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ABSTRACT

Top ranked universities have long utilized alumni for the continuous improvement of student education, and for their financial contributions. These universities have attributed a great deal of their success to the partnerships created with their alumni. While the University of Wisconsin-Stout Hospitality and Tourism program continues to utilize its alumni for continuous improvement of its department, the opportunity to further improve upon their current practices still exists.

Four research objectives were used in this study to assist with the identification of alumni perceptions, expectations, and willingness to make financial and or personal contributions to the current Hospitality and Tourism Department. Students earning a Bachelor of Science degree in Hospitality and Tourism were surveyed in this study. All graduates with current e-mail addresses from 1997-2008 were sent an invitation to complete the online survey. One survey question revealed that 87% of all subjects rated the value of their education as (good) or (exceptional). A
second survey question revealed a total of 53% of subjects indicated better communication with the university and fellow alumni would increase their participation with the Hospitality and Tourism Department. A third survey question revealed 100% of subjects are willing to donate their personal time and efforts.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Background

The University of Wisconsin Stout (UW-Stout) has been well known for its successful development of thousands of graduates over the last one hundred years. In 1968 under The School of Home Economics the Department of Hospitality & Tourism (H&T) was created. Its implementation was noted as the only H&T program currently offered in the Midwest (Misfeldt, n.d.). To further distinguish itself from other universities, UW-Stout not only offered courses that were included in the Food and Nutrition Department, but offered additional courses in catering, sanitation, and restaurant menu planning courses (Misfeldt, n.d.).

The H&T Department continued to demonstrate its ability to adapt its programming in an attempt to meet industry demands. Several adjustments including changing its B.S. in Hotel and Restaurant Management degree to a B.S. in Hospitality & Tourism Management occurred in 1995. The H&T Department also elevated its educational opportunities for students by implementing a Master’s of Science Degree in Hospitality & Tourism. In 2007 the H&T Department was involved in the restructuring of university programs. The university had elected to move the H&T Department from the College of Human Development to reside under the School of Management.

The H&T program continued to produce highly skilled graduates to the hospitality industry. A survey conducted in 1997 by Cornell University ranked UW-Stout as the ninth best program in the country (Misfeldt, n.d.). While the H&T program continues to be recognized for supplying students with the necessary attributes to become educated leaders in business and industry, the program’s national reputation has decreased in comparison to the 1990’s. It no longer remains listed as a top ten H&T program, but it has continued to offer a B.S. in H&T with concentrations that include:
Food Service Management
Gaming Management
Hospitality Management
Lodging Management
International Hospitality Management
Property Management
Resort Development and Tourism Management

The Master’s of Science degree that was previously offered has been temporarily suspended. Its reimplementa
tion is currently being reevaluated to determine if it is a viable option in the future.

Currently the H&T Department has the largest student enrollment at UW-Stout. Yet, various factors such as increased numbers of in-state and regional colleges offering two year H&T programs, and a reduction of UW-Stout’s H&T name recognition, has reflected a decrease in enrollment of almost 50% when compared to the 1200 students enrolled in the 1990’s.

With current student enrollment averaging 600 students and with the multiple degrees currently offered in the H&T Department, numerous questions and concerns have been raised by administrators and faculty to determine if the H&T Department would benefit from increased partnership with its alumni. Fogg (2008) reiterates how alumni play many critical roles for school including the possibilities of returning to teach, counseling graduating students, serving on advisory boards to the school, and providing financial resources for the programs we need to execute our mission.

The UW-Stout H&T Department currently meets with an advisory board comprised of approximately 20 H&T alumni. The meetings are held every six months to further gain its professional knowledge, insight on current trends, and input of current expectations from business and industry of graduating students. It also holds a reception for alumni at the National Food Show held in Chicago, Illinois. This does not include the numerous events that are held throughout the year by the Stout University Foundation.
Current trends of top H&T universities, such as Michigan State University, demonstrate how schools and departments within universities take it upon themselves to continuously engage alumni beyond the usual events sponsored by university foundations. The School of Hospitality Business at Michigan State University has incorporated multiple events to encourage alumni participation. The following is an example of its current offerings posted on its website Michigan State University (2009) designed specifically for its alumni. The Alumni Association fulfills its mission in a number of ways that benefit the school. It sponsors several major events:

- Executive Board of Directors Meetings each May in Chicago, and each October on campus
- Homecoming parade and barbeque, game day reception and game each fall
- Celebration of Leadership during the November New York International Hotel/Motel and Restaurant Show in New York City
- Annual Auction (sponsored jointly by the Alumni Association and the student Hospitality Association) each February
- Annual Gathering of Leaders Reception during the May National Restaurant Association Show in Chicago
- Patriarchs Breakfast each June on campus

Events such as these are currently implemented by numerous universities across the country. These events are an example of a systemic approach to generating interest in the current and future plans of the university.

With future goals in mind, the necessity of financial resources to attract the most influential instructors and students will be a significant factor in determining university success (Supiano, 2008). According to the University of Wisconsin-Stout (2009), the Stout University Foundation reported the state supplies less than 32% of the overall budget. The remaining 68% comes from tuition, fees, federal grants, and corporate and private support. Annual gifts may be given to individual schools and departments within the university. A critical component to receiving these gifts is the continuous communication and involvement of the H&T alumni. The
researcher found no method for tracking and communicating with its alumni within its department at this time.

Borden (2008) states the importance of supporting alumni and their contributions may attribute a higher level of success in universities. To achieve this, universities need to be very clear about how alumni can help them reach their common goals.

Current trends would indicate that top ranked universities throughout the nation have made a continuous effort to develop partnerships, obtain resources from their alumni, and attribute a great deal of their university success from their contributions (Singer & Hughey, 2002). Even though the UW-Stout H&T Department is currently conducting advisory board meetings twice a year and continues to have informal contact with its alumni, it is uncertain if the department is meeting the expectations of its alumni. It is also unclear if the current participation of alumni involvement has influenced the path the H&T department has taken.

Statement of the Problem

Even though the H&T department continues to offer quality education to its students, a continuous effort is made to improve its educational practices. A standardized survey of all UW-Stout graduates is conducted annually by the Budget, Planning, and Analysis Department. The H&T Department also conducts a H&T program specific survey of all its graduates. The intent of this survey is to determine if the H&T Department is meeting the alumni’s educational/professional goals and objectives as it pertains to their experience with the H&T Department. While this data is used to evaluate the current H&T program, the importance of building, utilizing, and maintaining an effective partnership with its alumni has not been studied.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify UW-Stout H&T alumni perceptions, expectations, and willingness to make financial and or personal contributions to the current H&T Department. The results may be used to assist with current and future decisions that will impact the H&T educational and Department goals.

Research Objectives

1. Identify UW-Stout H&T alumni perceptions of the H&T department.
2. Identify UW-Stout H&T alumni expectations of the H&T department.
3. Identify UW-Stout H&T alumni willingness to commit financial and or personal contributions to the H&T department.
4. Determine the importance of building partnerships with alumni in higher education.

Importance of the Study

The importance of the study includes the understanding of perceptions and expectations from UW-Stout H&T alumni will enable the current H&T program to meet the challenges and demands of the continuously changing business and industry. Additionally, data gathered from alumni may allow the H&T Department to develop a comprehensive system to increase its participation and resources from alumni. By demonstrating the importance of H&T alumni to the future of the H&T program, a greater appreciation and willingness to contribute to the success of the H&T program may be displayed.

Definition of Terms

UW-Stout. The University of Wisconsin Stout

H&T. Hospitality and Tourism
Partnership. The relationship and cooperation between universities and their alumni working together to accomplish common goals.

