AN EXAMINATION OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS (CSAOS) PERCEPTIONS OF CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

by

BOBBY R. WOODARD

(Under the Direction of Diane L. Cooper)

ABSTRACT

This study examines chief student affairs officers' (CSAOs) perceptions of professional competencies and support for a voluntary continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system. The purpose was to gauge CSAOs support of the concept of professional competencies and to determine, from the perspective of CSAOs, if the profession of student affairs needs to put forth the effort and resources into such a project. The researcher developed five (5) research questions and answered the research questions utilizing a quantitative research method.

Resources are currently being used by many organizations such as ACPA, NASPA, and ACUI to investigate the functionality of professional competencies and a voluntary continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system. This study presents information that will be useful to these organizations as they proceed in that inquiry into these topics. Findings from this study will become part of the body of knowledge pertaining to professional competencies and a voluntary CPECs system in the profession of student affairs.

Answering the five (5) research questions began by the development of the "*Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies*" questionnaire. This questionnaire contained four sections that asked the participants their perceptions on the following categories: a) chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) professional development practices, b) perceptions toward professional competencies, c) perceptions toward continuing professional development credits (CPECs) system, and d) a demographic section. Collected data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent t-test, and one-way ANOVA.

Results show that chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) from of one of the major student affairs professional organizations support a more structured system for professional development, which includes professional competencies. Also, noted in this research was that CSAOs felt that having a history of practitioners professional development activities would be a benefit during the hiring process. This research also addresses implications and areas for future research to faculty and administrators in the student affairs profession.

INDEX WORDS: Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs), Professional Competencies, Professional Development, Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPECs), Certification System

AN EXAMINATION OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS (CSAO) PERCEPTIONS OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

by

BOBBY R. WOODARD

B.S., East Carolina University, 1998

M.A., University of Central Florida, 2000

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

AN EXAMINATION OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS (CSAO) PERCEPTIONS OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

by

BOBBY R. WOODARD

Major Professor: Diane L. Cooper

Committee: Merrily S. Dunn
Richard H. Mullendore
Rodney D. Bennett

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2009

DEDICATION

I am a very lucky person to have such a big and supportive family no matter what endeavor I chose to embark on in my life, both professionally and personally. As I grew in age so did my luck with the meeting of my beautiful wife, Summer Patrick Woodard. Summer has always supported me and with very few questions. This long journey would not have been possible without the support, encouragement, and love that she has afforded me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"Even the snail made it to the Arc by persevering"
--Rick Warren
The Purpose Driven Life

The above quote was my motto on my journey through the doctoral program. I have never lost sight of the ultimate goal, even though there were bumps along the way. Now that I am at this point, it is hard to know exactly what to say and how to say it in a non-rambling manner. My success is owed to many individuals along the way. I will attempt to mention a few of the individuals in this section but please know that they are too numerous to cite all.

First, I must thank my committee members. Dr. Diane Cooper, Dr. Merrily Dunn, Dr. Dick Mullendore, and Dr. Rodney Bennett were very patient and supportive throughout my journey. They all stuck with me through a longer process than either they or I initially anticipated.

Dr. Diane Cooper served as my major professor and committee chair. I sincerely appreciated her succinct perspective and the short one-on-one meetings. There was no wasting time; simply clear directions that eventually led me to the final product. I was extremely lucky to have a professor so well-respected and published in the profession of student affairs. She was instrumental in the successful completion of my degree.

Dr. Merrily Dunn was just the right amount of touchy-feely that I needed. I didn't need or want a lot of the touchy-feely but she would always ask how my wife was and we

would lose track of time just talking about college sports, especially college football. This personal touch helped keep things in perspective.

Dr. Dick Mullendore always let me pop into his office just to drop by and chat for a few moments. I appreciate his suggestions and his quick responses to my questions or writings. His availability helped me through difficult times during the writing process.

The last committee member was Dr. Rodney Bennett was one the first people I met when I arrived at the University of Georgia. Dr. Bennett offered me a doctoral assistant's position in his office. I have always been treated as a full-time professional and not just another graduate student. Even after I took a full-time position in the division, he remained in contact with me and with my progress. After a setback in my studies occurred in December 2008, Dr. Bennett took time out of his busy schedule to meet with me every Monday morning to help me finish work. I will forever be grateful for his time and effort in assisting me.

Another colleague to whom I owe a great deal is Dr. Jan Barham. Jan was not on my committee but met with me each and every Monday to give me guidance on how to persevere through this program. I cannot give her enough thanks and credit. I will always be appreciative of the extra work and time she put in for me.

Throughout my time in the program, I met friends that I will have for life. My cohort group included Alicia Caudill Colburn, Brandon Frye, Wanda Gibson, Sheri King, Andy Wilson, Jon Coleman, Dianne Timm, Michael Shutt, Rick Gibson, and Jan Lloyd. We began the program together but are completing at various intervals. We go on our separate journeys, we have maintained contained with one another and they all continue to give me support.

Sheri King often visits the UGA – Athens campus, constantly reminding me of my ability to complete the program. Wanda Gibson is my fellow Carolina fan and even though she is currently working in California, we continue to talk about the 'Heels and life. Alicia appears to be the voice of reason in the group, which is somewhat scary. I have always admired her sense of reason and will continue to do so. Andy Wilson, my SACSA presentation buddy, has always amazed me. He not only fought and demolished cancer but he worked full-time and finished this program in three years. I will continue to call him friend and a great colleague. Jan Lloyd, with whom I worked at UCF, became a great friend and trusted colleague when we started the doctoral program together at UGA. I know that I can call on her with any issue or just to get things off my chest. Brandon Frye and I entered the program together and instantly became great friends. We have many things in common and some of the same career goals in the profession of student affairs. I can call on Brandon anytime day and night and know that he will be there. I am honored that we have the opportunity to graduate together. Brandon and I will continue to be great friends long after both of us finish the program.

I began the program as a full-time student and then switched to working full-time. The pursuit of a doctorate part-time is only possible with the support from my colleagues in the Department of Campus Life at the University of Georgia. The director, Willie Banks, and the other professionals in the department afforded me this opportunity by allowing me to take days off in an effort to complete my degree requirements.

During this time I have always greatly treasured my home life. My in-laws, Sammy and Ramona Patrick, always supported me through the doctoral program but also gave me the opportunity to share my life with their wonderful daughter, Summer Leigh

Patrick. My parents, Tom and Faye Woodard have been my role models my whole life. My mom has always supported my endeavors even when she didn't agree with them. That is a true sign that a mom loves her child. My dad (Pops) is the most wonderful person I know and I strive everyday to be half the person that he is in my eyes. Having four siblings, I come from a large family. Each and every day I am very thankful and proud to call them my brothers and sister.

I also would like to thank my wonderful wife, Summer Woodard, but it is very difficult to find the words to express my gratitude. I came home one day and told her that I had been accepted to the doctoral program at UGA, asking her what she thought about moving to Athens, Georgia. She stated if that is what I wanted to do, then we are moving to Georgia. Change is not an easy concept for her. Summer has been asked to sacrifice more than she should have, but she has never complained. I truly know that I "married up" and every day I am thankful that she is in my life. I am looking forward to continuing our life together with no school work tagging along.

Finally, I would like to thank God for everything that he has done in my life and for giving me my two stress relievers, my dogs Jessie and Murrey. Who knew that these animals would have such effect on reducing my stress level as they did and I love coming home to spend time with them. God allows me to wake up every morning and to experience His greatness and creation. I am a very lucky person and this journey, along with the people with whom I have experienced it, have made me a better person, both professionally and personally. I would just like to say thank you to everyone.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

After the Civil War, colleges in the United States adapted a more holistic approach for working with students, opening the door for the field of student affairs to emerge (Winston, Creamer, & Miller, 2001; Young, 1996). The first noted student affairs position, "Dean of Men", was established in 1870 at Harvard University (Appleton, Briggs, Rhatigan, 1978). From this original position over 117 years ago, student affairs has evolved into a pivotal part of the mission of every higher education institution. The previous statement is solidified by the evidence that all programs, services, and policies at any given institution are developed to enhance the behavioral and social aspects of education for all students (Sandeen, 1991). One of the functions, if not the primary function, of student affairs practitioners is to aid every student in their holistic development.

To illustrate this point and operationalize the concept of a holistic individual, a group of higher education leaders composed *The Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV) in 1937, establishing a foundation for the values and functions of student affairs. The 1937 version of the *Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV) was revised in 1949 to more clearly outline the roles and responsibilities of student affairs work. Through the years, other documents have emerged to continue the process of role clarification and professional credibility. In 1987 the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education published *A Perspective on Student Affairs*, further clarifying the roles of

student affairs professionals (NASPA, 1989), and in 1996, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) published the *Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs (SLI)*, later endorsed by the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, which included a commitment to the achievement of the institution's central purpose which is to promote student learning and personal development.

The profession of student affairs is composed of functional units, including student activities, recreational sports, university housing, university health centers, Greek life, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) resources centers, career services, financial aid, disability resource centers, judicial programs, multicultural student programs and leadership and service centers that cross interdisciplinary lines. It is in fact this overlap of services and skills that has added to a clear struggle for the profession of student affairs identity (Carpenter, 2003). The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs was founded in 1979 in part to provide the functional areas within student affairs consistency related to the quality of the programs and services each offers. The name of the organization was changed in 1992 to the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) and currently has 36 member organizations. The Council's main objective is to develop standards to help guide student affairs practitioners, and those in other, relates functional areas in their daily work (CAS, 2006).

Practitioners in student affairs range from a specialist in a functional area to a generalist who oversees different functional units within a department or division. With different areas and positions in the profession, Sandeen (1991) stated that, "it is the Chief

Student Affairs Officers' (CSAO) major responsibility to see that everything that occurs within the student affairs division is in support of the goals of having specialists and generalists in their functional area" (p.6).

Although there are different positions in a division of student affairs, one person, the senior student affairs officer (SSAO) or chief student affairs officer (CSAO), is ultimately responsible to the university's senior administration, stakeholders, general public, and students (Cooper & Saunders, 2000). For the purpose of this study, the researcher will use the title of chief student affairs officer (CSAO) to connote the individuals who are the first line of administration within the student affairs unit on a campus. The CSAO office may provide oversight to any of the following areas; housing, financial aid, student activities, recreational sports, minority services and programs, health services, student judicial affairs, student unions, and even campus security and transit systems, just to mention a few. In this context, the CSAO must assume different roles to include: manager, mediator, and educator to students and student affairs practitioners alike (Sandeen, 1991).

Establishing and communicating clearly defined objectives and goals are a must for the chief student affairs officer. This level of communicating is key so that employees in the division have clear expectations. One of the first priorities for a CSAO is to establish personnel practices that allow all professional and student staff members to complete their task(s) while providing opportunities for professional advancement (Sandeen, 1991).

As the role of the chief student affairs officer evolves, and as the variation in functional areas change, all practitioners must make a concerted effort to stay abreast of

changes in the field. Continuous learning through professional organizations aids the process and encourages professional development while learning, doing, and contributing (Carpenter, 2001). Carpenter stated that "the point of being a professional is to bring preparation and experience, guided by continual learning, into play in a complex way" (p. 582). The importance of continuing professional development is a responsibility of all practitioners whether they are entry-level professionals, preparation program faculty, or chief student affairs officers.

Establishing professional development programs for student affairs professionals constitutes an investment in enhancing and developing skills for personnel in order to better meet an organization's goals (Grace-Odeleye, 1998). McDade and Lewis (1994) noted that with the help of professional development, student affairs practitioners are viewed as an integral part of the institution's mission. By intentionally considering the impact of the completion of professional development activities in student affairs, both students and institutions will benefit. Winston, Creamer, & Miller (2001), stated that the best administrators in student affairs continuously strive to create a learning atmosphere that represents seamless opportunities for student learning by enhancing their own skill sets.

The field of student affairs must recognize the barriers in attracting and retaining high-quality professionals in the field and, at the same time, understand that not all those working as student affairs practitioners emerge from a graduate preparation program in student affairs, higher education, or counseling. In addition, student affairs practitioners must continue to alter, evolve, and transform their roles and functions to ensure stronger, more effective professional practices in the field.

Statement of the Problem

The field of student affairs has been referred to as an emerging profession in literature by Winston, Creamer, & Miller (2001). The reasoning behind the label 'emerging' is the belief, by some, that there is no clearly defined knowledge base and skills requirement for a professional working in student affairs. Recognized professions like medicine and law have well defined requirements for entrance into the field and procedures in place for members to retain "good status." When an individual has obtained a professional role, regardless of the field, a concurrent expectation for professional performance exists.

Practitioners in student affairs have been debating, for more than 15 years, the need for "some" type of certification process for the profession (Blimling, 2004). There are two student affairs' overarching organizations, the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), which have both established and funded committees to examine the pros and cons of a certification process for the field. The Professional Standards Division of NASPA and the ACPA Task Force on Certification have listed economic resistance, lack of consensus of what professional development is needed, and the process of obtaining the professional development credits as issues that have a major impact on the idea of a certification process for the student affairs field (Janosik, 2002; ACPA, 2006).

In July 2007, a committee formed by ACPA released a document on professional competencies titled *Professional Competencies: A Report of the Steering Committee on Professional Competencies*. This report recommended eight competency areas; a) advising and helping, b) ethics, c) leadership & administration/management, d) student

learning and development, e) assessment, evaluation, and research, f) legal foundations, g) pluralism and inclusion, and h) teaching for the profession of student affairs (ACPA, 2007). Even though this group recommended these competencies, to date there is no agreement across the profession on a set of competencies required for professional practice. The lack of endorsed competencies permits individuals to enter student affairs with no historical or theoretical knowledge of what is needed to be a successful student affairs practitioner and no established internal training model that is consistent across the board. While institutions employ practitioners without an educational background in student affairs who bring different perspectives to the field, it is critical that they have a familiarity with core values and teachings of student affairs. Immersion in the student affairs culture and participation in intentional professional development are means to accomplishing this goal (ACPA, 2006).

