of the groups (experimental and control), because if randomization is present, then the assumption is that both groups are equal at the outset (Abbott, 2011).

Fifth, the time gap within the process of finding is a limitation. Literature review unveils a paucity of scholarly studies on the central phenomenon in this study. As Jackson and Glass (2000) explained, only limited research has been done exploring issues related to resources development as well as private fundraising at community colleges. For example, the participation of community colleges into alternative revenue resources as fundraising suffers from lower prestige as a field of expertise or research in the academe. There is a prevailing point of literature gap due to limited information available. The chief executive officers of funding at most community colleges are not very comfortable at giving the details or the strategies of their fundraising to external bodies. It is believed that doing this will unveil the secret of their managerial surviving strategy to other colleges who are also competing for dollars as well as the undergraduate students. This striking limitation exposes the revelation of window dressing seen in our colleges in the path of advertisement that does not match with the actual college financial setting.
Lastly, this study embraces the unique frame of a cluster approach, which enhances the connection between community colleges with international humanitarian actors and national, state, and counties in New Jersey. Yet, in the examined case studies, the international focus of the cluster approach could undermine national ownership and specific dividends across the community colleges. This fundraising approach can weaken capacity, duplicate structures, undermine the sustainability of achievements, and weaken ownership by the community colleges.

Again, the use of ANOVA is a limiting factor. It would be interesting to appreciate the convergence expressed in the chosen type of variables, and more notably the types of explanatory variables. In the typical ANOVA, there are categorical variables with different groups, and the researcher attempts to determine whether the measurement of a continuous variable differs between groups. On the other hand, OLS tends to be perceived as primarily an attempt at assessing the relationship between a continuous regression or response variable and one or more regressors or explanatory variables. It is in this sense that regression can be viewed as a different technique, lending itself to predicting values based on a regression line. However, this difference does not stand the extension of ANOVA to the rest of the analysis of variance alphabet soup (ancova, manova, mancova), or the inclusion of dummy-coded variables in the OLS regression.

I am unclear about the specific historical landmarks, but it is as if both techniques have grown parallel adaptations to tackle increasingly complex models. The major advantage of linear regression is that it is robust to the violation of homogeneity of variance when sample sizes across groups are unequal. Another is that it facilitates the inclusion of several covariates (though this can also be easily accomplished through ancova when researchers are interested in including
just one covariate). Regression became widespread during the 70s with the advent of advances in computing power. The researcher may also find regression more convenient if he is particularly interested in examining differences between particular levels of a categorical variable when there are more than two levels present (so long as the researcher sets up the dummy variable in the regression so that one of these two levels represents the reference group). This could save us the time of having to conduct post hoc tests to compare the means between groups after running ANOVA.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Considering the details of my findings with this specific research, I would suggest that higher education engage the path of introducing additional graduation rate measures for part-time and transfer students, which will address some of the already established limitations or challenges. Based on the statistical data findings discussed in Chapter 4, for the 19 sample community colleges, the approximate percentage of variability can be credited to the Multiple R, which is the value of the proportion of the variance that is explained by the linear relationship between fundraising and completion rates.

The overall significance of the coefficient equation with specific focus on each of the four chosen models (2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013) is descriptively articulated based on the result explained by the linear relationship between $x$ and $y$ values. This implies that there is much to be achieved through fundraising as it relates to completion rates. Therefore, I would first suggest that college presidents should design new working strategies of fundraising to match the number of students at a lower percentage rate of completion with their existing financial strength, as a new strategic basis for future research.
Community colleges should have written policies and procedures for development-related activities, critical not only for showing that they adhere to ethical fundraising practices, but also for enhancing relations with donors and fundraisers and improving development staff efficiency and effectiveness. Again, community colleges should consider adapting and using specific fundraising programs, with particular reference to higher education’s econometric evaluation. According to Wolak (2011), economic models are statistical models used in econometrics.

An econometric model specifies the statistical relationship that is believed to hold between the various economic quantities pertaining to a particular economic phenomenon under study. Reiss (2006) explained that the logic of structural econometric modeling works with economic and statistical assumptions required to estimate economic quantities, because the imposed structure does not automatically make them sensible. To be convincing, structural models minimally must be (a) flexible statistical descriptions of data; (b) respectful of the economic institutions under consideration; and (c) sensitive to the no experimental nature of economic data. When, for example, there is little economic theory on which to build, the empiricist may instead prefer to use nonstructural or descriptive econometric models.

Alternatively, if there is a large body of relevant economic theory, then there may be significant benefits to estimating a structural econometric model, provided the model can satisfy the previously discussed demands. This stipulated program will embrace the community mission statement motif. It will enhance the education of fundraising with training, professional obligations, solicitation, use of philanthropic funds, presentation of information, and compensation logistics. This construct will automatically help future researchers to be more creative and propelled to new and better ways to raise funds for community college. It will
improve higher education’s policy on transparency related to completion, if guided by a resource
dependence theoretical framework.

A proper examining of all $R^2$ results from the outputs in the entire 4-year respective
multiple regression analysis in New Jersey community colleges shows that the number of the
coefficient determination in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variables
was low, pointing to the fact that the greater dimension of the variation in the dependent
variables (completion rates) is explained by other factors. Again, future students could expound
on this study if enough resources are incorporated into fundraising by the federal government,
the state of New Jersey, and the counties where community colleges are located.

Considering that we are in the information age, I would recommend using digital learning
tools to customize the educational experience on fundraising. This will enhance the community
colleges’ involvement in fundraising and strengthen the path to completion rates. Community
colleges in New Jersey should marshal new policies to enhance overall fundraising satisfaction
driven by their mission statement. Students should be provided with professional faculty ready to
promote fundraising skill-building to ensure that high completion rates are achieved annually.
Again, funding philosophy should be practiced, especially when community colleges combine
fundraising to ensure that students from low income families have more of the resources.

To ensure collective workable fundraising, attention must be given to well developed,
unified strategies. Campaign managers should identify existing preparations, response,
coordination mechanisms, and capacities coming from each community college and carefully
connect them with support dynamics as well as complement them where appropriate for initial
and continual organizational collaboration. Leaders of fundraising should conduct an analysis of
the context, as well as existing coordination, response mechanisms, and capacities before
implementing clusters to ensure appropriate links with rapid response mechanisms. They should identify appropriate partners in the various community colleges, so as to strengthen cooperation and coordination between clusters. Community colleges need to expand their link to national actors and development actors at every stage, from preparedness to response, and from transition to development, as basis for future research.
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