Personal contributions. The alumni’s willingness to donate: time, skills, knowledge, etc.

Limitations of Study

1. The study is limited to the H&T alumni at UW-Stout.

2. The validity and reliability of the research instrument has not been previously tested.
   While every effort will be made to ensure validity and reliability, the instrument was developed by a novice researcher.

3. The use of e-mail to distribute the survey only allowed subjects with current e-mail addresses to complete the survey.

Methodology

This study is divided into four additional chapters. Chapter Two will review the literature that offers insight on the potential partnership of universities and their alumni. Chapters Three and Four will address the methodology of the study and the results of the study. Chapter Five will summarize the study and offer conclusions and/or recommendations as determined by the study.
Chapter II: Literature Review

The impact of alumni and their contributions to university success continue to be discussed and researched. Opportunities for growth and development are impacted by the partnerships between students and alumni affairs (Singer & Hughey, 2002). In higher education cooperation is essential to provide continuous improvement (Singer & Hughey, 2002). The following review of literature will address the following: Alumni Assessment, Alumni’s Impact on Universities, and Strategies for Increasing Alumni Partnerships.

*Alumni Assessment*

A review of literature indicates higher education institutions have taken particular interest in communications with their alumni. The importance of alumni participation in supporting higher education continues to be demonstrated by the increase amount of devoted time and resources to learning about their alumni base (Cabrera, Weerts & Zulick, 2005). Alumni participation may also be viewed as an opportunity to learn about the institutional interests as well.

The use of surveys is still considered to be the most efficient method for measuring the accomplishments and outcomes of postgraduates (Baird, 1996; Borden, 2005). Borden (2005) further suggests that alumni surveys used with additional university instruments may contribute to the university educational outcomes and performance objectives. With the extreme diversity of programs and majors that are offered across the U.S., a continuous effort by higher education institutions has strived to obtain data with the goal of creating an open partnership with its alumni.

With the challenges of designing and administering effective surveys, it is critical to apply as much rigor to the development of valid and reliable alumni surveys (Borden, 2005;
Cabrera et al., 2005). Organizational capacity to effectively utilize these results varies among universities, but is a critical factor to gathering both valid and reliable data. The National Center for Education Statistic’s Survey of Recent College Graduates is one resource that may be used as a model for the development of university surveys. It also allows the capability to compare individualized results at a national level (Borden, 2005).

According to Cabrera et al., (2005) two types of surveys are most commonly used to retrieve data from alumni. Alumni outcome based surveys seek to measure institutional quality by evaluating alumni accomplishments in their designated careers. Benefits of outcome based surveys include the ability to answer policy questions such as alumni achievements, participation in civic activities, and the possible impact on curriculum modification. Alumni competency based surveys focus on the alumni’s knowledge/skills and how they apply these attributes as a result of their college experiences. This method may be the preferred choice of institutional leaders due to its ability to address multiple audiences. Institutional preference was the predominant reason for the choice of survey instrument implemented.

According to Borden (2005) the purpose of these surveys are generally limited to only a few categories. Individual programs that receive specialized accreditation use their alumni surveys to maintain their accreditation requirements. Alumni offices use surveys for maintaining relationships with their alumni. Centralized institutional research offices use alumni surveys to support overall assessment efforts and their impact on regional accreditations. Ingram, Haynes, Davidson-Shivers, and Irvin, (2005) also identify the potential for student networking and student preparedness for their professional careers as potential categories.

According to Melchiorti (1988) as stated by Kraus (2007), “the purpose of such research is to identify broad educational, psychological, and sociological changes or to assess the impact
of higher education on its consumers” (p. 9). An alternative approach to the implementation of surveys is stated in two studies (Cabrera et al., 2005; Ingram et al., 2005) both indicate the use of survey instruments can also be used to reach key audiences in order to have a positive impact on public policy, planning, and advancement of higher education institutions.

Several challenges are also associated with alumni survey results. According to Kuh (2006) student engagement and outcomes data must be analyzed and interpreted in responsible ways. Diversity of student’s backgrounds, abilities, and institutional missions and resources are factors that may impact survey results.

Borden (2005) states concerns with how universities may use survey results in a punitive manner which may directly affect educational staff’s willingness to participate in such surveys. However, the assessment and accountability of survey results is based primarily on the universities’ level of commitment and actions carried out by the university leaders. This level of commitment is also stated in Ingram et al. (2005) which suggests universities have a strong belief that the administration of surveys will increase alumni participation and program development.

Alumni’s Impact on Universities

Previous research identified universities have created assessment systems used to monitor program, departmental, and institutional goals (Good & Kochan, 2008). The importance of alumni to assist with the assessments and accomplishment of these goals has become more apparent with the current economic constraints imposed on universities (Hoey & Gardner, 1999; Bellack, 2006). Two examples of alumni’s impact on universities were identified as program development and alumni donations.

Program development. The U.S. continues to rely on support from alumni to evaluate and revise university missions and programs (Cabrera et al., 2005). UW-Stout conducts surveys on
all its alumni one and five years after their graduation. Bosshart, Wentz, and Heller (2009) state these surveys provide critical information for assessing and determining the effectiveness of programs. These results may then be utilized for program improvement.

In a study conducted by Plice and Reinig (2008) to address the declining enrollment of Information Systems, students identified the need for evaluating their curricula to better address the needs of their stakeholders. The study further explains how graduates have first-hand knowledge and experience of the curriculum and the requirements of industry. Graduates from the preceding 10-year period were used in the study. Alumni were used to identify specific course by course evaluation of the curriculum to justify the necessity of the current curriculum. The results indicated the necessity to further develop interpersonal communication skills, and the primary focus of curriculum should address a broad range of technical topics as opposed to focusing in-depth on a limited number of topics. While the results of the Plice and Reinig (2008) study are limited to a program specific survey, the results may be used as a model for future alumni analysis at additional universities.

According to the University of Wisconsin Stout (2006) Budget, Planning, and Analysis Department, the 2006 H&T department's program specific survey indicated 42.3% of the 25 alumni respondents felt preparation at UW-Stout allowed them to be (very prepared) for oral communication skills in their current position. The survey also includes 20 specific courses that used a five point scale ranging from (no value) to (very valuable). These results may be used to identify the perceived value and impact of individual course curriculum in relationship to their careers.

*Teaching excellence.* In contrast to the evaluation of course curriculum, a different approach to increased program development includes emphasis on teaching excellence. In the
Journal of Further and Higher Education, Moore and Kuol (2007) wrote “At a time when the relevance and impact of higher educational experiences are being subjected to increasing scrutiny, there is a continued need for educators to understand the teaching experience from many perspectives, not least those of past (as opposed to present) students” (p. 135). These findings indicate teacher attributes more than actions have a greater impact on students. Students are also more likely to recall sense of belonging, community, cared about, and respected in the classroom setting. Moore and Kuol (2007) state “University alumni represent a relevant group of people who can act as dedicated champions or critical questioners of the benefits of higher education in general and of their own universities in particular” (p. 125). Capitalizing allows places of higher education to enhance their quality and effectiveness of their current instruction and programs.

Systematic processes. Ingram, et al. (2005) further examines how universities may create a systematic process for alumni involvement and the potential impact on program improvement. Five broad questions were developed to assist with the creation of the systematic process and identify the needs of students.

1. What are the career paths of Master’s and Ph.D. alumni?
2. How well did the program prepare alumni for their career paths?
3. At what level would the alumni like to be involved in the program?
4. What can be done to make alumni participation involvement easier?
5. How can we keep a current database of our alumni?