Practitioners with no formal student affairs training are not the only professionals who need to concentrate on intentional professional development. Individuals with a graduate education in student affairs also need to continue making professional development a priority (Carpenter, 2003). Currently there is no formal structure in the field for the maintenance of professional competencies for a student affairs practitioner. Completing a student affairs professional preparation program is not, in and of itself, enough to sustain practitioners throughout their careers. A main professional objective being the importance of intentional, lifelong learning (ACPA, 2006), Carpenter (1991) stated that good professional practice does not happen by accident and it takes effort and planning. As an emerging profession, student affairs will evolve when its practitioners

have clearly defined expectations and standards to help guide their professional development throughout their careers (Miller & Sandeen, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) perceptions and support of the topics of professional competencies and continual professional education credits (CPECs). Secondly, this study will aid in if the profession of student affairs needs to invest the time and effort in the development of professional competencies and the continual professional education credits (CPECs) system. Finally, this study will provide the profession with a case to continue or not continue with the idea of professional competencies and a voluntary certification system.

Research Questions

The research questions (RQ) for this study are:

RQ1: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) endorse an establishment of professional competencies in student affairs?

RQ2: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) believe that they would sanction hiring only new professionals from graduate preparation programs in student affairs, higher education, counseling or related program?

RQ3: Will Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO) support the participation of practitioners in professional competencies and a voluntary certification system?

RQ4: What is Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) perceptions of the functionally of participation in continuing professional development credits (CPECs) system?

RQ5: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) have the perception of marginalization on their campuses as a result of the lack of a voluntary certification system in the profession of student affairs?

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study – a list of terms have been defined by the researcher.

Profession

Profession is defined as a specific kind of work, which requires specialized knowledge and skills based on service motivation and extended preparation in the particular area of work (Brint, 1993). A profession must also include certain qualities such as: practitioners who share goals, professional communities to monitor appropriate and inappropriate behaviors of each practitioner, and finally accepted practices to regenerate professionals with continuing education (Carpenter, 2003). Carpenter (1991) suggested that all professions rely on their members to demonstrate good professionalism and shared goals in their daily activities and "the existence of a professional community that supports members and stakes out boundaries and sanctions and attention to socialization and regeneration" (Carpenter & Stimpson, 2007, p. 268). The term profession and field may be used interchangeably for the purpose of this study.

Professional

A professional is defined as someone who is working in the field and who displays "a high degree of independent judgment, based on a collective, learned body of

ideas, perspectives, information, norms, and habits of professional knowing" (p. 3). Therefore, student affairs professionals are defined as competent and confident individuals who exercise autonomous judgment with integrity in their daily practices. These professionals also demonstrate commitment to their own continued development with the profession (Baskett & Marsick, 1992). The term professional and practitioner may be used interchangeably for the purpose of this study.

Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO)

The Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) is defined as the highest ranking student affairs professional at an institution. The two most common titles that the CSAO possess are the Vice President of Student Affairs or the Dean of Students (Affairs). The CSAO is ultimately responsible for the effective management of the student affairs division at an institution of higher education (Mech, 1997). A key factor to remember is that the CSAOs chief responsibility is to be the voice of the students and to represent the students' point of view, as well as educate the students (Sandeen, 1991).

Professional Development

For the purpose for this study, the researcher will use the following definitions for professional development. Winston and Creamer (1997) defined professional development as an intentional effort to aid practitioners in improving their effectiveness and leading to improved organizational success. Professional development has a three-fold effect on the field of student affairs. First, professional development improves practitioners personally, so they can in turn apply those skills acquired to any aspect of their lives. The second effect is that practitioners, in theory, will become more productive professionals through the skills that they obtain in the professional

development activities. Finally, professional development aids to improve the organization's effectiveness (Winston & Creamer, 1997). Professional development has a lasting effect on the individual practitioners as well as the institution in which they are employed.

Significance of Study

This study was significant because it aided in determining if the profession, as seen through the eyes of CSAOs, should create a standard of practice. The examination of the perceived acceptance of, or resistance to, a set of professional competencies and a certification system by CSAOs will lead to the development of further research that deepen the understanding of how practitioners should proceed in their roles of contributing to their own professional development. Winston, Creamer, and Miller (2001) stated, "Every position in student affairs should make either a direct or indirect contribution to student learning" (p. 33).

All practitioners should have a baseline of knowledge in order to contribute to student learning (Winston & Creamer, 1997). The role of an educator, leader, and manager is enhanced by practitioners continuing to learn and exploring new ways to better assist them in their positions. Student affairs is widely recognized for its vital contributions to higher education, which results in making strides in achieving professional status (Winston, Creamer, & Miller, 2001).

Limitations of Study

This study was limited by a) self-reported data; b) rolling random sampling; c) the locally developed instrument (LDI); and d) no agree upon set of competencies or standards in the field. The first limitation of this study was the use of self-reported data

that may prove to be unreliable (Huck, 2000). In addition, this study used the method of a rolling random sampling which is, the basic sampling technique where a select group of subjects are drawn from a larger group and if an acceptable response rate is not achieved then more subjects are surveyed. All sample members of the larger group were chosen by chance. Every possible sample of a given size had the same chance of selection (Huck, 2000). This limitation was that it did not capture all of the CSAOs across the country but it was a representative of a percentage of CSAOs.

The locally developed instrument (LDI) was also a limitation since the survey was developed by the researcher for the purpose of this study. This limitation is discussed further in chapter three. Another limitation to this study was that there is no agreed upon measure of certification or professional competencies in the field of student affairs and that each CSAO may have a different interpretation of these concepts.

Chapter Summary

The proposal of a voluntary certification and professional competencies process in student affairs is a complex topic. While student affairs has made enormous strides in achieving professional status with its contributions to higher education, further research is still needed for the growth of the profession and its practitioners (Winston, Creamer, & Miller, 2001). This study made significant contributions to the understanding of the acceptance and endorsement of an agreed upon professional competencies and a voluntary certification system by Chief Student Affairs Officers. The findings of this study, with support of the CSAO will give practitioners a guide to begin to intentionally examine their practices as a professional in student affairs and to better benefit the students that they work with on a daily basis.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Student Affairs

The first evidence of a student affairs professional role was incorporated into faculty duties through the philosophy *in loco parentis*, meaning "in the place or role of a parent" (Conte, 2000). This chapter will discuss the history and development of student affairs, the history of the chief student affairs officer (CSAO) including responsibilities, professional competencies, and professional development. This chapter will also review the certification process for professional counselors.

The Early Years: 1636-1850

The formation of the colonial colleges, only available to a limited group of wealthy, white men, aided in the development of student affairs by providing dormitories and dining halls. The dormitories provided common areas for the interaction between faculty and students, and the faculty actually lived in the dormitories with the students. This environment allowed faculty and students to discuss not only scholarly material, but also personal life experiences. In addition to meeting in classrooms and the dormitories, faculty and students also ate every meal together in the dining halls. The constant interactions provided an opportunity for the faculty to offer close supervision and parental guidance to the students (Rudolph, 1965).

The faculty believed supervision was necessary because they viewed students as immature adolescents who needed constant attention (Leonard, 1956) thus justifying the

philosophy and practice of *in loco parentis*. *In loco parentis* enabled the faculty to enforce rules and regulations for the students as they saw fit (Conte, 2000). This authoritarian approach required the faculty to take charge of enforcing all disciplinary measures at the institution. *In loco parentis* remained in existence, in one form or another, until the 1960s (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

To help forestall potential disciplinary issues, extracurricular activities were integrated to accompany the highly structured activities of the classroom. Students themselves were instrumental in forming extracurricular activities to balance out the strict classroom curriculum. The benefit for the faculty and higher education as a whole was that such activities aided in the holistic development of the student (Geiger, 2000).

This holistic approach helped students develop intellectually, socially, and physically. While students enhanced their intellectual abilities in the classroom, they also improved their physical and social capacities through specific extracurricular activities such as intramurals. The most popular extracurricular activities during the colonial college era were debate clubs and literary societies (Geiger, 2000).

During the 1700s and 1800s student rebellions became more prevalent because of student displeasure with the way they were treated in areas from course work, to dining hall food to the forms of discipline handed down to those who violated the rules. Jackson (2000) stated that after the 1840s most of the upheaval and student rebellions became less combative. As colleges and universities continued to grow, students saw these institutions as a means of social and economic mobility. This period began an era of higher education for the common man (Leonard, 1956).

Diversification: 1850-1900

From 1850 to 1900, higher education was shifting its mission from primarily developing students to forming a nation of educated citizens. Factors that aided in this shift were the increase in coeducation, the emergence of women's colleges and changing faculty roles (Boyer, 1990b; Rudolph, 1965). The Morrill Act of 1862, which created land grant colleges, was the most notable change in higher education during this period. The Morrill Act created grants of federal land to U.S. states for the purpose of creating public colleges that would provide access in admitting students to study agricultural and mechanical engineering (James, 1910).

African-Americans were also given the opportunity for higher education after the Civil War and Emancipation from slavery. Black colleges were founded in Atlanta, Nashville, and Washington, D.C., between 1865 and 1867. Twenty-eight years after the first Morrill Act of 1862, in 1890, the second version of the Morrill Act was instituted by the federal government and also led to the creation of seventeen more Historical Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) (Perkin, 1997). The purpose of the 1890 Morrill Act was to fund the establishment of Black colleges in select states (Rudolph, 1965). While the Morrill Act of 1890 afforded opportunities for African-Americans to gain access to higher education the Act also promoted and endorsed segregation. Never the less, both the Morrill Acts, 1862 and 1890, had a significant role in increasing access to higher education for all people regardless of ethnicity or gender, and this period marked an increase both in the participation of African-Americans in higher education and dramatic growth in the number of women in higher education (Geiger, 2000; Nidiffer, 2001). As

a result of the increase in diversity of the student population in higher education, the field of student affairs needed to also diversify its practitioner base (Geiger, 2000).

Continuing enrollment in the late 1800s led to dormitories being at capacity as students were forced to search for other on- and off-campus options for housing. The overcrowding resulted in many students moving off campus, shifting the environment from what had been the norm in the colonial period. In the colonial college environment faculty had almost complete control over the students; however, shifts in circumstances during the late 1800s and early 1900s created a context in which good conduct was expected rather than imposed (Leonard, 1956).

Outside influences also played a role in the changing philosophy of higher education. During this period, the American higher education system was influenced by the German university system, and this had an impact on student life. Johns Hopkins University was modeled after the German system as it related to graduate education and opened the first school in October 1876. The German university system influence was most notable in the formation of gymnasiums, athletic activities, and graduate education (Leonard, 1956; Rudolph, 1965). One of the first European influenced athletic events was a soccer meeting between Rutgers and Princeton in 1869 (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). This emphasis on athletic activities aided in the development of the whole person by meeting the physical, social, and mental needs of the students. This German idea of how students in higher education should be managed bled into the American system and caused an about-face in how American faculty dealt with students and collegiate life. More and more faculty members were traveling overseas to study how their counterparts

were teaching and influencing students (Crowley & Williams, 1991). As a result, faculty lessened their involvement in residence halls and student discipline.

This decline of involvement in student life by the faculty led the way for the creation of the first official student affairs position. In 1870, Harvard University appointed Professor Ephraim Gurney as the Dean of Men, marking the first position of its kind in American higher education (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978). Although he continued his teaching, Professor Gurney's main responsibility was to be the disciplinarian for the institution, relieving the president of this duty (Stewart, 1985). In 1891 the role of the Dean of Men was expanded from a disciplinarian role to include personal counseling for the students at Harvard. Following Harvard, the University of Illinois created its first Dean of Men position in 1901. Thomas Arkle Clark, the University's first Dean of Men, said of his responsibilities, "I relieved the President of some very unpleasant duties" (Williamson, 1961, p. 6). The Dean of Men position had a great impact on the changing role of American higher education from the colonial college days of authoritarian faculty to a more open minded faculty, which believed in a curriculum that offered elective courses for the students. In the early 19th century the position of Deans of Women began to emerge. Oberlin College, in 1833, established the first official position as in the form of a principal (Herdlein, 2004). Some of the most significant practices of student affairs administration that currently exist were the result of the work of the deans of women (Tuttle, 2004). Although for those working as Deans of Men were not in favor of graduate education, Deans of Women encouraged graduate study and championed the idea. One of the major contributions of Deans of Women was the creation of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae which formed in the 1880's and

was a precursor to NASPA (Schwartz, 2001). These early Deans of Students positions gave the field of student affairs more validity (Sandeen, 2004).

Emergence of the Profession: 1900-1945

This period of higher education saw greater recognition of student responsibility. As part of this trend, many universities saw the formation of student organizations such as student government associations and student councils. Brubacher and Rudy (1976) noted that "in the years following 1918, the student affairs movement was becoming self-conscious, confident, and widely influential" (p. 336). The modern student affairs field, as recognized today, began to progress following World War I (Rentz, 1994; Williamson, 1961). By 1925, a large number of colleges and universities were providing student health services to meet the physical and psychological needs of students, which led to the creation of more student affairs positions (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). Because of the increase in student affairs positions came the need for a wider variety of titles, including dean of students, social director, director of personnel and others (Williamson, 1961). With so many new student affairs positions and with the expansion of services offered by colleges and universities, administrators saw the need to create a formal preparation process to train individuals for these roles.

