To identify and itemize specific direct and indirect costs related to resources, personnel and programming used to address various symptoms of student disengagement

Gather information through the collaboration of budget personnel, institutional researchers, information officers, and other university personnel

Analyze aggregate data to identify, describe, and interpret trends in spending and other types of resource allocations
OVERVIEW: TIMEFRAME & SAMPLE
- January 1, 2008 - September 8, 2008
  - Recruitment, instrument development, data collection, analysis, and final report
- Sample of 9 schools
  - Sample spans geographic location, number of students, institutional type & mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification v2006-2007</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/AS: Baccalaureate Colleges-Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral; Research Intensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L (Master’s Colleges &amp; Univ./Larger progs.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S (Master’s Colleges &amp; Univ./Smaller progs.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Art School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH (Research Univ./Very high research activity)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01-02 Median</th>
<th>06-07 Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>$86,486,000</td>
<td>$122,392,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Tuition</td>
<td>$20,200</td>
<td>$26,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$8,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Undergraduates</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>6,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # FT Faculty</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Administrative Staff</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
AVG. % CHANGE: FY 01-02 TO FY 06-07

SURVEY DATA CATEGORIES
- Institutional Data
- Counseling and Psychological Services
- Alcohol/Substance Abuse Prevention
- Security/Emergency Services/Crisis Response
- Civic Engagement
- Engaged Learning Efforts
- Student Activities/Residential Life
- Institutional & Funded Research
- Judicial Affairs
- Insurance*
- Legal Counsel*

RESOURCES = Total operating budget, specific programming budgets, total # of staff, salaries, programming hours, # student participants, “In-kind” funding
Demand for services has increased over time
- Staff has stagnated or declined
- Programmatic spending generally increased
  - For programs related to amelioration (counseling, alcohol programming)
  - For programs related manifestation of disengagement (security services, judicial affairs)
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS: ENGAGED LEARNING & CIV. ENG

- Involvement among students and faculty increased
- Programmatic spending
  - Engaged learning: wide variation
  - Civic engagement: substantial increase
- Analysis highlights challenges in accountability

TRENDS: ENGAGED LEARNING & CIV. ENG

- EL: Student Participation
- EL: Faculty Participation
- CE: Student part. Leadership Programs
- CE: Fac. part. CE Programs
ENGAGED LEARNING & CIV. ENG.: TRENDS IN SPENDING

- Engaged learning
  - Wide variation in spending patterns
  - Spending per student showed deficit spending or modest increase
  - Indication that faculty training is increasing

- Civic engagement
  - Substantial increases over time
  - The good news about missing data?

TOTAL ALLOCATION FOR BRINGING THEORY TO PRACTICE EFFORTS

- Composite variable of average change across budget years
- Aggregation across 12 resources central to engaged learning, civic engagement, mental health and alcohol/substance use
- Approximately 67.6% increase over time
- The public/private divide
  - Private institutions = more total $ but decreased % change in spending (-5.0%)
  - Public institutions % change in spending increased 15.4%
LIMITATIONS & CAVEATS

- Missing and unreported data
- Small sample size
- Speaking a common language
- The campus divide & the coordination of collection efforts

NEXT STEPS: BTtoP RESPONSE TO COST STUDY FINDINGS

- Budget accountability & communication
  - Building transparency
- Program allocation & staffing resources
  - The reality of doing more with fewer people
  - (Re)Allocation of efforts
  - Innovation
- The Cost-Benefit Analysis
  - Thinking about resources as before & after effects
  - Assessing preventative and responsive measures