The survey resulted in the identification of tracking systems, identification of programs that promote alumni community, coordination of alumni and university efforts, and the determination of program effectiveness (Ingram et al., 2005). The identification of these key attributes could
then be used to improve current programs and serve as a model for future programs in the quest to increase alumni’s impact on program development.

The UW-Stout H&T program-specific survey addresses the criteria of identifying the alumni career paths and program preparedness. In both the UW-Stout H&T program-specific survey and the UW-Stout follow-up survey of all graduates, no questions were observed by the researcher that specifically addressed the level of alumni involvement, increasing the ease of alumni participation, or preference in maintaining a current database of alumni.

In order for universities to adequately address these issues, considerations for university staffing dedicated to administrative and human resource support is needed to gather and record the alumni information (Ingram et al., 2005). To further reiterate the importance of staffing Thomas (2005) wrote, “Student affairs professionals should be assured that their efforts may not only enhance students’ experiences while they are on campus, but years down the road these alumni may feel good about making a gift to the university to help other students have the same type of quality experiences” (p. 26).

*Alumni donations.* The financial support that alumni provide universities is no longer considered to be a luxury, but a necessity (Masterson & Brainard, 2009; Supiano, 2008). With the economic challenges the US is currently facing with the lack of state and federal funding, universities have turned to their alumni affairs departments to increase alumni’s financial support of the university (Supiano, 2008; Cabrera et al., 2005; Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Cabrera et al. (2005) further explains, “Declining state support has led institutions of postsecondary education to search for alternative sources of revenue, ranging from tuition and fees, to private grants, to alumni gifts” (p. 10).
As stated by Cabrera et al. (2005) Wisconsin’s state support of the university system accounted for 52 percent of funding in 1973-1974, while 35% of funds were contributed by alumni gifts, grants, and trust funds. As of 1999 gifts, grants, and trust funds account for 50 percent of the total budget for the university system, in comparison to the state covering only 33 percent as reported in 1999–2001 Biennial Budget Information.

According to Woverton (2008), an extremely strong economy and stock market drove American universities to raise an estimated $29.8 billion in the 2007 fiscal year, which was the highest total ever recorded. Evidence of these prosperous times for universities is also seen in the annual Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) survey conducted by the Council for Aid to Education (2008). Contributions to colleges and universities in the United States grew by 6.2 percent in 2008, reaching $31.60 billion. The $31.60 billion raised in 2008 represents an increase of $1.85 billion over the $29.75 billion raised in 2007. The twenty institutions that raised the most in 2008 received $745.31 million more than the twenty institutions that rose the most in 2007.

With the current economic struggles the country is facing, many fund-raising experts are preparing to encounter considerably more difficult times ahead (Wolverton, 2008). Despite these initial concerns, Woverton (2008) further identifies foundation contributions increased by 19.7 percent and gifts from family funds increased 31.5 percent between 2006 and 2007, according to a sampling of more than half the 1,023 institutions surveyed. Even though the percentage of alumni who made gifts dropped, alumni giving has increased more than 25 percent.

*Donor predictors*. With the increased awareness of alumni contributions continuing to be a growing priority, universities have increased their research objectives to include the identification of characteristics that may be used to maximize their efforts (Cabrera et al., 2005).
One approach to identify alumni characteristics typically includes the sending of a survey to alumni (Baird, 1996; Borden, 2005). An alternative approach to the study of alumni giving after graduation is for universities to concentrate their efforts on currently enrolled undergraduate students (Utter & Noble, 1999). These studies focus on the factors that influence their giving tendencies while at the university. The belief that students will carry over these tendencies after graduation has allowed universities to identify potential alumni donors and cultivate the students while at the university will produce greater alumni giving results after graduation. Further research identified demographics (Utter & Noble, 1999; Weerts & Ronca, 2008), tradition (Todd, 2003), and student engagement (Weerts & Ronca, 2008) as potential indicators of alumni donors. Administrative preference may also be a determining factor in the approach universities utilize to identify potential alumni donors.

Various demographic studies have identified time since graduation, field of major, current occupation, income, and age of children as potential donor indicators (Utter & Noble, 1999). In contrast, the Weerts and Ronca (2008) study indicated that age and employment status were not significant indicators of alumni donors. The study by Utter and Noble (1999) showed that students with higher perceptions of tuition expenses had fewer intentions to give to the university after they graduated. Females were also identified in the study as perceiving tuition costs to be higher than males. Thus, universities may consider targeting males as the most likely to make financial contributions.

Relocation of alumni may also factor into the involvement of alumni in local and state government (Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Political advocacy of alumni is often considered to be an important role of alumni. Research indicates that alumni located out of state are less likely to have a predominate influence on state legislators.
Tradition may also be considered to be a determining factor in alumni donors. Todd (2003) states tradition and connectivity are identified as long standing characteristics of higher education in America. Todd (2003) further states, “Families with multiple generations of alumni are generally more engaged in university life after graduation as donors, referral sources of new students, volunteers on advisory boards, and participants in continuing education and cultural events” (p. 140).

A strong a predictor of future giving is the perception of value (Utter & Noble, 1999). Studies have also shown that students’ and alumni perceptions of their educational experiences are a key factor in their willingness to make financial contributions (Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Landrum and Lisenbe (2008) explain in further detail how alumni evaluate their perception of value as a key factor to future contributions. In addition to value, a trend of students’ awareness of how institutions spend their tuition dollars has surfaced over the past several years (Utter & Noble, 1999). Students who viewed tuition as an excess expense were also less likely to make financial contributions in the future.

Gender has also been found to play a significant role in perceptions. Females tend to perceive tuition costs to be higher than males (Utter & Noble, 1999). The study further indicated the necessity to determine who should be targeted for potential fundraising characteristics. Large gift donors also view student and alumni perceptions as a potential measuring device. Bellack (2006) states, “A high level of alumni participation in annual giving, as well as faculty giving to their own employing institution, sends a clear message to potential large-gift donors that the school’s alumni and employees believe in and are willing to invest in the school, and reassures them that the school’s future is worth their investment, as well” (p. 147).
**Student engagement.** Alumni engagement can typically strengthen the relationship between the alumni and the universities resulting in the possibility of increased financial contributions (Grant, 2008). Concentrating efforts to attract and recruit alumni to participate in advisory boards, to speak to corporations about the institution, and to mentoring graduates may lead to increased giving to universities (Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Studies have also identified relationships between giving and psychographic factors such as alumni opinions of educational experiences, involvement in organizations, attachment to the university and success of athletic teams (Utter & Noble, 1999). Contrary to these research findings, Thomas (2005) wrote alumni that participate in academic groups, athletic activities, performance groups, and spiritual groups did not indicate a significant relationship to alumni giving. However, Thomas (2005) found students with a higher level of involvement in social activities served as an indicator for alumni donations. These findings are attributed to higher level of satisfaction, or greater financial success attributed to their leadership capabilities.

**Alumni volunteer characteristics.** According to Weerts and Ronca (2008) alumni want to give back to a university or program that equips them with educational and professional/life benefits. One method of giving back to programs and universities is by the demonstration of volunteer support.

A study conducted by Weerts and Ronca (2008) involving 2,400 undergraduate alumni indicated the following:

- Alumni decisions to volunteer may be directly aligned with their personal values about service in comparison to institutional solicitations.
• Universities fostering a strong commitment to quality academic experiences and focus on teaching and learning, tend to be more successful in the development of alumni volunteers

• Alumni that are actively engaged with non-profit organizations were 2 times more likely to volunteer at their university

• Women are 1.94 times more likely than their male counterparts to volunteer at the university

• Alumni donors volunteer based on their expectations of the university

• Alumni donors that demonstrated high levels of academic engagement were 1.88 times more likely to volunteer

• Strong professional experiences and social capital are two of the contributing factors to the alumni volunteering

In addition to the identification of alumni donor volunteer characteristics, numerous limitations were also identified. According to Weerts and Ronca (2008) proximity of alumni to the university can drastically affect the alumni’s capacity to volunteer. Alumni donors that reside in the home state in which they graduated are 2.19 times more likely to volunteer as opposed to alumni living outside the state. The results were further examined and concluded that no matter how motivated alumni were to volunteer, distance could be a significant factor in the level of volunteer involvement.