The first formal educational preparation program for student affairs practitioners was developed at Columbia University's Teachers College in 1914, which awarded a Master of Arts degree for an "Advisor of Women." This degree concentrated on the vocational guidance of students (Bashaw, 1992; Gilroy, 1987; Teachers College, 1914**).** Fifteen years later, in 1929, the first doctorate in the field was awarded to Esther Lloyd-Jones. It was not until 1932 that men were allowed to pursue degrees in student affairs

preparation areas (Gilroy, 1987). As of 2007 the *Directory of Graduate Preparation Programs in College Student Personnel*, stated that there were 146 master's and doctoral degree programs in student affairs (American College Personnel Association, 2007). This allows professionals to specialize their education in student affairs, which led professional associations to establish best practices for graduate education.

Professional associations thereby provided men, women, whites and people of color an opportunity to come together to discuss some of the challenges they faced on their home campuses. People of color and women were not always widely accepted at these meetings but when these practitioners were afforded the opportunity to attend it gave them a chance to interact with other practitioners of minority status (Bashaw, 1992; Sturdevant & Hayes, 1930). There have been many different student affairs professional organizations throughout the history of higher education. Women practitioners in 1916, mainly from the Northeast and Midwest, formed the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW) focused on the needs of women in higher education (Bashaw, 1992). Although the NAWE had a strong history, the membership begin to decline at a rapid rate and the board decided to dissolve the association in 2000 (Gagone, 1999; Nuss, 2000).

Male professionals in higher education developed the Conference of Deans and Advisors of Men at the University of Wisconsin in January 1919. After a couple of name changes and failed attempts to solidify the association, its leaders changed its name to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) in 1951. To ensure that NASPA did not fail the existing members, the board began to recruit new professionals in the field of student affairs (Rhatigan, 2001) and also began to allow

women to become involved in the association. By increasing the diversity of its member base NASPA increased the strength of the association.

Mary Ethel Ball, the acting dean of students at the University of Colorado, served as an "institutional representative" for NASPA in 1958, making her the first woman to hold a position within the organization. Women were not able to hold a position of leadership in NASPA until 1965 -1975. This period of change included the establishment of the women's network in 1971, which paved the way for Alice Manicur of Frostburg State University to become the first female president of NASPA. Manicur's new position in NASPA was a huge step for not only the association but also for women in the student affairs field more broadly. This was a huge accomplishment because it broke through the 'glass ceiling' for women and their leadership in major associations (Rhatigan, 2001).

The National Association of Appointment Secretaries (NAAS) was founded in1924, and in 1931 changed its name to the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). ACPA is one of the two overarching national student affairs associations today, with the other national association of NASPA (Bloland, 1983; Johnson, 1985). In 1952, ACPA helped form the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) and the associations remained affiliated with one another until 1992, when ACPA decided to become independent at the request of its members (Nuss, 2000).

While this period in student affairs history spawned the two overarching organizations, it also helped to develop more specialized national organizations. In 1914, the Association of College and University Unions, which was created mainly by students, formed to help student union/center professionals become better educated and provide a higher level of service to their constituents. It was not until 1929 that professional

members outnumbered student members. The association changed its name in 1968 to the Association of College Unions International (ACUI), to better represent the organization's mission statement and its member institutions outside of the United States (www.acui.org, 2008).

All of these organizations and associations had a major impact on the formation of the student affairs field, but one major piece of literature stabilized the field: the *Student Personnel Point of View (SPPV)* of 1937. The *Student Personnel Point of View* was a pivotal report for the profession and the practitioners who had devoted their life to this field. This report was the result of a committee formed by the American Council on Education (ACE) to study student personnel practices in higher education (American Council on Education, 1994a). The committee understood and recognized the history that led to the formation of student affairs and the activities that the practitioners in the field thought were essential to the college experience. In its final report, the committee emphasized the importance of the individual student and argued that student services units must be structured in a way that supports the unique mission of each college or university. The report also identified expectations of effective student personnel programs by developing a list of 23 essential functions of these programs (American Council of Education, 1937).

The *Student Personnel Point of View* (1949) revised the original report of 1937. The 1949 edition concentrated on the development of the whole student, which includes the physical, social, emotional, and spiritual aspects of the student. In addition, the report outlined goals for student growth and identified fundamental elements for preparation programs and administrative governance (American Council of Education, 1949, 1994b).

This version was more in depth and gave a glimpse into the philosophical assumptions that underlie student affairs today.

Expansion: 1945-1985

During the period of expansion the student affairs profession was influenced by a combination of factors, including federal support, legal challenges, philosophical changes, the emergence of student development theory and research and the implementation of professional standards.

The federal government became involved in student affairs as a result of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act, Truman Commission Report and reports such as the Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act was passed in 1944 and is more commonly known as the G.I. Bill (The Library of Congress, 2008). This act gave access and funding to higher education for men and women who had served in the armed forces after World War II. More and more individuals began to take advantage of this opportunity, leading to a dramatic increase in higher education enrollment from the late 1950s through the 1970s (Cowley & Williams, 1991). Today the G.I. Bill remains a major recruiting tool of the U.S. Armed Forces (United States Army, 2008).

Another major impact to higher education came in 1947 with the Truman Commission Report. The Truman Commission Report, titled *Higher Education for American Democracy*, was an investigation into how higher education could be accessible to even more individuals than the G.I. Bill included. The report's authors developed specific ideas to expand access to higher education, including increased financial aid and more well-rounded courses that were inclusive not only of the U.S. but

also of the rest of the world. Debatably, the most significant contribution was the development of a community college system (Cowley & Williams, 1991). The community college concept provided greater access to higher education in locations where major colleges and universities were absent. This concept also met the needs of individuals who needed or wanted to continue working full time while attending college (American Association of Community Colleges, 2008).

Following the Truman Commission Report in 1947, the federal government next became involved in higher education through the establishment of Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950. This act established funds for housing construction on college campuses. The construction of more housing and the addition of high-rise dormitories gave colleges and universities a way to feed and house large numbers of students. This housing expansion influenced the environment in which students lived and studied and aided in the approach to curricular and extracurricular activities by giving the opportunity for participation, which in turn helped to develop the whole student (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 was just one of the increases in federal involvement in higher education.

The increase in federal involvement during the 1960s had a major impact on the student affairs profession and on the policies practitioners had been utilizing. A few examples of the far-reaching legislation passed during the 1960s include the Vocational Education Act, the Health Professions Act, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Yodof et al., 2002). The most notable pieces of legislation during the expansion era were Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which required all colleges and universities receiving federal

funding to provide equal access for all persons attending their institutions. Title IX and Section 504 also created a need for new positions and offices to assist in meeting these federal requirements. This led to new positions in disability services, financial aid, and an expansion in the housing practitioner's responsibilities. As new positions were created and new personnel hired to meet these needs, the student populations served by these positions were rapidly increasing (Yodof et al., 2002).

University life in the 1960s was characterized by student activism, the sexual revolution, years of civil rights, and the downfall of in loco parentis (Nuss, 2000). This environment reflected what the nation as a whole was experiencing during this time. Some of the key events of the 1960s were the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., the Vietnam War, the Cuban Missile Crisis, Apollo 11 landing on the moon, the end of desegregation at the University of Alabama and other formerly all-white institutions, and the Civil Rights Movement (National Museum of American History, 2008).

All of these events changed the way students interacted with institutions of higher education and how the faculty and staff treated the students. One major change in the relationship between students and the administration at higher education institutions was influenced by the 1961 case of *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education*. This case examined the need for procedures of due process for students at a state-supported institution. The Supreme Court ruled that no student may be expelled without proper procedures, including a hearing to establish whether the student was in fact in violation of university policy (Library of Congress, 2008). In reference to the *Dixon* decision, Bickel and Lake (1994) noted that "persons above the age of eighteen are legally adults and that

students at public colleges do not relinquish their fundamental Constitutional rights by accepting student status at an institution" (p.274). These decisions led to a more participatory role of the student affairs practitioner in judicial matter, which in turn led to the creation of student judicial services (Geiger, 2000).

Another major event during this period was the protesting of the Vietnam War on campuses across the nation, many resulting in injuries and even death. Kent State is the most famous and deadly of all of these protests. To that end, President Nixon announced the invasion of Cambodia on April 30, 1970. Many students at Kent State began to rally on the grounds to protest the war. After three days of continuous altercations between the Ohio National Guard and the students of Kent State, the unimaginable occurred. In a 13-second time period, 67 shots were fired, leaving four students dead and nine others injured (www.may4.org). As a result of this tragic event the public put more pressure to control the campus environment on higher education and student affairs professionals were among those responsible for dealing with the public outcry. Because of this, conflict resolution and mediation skills became mandatory skill development for all student affairs practitioners.

Incidents such as the Kent State tragedy, in conjunction with the elimination of *in loco parentis,* changed the duties of student affairs professionals and altered their relationship with students. The student affairs practitioner's role moved more toward education and away from disciplinary duties (Garland & Grace, 1993). One of the most important changes in student responsibility came out of the *Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms* in 1967-- information released *before* the 1970 event at Kent State University. In March 1989 a committee was convened in Washington, D.C. through

Commission I (Administrative Leadership) of ACPA. This committee examined the original Joint Statement based on current concerns on college campuses. Chair, Richard Mullendore, suggested that this committee contact the original organizations to identify if they were interested in reaffirming or amending the document. The organizations were composed of members of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the United States National Student Association (USNSA), the American Association of Colleges (AAC), NASPA, and NAWDAC (Bryan & Mullendore 1992; Garland & Grace, 1993). During the reaffirmation of the Joint Statement three additional associations asked to join the other committees. These organizations were: the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA), American Association of University Administrators (AAUA), and Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA). The *Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms* outlined minimal standards of academic freedom for students and is still in existence today (Bryan & Mullendore, 1992).

In 1992, on the 25th anniversary of this document, professionals from the same organizations met again in Washington, D.C. to evaluate whether the document needed to be updated or whether it was still relevant for contemporary higher education. After a three-day session, the committee released a statement saying that the document remained relevant and continued to provide appropriate principles for institutions of higher education. The committee made changes to the document only where changes in the law had occurred since 1967. As the relationships of students and administrators begin to change, the field itself began to be referred to as “student affairs” or “student development” rather than the outdated “student personnel” (Gehring, 2000).

Boyer (1987) noted that during the expansion time period, higher education administrators thought that the distance between academic and extracurricular experiences began to widen due to the increased role of student affairs practitioners. The discussion about the theoretical base of student affairs practices and higher education became a hot topic. Scholars debated on different "schools of thought" and questioned whether the development of the whole student was a necessity or a good use of resources. In 1975, in the midst of this debate, the Council of Student Personnel Associations (COSPA) published a report entitled, *Student Development Services in Postsecondary Education* (Rentz, 1994). This document stated that the "purpose of student development services in postsecondary education was to provide affective and cognitive expertise in the processes involved in education" (COSPA, 1975, p. 429). The report also concluded that student affairs was responsible for the administration, instruction, and consultation of student development theory.

In 1972, Robert Brown authored *Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy*. Brown wrote that student affairs professionals must have an awareness of the "total environment of the student – not just where he lives or what organization he belonged to" (Brown, 1972, p. 38). Brown emphasized that student affairs practitioners and faculty need to work together and that student development should take place not only outside but also inside the classroom (Brown, 1972). The debate over student development theory was not exclusive to the expansion period of student affairs history. Even today, scholars in the field continue to debate the utility of the concept of student development theory.

Bloland, Stamatakos, and Rogers (1994) questioned the concept that student development has on the student affairs profession. These authors argued that the student affairs profession would be better served by sticking to the *Student Personnel Point of View* philosophy of higher education, which "is not student development per se but the development of the whole person including, of course, intellectual ability and educational achievement" (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994, p. 112). Two recognized scholars in the field, Strange (1994) and Upcraft (1994) joined the debate, noting that student development theory is difficult to translate into professional practice. Many if not all college student affairs preparation programs teach student development theory, and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) lists it as one of the professional standards for preparation programs.

Emergence of Professional Standards

Professional standards were not well established for the student affairs field until 1979. Members of the field wanted a measuring stick of best practices that would solidify the profession's place as an essential part of higher education (Mable, 1991; Miller, 1991). Mable (1991) noted that the meeting of student affairs professional organizations in 1979 was to "consider the desirability and feasibility of establishing professional standards and accreditation programs in student affairs" (p. 11). This meeting of student affairs organizations led to the formation of the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). Today CAS has 36 member organizations and promulgates standards for more than 30 functional areas (CAS, 2009). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education will be discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

The Contemporary Campus: 1985 to Present

This most recent time period in student affairs history is sometimes referred to as the status quo, but in reality the 1980s were a time in which state legislators began to exert more influence in the higher education sector (Kerr, 1990; Callan, 1993). During the 1990s five new concerns were at the top of everyone's agenda: enrollment demands, rising college costs, competition for public funds, concerns about quality, and the overall view that higher education is failing to address the nation's most pressing problems. With all of the debate over and questioning of what higher education actually provides to students and the general population, the emphasis both inside and outside the classroom moved more toward service learning and experimental learning (Edgerton, 1997).

The writing of Levine and Cureton (1998) also indicates that during this time period more students of both traditional and non-traditional age were entering higher education with psychological and emotional problems. As a result of more and more students entering with these issues, the counseling, mental health, disability services, and other support services units experienced an increase in workload and a pressing need for more resources. The issues that arose in the 1980s and 90s influenced a variety of developments prevalent in student affairs today. The most notable developments are increased diversity, shifts in public policy, concerns about campus climate, increased attention to the needs of graduate students, the role of student affairs in facilitating student learning, and internationalization. Perhaps most important for student affairs, was the critique of the field that emerged during this time (Nuss, 2003).