A further comparison to the previously stated findings of gender and level of volunteering may be examined at the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The research reported in the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008) survey indicates 42% of men and women with a bachelor’s degree or higher
participate in volunteering. The results also stated 29.4% of women are also more likely to volunteer as opposed to 23.2% of men.

Limitations of the Weerts and Ronca (2008) study is that the survey was administered to alumni that have graduated with their undergraduate degree over a vast number of years. Additionally, the study only included alumni that were attending a large extensive research university. While additional studies address strategies to increase alumni engagement (Kuh, 2006; Grant, 2008), no other studies were found by the researcher that directly attempted to identify the characteristics that may be used by universities to determine potential alumni volunteers.

*Strategies for Increasing Alumni Partnerships*

Institutions are becoming more aware of the opportunities that exist for student affairs and professionals to form partnerships with their colleagues in alumni affairs (Singer & Hughey, 2002). Recently, colleges and universities have taken great strides to increase their awareness of the advantages associated with orienting and integrating academic affairs, student affairs, and alumni services toward common goals and objectives (Singer & Hughey, 2002). Buck and Woods (2003) further explain the partnership between academic and student affairs is a critical step in the supporting of students’ educational goals. Universities may accomplish this by installing a well functioning system with opportunities for learning.

Supiano (2008) further identifies the greater incorporation of current students in events, increased media strategies, and even parents of recent graduates are being targeted as potential opportunities to increase university endowments. Universities are attempting to increase student engagement with the implementation of technology to design institutional lifelong alumni e-mail accounts, social networking sites, and innovative social functions.
Lifelong alumni e-mail accounts. According to Taylor (2001) e-mail may be used to inform alumni of events, newsletters, and even a means for soliciting financial contributions. A study conducted by Ingram et al. (2005) states that 83% of alumni indicated the best way to contact them is through e-mail. Alumni were further asked to identify their preferred information sources. The results indicated 61% of alumni preferred a web newsletter. However, maintaining current e-mail addresses of alumni has presented a notable challenge for universities (Ingram et al. 2005). To address this challenge, universities have begun offering lifelong e-mail addresses. According to Taylor (2001); Ingram et al., (2005) also state universities offering lifetime e-mail addresses allows for a greater capability to track alumni after their graduation in comparison to the traditional methods such as the postal service or by phone.

Even supplying a reliable means of communication to alumni may not encourage students to activate or pursue lifetime e-mail accounts (Taylor, 2001). To further promote these lifetime e-mail accounts universities are using the name recognition and the prestige of the university to encourage alumni participation. By incorporating the name of the university in the alumni e-mail address such as “standfordalumni.org” or “UCLAAAlumni.net” universities are hoping to increase alumni’s participation in the lifetime e-mail accounts.

An additional value that universities are incorporating into their lifetime alumni e-mail accounts is the incorporation of bulletin boards, job postings and other offerings (Taylor, 2001). By offering such services and resources, universities are attempting to encourage alumni to continue and expand their capabilities to make future contributions to the universities.

Social networking sites. Hermes (2008) explains that universities have struggled to attract and maintain a partnership with alumni using their current online systems. Social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace have become a popular choice for alumni and students.
Facebook has more than 70 million users and claims that 85 percent of students at four-year universities have Facebook profiles. As stated by Hermes (2008) about 70 percent of Internet user's ages 18 to 29 have profiles located on social networks, according to the Pew Internet & American Life Project.

Challenges associated with extracting of data from public sites such as Facebook and MySpace have increased the pressure for universities to create their own social networking sites (Hermes, 2008). Universities have attempted to capitalize on this trend. They have embraced the social networking system by building their own network. However, this commitment by the universities does come with a price. A well known developer of this technology is Affinity Circles Inc. iModules Software Inc. which states an average operational coast of at least $10,000 a year is required to implement a software program to meet university demands (Hermes, 2008). These systems are relatively new applications for the promotion of alumni engagement and the accomplishment of university objectives. Limited research has been conducted on social networking and their impact on universities and their alumni. Future studies are needed to determine the effectiveness and the results achieved by the incorporation of such technology.

*Teaching student and alumni engagement.* Recently, colleges and universities have taken great strides to increase their awareness of the advantages associated with orienting and integrating academic affairs, student affairs, and alumni services toward common goals and objectives (Singer & Hughey, 2002). The increase partnership of alumni in university sponsored activities has been identified as a priority for universities (Strout, 2006; Walters, 2005; Grant, 2008). However, Strout (2006) states, "For younger alumni especially, earning a diploma isn’t enough of an incentive to automatically join an alumni association, as it may have been for those who graduated in decades past, because they already have countless volunteer, cultural, and
networking opportunities” (para. 7). Strout (2006) further explains that alumni commonly ask themselves what will they get in return for their participation in university activities and membership to alumni associations.

Partnerships between student and alumni affairs can provide students with significant opportunities for growth and development (Singer & Hughey, 2002). Further research suggests universities that teach students throughout their academic endeavors may significantly increase the chances of student’s perceived value, sense of ownership, and increased financial contributions (Utter & Noble, 1999). It is the university’s responsibility to continuously educate students why a lifelong relationship with the university is beneficial to them (Grant, 2008). Grant (2008) further explains, “It is equally important that universities identify the purpose of your alumni association and the audience it serves, and determine how these stakeholders can further the mission of your college” (p. 18).

*Social functions.* When universities discuss and implement their strategies to increase alumni partnership through social functions, it is necessary to identify what alumni want. Events that pair students with alumni, such as “Dinner with 12 strangers” allows universities to bring students and alumni together socially and provides an opportunity for individuals to interact and network with one another (Stout, 2006; Ingram et al., 2005).

While these events may have appropriate applications, alternative methods have also been implemented. Walters (2005) states, “Colleges have a stake in fostering a sense of community among alumni, but the standard eat-and-greet events do not appeal to all graduates” (para. 3). More universities are asking alumni to unify their efforts on a national scale in hopes of greater recognition of the importance of alumni engagement (Walters, 2005). As stated by Walters (2005) Lori Ann Summers, Associate Director of Alumni Relations at Colorado College
states, “Having alumni across the country working on the same day makes them feel like they're part of something bigger and connects them to the college in a new way” (para. 9). A relatively simple but effective means of promotion of alumni engagement at social functions is to give alumni college T-shirt’s as welcome gifts (Grant, 2008). Offering activities that address the needs and wants to meet the expectations of the diverse population of alumni should be strategically planned to maximize the events impact on alumni engagement (Walters, 2005).

**Fundraising.** With the financial challenges universities are currently faced with, the need to update and revise university fundraising strategies and their partnership with alumni has drawn more attention. Strout (2006) explains that universities must become entrepreneurial and offer educational opportunities, industry events, career networking and even online job services. With fund-raising expected to be on the decline this year, a list of suggestions for universities has been generated.

1. **Show impact.** When the University of California at Los Angeles recently surveyed donors who had given $50,000 or more during its last campaign, the development staff found that donors wanted continued and consistent communication about the impact their gifts had had on the university. Be sure to make those updates consistent across units.

2. **Focus on the future.** Gift annuities can provide donors with dependable income—-not a bad thing in this economy—while providing a way to give.

3. **Emphasize mission over money:** Rather than trumpet progress toward overall campaign goals, talk with prospective donors about the need for their gifts and the impact they can have on the institution.
4. Avoid the hard sell. Emergency appeals can turn people off, says The Chronicle of Philanthropy, but don't be afraid to bring the economy into the discussion to show how the downturn is affecting students.

5. Match the money. Consider the power of matching gifts as an incentive for new donors, LaGrange College, in Georgia, is using $1-million from a larger bequest to match new donations to its annual fund. For every dollar given, the college will give $2, up to $500,000, according to The Chronicle of Philanthropy (Masterson, & Brainard, 2009).

Summary

The impact of alumni and their contributions to university success continue to be discussed and researched. While universities have long attributed a portion of their success to the contributions of their alumni, recent economic conditions have generated an increased concern and awareness of universities’ partnerships with their alumni. Opportunities for growth and development are impacted by the partnerships between students and alumni affairs (Singer & Hughey, 2002). Three areas of opportunity have been identified in literature as alumni assessment, alumni’s impact on universities, and strategies for increasing alumni partnerships that may be used by universities to assist with the further development of partnerships with their alumni.

Alumni assessment is used by universities to often assess the universities performance and students satisfaction with their educational experience. Surveys are often the most commonly used device for alumni assessment. Outcome and competency based surveys have been identified as the primary types of alumni surveys. Currently, the most common goal of surveys is for university and program accreditation, maintain relationships with alumni, and for
university and program assessment. However, the level of commitment implemented by universities varies drastically.

Two examples of alumni’s impact on universities were identified as program development and financial support. Contributions from alumni may have a significant influence on program development by influencing curriculum development, teaching excellence, and identifying the need for university systematic processes. With the increase of financial challenges universities are experiencing across the nation, special attention has been directed to the research of student engagement, volunteer characteristics, donor predictors, student and alumni perceptions, and how these characteristics impact alumni’s willingness to make financial contributions.

Institutions are becoming more aware of the opportunities that exist for student affairs and professionals to form partnerships with their colleagues in alumni affairs (Singer & Hughey, 2002). The literature has identified some of the strategies for increasing alumni partnerships. The use of technology may be used to generate lifelong e-mail accounts and social networking sites. Research has indicated that teaching students the importance of alumni engagement while students are attending school may significantly impact their willingness to make contributes after graduation.

Overall, alumni have long been viewed as an important part of the future success of universities. How universities choose to utilize their alumni depends on the level of commitment the university is willing to invest in the development of partnerships with its alumni. There is no specific formula or strategy that applies to all universities. However, the top universities in the U.S. have dedicated a tremendous amount of time, money, and resources to the development of partnerships with their alumni.
Chapter III: Methodology

While the H&T Department continues to offer quality education to its students, the department continues to strive to improve its current practices. UW-Stout conducts annual surveys of all graduates at one and five years after graduation. Additional program specific surveys may be developed by the departments in an attempt to determine the effectiveness and alumni satisfaction with the education they received. The purpose of the study is to identify UW-Stout H&T alumni perceptions, expectations, and willingness to make financial and or personal contributions to the current H&T Department. The results may be used to assist with current and future decisions that will impact the H&T educational and department goals.

This chapter outlines the sections to be addressed in Chapter 3. These sections include subject selection and description, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis, and limitations of the methodology.

Subject Selection and Description

The subjects for the study are former UW-Stout H&T Bachelor of Science graduates. A list of H&T graduates has been supplied by UW-Stout Alumni Office. Subjects were selected based on their graduation dates ranging from 1997 through 2008. The year 1997 was selected to allow an adequate sample of participants. E-mail was chosen by the researcher for the distribution of the survey. Only alumni with current e-mail addresses available were selected for the study. A total of 368 e-mail addresses was supplied by the Stout Alumni Office. The subjects were then divided into three distinct groups to assist with the analysis of data. Group 1 represented subjects graduating from 1997-2000. Group 2 represented subjects graduating from 2001-2004. Group 3 represented subjects graduating from 2005-2008.
Instrumentation

Survey questions were generated by the researcher and from the UW-Stout Alumni Follow Up Survey (2006). A total of sixteen questions was included. In an effort to further compare survey results to extant data sources from UW-Stout, four survey questions were used from the UW-Stout follow up survey. All questions have been constructed to obtain adequate data to address the research objectives.

The survey instrument for this research utilized a mixed method approach by using both quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell, 2003). The alumni provided quantitative data that identified subjects’ demographics, and insight into past and present experiences. Qualitative, questions were used to allow subjects to further explain answers to selected quantitative questions and for open-ended questions (Rice, Stewart, & Hubjer, 2000). The questions also allowed subjects to state responses to the questions the researcher may not have considered.

A five point Likert scale was used to rate subjects responses for 7 survey questions. The rating options used in the questions did vary slightly from question to question to remain consistent with extant data from previous surveys. The rating options consistently used the first rating option such as poor, very low, etc., as the first choice proceeded by rating options that ended with strongly agree, very high, definitely yes, etc.

Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were developed to identify demographic information of subjects such as year of graduation, employment status, job title, number of employees, and proximity from UW-Stout campus. Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 attempt to identify subjects overall satisfaction; preparedness for employment; program effectiveness; and value of the education they received from UW-Stout. Questions 10, 11, 12, 13, and 16 attempt to identify subjects’ perceptions of the UW-Stout H&T program, level of satisfaction of alumni involvement, and
what actions may increase subjects’ future involvement in the program. Questions 14, and 15 attempt to identify what subjects are willing to assist with and donate to the UW-Stout H&T program.

The questions were reviewed by the H&T Department, the Stout Alumni Director, research committee, and the UW-Stout Institutional Review Board. All departments submitted feedback in which the suggested revisions were made. The corrected questions were resubmitted again to previously listed departments and committees, and approved for survey distribution.

Data Collection Procedures

The survey questions have been inputted into the Qualtrics survey tool for delivery of the survey. Subjects were contacted by e-mail using Bcc to conceal e-mail addresses of participating subjects. An e-mail was sent out on July 29, 2009 to 368 subjects inviting them to participate in the research study. A link with the URL address was displayed for direct access to the survey instrument along with an attachment of a detailed consent form explaining the research. Completion of survey was estimated at 7 minutes.

A total of 55 e-mail addresses was sent back to the researcher as misdirected and undeliverable. A total of 36 responses was submitted as of August 4, 2009. A second e-mail was sent out on August 5, 2009 as a reminder to please complete the survey by August 6, 2009. An additional 25 subjects completed the survey which resulted in a total of 61 of the 368 subjects or 16% participation in the survey. If the 55 e-mail addresses that were returned to the researcher as undeliverable were eliminated from the total e-mails sent, the survey participation rate would increase to 19% of subjects that received e-mails.

Data Analysis
Data was obtained from the Qualtrics survey tool. Incomplete and inadequate answers were removed from the results. Qualtrics is equipped with programming that allowed a number of statistical analyses. The statistical analyses used in this study included frequency, mean, and percentages. Quantitative questions were grouped in order to perform the necessary statistical analysis. Qualitative data including responses to open-ended questions and any additional subject responses to questions were also group together by researcher to identify subject response frequencies and tendencies.

Limitations

In order to obtain adequate data to address the research objectives, the researcher used previously developed questions from a review of literature as well as questions generated by the researcher. Even though questions were viewed by qualified researchers, the reliability of the survey instrument has not been determined.

The method of survey distribution may have also limited the number of participants that completed the survey. The number of subjects that graduated from the UW-Stout H&T program over the past 12 years exceeded 1500. Only 368 e-mail addresses of the graduates were currently available from the alumni office.