During the 1980s and 1990s the student population became more diverse than at any other time in American higher education history, although the overall enrollment

numbers did not change significantly (Altbach, 1993; Baxter Magolda & Terenzini, 1999). Certain groups began to emerge more rapidly than others: African-Americans, Hispanic, gay, lesbian, transgender, and Native American. Faculty and student affairs professionals had to adapt their practices to aid these students in their success in higher education (Altbach, 1993).

Along with the changing demographics of the student population, a shift in public policy affecting higher education also emerged. The public and consumers of colleges and universities wanted to know more about the "ivy towers" of higher education. Due to the increased pressure to know more about what happens on campuses of higher learning, state and federal legislators began to enact laws to provide more and equal access to information.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the 1990 Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, and the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 represent just a few of these shifts in public policy (Blimling & Whitt, 1999). The approval of these acts and amendments led to a decrease in the privacy and confidentiality of student discipline records, which could result in the reduction or elimination of financial assistance to a student who has violated a rule or committed a crime. These changes in public policy also affected how states viewed access to their public institutions: Texas, California, and Florida, for example, all confronted affirmative action and it's utility at their respective campuses (Kolling, 1998).

These shifts in public policy altered the relationship between students and their institution, which in turn modified campus climates. Universities during this time began to allow students more freedom in relation to their conduct and social matters. While

students enjoyed this freedom, public entities continued to debate the responsibility of college campuses for managing student conduct. Alcohol and drug use were on the rise, and with the highly publicized drug usage and death of University of Maryland/Boston Celtics basketball star Len Bias in 1986, the public called for reining in students' behavior and instituting stronger expectations of acceptable conduct (Boyer, 1990a, 1993).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching released a report in 1990 entitled *Campus Life: In Search of Community*. This guide was aimed at administrators in hopes it would assist them in helping students understand their own lives in the context of the larger world (Boyer, 1993). After the report was issued, campus administrators received more attention about how they handle and manage substance abuse, race relations, and other areas of concern of campus (Blimling & Whitt, 1999).

Although much attention to campus climate focused on the undergraduate experience, higher education administrators were also responsible for the well-being of graduate and professional students. Student affairs programs, policies and activities concentrated on undergraduate and traditional students are not always easily applied to the issues facing graduate and professional students. For example, the role of graduate assistants and whether they should be treated primarily as employees or students is a specific concern that must be considered. Student affairs professionals are charged with ensuring the quality of students' out-of-class experience, and they must remember that graduate and professional students have a need to increase their quality of life while at the institution; they are not just cheap labor (Baxter Magolda & Terenzini, 1999).

Student affairs practitioners were once seen as professionals whose main responsibility was to support the academic mission of the institution. Today, the role of the student affairs professional has evolved into one with greater responsibility for the development of the whole student. Developing the whole student requires that the institution and student affairs professionals provide an enhanced quality of education and student learning. Student affairs practitioners enhance the learning environment by providing out-of-class learning that supports in-class education. Student affairs and academic affairs professionals work in partnership to create an overall educational experience for an increasingly diverse population (Nuss, 2003).

Creating an enhanced educational experience at an institution with different divisions competing for resources can be challenging. Boyer (1987) relayed that, "conflicting priorities and competing interests could diminish the intellectual and social quality of the undergraduate experience" (p. 2). In 1990, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching advocated more research and recommendations about the student experience in light of concerns about "an unhealthy separation between in-class and out-of-class activities" (p. 2). Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, and associates were similarly focused on these two priorities, but more optimistic about their relationship, when they observed in 1991, "institutional factors and conditions work together in different colleges and universities to promote learning and personal development through out-of-class learning experiences" (p. 4). Also in 1991, Pascarella and Terenzini launched a summary report of existing research on the effects of higher education on individual students, entitled, *How College Affects Students*. Pascarella and Terenzini's report had an impact on how practitioners approached student learning and the out-of-class experience.

Not only were individuals researching and writing about student learning, but major professional associations also began to conduct their own research on the topic. Associations such as NASPA, ACPA, and AAHE (American Association of Higher Education) began projects to encourage discussion about how practitioners could create environments that fostered student learning and development (American College Personnel Association, 1994). These activities by major associations aided practitioners, students, and institutions in knowing what to expect from each other in creating an enhanced learning experience (Kuh, Lyons, Miller, & Trow, 1995). In 1997 ACPA and NASPA published the *Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs*, which stated that, "only when everyone on campus—particularly academic and student affairs staff—share the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it" (p. 1). This is not a new concept for practitioners in student affairs or higher education in general. The Joint Task Force in *Powerful Partnership* (1998) stated that all practitioners in higher education should think of themselves as teachers, learners, and stewards of collaboration throughout the institution. Service learning and community service programs are two clear examples of activities in which student affairs professionals can actively contribute to student learning.

Even national associations not normally associated with student affairs began issuing reports about student learning and the importance of academic and student affairs collaboration. One of the more prominent of these associations was the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). The AAC&U developed programs involving collaborative leadership for institutional effectiveness (AAC&U, 2008). According to the Kellogg Commission in 1997, the National Association of State

University and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) issued a statement encouraging more consideration of the undergraduate student experience. During this time frame all facets of higher education began to realize and research the importance of enhancing the student learning experience through collaboration and modifying professionals' roles to incorporate that of a leader and teacher. This led higher education professionals to examine their roles and resulted in a reevaluation of the profession of student affairs.

During this period of student affairs history, professionals began to ask two critical questions: Is student affairs a profession? And, what is the purpose of student affairs work? In 1981, Stamatakos wrote that student affairs had begun to examine and debate whether or not it met the definition of a profession. During the self-examination, student affairs professionals and associations explored the assumptions and myths of the profession (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). Some argued that as an emerging profession, student affairs would develop a firm foundation only when its practitioners had clearly defined expectations and standards to guide the profession (Miller & Sandeen, 2003). This topic will be discussed more in depth later in this chapter.

The second area of investigation during this period focused on the purpose of student affairs work. Woodard, Love, and Komives (2000) stated that the student affairs profession does not adequately concentrate on the whole student and that the profession focuses almost exclusively on the "traditional" student. As responsible student affairs professionals, we must make an intentional effort to include all students--of all diverse backgrounds--in our programs and services (Woodard, Love, and Komives, 2000). Carpenter (2001) and Young (2001), among others, pushed for a more rigorous

assessment of the profession and an examination of whether the profession is considered a form of scholarship.

History of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Position

In 1869 Charles Eliot, the president of Harvard, appointed history professor Ephraim Gurney as the Dean of the College but gave him no specific responsibilities. In the 1890s, Harvard's enrollment began to grow at a rapid rate and President Eliot decided to divide the deanship of the college into two positions, one held by Ephraim Gurney and the other by LeBaron Russell Briggs. Professor Briggs was a relatively shy 35-year-old English instructor, whom the students visited on a regular basis to discuss a variety of issues they were having with the institution (Sandeen, 1991). President Eliot admitted later that Briggs relieved him of having to deal with some very unpleasant duties with the students (Cowley, 1936). This information offers evidence that the first student affairs professional and chief student affairs officer (CSAO) was Professor Briggs at Harvard University. The position would later be known as the dean of men, because Harvard had only male students at this time. Dean Briggs had the ability to aid and assist students, whether it was bringing flowers to the sick or writing the student's parents about their progress or lack thereof (Brown, 1926; Fley, 1979). Dean Briggs was so exceptional at his role that student affairs practitioners today still refer to his writings from 1900 (Sandeen, 1991).

Although the male students were being assisted at Harvard, what about institutions that had female students? President William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago recruited Alice Freeman Palmer in 1892 to become the first dean of women and to aid him in implementing his plan of recruiting more women as undergraduate,

graduates, and faculty members (Solomon, 1985). Unlike Dean Briggs at Harvard, Dean Palmer had to be more of an advocate for the students she represented. Dean Palmer advocated for a curriculum that would prepare women for a productive life after college (Fley, 1979). These new positions, dean of men and dean of women, were created to maintain collegiate values in an atmosphere of specialization within the higher education system at this time. By 1910, deans of men and women were appointed at most colleges and universities, thanks to the forward thinking of Harvard and Chicago Universities (Sandeen, 1991).

In 1937 W. H. Cowley gave an address that predicted the future of student affairs and the dean of men title. Cowley stated that a new position was evolving to coordinate all institutional services related to the out-of-class experiences of the students. The new title for this position was "dean of students" or "dean of student affairs." Cowley's prediction proved true by the 1950s, with the creation of the first campuswide dean of students (Sandeen, 1991). This notion was made more evident by a larger number of campuses no longer segregated by gender in the 1960s.

However, some institutional personnel were not so keen on a new administrative position on campus. Some faculty members did not approve of this new position because they saw it as directly competing for resources and as just another power structure in the institution. The opposition to the new dean of student position was not limited to academic affairs, however, but existed as well within the student affairs community. Student affairs department heads were concerned about the idea of one central head of student affairs because of the possible loss of the autonomy that they had been used to in their positions (Sandeen, 1991).

The reality was that the actions of student affairs practitioners were critical to the institution's mission. Institutions began to feel the effect of the student affairs profession with the issues on campus surrounding the Vietnam War, gender and racial equity, and student participation in campus governance (Fley, 1979). These situations forced student affairs administrators into the limelight on their campuses and in their communities, which led to the formation of the vice president for student affairs position or chief student affairs officer of today (Sandeen, 1991).

The positions of student affairs administrators and CSAO have changed over the past 100 years, from Dean Briggs, Dean of Men at Harvard to today's vice presidents for student affairs. Not only has the title changed for the CSAOs, but their responsibilities have also changed. The evolution of these responsibilities has led the CSAOs to become major participants in the leadership of their institutions. Although the early CSAOs were chosen from the ranks of faculty, today this is not commonly the case in recruiting individuals for these leadership positions. Today's CSAOs have veered from their traditional role as just educators, according to the *Student Personnel Point of View* (1937; 1949; NASPA, 1989) and expanded their role to one of a disciplinarian to an educator, leader, and manager (Sandeen, 1991; Winston et al., 2001).

CSAO Position Responsibilities

In 1991, Arthur Sandeen's book *Chief Student Affairs Officer* became one of the first books devoted solely to this position and its functions. The three principal roles he discussed for the CSAO were educator, leader, and manager. The *educator* implemented programs and services for the students, the *leader* provided a vision to accomplish tasks for both student affairs and the institution as a whole, and the *manager* resolved conflicts

while coordinating the people and resources of the division (Winston et al., 2001). Sandeen (1991) argued that CSAOs must execute these three roles effectively to meet the needs of the students, division, and institution.

An educator is generally thought of as an individual within a school setting who sees the potential for growth in learners (Clifton & Anderson, 2002). Hayes (2003) defined an educator as someone who has the endless ability to touch the lives of others. Sandin (1992), an expert on the importance of teaching and scholarship, described an educator as a person who serves the purpose of human development through a combination teaching and scholarship.

While Sandin identified teaching and scholarship as the foundations of an educator, Knefelkamp (1992) raised the question of whether education and the profession of student affairs are synonymous. The basis of this debate was whether the student's education involved their intellectual or holistic development, raising questions about the roles of student personnel and student affairs. Knefelkamp posed the question of whether the role of student affairs practitioners was simply to provide a service to the students, or whether practitioners were educators who took an active approach in engaging student learning.

Winston et al. (2001) argued that student affairs practitioners have always been educators as far back as Dean Briggs in the 1890s. Dean Briggs, as a disciplinarian, was an educator by holding students accountable for their actions and teaching them the difference between right and wrong. This view is backed by the *Student Personnel Point of View* (1937; 1949; NASPA, 1989), which addresses the development of the whole student as opposed to just the intellectual development of the student. As far back as

1954, Lloyd-Jones and Smith wrote that student affairs is an unconventional teaching and learning environment that assisted student learning outside of the traditional classroom setting. They also stated that student affairs' main purpose in its early years was to complement the academic curriculum and further the learning environment.

As student affairs practitioners continued to support the academic curriculum and aid in developing the whole student, they would still have to work diligently to convince their faculty counterparts of the educational value of their work (Baxter Magolda, 2001). Student affairs practitioners sought to illustrate the educational nature of their work by creating personal and social development opportunities and programs outside the classroom, enabling the faculty to concentrate solely on students' intellectual development. Baxter-Magolda (2001) noted that recent literature identifying student affairs practitioners as educators has focused on the profession's increased engagement in student learning through its integration of intellectual, personal, and social development.

Asher (1994) added that the strength of the student affairs profession from the beginning was its ability to engage students in the learning process to enhance their personal and social well-being. A paramount document in student affairs, the *Student Learning Imperative (SLI)* (ACPA, 1994), relayed the message that the profession was first and foremost educational in nature and further confirmed the role of practitioners in fostering student learning both inside and outside the classroom. The *SLI* bluntly stated that the profession should concern itself with the cognitive, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and practical competencies of its constituents, the students. A key statement was made by Knefelkamp in 1992, when she wrote that at least three-quarters of all college students believe that the most significant educational experiences they have in college will take

place outside of the classroom (p. 9). In addition to being an educator, the CSAO also had to be a leader on campus for the division and the students.

It wasn't until the late 1960s or early 1970s that the CSAOs were given the title of a leader and not just an administrator. This role was confirmed in Birnbaum's (1992) research, which found that presidents and chancellors recognized CSAOs as leaders as often as they did other vice presidents on campus. The view of CSAOs as leaders was confirmed by their location on the institutional organizational charts (Winston et al., 2001). To examine the CSAO's role as a leader, Sandeen (1991) brought to the forefront the idea that other than the president of the institution, the CSAO is the most visible administrator to the campus community and is the most proactive in building relationships and partnerships. By building these relationships and partnerships, the CSAO is a key component for the institution to accomplish its mission and in generating support for student affairs programs and services.