Summary

Graduates of the Bachelor of Science degree in H&T from UW-Stout were surveyed to identify UW-Stout H&T alumni perceptions, expectations, and willingness to make financial and or personal contributions to the current H&T Department. Graduates that were contacted by e-mail n = 368, of which 61 subjects completed the survey. Data was collected by Qualtrics survey tool and calculates responses using descriptive statistics.
Chapter IV: Results

This chapter will address the findings of the study. The survey instrument Qualtrics was used for the distribution of the survey which was sent to 368 H&T Bachelor of Science graduates from UW-Stout. All graduates from 1997 to 2008 were selected with valid e-mail addresses that were available from the UW-Stout Alumni Office. A total of 61 or 16% of the subjects completed the survey. When e-mails were sent to subjects, 55 addresses were found to be undeliverable or misdirected. Three hundred and thirteen subjects are presumed to have received the e-mail with the instructions asking subjects to participate in the survey. Two e-mails were sent out to subjects. The first e-mail explained the purpose and instructions informing subjects how to complete the survey. A total of 36 subjects completed the survey at that point. An additional reminder was sent out which resulted in an additional 25 subjects completing the survey for a total of 61 submissions.

Item Analysis

Table 1 illustrates the results to survey question one. Survey question one identifies the year of graduation. The results indicate 79% of overall responses were subjects that graduated in 1997-2004. Subjects that graduated in 2001-2004 had the highest response rate at 22% in comparison to 1997-2000 and 2005-2008 which both had a 14% response rate.
Table 1

*What Year Did You Earn Your Bachelor’s Degree?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses by Year</th>
<th>Overall Response Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2008</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question two. The results indicated that 80% of subjects between 1997-2008 surveyed are employed in the H&T industry. The highest overall percentage employed in the industry at 34% were subjects that graduated between 2001-2004. The lowest overall percentage not employed in the industry at 18% were subjects that graduated between 2005-2008. However, subjects that graduated between 1997-2000 have the highest overall percentage not employed in the industry.

Table 2

*Are You Currently Employed in the H&T Industry?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Overall Percentage</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Overall Percentage Not Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question three. The results identified the current job titles of H&T subjects. The results indicate that 91% of subjects that graduated between 2005-2008 are employed as managers. The only executives indentified in the survey were 2 subjects or 8% of the subjects that graduated between 1997-2000. The results also indicate 26% of subjects that graduated between 1997-2004 are employed as other. Responses included: Product Manager, Director of National Sales, Sr. Product Specialist, Human Resource Manager, Information Solutions, Sales Manager, Buyer, Police Sergeant, Self Employed, Financial Advisor, Stay-at-home Mom, and Employment Recruiter. Three subjects also indicated they were Owner/Operators of their own business.

Table 3

*Current Job Title*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question four. Question four identifies the number of employees in current operation of the subjects’ employment. Subjects employed in operations ranging from 1 to 99 employees account for 56% of overall results. Additionally 22%
or 13 subjects overall indicated they work in operations that employ 400 or more. No subjects that graduated between 2005-2008 work in operations with 400 or more employees.

Table 4

*Number of Employees in Your Operation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 99</td>
<td>16 66%</td>
<td>10 43%</td>
<td>7 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>3 12%</td>
<td>4 17%</td>
<td>3 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>1 4%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 and above</td>
<td>4 16%</td>
<td>9 39%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 illustrates responses to survey question five. Question five identifies the distance subjects live from UW-Stout. Results indicate 52% of overall subjects that graduated between 1997-2008 live 199 miles or less from UW-Stout. Results also indicate 26% of graduated in 1997-2008 live 400 or more miles from UW-Stout. The lowest percentage or 8% of subjects that graduated between 1997-2008 live between 300-399 miles from Stout.
Table 5

*Approximately How Many Miles Do You Currently Live from UW-Stout*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 and above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question six. Question six identifies subjects’ willingness to enroll in the same program again. Subjects that graduated between 1997-2008 indicated 0% would definitely not enroll in the same program again. A total of 39 or 65% of subjects graduating between 1997-2008 rated willingness to enroll in the same program as 4 (probably yes) and 5 (definitely yes) To further compare the results of this survey to previous extant data, the UW-Stout Undergraduate Five Year Follow Up Survey of H&T alumni (2007) was examined. The same question was used in both surveys. The results indicated a variance of 2% from the responses received from graduates between 2000 and 2002 that selected 4 (probably yes) and 5 (definitely yes) in comparison to the results obtained from question six in this study.
Table 6

*If You Had To Do It All Over Again, Would You Enroll in the Same Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Definitely No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Definitely Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question seven. Question seven identifies the subjects’ opinions on the effectiveness of the H&T program and major. A total of 80% of 1997-2000, 78% of 2001-2004, and 91% of 2005-2008 subjects responded to overall program effectiveness as 4 (*high*) or 5 (*very high*). The same question was used in the UW-Stout Undergraduate Five Year Follow Up Survey of H&T Alumni (2007). The responses were again analyzed by adding the number of subjects that rated overall program effectiveness as 4 (*high*) or 5 (*very high*). A total of 81% of 2000 graduates and 90% of 2002 graduates surveyed indicated the overall program effectiveness was 4 (*high*) or 5 (*very high*).
Table 7

Rate Overall Effectiveness of Program/Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Very Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Very High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 8. Question eight identifies subjects’ perception of educational value gained from UW-Stout. A total of 92% of 1997-2000, 82% of 2001-2004, and 83% of 2005-2008 subjects responded to value of education as 4 (good) or 5 (exceptional). The same question was used in the UW-Stout Undergraduate Five Year Follow Up survey of H&T Alumni (2007). The responses were again analyzed by adding the number of subjects that rated overall program effectiveness as 4 (high) or 5 (very high). A total of 68% of 2000 graduates and 78% of 2002 graduates surveyed indicated the overall program effectiveness was 4 (high) or 5 (very high).
Table 8

*Rate Value of Your Education, “Given the Cost of Education and Your Investment of Time and Effort”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>3 13%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 8%</td>
<td>1 4%</td>
<td>2 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 48%</td>
<td>12 52%</td>
<td>7 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Exceptional</td>
<td>11 44%</td>
<td>7 30%</td>
<td>3 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25 44%</td>
<td>23 30%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 60)

Table 9 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question nine. Question nine identifies subjects’ perception of overall preparedness for professional employment. A total of 76% of 1997-2000, 82% of 2001-2004, and 91% of 2005-2008 subjects responded to value of education as 4 (*high*) or 5 (*very high*). The same question was used in the (2007) UW-Stout Undergraduate Five Year Follow Up survey of H&T alumni. The responses were again analyzed by adding the number of subjects that rated overall program effectiveness as 4 (*satisfied*) or 5 (*very satisfied*). Table 10 illustrates the 2000 graduates of the UW-Stout Five Year Follow Up Survey had the highest mean of 4.5. All other years ranged from 4.0 to 4.25.
Table 9

*Rate Overall Preparation for Professional Employment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Overall Preparation for Professional Employment (Mean Scores)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2004</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2008</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 UW-Stout 5 Year Follow Up Survey</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 UW-Stout 5 Year Follow Up Survey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 10. Question 10 identifies subjects’ perception of the UW-Stout’s H&T program as a leader in H&T education. Responses indicate 52% of subjects that graduated between 1997-2008 (strongly disagree) or (disagree) that UW-Stout’s H&T program is a leader in H&T education. The results also indicate 21 subjects or 35% that graduated between 1997-2008 (agree) or (strongly agree) that UW-Stout’s H&T program is a leader in H&T education. The remaining 13% of graduates in 1997-2008 indicated neither applied.