Brown (1997) stated that the CSAO is instrumental in educating the institution's constituents about the academic mission and demonstrating how student affairs may partner with academic affairs to enhance the mission of both divisions and the institution as a whole. One of the most important aspects of the CSAO's leadership role is the ability to integrate academic and student affairs communities, as well as the campus community and the larger society (Garland & Grace, 1993). To complete this task the CSAO must have an understanding of the campus culture, the institution's relationship with the surrounding community, and the priorities the institution has set for itself (Sandeen, 1991).

Along with these responsibilities the CSAO must articulate knowledge about student development to faculty members and handle conflict and crisis situations so the institution can move forward in its educational mission (Barr & Desler, 2000). Sandeen (1991) summed up the CSAOs of the 21st century by describing them as great leaders who are expected to be change agents as well as administrators, while maintaining positive relationships with both internal and external constituents. Alongside all these leadership roles, CSAOs must also be excellent managers of their division and the university as a whole.

The CSAO position was one of the first formal college administrative positions after the position of the college president. The higher education realm perceived CSAOs solely as disciplinarians and housing supervisors (Garland & Grace, 1993). Much has changed in the intervening years, as recent research (Lovell & Kosten, 2000) reveals successful management of the division is critical to the success of the CSAO position. Scharre (1996) stated that much of the CSAO's time is spent on budget administration, student conduct, conflict resolution, and legal issues. With these expanded responsibilities, CSAOs today are considered to have a greater managerial role in their institutions.

Although the fundamentals of being a student affairs practitioner are taught in preparation programs, managerial roles are often and unfortunately learned through on-the-job-training, often through trial-and-error (Deegan, 1981; Ottinger, 2000). Deegan (1981) stated that the CSAO's managerial role includes planning, organizing, budgeting, and directing, a finding that was validated by Scharre's 1996 study. McClellan and Barr (2000) made a profound statement on the managerial role of CSAOs, observing, "a

student affairs manager is one who organizes human and fiscal resources to meet both institutional and area goals, while being efficient, effective, and ethical" (p. 197). The literature discusses not only the role of CSAOs in student affairs but their effect on the management of the institution as a whole (Barr & Desler, 2000; Komives & Woodard, 1996; Sandeen, 1991; Winston et al., 2001).

Professional Competencies

Many professions discuss professional competencies as a focal point of their movement toward the professionalization of their field (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). The Task Force on Certification was recently commissioned by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) to identify competencies and knowledge sets to be used for curriculum for student affairs professionals. A tremendous amount of research on core competencies that affect the student affairs professionals has been completed (Herdlein, 2004; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Pope & Reynolds, 1997). These competencies were developed to serve as a foundation for professional development in student affairs.

Learning Reconsidered (ACPA & NASPA, 2004) encouraged the profession to refocus its work on student learning and develop outcomes with an emphasis on the accountability of how student affairs professionals work with students. The profession was originally directed to aid in holistic development (ACPA, 1937, 1942), but as there is more diversity in relation to religion, age, ability, racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic status professionals need to gain more in depth knowledge of the current student population. Another significant point was that accrediting bodies are holding institutions more accountable, thus the student affairs profession has taken a more participatory role in this process (ACPA, 2007). By the profession taking more of an active role in accreditation

practitioners must develop an assessment mindset, which requires common knowledge and competencies (Love & Estanek, 2000). The establishment of these competencies will aid practitioners' success in working with students and in the profession (American College Personnel Association Taskforce on Certification, 2006; Janosik, 2002; Schoper, Stimpson, & Segar, 2006).

Graduate preparation programs are designed to provide a foundation in the field, but not all current practitioners have completed such a program. Even with the completion of graduate preparation programs, professionals will not have all the knowledge and competencies that they need for an entire career. The Task Force on Certification developed eight competencies: a) advising and helping, b) assessment, evaluation, and research, c) ethics, d) legal foundations, e) leadership & administration/management, f) pluralism and inclusion, g) student learning and development, and, h) teaching. These competencies are for the broader profession of student affairs with the understanding that there might be additional competencies for specialty area (ACPA, 2007).

The set of competencies that the task force developed serves as a tool for practitioners and student affairs divisions to use in establishing a professional development plan. All eight competency areas include skill sets written as learning outcomes (basic, intermediate, and advanced skills). These areas are designed as a starting point and not an exhaustive list. Each practitioner must self assess to identify their lack of experience in a particular competency. This list can be an instrument that professionals at all level utilize to examine their growth and development (ACPA, 2007).

"Professionals committed to ongoing learning, must bear the same responsibility as the students, and seek to develop their own professional skill set" p.3 (ACPA, 2007).

Professional Development

CSAOs must be aware that the needs of their constituents and institutions change, requiring them to update their skills and abilities to maintain their effectiveness as CSAOs (Sandeen, 1991). They can enhance their skills with an active approach to professional development. Through professional development CSAOs can refamiliarize themselves with the changing field while renewing and enhancing their professional knowledge and skills (Bryan & Schwartz, 1998).

Although the field of student affairs is relatively new, it has a strong tradition of providing training and specialized education. Professional development has been especially important in this field due to the diverse nature of the student affairs profession and the practitioners' roles. The changes in student demographics and the public's high expectations for higher education are motivation enough for CSAOs to be invested in professional development. As stated by Bryan and Schwartz (1998), the tenure of CSAOs at one institution or one type of institution is shorter than it was in 1993. This is another reason for CSAOs to be active participants in professional development in order to continue their professional growth.

DeCoster and Brown (1991) suggested, "The need for continuous professional growth seems self-evident" (p. 583). Committing to professional development can increase knowledge, leadership skills, competency, job satisfaction, commitment, and job performance. These results provide only part of the rationale for professional development to be at the heart of a division's commitment to quality. Furthermore,

practitioners should be encouraged by senior administration to be involved in professional development opportunities to increase their efficiency and effectiveness in their jobs (Bryan & Mullendore, 1990). Encouraging professional development is paramount for CSAOs to be good leaders, managers, and educators of their divisions.

In discussing professional development opportunities it is important to recognize that these programs are delivered through many different vehicles and on a variety of levels (Bryan, 1996). According to Bryan (1996), the different levels of professional development are individual, group or programs, departmental, divisional, and professional associations. In addition to the various levels of professional development, there are also three distinct types of professional development: formal, non-formal, and informal (Bryan, 1996). Various levels and types of professional development lead to a variety of outcomes. The outcomes of professional development are often individualized to the practitioner participating. All practitioners who participate in professional development opportunities should be able to apply the learning outcomes of the session throughout higher education.

There has been widespread discussion among student affairs practitioners about the value of and need for professional development. On one side of the debate, professional development is viewed as a vehicle to address deficiencies and to stay abreast of the changes in the field. Some also see professional development as a way to achieve organizational mobility and progress. On the other side of the discussion, some practitioners and administrators believe that professional development is just a way for professionals in the field to socialize with their counterparts from around the country, though this can also be seen as a positive (Barr & Associates, 1993; Bryan, 1996).

The outcome of participation in professional development is a sense of renewal that is not often experienced through any other professional activity (Barr, 1993). Professional development is essential for all professional and support staff members so they improve their skill levels (Bryan, 1996). Barr and Associates (1993) argues that participation in professional development opportunities is an ethical decision that professionals must make to maintain a certain level of knowledge. One of the most convincing ideas in the literature is that institutions of higher education are dependent on their most valuable resource, human capital, so any resources spent on improving this capital are well spent (Barr & Associates, 1993).

Certification Process

The idea of creating a more systematic method of professional development activities in student affairs has been discussed and written about for decades (Carpenter, 1998; Creamer & Claar, 1995; Creamer & Woodard, 1992; Creamer, Winston, Schuh, Gehring, McEwen, Forney, Carpenter, & Woodard, 1992; Creamer, Janosik, Winston, & Kuk, 2001; Dean, Woodard, & Cooper, 2008; Janosik, 2002). However no resolution has evolved (Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer, 2006). Creamer et al. (1992) stated that professionals in student affairs are very supportive of a more structured professional development program within the profession. This support had been expressed in public and private, small and large institutions (Creamer et al., 1992). The idea of a voluntary certification/registry affects both the individual practitioner and all organizations related to the student affairs profession.

Schwartz and Bryan (1998) asked, “To what degree is the individual responsible for his or her own professional development? If we can expect physicians, accountants,

plumbers, and school teachers to maintain and advance their knowledge to renew a license or certification, should we expect the same of student affairs professional?" (p. 5). These questions are discussed often in student affairs professional associations. Carpenter (2001, 2003) repeated many times in his writings that one's professional development is their own responsibility, but if the profession of student affairs wants to be considered on the cutting edge it must pursue a systematic method of professional development.

A focus on personal responsibility for professional development is likely to be insufficient due to the ever-increasing accountability in higher education. Moreover, the doubling of information every seven years speaks volumes about the need for leadership by professional organizations (Thelin, 1996: Carpenter, 1998; Schroder, 2003). Creamer et al. (1992) suggested that to create a higher quality workforce and for the profession's well-being, the establishment of an "assessment of professional competencies and needs, continuing professional education, and recognition and reporting systems" (p. 3) is a must. These bold statements by well-known scholars in the profession have led the charge in calling for the establishment of a more systematic professional development system within student affairs.

The executive board of the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education commissioned a group led by Steven Janosik to study the support for a national voluntary registry from the professionals in the field. Student affairs professionals were asked to respond to a 16-item questionnaire on such topics as creating a professional development curriculum, assigning Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPECs) to programs, earning credits and record keeping, and seeking voluntary

professional certification. The study revealed that a large majority of professionals supported the creation of a more intentional program for professional development. Ninety-three percent of respondents supported an effort to develop a professional development curriculum based on core professional competencies; eighty-three percent agreed with an effort to certify professional development programs that met a set of standards for assigning CPECs; eighty-seven percent agreed that they would participate in a program where CPECs could be voluntarily earned and recorded; and eighty-seven percent supported the creation of a program through which members could voluntarily seek professional certification (Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer, 2006).

Most of the items examined in this study were taken from other professions that require continued professional development, such as teachers, counselors, nurses, and doctors.

Notably, participants in the study who came from smaller institutions and community colleges were just as supportive as their colleagues from larger institutions (Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer, 2006). This study was the first large-scale assessment of intentional professional development and a voluntary certification process. Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer (2006) stated, "This study has shown that, despite the concern expressed by some leaders in the field, the members of one of the largest student affairs associations support a more structured system of professional development that includes the earning of CPECs and being recognized in some official way by their associations for their efforts" (p. 145).

An additional study regarding credentialing surveyed members of the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA) (Dean, Woodard, & Cooper, 2008).

Participants were asked to respond to a 46-item questionnaire about their perceptions about the need for, and benefits of, professional development credits (PDCs) in student affairs. This study revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in perceptions of subject matter based on sex, institution type, highest degree earned, enrollment in graduate courses, or classification. However there was a statistically significant difference in the years worked in the field. The newer the student affairs practitioners the more likely they were to agree with the items' on the survey (Dean, Woodard, & Cooper, 2008).

One of the items was, "The student affairs profession should consider establishing a licensure system for practitioners." This item yielded a mean of 3.42 (SD=1.12) which indicated that SACSA members supported professional development credits (PDCs) but the support for licensing as a method was limited. Again, members that are newer to the field agreed more overwhelming than did seasoned practitioners. The last major result from this study was that the respondents favored a national system over a state or local system (Dean, Woodard, & Cooper, 2008). Both of these studies show that there is a perceived need for and interest in a system of certification in the field of student affairs.

Certification in Counseling

The profession of counseling, which is closely related to student affairs, has a required certification process for its practitioners. The process of certification in counseling became an issue in 1972, when John Weldon a career counselor in Virginia was forced to stop his private practice by a court order filed by the Virginia State Board of Psychologist Examiners. At this time the Virginia State Board of Psychologist Examiners had a mandatory certification requirement for their practitioners. John

Weldon argued that he was not a psychologist and that guidance and counseling were completely separate from the psychology field, thus he should not be held to the same standards and requirements by the state board (Hosie, 1991). The court ruled that "…the profession or personnel and guidance counseling is a separate profession (from psychology) and should be so recognized … However, this professional does utilize the tools of the psychologist… therefore it appears that he must be a regulatory body to govern the profession…" (Swanson, 1988, p.1).

Based on this decision, Weldon and other counselors like him were restricted from practicing and were unable to earn a livelihood. In 1975, the Virginia Personnel and Guidance Association persuaded the state legislature to pass the first counselor regulatory act. This act established counseling as a profession that is separate from psychology. One year later, 1976, this legislation was revised that provided licensing/certification for counselors in the state of Virginia (Hosie, 1991). During the time of the above case in Virginia, the American Personnel and Guidance Association, known today as the American Association for Counseling and Development, published a position paper on "Licensing in the Helping Professions". This position paper was developed in "vigorous, responsible action to establish provisions for the licensure of professional counselors in the various states" (Cottingham & Warner, 1978, p.604).

The American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD) established a special Licensure Commission in 1975, which was led by Thomas Sweeney of Ohio University. The commission's main focus was to give AACD the direct responsibility in reacting to increasing counselor concerns about certification. There were basically three tasks: collect and disseminate information at the state and national levels, assist members

to resolve certification problems, and provide leadership in seeking relationship with other professional groups (Cottingham & Warner, 1978). Most importantly the basic philosophy was to help develop policies to make the profession more proactive than reactive in the pursuit of counselor certification. By January 1976, the commission released a packet that included an "Overview of Counselor Licensure". Members were encouraged to evaluate the recommendations so that a final version could be forwarded to the AACD (APGA, 1976).