Table 11

**UW-Stout’s H&T Program is a Leader in H&T Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 11. Question 11 identifies subjects’ perception of their partnership with the UW-Stout H&T department in relation to the future success of the H&T program. The results indicated 1 subject or 1% of graduates between 1997-2008 (strongly disagree) or (disagree) that the subjects’ partnership with the H&T
Department is critical to the future success of the program. In contrast, 83% of graduates between 1997-2008 (strongly agree) or (agree) an active partnership is critical to the future success of the H&T program. The remaining 15% of graduates between 1997-2008 responded (neither).

Table 12

*An Active Partnership Between the H&T Department and Its Alumni is Critical to the Future*

*Success of the H&T Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>12 (52%)</td>
<td>4 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 illustrates subjects' responses to survey question 12. Question 12 identifies subjects' level of satisfaction with the H&T Department and its involvement with alumni. Only one subject that graduated between 1997-2008 indicated they (strongly disagree) and only two subjects (strongly agree) with the current level of involvement the H&T department offers its alumni. The results further indicated 35 or 60% of subjects that graduated between 1997-2008 selected (neither) as their response to the question. No explanation was given for the (strongly
section. Three responses were given for the *(disagree)* section. These responses included the following comments:

- Two subjects indicated this was their first communication in regards to the H&T program.
- "I don’t believe the H&T department utilizes their alumni as much as they could”
- “Very few updates”
- “Just asking for money or info on conferences that do not pertain to us”
- “When I was in the H&T program, we had a very tight knit close group. That close knit group fell apart the day after the graduation ceremonies”

Comments from subjects that *(neither disagree)* or *(agree)* included:

- “I frequently receive e-mail updates, however I am not in the industry, but know people who are and do use”
- “I would welcome more involvement”
- Two subjects indicated this is the first communication I have received thus far
- Three subjects indicated they didn’t know that they offered anything to their alumni.

These comments included:

- “It’s great that we have events during NRA, but otherwise
- “I never hear what’s happening unless Stout wants money”
- “Not aware of any opportunities to be involved”
- “Don’t really have time to participate in current involvement for alumni.”
Comments from subjects that (strongly agree) and (agree) include:

- "I do get e-mails regularly about this which is good"
- "I’m happy that I have the opportunity to speak a few times a year with classes as a professional, but am very disappointed in the fact that Stout is now requiring such high expectations for professors"
- "I learned more from my teachers that have 20 years of experience than someone who hasn’t left a campus"
- "I think the university is missing some great experience by having these handcuffs"
- "It would be fun to have more affordable outings and perhaps our own newsletter bi annually to update people and send in photos"
- "I think the internet provides the resources needed by alumni, but we know what the school is seeking from the alumni; I think their needs to be more involvement"
- "There needs to be more of an outreach to alum to come to Stout and talk about the industry with current students and talk about how important internships are and gaining experience is"
- "I think they should have more alumni socials and reach out to the alumni more and not just for money; It is good to see what current grads are coming as well as getting feedback of what is going on in the industry"
- "They keep us informed and keep it fresh"
Table 13

*I am Satisfied with the Current Involvement the H&T Department Offers its Alumni.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 58)

Table 14 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 13. Question 13 identifies subjects’ expectations of the UW-Stout H&T Department. Graduates from 1997-2008 indicated 80% or 48 subjects expect notification of alumni events. Notably, 100% or 12 subjects between 2005-2008 expect notification of alumni events and ability to communicate with fellow alumni. 44 subjects or 73% of subjects between 1997-2008 also indicated the ability to communicate with fellow alumni as an expectation of the H&T Department. Additional comments made by subjects include:

- “Information about masters program and changes within the industry”
- “I want Stout to make the H&T program a national recognized program again”
- “It hurts the alumni when the program falls off the tracks, as it has in the past decade”
- “Offer more career development opportunities”
• Contact us with potential interns
• Opportunities to speak to classes in specific areas of study
• More regional events
• “It would be great to have people send in a college photo because there are a lot of people whose last name I can’t remember; Mentoring info between current students and alumni”

Table 14

*I Expect the H&T Department to Include or Offer Its Alumni*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of alumni events</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of changes occurring within department</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate with fellow alumni</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide highly skilled students for potential employment in my organization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 14. Question 14 identifies subjects’ willingness to assist the H&T program by donating their expertise. A total of 10% of graduates between 1997-2008 indicated they would assist with fundraising. No significant
difference between the three groups surveyed was present. The results indicated 68% or 25 subjects between 1997-2008 are willing to participate in H&T advisory boards. Other responses include the following: willingness to assist with event planning and willingness to discuss why people choose to stay in the industry.

Table 15

*Would You Be Willing to Assist the H&T Program by Donating Your Expertise in Any of the Following*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Communications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of H&amp;T</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program in your community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer recommendations to enhance curriculum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in H&amp;T advisory board</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 illustrates subjects’ responses to survey question 15. Question 15 identifies what subjects are willing to donate to the H&T Department. The resulted showed 13% of subjects
between 1997-2008 are willing to donate money or professional equipment. In contrast 100% or 40 subjects indicated they are willing to donate personal time and effort. Other responses include: Roundtable discussions on the industry, fundraiser ability and other resources as they are available, money, facilities, etc.

Table 16

*I Am Willing to Donate to the H&T Department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of my professional facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal time and effort</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 16 asks subjects what the H&T program can do to increase subjects’ participation in the H&T Department. A total of 28 responses was submitted. No significant differences were observed between the three groups surveyed. Data was compiled to illustrate overall subjects’ comments. Communication was indicated as the primary suggestion for increased participation. A total of 15 or 53% of subjects indicated by increasing the communication between the H&T program and its alumni may increase their participation. Suggestions by subjects for increasing the communication include sending semester updates; sharing alumni list; and starting a Facebook page and getting on twitter. Additional comments
for question 16 also included offering continuing education opportunities at off campus sites and offering discounted travel rates or coupon books for members. The results also indicated that 17% of subjects stated the following: They were unsure of what the H&T program could do, or nothing would increase level of participation in the H&T program.
Chapter V: Discussion

Universities continue to research how the educational and financial success of universities is impacted by its alumni. While efforts have been made to maximize the contributions of H&T alumni using surveys and discussion groups, the H&T Department continues to search for additional opportunities to increase alumni contributions. The potential opportunities for H&T alumni to engage in have not been extensively researched.

Summary

Restatement of the problem. The purpose of this study is to identify UW-Stout H&T alumni perceptions, expectations, and willingness to make financial and or personal contributions to the current H&T Department. The results may be used to assist with current and future decisions that will impact the H&T educational and department goals.

Methods and procedures. The subjects for the study are former UW-Stout H&T Bachelor of Science graduates. A list of H&T graduates has been supplied by the UW-Stout Alumni Office. Subjects were selected based on their graduation dates ranging from 1997 through 2008.

Subjects were asked to complete a 16 question survey. The survey questions were generated by the researcher and the UW-Stout Alumni Follow Up Survey (2006). In an effort to further compare survey results to extant data sources from UW-Stout, 4 survey questions were used from the UW-Stout follow up survey. All questions have been constructed to obtain adequate data to address the research objectives. The survey questions have been imputed into the Qualtrics survey tool for delivery of the survey. Data was then obtained from the Qualtrics survey tool. Incomplete and inadequate answers were removed from the results.
Limitations of the study.

1. The study is limited to the H&T alumni at UW-Stout.

2. The validity and reliability of the research instrument has not been previously tested. While every effort will be made to ensure validity and reliability, the instrument was developed by a novice researcher.

3. The use of e-mail to distribute the survey only allowed subjects with current e-mail addresses to complete the survey.