The commission delivered the final version to the AACD in 1978 and had established a national licensure network. At this point the commission scheduled regional and state workshops on certification and dialogues with Division 17 of American Psychological Association **(**APA**),** the American Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) (APGA, 1979). The commission report outlines the steps to certification for a counseling professional. To obtain a certification a professional must complete and accredited master's degree program, which includes the passage of written and oral exams. Once these steps are completed then a professional must maintain their certification by completing a certain number of continuing education units every two years, which are approved by the board. To assist professionals who where providing services at the time, the board adopted a provisions under a "grandfather clause", that allows a 5-year time period to practice under a limited certification while they pursue the new requirements (Hosie, 1991).

Chapter Summary

The profession of student affairs has evolved immensely since the creation of the first student affairs position at Harvard University. The campus environment is

constantly affected by the passage of laws and by national and world events, both of which may directly impact higher education and student affairs practitioners. Over time the college student population has changed and higher education has become more inclusive. The change in student demographics and an increase in student population led to the formation of the first student affairs administrative position in 1890 at Harvard University (Cowley, 1936). This first position evolved into what is referred to today as the chief student affairs officer (CSAO) position. This position is commonly given such titles as Vice President or Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs or Student Services. The CSAO position carries with it the responsibility for leading the student affairs division and its personnel.

The individuals who hold the CSAO positions are leaders, managers, and educators. Individuals in the CSAO position must stay current in their fields in order to help practitioners in their division stay up-to-date on issues that affect their daily responsibilities (Sandeen, 1991).

One of the controversial topics related to this need to stay current in the field is the proposal of a voluntary certification system. Both national associations, NASPA and ACPA, have formed task forces to investigate the utility of implementing such a system. While these associations are still considering whether or not a CPECs system is feasible, there remains a limited amount of research and literature on this topic. This in turn is why there is a need or rational for continued professional development and professional competencies to aid in the intentional shaping of professional development.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLGY

The purpose of this study was to examine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) perceptions and support of the topics of professional competencies and continual professional education credits (CPECs). Secondly, this study will aid in if the profession of student affairs needs to invest the time and effort in the development of professional competencies and the continual professional education credits (CPECs) system. Through use of a research-developed questionnaire, the researcher will assess the perceptions of Chief Student Affairs Officers on the topics of professional competencies and a voluntary certification system. A note to remember is that not all functional areas, such as financial aid and health services have the same training regiment as most student affairs functional areas. This chapter will outline the methodology of this study by identifying the participants, describing the data collection, the development of the survey instrument, and describing the data analysis methods.

Participants

The target population of participants for this survey were chief student affairs officers (CSAOs), who are the highest ranking student affairs professional at an institution (Mech, 1997), that are currently members of the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. NASPA has 11,000 members who represent institutions in 29 countries (NASPA, 2008). NASPA maintains a directory of CSAOs at each institution that is currently represented with their memberships.

After receiving the membership list from NASPA, the researcher compiled email addresses for each CSAO within the NASPA membership and developed an initial invitation for participation in the study. The invitation explained the purpose of the study, the population of participants, the benefits of completing the survey, consent form and a link to the survey (Appendix A). The invitation asked that all surveys be completed within two weeks of receipt of the invitation to participate. The researcher sent the invitation to four hundred (400) participants at the same time, using a rolling random sample; all individuals were blind copied, in order to protect each participant's confidentiality. The participants were chosen randomly by a computer system out of a list provided for the researcher by NASPA of their CSAOs members.

Data Collection

After the initial invitation to participate the researcher sent an additional email one week out of the two week deadline as a reminder to complete the survey (Appendix B). Based on the number of responses received at the one week deadline, a final reminder (Appendix C) was sent to the participants two days before the deadline. The researcher removed the survey's web site so that the survey is no longer available to participants after the deadline date. Once the survey was no longer accessible all data was placed in a Microsoft Excel file and forwarded to the researcher to begin the analysis. The power analysis revealed the need for a sample of one hundred and twenty (120) participants for the study to be statistically significant. The researcher was then imported the files into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was adapted from a previous study's survey, completed by Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) along with the addition of information presented in the ACPA (2007) report on professional competencies. Table 1 identified the sources for each of the forty-two items for this study. The survey was a locally developed instrument (LDI) instead of a commercially developed instrument (CDI). Several steps are necessary in creating an LDI and for this study, steps set forth by Upcraft and Schuh (1996) were used. Those steps were: (a) what information is needed, (b) format of the questions, (c) determine the measurement scale, (d) decide on the wording of the questions, (e) sequencing of the questions, (f) format the instrument, (g) pilot test the instrument, and (h) analysis the instrument (Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). The survey has been reviewed by other student affairs practitioners to provide content validity. After reviewing the feedback by the student affairs practitioners, a few of the statements were clarified and the format was revised in hopes of receiving more accurate information.

The survey used in the Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) study provided valuable information that influenced the creation of this instrument. The information in the ACPA (2007) professional competencies report provided this instrument with a more well-rounded approach to the assessment of the profession of student affairs and its practitioners.

Table 3.1
Perceptions of Professional Competencies and CPECs

Question	Citation(s)
Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) Practices:	
1 Strong personal commitment to my professional growth and development	Lovell & Kosten (2000); Knefelkamp (1992); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
2 My professional development is my own responsibility	Knefelkamp (1992); Komives & Woodard (1996); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
3 My institution should aid in my professional development	Knefelkamp (1992); Komives & Woodard (1996); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
4 Balance between personal needs and professional expectations	Komives & Woodard (1996); Sandeen (1991)
5 Read professional journals or periodicals to keep current	Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
6 Attend professional state conferences yearly	Knefelkamp (1992); McClellan & Barr (2000); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
7 Attend professional regional conferences yearly	Knefelkamp (1992); McClellan & Barr (2000); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
8 Attend professional national conferences yearly	Knefelkamp (1992); McClellan & Barr (2000); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
9 Connection to the profession of student affairs	Lovell & Kosten (2000); Komives & Woodard (1996); Sandeen (1991); Winston et al. (2001)
Professional Competences:	

10	Practitioners must bear the same responsibility as their students, and seek to develop their own professional skill sets	ACPA (2007)
11	Profession has and is likely to continue to attract individuals whose backgrounds do not include completion of formal study	ACPA (2007)
12	Student affairs profession should endorsed hiring only Master level preparation practitioners that completed studies in student affairs, counseling, or higher education	ACPA (2007)
13	Graduate preparation programs outcomes can develop professional competencies	ACPA (2007)
14	Graduate preparation programs should support the learning of professional competencies for their graduates	ACPA (2007)
15	Professional competencies will serve as a foundation upon which professional development activities can be shaped	ACPA (2007)
16	Professional competencies set by ACPA/ NASPA should represent the general overarching profession of student affairs	ACPA (2007)
17	Professional development based upon ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to practitioners	ACPA (2007)
18	Professional development based upon ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to student affairs	ACPA (2007)
19	Professional development based upon ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the students of higher education by having better guided practitioners	ACPA (2007)

20 Professional competencies can serve as a tool by which professionals can map out professional development plans	ACPA (2007)
21 The profession has an obligation to help practitioners organize their professional development with professional competencies	ACPA (2007)

Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPECs):

22 CPECs represent a mark of quality assurance for conference presentations or workshops	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
23 CPECs will aid practitioners to remain current in the profession	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
24 CPECs confirms that practitioners have attained the learning outcomes that were intended by the professional development activities	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
25 CPECs need to occur as a continuous process of updating professional knowledge	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
26 CPECs has a direct relationship on the practitioners performance	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)

27 CPECs has a direct impact on the growth of practitioners as individuals	Carpenter (1998): Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
28 CPECs would provide a history of the practitioners' professional development activities	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
29 If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system then a national organization should establish the standards	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
30 CPECs should be available online to allow for easy accessibility	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
31 CPECs should be available at the institutional level	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
32 CPECs should be available at the regional level	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
33 CPECs should be available at the national level	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al.

	(2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
34 Student affairs is still an "emerging" profession	Sandeen (1991)
35 The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs would require is desirable	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
36 CPECs would give the profession more validity	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
37 Lack of a CPEC system leaves student affairs practitioners at a disadvantage in that they are viewed to be credentialed	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008);Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)
38 There is a need for CPECs in the profession of student affairs	Carpenter (1998); Creamer & Claar (1995); Creamer & Woodard (1992); Creamer et al. (1992); Creamer et al. (2001); Dean, Woodard & Cooper (2008); Janosik (2002); Janosik, Carpenter & Creamer (2006)

This study asked participants to complete a web-based survey titled, *Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies* (Appendix D). The survey was available using the web based survey software program Perseus, which was available through the University of Georgia's Division of Student Affairs server. The survey is composed of forty-six (46) items that evaluate the CSAOs

professional development activities, perceptions of professional competencies, and thoughts on a voluntary certification system. Participants were asked to mark the appropriate box to indicate their opinion on each question. The rating of items were on a 4-point, Likert scale. In the coding process, a "1" denotes "strongly agree", and a "4" denotes "strongly disagree" for each item. The instrument also has a demographic information section. Various demographic questions were asked to gain a better understanding of the CSAOs who were completing the survey. This information will also provide more rich data for the analysis portion of this study.

Data Analysis

Several methods of statistical analyses were used, including independent t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation. When using an independent t-test, Levine's test for equality of variance was used. Where appropriate, with the Levine's test, equality of variance is assumed. All statistical data was analyzed using SPSS 16.0 and evaluated on a significance level of $p < .05$. Any values that are not answered were coded as missing so not to skew the results.

The following statistical analysis was conducted to analyze the data collected for each research question.

RQ1: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) endorse an establishment of professional competences in student affairs?

Descriptive statistics were used to analysis if chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) agree or disagree with the establishment of professional competencies in the field. An independent t-test and one-way ANOVA examined the difference in endorsement or not of professional competencies between the demographic categories.

RQ2: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) believe that they would sanction hiring only new professionals from graduate preparation programs in student affairs, higher education, counseling or related program?

To analyze this research question the researcher used descriptive statistics to determine if CSAOs would sanction the hiring only new professionals who have completed a graduate preparation program in student affairs, higher education, counseling or a related program. An independent t-test and one-way ANOVA examined the belief that CSAOs would sanction hiring only new professionals between the demographic categories.

RQ3: Will Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO) champion the participation of practitioners in professional competencies and a voluntary certification system?

An independent t-test procedure examined the belief that CSAOs will champion the practitioners participation in professional competencies and a voluntary certification system between CSAOs who are employed at a public and private institutions; two-year and four-year institutions.

RQ4: What is Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) perceptions of the functionally of participation in a continuing professional development credits (CPECs) system?

An independent t-test and one-way ANOVA to identify if CSAOs differ on their perception of the functionally of participation in a CPECs system between the demographic categories.

RQ5: Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) have the perception of marginalization on their campuses as a result of the lack of a voluntary certification system in the profession of student affairs?

This research question used an ANOVA to identify if CSAOs from small, medium, and large campuses differ on their perception of marginalization on their campuses. An independent t-test and one-way ANOVA measure the difference of thoughts of CSAOs on a voluntary certification process in the field of student affairs between the demographic categories.

Limitations

Limitations exist in all research studies. The following delimitations were present in this investigation: 1) length of time between the completion of the participant's graduate program and completion of the questionnaire, 2) CSAOs are asked to self report data 3) only current CSAOs are asked their perception of professional competencies and not a wider variety of practitioners in the profession, and 4) the instrument is a locally developed instrument by the researcher could serve as a limitation.

Chapter Summary

A locally designed instrument was utilized to gather the data about the perceptions of professional competencies by chief student affairs officers (CSAOs). The instrument went through a multi-phase process to ensure content validity and a factor analysis of the pilot test was utilized to test reliability. The researcher used the chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) listserv provided by the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education as participants. A random rolling sample of participants will be formed for usage in this study. The researcher will use SPSS 16.0 to

analyze the data received from the *"Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies"*.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study surveyed 400 of the NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) through their listserv. A total of 131 surveys were completed on-line (32.8%). Discussion of this study will include the following: a report on demographics of the respondents, the presentation of data for each research question, and a synopsis of the data as it pertains to each research question. The questionnaire was administered electronically and was accompanied by a letter requesting participation and a consent form. The researcher chose an electronic method for the following reasons; shorter return time, cost effectiveness, paper reduction, and ease of instrument return for the CSAOs. The researcher entered the data into SPSS 16.0 (statistical program) for analysis. To prepare for data analysis, some results were converted into new categories.

All data collected from the questionnaire where significance was found on any item are included in tables in this chapter. A common reality was noted by Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) when they stated for, " most on-line data collection processes, the actual return rate is likely to be higher if calculated on the number of requests that were successfully received by listserv members (e.g., not limited by e-mail filters, incorrect addresses, etc.) (p. 49)." Each table includes the section heading and the question. A copy of the complete questionnaire is included in Appendix D.

Participant Demographics

Demographic information is provided in Table 4.1. The collected demographic information found that 81 of the participants were male, and 50 were female; of these participants, 100 were white practitioners while 31 were practitioners of color. The largest number of respondents had been in the field for 21-25 years, and most had earned a doctorate or professional degree. Another key factor noted was that 70.2% or 92 of the chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) surveyed were from four-year institutions. A final, important demographic characteristic was that an equal response rate came from CSAOs of small (53) and large (53) institutions. Please note that some data is missing, and some of the tables do not add up to 100% due to participants not responding to some of the survey questions.

Table 4.1
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	N	Percent*
Gender		
Female	50	38.2%
Male	81	61.8%
Transgender	0	0.0%
Ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0%
Asian American	2	1.6%

Black or African American	16	12.3%
Hispanic/Latino/Latina	8	6.1%
Native American	0	0.0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0.0%
Multi-Racial	2	1.2%
White/Caucasian	100	76.4%
Other	3	2.4%
Years in Current Position		
1 – 5	8	6.1%
6 – 10	6	4.6%
11 – 15	7	5.4%
16 – 20	24	18.3%
21 – 25	27	20.6%
26 – 30	29	22.1%
31 – 35	19	14.5%
36 – 40	11	8.4%
Highest Degree Earned		
Associates	0	0.0%
Bachelors	0	0.0%
Masters	36	27.5%
Specialist	2	1.5%

Professional (Law, Medical, etc…)	5	3.8%
Doctorate	87	66.4%
Field of Study of Highest Degree Earned		
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	22	16.8%
Higher Education Administration	72	55.0%
Counseling	6	4.6%
Other	30	22.9%
Type of Institution		
Private	68	51.9%
Public	53	40.5%
Two-year Institution	4	3.1%
Four-year Institution	92	70.2%
HBCU	2	1.5%
Religiously Affiliated	26	19.8%
Single Sex	0	0.0%
Institutional Enrollment		
Small (0-4,999)	53	40.5%
Medium (5,000-9,999)	25	19.1%
Large (10,000+)	53	40.5%

*Percent will not always add up to 100% as there is some data missing.

Analysis of Data

This study used several types of statistical analyses including independent sample t-tests, descriptive statistics, and one-way ANOVA. When the data were analyzed using an independent sample t-test, Levine's test for equality of variances was also employed; equality of variances was assumed where appropriate. All statistical tests were evaluated at the .05 alpha level.

Research Question One

Research question one (RQ1) investigated whether CSAOs endorsed an establishment of professional competencies in student affairs. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and an independent sample t-test. The independent sample t-test examined the perceptions between male and female practitioners and white practitioners and practitioners of color. Results for the ranked descriptive statistics for the CSAOs endorsement of professional competencies are presented in Table 4.2. The scale for the questionnaire was ranked on a one (1) to four (4) Likert Scale with one (1) being Strongly Agree and four (4) being Strongly Disagree. The lower the mean the more the respondents agreed with the item. The item with the lowest mean was "Graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies" ($M = 1.54$, $SD = .598$). The item with the highest mean was "Professional competencies set by ACPA/NASPA should represent the profession" ($M = 1.92$, $SD = .664$). Tables 4.3 through 4.10 represent the descriptive statistics for each survey question that applies to research question one (RQ1). Independent sample t-tests were run to compare perceptions of male and female practitioners and white practitioners and practitioners of

color. The independent sample t-test results for the comparison between male and female practitioners are presented in Tables 4.11. Two questions were found to be significant: one, “Graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies” ($t = -2.102$, $p = .038$) was significant based upon male and female responses; and two, “Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to students attending college by having better informed practitioners” ($t = 2.050$, $p = .042$) was based upon white practitioners and practitioners of color responses.

Table 4.2

Ranked Descriptive Statistics for CSAOs Endorsement of Professional Competencies

Question	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies.	1.54	0.598	131
Professional competencies can serve as a tool to map out professional development plans.	1.66	0.615	131
Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to practitioners.	1.70	0.578	131
Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the profession.	1.70	0.591	131
Professional competencies should serve as a foundation.	1.73	0.593	131
Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful by having better informed practitioners.	1.79	0.591	131

The profession has an obligation to help practitioners organize their professional development.	1.91	0.717	131
Professional competencies set by ACPA/NASPA should represent the profession.	1.92	0.664	131

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.3

Graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.46	0.526	81
Female Practitioners	1.68	0.683	50
White Practitioners	1.51	0.577	100
Practitioners of Color	1.65	0.661	31
Masters/Specialist	1.63	0.541	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.50	0.620	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.55	0.510	22
Higher Education	1.57	0.668	72
Counseling/Other	1.50	0.507	36
Private Institution	1.57	0.527	68
Public Institution	1.55	0.695	53
Small Institution	1.58	0.535	53
Medium Institution	1.44	0.507	25
Large Institution	1.55	0.695	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.4

Professional competencies should serve as a foundation.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.69	0.516	81
Female Practitioners	1.80	0.700	50
White Practitioners	1.74	0.579	100
Practitioners of Color	1.71	0.643	31
Masters/Specialist	1.79	0.577	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.71	0.603	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.77	0.612	22
Higher Education	1.75	0.622	72
Counseling/Other	1.67	0.535	36
Private Institution	1.76	0.550	68
Public Institution	1.72	0.662	53
Small Institution	1.77	0.542	53
Medium Institution	1.64	0.569	25
Large Institution	1.74	0.655	53

1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.5

Professional competencies set by ACPA/NASPA should represent the profession.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.90	0.625	81
Female Practitioners	1.96	0.727	50
White Practitioners	1.95	0.687	100
Practitioners of Color	1.84	0.583	31

Masters/Specialist	1.95	0.613	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.91	0.690	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.05	0.722	22
Higher Education	1.92	0.687	72
Counseling/Other	1.86	0.593	36
Private Institution	1.97	0.598	68
Public Institution	1.87	0.785	53
Small Institution	1.98	0.635	53
Medium Institution	1.84	0.688	25
Large Institution	1.91	0.687	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.6
Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to practitioners.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.69	0.574	81
Female Practitioners	1.72	0.607	50
White Practitioners	1.72	0.587	100
Practitioners of Color	1.65	0.551	31
Masters/Specialist	1.68	0.525	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.71	0.603	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.64	0.581	22
Higher Education	1.76	0.617	72
Counseling/Other	1.64	0.487	36
Private Institution	1.71	0.520	68
Public Institution	1.70	0.668	53
Small Institution	1.70	0.540	53
Medium Institution	1.72	0.678	25
Large Institution	1.70	0.575	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.7
Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the profession.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.65	0.574	81
Female Practitioners	1.78	6.160	50
White Practitioners	1.73	0.601	100
Practitioners of Color	1.61	0.558	31
Masters/Specialist	1.66	0.543	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.72	0.617	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.64	0.581	22
Higher Education	1.76	0.639	72
Counseling/Other	1.64	0.487	36
Private Institution	1.69	0.526	68
Public Institution	1.74	0.684	53
Small Institution	1.68	0.547	53
Medium Institution	1.72	0.678	25
Large Institution	1.72	0.601	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.8
Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful by having better informed practitioners.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.79	0.541	81
Female Practitioners	1.80	0.670	50
White Practitioners	1.85	0.592	100
Practitioners of Color	1.61	0.558	31

Masters/Specialist	1.84	0.547	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.77	0.613	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.68	0.646	22
Higher Education	1.82	0.613	72
Counseling/Other	1.83	0.507	36
Private Institution	1.81	0.553	68
Public Institution	1.79	0.631	53
Small Institution	1.85	0.533	53
Medium Institution	1.84	0.688	25
Large Institution	1.72	0.601	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.9
Professional competencies can serve as a tool to map out professional development plans.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.65	0.574	81
Female Practitioners	1.68	0.683	50
White Practitioners	1.65	0.609	100
Practitioners of Color	1.71	0.643	31
Masters/Specialist	1.71	0.515	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.64	0.656	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.59	0.503	22
Higher Education	1.71	0.680	72
Counseling/Other	1.61	0.549	36
Private Institution	1.68	0.558	68
Public Institution	1.70	0.668	53
Small Institution	1.58	0.602	53
Medium Institution	1.72	0.678	25
Large Institution	1.72	0.601	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.10
The profession has an obligation to help practitioners organize their professional development.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.86	0.685	81
Female Practitioners	1.98	0.769	50
White Practitioners	1.93	0.714	100
Practitioners of Color	1.84	0.735	31
Masters/Specialist	2.00	0.771	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.87	0.699	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.05	0.653	22
Higher Education	1.89	0.762	72
Counseling/Other	1.86	0.762	36
Private Institution	2.00	0.691	68
Public Institution	1.79	0.769	53
Small Institution	2.02	0.665	53
Medium Institution	1.96	0.790	25
Large Institution	1.77	0.724	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.11
Statistically Significant t-test Results for Survey Questions Related to Research Question One (RQ1)

Question	Demographics	Means	t	p
Graduate preparation programs should support the learning of professional competencies for their graduates.	Male/Female	M = 1.46 F = 1.68	-2.102	0.038

Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to students attending college by having better informed practitioners.	White Practitioners/ Practitioners of Color	W = 1.85 P = 1.61	2.050	0.042

Research Question Two

The goal of research question two (RQ2) was to examine whether chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) believed that they would endorse hiring only new professionals from graduate preparation programs in student affairs, higher education, counseling, or a related program. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and an independent sample t-test was run to identify if there are any differences between the answers of the participants. Results for the descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.12, and the categorical results are presented in Table 4.13. The item, "Endorse hiring only practitioners who have completed graduate-level preparation in student affairs, counseling, or higher education" (M = 2.60, SD = .838) was a major factor in evaluating research question two. Compared responses from participants based on the demographic information were determined by an independent sample t-test, and no statistical significances were found.

Table 4.12

Descriptive Statistics for Hiring from Graduate Preparation Programs

Question	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Endorse hiring only practitioners who have completed graduate-level preparation in student affairs, counseling, or higher education.	2.60	0.838	131

1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.13
Endorse hiring only practitioners who have completed graduate-level preparation in student affairs, counseling, or higher education.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.60	0.832	81
Female Practitioners	2.60	0.857	50
White Practitioners	2.62	0.850	100
Practitioners of Color	2.55	0.810	31
Masters/Specialist	2.55	0.795	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.63	0.861	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.41	0.796	22
Higher Education	2.51	0.856	72
Counseling/Other	2.89	0.785	36
Private Institution	2.57	0.798	68
Public Institution	2.60	0.862	53
Small Institution	2.58	0.795	53
Medium Institution	2.44	0.821	25
Large Institution	2.70	0.890	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Research Question Three

Research question three (RQ3) investigated if CSAOs would support the participation of practitioners in professional competencies and a voluntary certification system. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and an independent sample t-test was run to identify if there were any differences between participant groups. The t-test results indicated that statistical significance existed in responses on the following

item: “CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.” This is presented in Table 4.22. On the above question, differences were noted in responses by the following groups; white practitioners/practitioners of color ($t = 2.657$, $p = .009$), highest degree earned ($t = 2.102$, $p = .038$), and type of institution ($t = 2.025$, $p = .045$). The scale for the questionnaire was ranked on a one (1) to four (4) Likert Scale with one (1) being Strongly Agree and four (4) being Strongly Disagree. The lower the mean the more the respondents agreed with the item. The item with the lowest mean was “CPECs would provide a history of practitioners’ professional development activities” ($M = 1.98$, $SD = 0.764$). The item with the highest mean was “CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance” ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.848$). The results for the descriptive statistics for each survey question that apply to research question three (RQ3) are presented in Tables 4.14 through 4.21.

Table 4.14
Ranked Descriptive Statistics for CSAOs Support, of Participation in Professional Competencies and a Voluntary Certification System

Question	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
CPECs would provide a history of practitioners’ professional development activities.	1.98	0.764	131
CPECs can insure that practitioners remain current in the profession.	2.29	0.789	131
CPECs represent a mark of quality assurance for conference presentations or workshops.	2.41	0.753	131

CPECs need to occur as a continuous method of updating professional knowledge.	2.44	0.852	131
CPECs have a direct impact on the growth of practitioners as individuals.	2.50	0.817	131
CPECs confirm that practitioners have attained the learning outcomes that were intended by the professional development activities.	2.53	0.816	131
CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.	2.66	0.848	131

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.15

CPECs represent a mark of quality.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.37	0.749	81
Female Practitioners	2.48	0.762	50
White Practitioners	2.41	0.653	100
Practitioners of Color	2.42	1.025	31
Masters/Specialist	2.53	0.603	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.36	0.806	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.55	0.671	22
Higher Education	2.38	0.740	72
Counseling/Other	2.42	0.841	36
Private Institution	2.38	0.647	68
Public Institution	2.55	0.774	53
Small Institution	2.32	0.701	53

Medium Institution	2.36	0.810	25
Large Institution	2.53	0.775	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.16

CPECs can insure that practitioners remain current.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.36	0.841	81
Female Practitioners	2.18	0.691	50
White Practitioners	2.32	0.723	100
Practitioners of Color	2.19	0.980	31
Masters/Specialist	2.34	0.708	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.26	0.824	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.32	0.719	22
Higher Education	2.31	0.762	72
Counseling/Other	2.25	0.906	36
Private Institution	2.26	0.704	68
Public Institution	2.40	0.817	53
Small Institution	2.17	0.753	53
Medium Institution	2.56	0.917	25
Large Institution	2.28	0.744	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.17

CPECs confirm that practitioners have attained the learning outcomes.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.57	0.805	81
Female Practitioners	2.46	0.838	50

White Practitioners	2.56	0.756	100
Practitioners of Color	2.42	0.992	31
Masters/Specialist	2.55	0.828	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.51	0.819	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.50	0.913	22
Higher Education	2.56	0.729	72
Counseling/Other	2.50	0.941	36
Private Institution	2.53	0.722	68
Public Institution	2.66	0.807	53
Small Institution	2.45	0.822	53
Medium Institution	2.56	0.870	25
Large Institution	2.58	0.795	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.18

CPECs need to occur as a continuous method of updating knowledge.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.51	0.910	81
Female Practitioners	2.34	0.745	50
White Practitioners	2.47	0.784	100
Practitioners of Color	2.35	1.050	31
Masters/Specialist	2.53	0.862	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.40	0.852	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.68	0.839	22
Higher Education	2.46	0.821	72
Counseling/Other	2.28	0.914	36
Private Institution	2.49	0.723	68
Public Institution	2.51	0.912	53
Small Institution	2.42	0.819	53