Conclusions

The first research objective asks subjects to identify their perceptions of the H&T Department. This research question was answered by responses to questions 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Subjects were asked if they had to do it all over again, would they enroll in the same program. Results indicated 0% of subjects would not enroll in the same program again. The results also indicated 65% of all subjects would (probably yes) and (definitely yes) enroll in the program again. These results were also consistent with the UW-Stout Five Year Follow Up Survey. A total of 82% of all subjects rated the overall effectiveness of program/major as (high) or (very high). Subjects not only felt the program was effective but, 87% of all subjects rated the value of their education as (good) or (exceptional) as well. The survey also revealed 82% of all subjects were (satisfied) or (very satisfied) with their preparation for employment.

Not all responses were overwhelmingly positive. The results showed 52% of all subjects (disagree) or (strongly disagree) that the H&T program at UW-Stout is a leader in H&T education. However, 35% of the subjects (agree) or (strongly agree) the H&T program at UW-Stout is a leader in H&T education.
Based on the overall results to the questions, subjects have indicated they perceive the education they received from the H&T program to be satisfactory. However, the subjects indicated they do not perceive the H&T Department as a leader in H&T education when compared to other leading H&T programs.

The second research objective asks subjects to identify their expectations of the H&T Department. This research question was answered by responses to questions 12, 13, and 16. The results show 80% of all subjects want to be notified of alumni events. An additional 73% of all subjects indicated they expect the ability to communicate with fellow alumni. A total of 53% of subjects indicated better communication with the university and fellow alumni would increase their participation with the H&T Department. When subjects were asked to rate their satisfaction with their current involvement the H&T Department offers its alumni, only 29% of all subjects (agree) or (strongly agree).

Overall, the results show subjects expect the H&T Department to provide them with adequate communication to and from the H&T Department and fellow alumni. Furthermore, the lack of communication may explain the small percentage of subjects satisfied with their involvement in the H&T Department.

The third research objective asks about subjects’ willingness to commit financial and or personal contributions to the H&T Department. This research question was answered by responses to questions 14 and 15. The results indicated only 10% of subjects were willing to assist the H&T Department with fundraising. However, at least 50% of subjects are willing to participate in H&T advisory boards, offer recommendations to enhance curriculum, and promote the H&T program in their community. When subjects identified what they were willing to donate
to the H&T Department, the results showed 100% of subjects are willing to donate their personal
time and efforts. In contrast, only 13% were willing to donate money to the H&T Department.

The overall results show subjects are willing to make contributions by donating their time
and knowledge as opposed to financial contributions.

The fourth research objective attempts to determine the importance of partnerships with
universities and their alumni. This research question was answered by responses to question 11.
The results showed 82% of subjects (agree) or (strongly agree) an active partnership between the
H&T Department and its alumni is critical to the future success of the H&T program. A total of
15% of subjects indicated they (neither disagree) or (agree).

The overall results show the subjects believe they are an essential resource to the future
success of the university.

Recommendations Related to this Study

1. The communication with the H&T Department and its alumni should be revisited. An
   analysis of the department’s capabilities (resources, personnel, technology, etc) vs.
   current practices may identify potential opportunities to increase the quality and quantity
   of communication between the H&T Department and its alumni.

2. Further research is needed to investigate the potential impact of alumni contributions to
   the H&T Department by offering additional opportunities for alumni participation. This
   participation may include additional advisory boards and committees, opportunities for
   curriculum improvement, demonstration of a particular set of skills, and sharing current
   industry trends with instructors and students.

3. An effort to expand this study is needed to obtain a larger sample of H&T alumni. The
   lack of current contact information (especially e-mail addresses) limits the ability to
maximize potential alumni contributions to the H&T Department. The use of electronic communications such as e-mail, and social networking sites is viewed as the preferred method of contact by alumni.

4. Further research is needed to determine how the H&T Department can increase its alumni's willingness to donate financial contributions. Factors such as student engagement, perceptions, and expectations need to be tracked and recorded in an attempt to identify potential opportunities for increasing contributions and to maximize departmental efforts.

5. The H&T Department needs to justify/promote to its students and alumni why the current H&T Department is a leader in H&T education. The communication of the departmental accomplishments in classrooms, student organizations, research journals, etc., may be used to educate the students/alumni why the H&T program is a leader in H&T education.

6. The H&T Department needs to increase communication with the Stout University Foundation to develop and implement a strategic plan to meet H&T alumni perceptions and expectations.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

1. Further research is needed to determine the characteristic and experiences that influence students' decisions to participate and make financial contributions to their university in the future.

2. Further research is needed to investigate the relationship between alumni's willingness to donate financial contributions in comparison to their capacity to donate financial contributions.
3. Further research is needed to identify to what degree students' perceptions of their educational experience are impacted on a longitudinal scale.

4. Further research is needed to determine the impact of extensively educating students throughout their tenure at the university on the importance of alumni contributions to the future success of the university.

5. Further research is needed to determine to what degree the incorporation of technologies such as social networking sites and lifelong e-mail accounts will increase the level of partnership with universities and their alumni.

6. Further research is needed to develop a standardized survey instrument designed for H&T universities in an attempt to allow universities to obtain and share survey results. By making the results more generalizable, universities may identify potential opportunities and weakness that otherwise would not be discovered.
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Appendix A: Survey Instrument

UW-Stout H&T Alumni Survey

Q1
☐ What year did you earn your Bachelor's Degree?
☐ 1997-2000
☐ 2001-2004
☐ 2005-2008

Q2
☐ Are you currently employed in the H&T industry?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Q3
☐ Current job title?
☐ Associate
☐ Manager
☐ Executive
☐ Other (please specify)

Q4
☐ Number of employees in your operation?
☐ 1 to 99
☐ 100 to 199
☐ 200 to 299
☐ 300 to 399
☐ 400 and above

Q5
☐ Approximately how many miles do you currently live from UW-Stout?
☐ 1 to 99
☐ 100 to 199
☐ 200 to 299
☐ 300 to 399
☐ 400 and above

Q6
☐ If you had to do it all over again, would you enroll in the same program?
Definitely No
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Definitely Yes
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Q7
rate overall effectiveness of program/major.
Very Low                      Very High

Q8
Rate value of your education. "given the cost of education and your investment of time and effort"
Poor                          Exceptional

Q9
Rate overall preparation for professional employment.
  Very Dissatisfied
  Dissatisfied
  Neutral
  Satisfied
  Very Satisfied

Q10
UW-Stouts H&T program is a leader in H&T education
  Strongly Disagree
  Disagree
  Neither Disagree or Agree
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

Q11
An active partnership between the H&T department and its alumni is critical to the future success of the H&T program
  Strongly Disagree
  Disagree
  Neither Disagree or Agree
  Agree
  Strongly Agree

Q12
I am satisfied with the current involvement the H&T department offers its alumni. Please explain briefly.
  Strongly Disagree
  Disagree
Q13

I expect the H&T department to include or offer its alumni: (check all that apply)

- Notification of alumni events
- Notification of changes occurring within department
- Ability to communicate with fellow alumni
- Provide highly skilled students for potential employment in my organization
- Other (Please specify)

Q14

Would you be willing to assist the H&T program by donating your expertise in any of the following? (check all that apply):

- Fundraising
- Alumni Communications
- Promotion of H&T program in your community
- Offer recommendations to enhance curriculum
- Participate in H&T advisory board
- Other (Please specify)

Q15

I am willing to donate to the H&T department: (check all that apply)

- Money
- Use of my professional facilities
- Professional equipment
- My personal time and effort (when possible)
- Other (Please specify)

Q16

What could the H&T program do to increase your participation in the H&T department?