Medium Institution	2.48	1.005	25
Large Institution	2.45	0.822	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.19
CPECs have a direct relationship to work performance.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.63	0.914	81
Female Practitioners	2.70	0.735	50
White Practitioners	2.76	0.740	100
Practitioners of Color	2.32	1.077	31
Masters/Specialist	2.89	0.649	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.55	0.906	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.91	0.811	22
Higher Education	2.61	0.797	72
Counseling/Other	2.61	0.964	36
Private Institution	2.78	0.643	68
Public Institution	2.66	0.939	53
Small Institution	2.72	0.769	53
Medium Institution	2.80	0.913	25
Large Institution	2.53	0.890	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.20
CPECs have a direct impact on growth.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.54	0.791	81
Female Practitioners	2.42	0.859	50

White Practitioners	2.49	0.785	100
Practitioners of Color	2.52	0.926	31
Masters/Specialist	2.55	0.795	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.47	0.831	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.73	0.703	22
Higher Education	2.43	0.836	72
Counseling/Other	2.50	0.845	36
Private Institution	2.46	0.700	68
Public Institution	2.66	0.854	53
Small Institution	2.40	0.793	53
Medium Institution	2.60	1.000	25
Large Institution	2.55	0.748	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.21

CPECs would provide a history of practitioner's professional development.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.94	0.780	81
Female Practitioners	2.06	0.740	50
White Practitioners	2.02	0.710	100
Practitioners of Color	1.87	0.922	31
Masters/Specialist	1.92	0.487	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.00	0.852	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.95	0.486	22
Higher Education	2.07	0.775	72
Counseling/Other	1.83	0.878	36
Private Institution	2.03	0.598	68
Public Institution	2.06	0.886	53
Small Institution	1.98	0.635	53

Medium Institution	1.84	0.746	25
Large Institution	2.06	0.886	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.22
Statistically Significant t-test Results for Survey Questions Related to Research Question Three (RQ3)

Question	Demographics	Means	t	P
CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.	White Practitioners/ Practitioners of Color	W = 2.76 P = 2.32	2.657	0.009
CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.	Highest Degree Earned	M/S = 2.89 D/P = 2.55	2.102	0.038
CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.	Type of Institution	Pri. = 2.78 Pub. = 2.66	2.025	0.045

Research Question Four

Research question four (RQ4) examined CSAOs perceptions of the functionality of participation in a continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system for student affairs. The data for this research question was evaluated by descriptive statistics, independent sample t-tests, and a One-way ANOVA. The scale for the questionnaire was ranked on a one (1) to four (4) Likert Scale with one (1) being Strongly Agree and four (4) being Strongly Disagree. The lower the mean the more the respondents agreed with the item. The ranked means of all of the survey questions that pertained to research question four (RQ4) are listed in Table 4.23. The item with the lowest mean was

"CPECs should be available online to allow for easy accessibility" (M = 1.87, SD = 0.748). The item with the highest mean was "There is a need for a CPECs system in the profession of Student Affairs" (M = 2.50, SD = 0.872). Descriptive statistics for each survey question that pertained to research question four (RQ4) are listed in Tables 4.24 through 4.31. Independent sample t-test results were run to compare the responses of the participants. Statistical significance for one item existed based on the difference of responses by white practitioners and practitioners of color. The item that was significant was "The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs system would require is desirable" (t = 2.292, p = .024) and was presented in Table 4.32. The One-way ANOVA results for CSAOs perceptions of the functionality of a continuing professional development credits (CPECs) presented no statistical significance, and the results were not presented in a table.

Table 4.23
Ranked Descriptive Statistics for CSAOs Perceptions of the Functionality of Participation in a Continuing Professional Educational Credits (CPECs) System.

Question	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
CPECs should be available online to allow for easy accessibility.	1.87	0.748	131
CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the national level.	1.95	0.705	131
CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the regional level.	1.98	0.679	131
If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system, then professional organizations such as ACPA/NASPA should establish the standards.	2.13	0.727	131

If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system, then professional organization such as CAS should establish the standards.	2.28	0.782	131
CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the institutional level.	2.31	0.774	131
The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs system would require is desirable.	2.31	0.851	131
There is a need for a CPECs system in the profession of student affairs.	2.50	0.872	131

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.24

If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system then ACPA/NASPA should establish standards.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.06	0.677	81
Female Practitioners	2.24	0.797	50
White Practitioners	2.17	0.697	100
Practitioners of Color	2.00	0.816	31
Masters/Specialist	2.18	0.563	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.10	0.785	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.14	0.834	22
Higher Education	2.04	0.659	72
Counseling/Other	2.31	0.786	36
Private Institution	2.10	0.550	68
Public Institution	2.26	0.812	53
Small Institution	2.11	0.670	53

Medium Institution	2.12	0.881	25
Large Institution	2.15	0.718	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.25
If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system, then CAS should establish standards.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.28	0.778	81
Female Practitioners	2.28	0.809	50
White Practitioners	2.34	0.728	100
Practitioners of Color	2.10	0.944	31
Masters/Specialist	2.26	0.644	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.28	0.843	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.18	0.733	22
Higher Education	2.38	0.740	72
Counseling/Other	2.17	0.910	36
Private Institution	2.28	0.688	68
Public Institution	2.38	0.790	53
Small Institution	2.21	0.793	53
Medium Institution	2.28	0.891	25
Large Institution	2.36	0.736	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.26
CPECs should be available online to allow for easy accessibility.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.88	0.678	81
Female Practitioners	1.86	0.857	50

White Practitioners	1.89	0.709	100
Practitioners of Color	1.81	0.873	31
Masters/Specialist	1.82	0.692	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.88	0.768	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.73	0.550	22
Higher Education	1.97	0.731	72
Counseling/Other	1.75	0.874	36
Private Institution	1.85	0.653	68
Public Institution	1.96	0.831	53
Small Institution	1.85	0.770	53
Medium Institution	1.68	0.748	25
Large Institution	1.98	0.720	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.27

CPECs should be available at the institutional level.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.26	0.738	81
Female Practitioners	2.38	0.830	50
White Practitioners	2.32	0.732	100
Practitioners of Color	2.26	0.930	31
Masters/Specialist	2.42	0.683	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.25	0.807	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.32	0.716	22
Higher Education	2.31	0.705	72
Counseling/Other	2.31	0.951	36
Private Institution	2.25	0.699	68
Public Institution	2.43	0.772	53
Small Institution	2.15	0.744	53

Medium Institution	2.44	0.870	25
Large Institution	2.40	0.743	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.28
CPECs should be available at the regional level.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.00	0.632	81
Female Practitioners	1.96	0.755	50
White Practitioners	2.02	0.619	100
Practitioners of Color	1.87	0.846	31
Masters/Specialist	1.95	0.517	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.99	0.734	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.86	0.560	22
Higher Education	2.07	0.678	72
Counseling/Other	1.89	0.747	36
Private Institution	1.91	0.566	68
Public Institution	2.17	0.727	53
Small Institution	1.87	0.652	53
Medium Institution	1.92	0.702	25
Large Institution	2.13	0.680	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.29
CPECs should be available at the national level.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	1.96	0.679	81
Female Practitioners	1.92	0.752	50

White Practitioners	1.98	0.681	100
Practitioners of Color	1.84	0.779	31
Masters/Specialist	1.87	0.578	38
Doctorate/Professional	1.97	0.748	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	1.86	0.560	22
Higher Education	2.04	0.701	72
Counseling/Other	1.81	0.786	36
Private Institution	1.90	0.626	68
Public Institution	2.08	0.756	53
Small Institution	1.87	0.652	53
Medium Institution	1.88	0.833	25
Large Institution	2.06	0.691	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.30
CPECs would be worth the additional effort.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.33	0.822	81
Female Practitioners	2.28	0.904	50
White Practitioners	2.40	0.778	100
Practitioners of Color	2.03	1.016	31
Masters/Specialist	2.37	0.675	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.28	0.918	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.36	0.581	22
Higher Education	2.35	0.875	72
Counseling/Other	2.22	0.959	36
Private Institution	2.29	0.793	68
Public Institution	2.42	0.865	53
Small Institution	2.21	0.817	53

Medium Institution	2.36	0.952	25
Large Institution	2.40	0.840	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.31
There is a need for a CPECs system in the profession of student affairs.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.46	0.837	81
Female Practitioners	2.56	0.929	50
White Practitioners	2.52	0.810	100
Practitioners of Color	2.42	1.057	31
Masters/Specialist	2.58	0.826	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.45	0.882	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.55	0.800	22
Higher Education	2.47	0.839	72
Counseling/Other	2.53	1.000	36
Private Institution	2.50	0.855	68
Public Institution	2.53	0.868	53
Small Institution	2.51	0.891	53
Medium Institution	2.52	1.005	25
Large Institution	2.47	0.799	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.32
Statistically Significant t-test Results for Survey Questions Related to Research Question Four (RQ4)

Question	Demographics	Means	t	p
The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs system would require is desirable.	White Practitioners/ Practitioners of Color	W = 2.40 P = 2.03	2.292	0.024

Research Question Five

Research question five (RQ5) focused on whether CSAOs have the perception of marginalization on their campuses as a result of the lack of a voluntary certification system in the profession of student affairs. Data for this research question were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and a One-way ANOVA. The categorical descriptive statistics for the three survey questions related to research question (RQ5) are shown in Tables 4.34, 4.35, and 4.36. Table 4.33 represents the ranked means for all survey questions that pertain to research question five (RQ5). The scale for the questionnaire was ranked on a one (1) to four (4) Likert Scale with one (1) being Strongly Agree and four (4) being Strongly Disagree. The lower the mean presented the more the respondents agreed with the item. The item with the lowest mean was, "Student Affairs is still an 'emerging' profession" (M = 2.40, SD = 0.982). The item with the highest mean was "Lack of a CPECs system leaves student affairs practitioners at a disadvantage in that they are not viewed to be credentialed in the same way as some related professionals on campus (e.g., counselors)" (M = 2.72, SD = .888). The ANOVA results for CSAOs' perceptions of marginalization on campus among other professions that have a certification process presented no statistically significant results, so they were not presented in a table.

Table 4.33
Ranked Descriptive Statistics for CSAOs Perceptions of Marginalization of Campus as a Result of No Voluntary Certification System.

Question	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Student Affairs is still an “emerging” profession.	2.40	0.982	131
CPECs would give the profession more validity.	2.42	0.885	131
Lack of a CPECs system leaves student affairs practitioners at a disadvantage in that they are not viewed to be credentialed in the same way as some related professionals on campus (e.g., counselors).	2.72	0.888	131

1 = Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.34
Student affairs is still an "emerging" profession.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.31	0.996	81
Female Practitioners	2.54	0.952	50
White Practitioners	2.44	0.978	100
Practitioners of Color	2.26	0.999	31
Masters/Specialist	2.32	0.989	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.42	0.986	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.23	1.152	22
Higher Education	2.49	0.934	72
Counseling/Other	2.31	0.980	36
Private Institution	2.32	0.854	68
Public Institution	2.49	1.067	53

Small Institution	2.32	0.956	53
Medium Institution	2.28	0.980	25
Large Institution	2.53	1.012	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.35
CPECs would give the profession more validity.

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.44	0.880	81
Female Practitioners	2.38	0.901	50
White Practitioners	2.43	0.832	100
Practitioners of Color	2.39	1.054	31
Masters/Specialist	2.37	0.913	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.43	0.881	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.50	0.740	22
Higher Education	2.39	0.848	72
Counseling/Other	2.44	1.054	36
Private Institution	2.44	0.835	68
Public Institution	2.42	0.949	53
Small Institution	2.43	0.844	53
Medium Institution	2.40	0.957	25
Large Institution	2.42	0.908	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Table 4.36
Lack of a CPECs system leaves student affairs practitioners at a disadvantage in that they are not viewed to be credentialed in the same way as some related professionals on campus (e.g., Counselors).

Category	Mean	Standard Dev.	N
Male Practitioners	2.80	0.843	81
Female Practitioners	2.58	0.950	50
White Practitioners	2.71	0.820	100
Practitioners of Color	2.74	1.094	31
Masters/Specialist	2.68	0.809	38
Doctorate/Professional	2.73	0.927	92
Student Affairs/Student Personnel	2.64	0.790	22
Higher Education	2.71	0.863	72
Counseling/Other	2.78	1.017	36
Private Institution	2.66	0.784	68
Public Institution	2.75	0.939	53
Small Institution	2.66	0.831	53
Medium Institution	2.60	0.957	25
Large Institution	2.83	0.914	53

1= Strongly Agree to 4 = Strongly Disagree

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the results of the following: a report on demographics of the respondents, presentation of data for each research question, and a quick synopsis of the data as it pertains to each research question. With an overall response rate of 32%, analyses were conducted using descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and One-way ANOVA. A number of tables were composed in this chapter to give a summary of the results of the data that was reported from the 131 Chief Student Affairs Officers

(CSAOs) who completed the survey. Furthermore, an in-depth discussion of the a) summary of the study, b) summary of significant findings, c) discussion of the meaning of those findings, d) implication for practice, and e) need for future research follows in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter includes an overall a) summary of the study, b) summary of significant research findings, c) discussion of the meaning of those findings, d) implication for practice, e) need for future research, and f) chapter summary.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) perceptions and support of the topics of professional competencies and continuing professional education credits (CPECs). Additionally, the researcher sought to understand the perceptions of student affairs' professionals related to the development of professional competencies and a continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system. Finally, the researcher examined whether the profession should invest in the concept of global professional competencies and a voluntary certification system. The researcher was guided by five research questions that utilized a quantitative methodology.

The *Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies* was developed by the researcher as a locally developed instrument to explore these constructs. An exhaustive literature review of professional competencies, continuing professional education credits, and CSAOs was completed by the researcher in the development of the instrument. The *Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies* included four components: *Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs), Professional Competencies,*

Continuing Professional Education Credits (CPECs), and *a Demographic Form.* A total of 131 surveys were returned out of a possible 400 for a return rate of 32.8%.

The researcher completed data analyses consisting of descriptive statistics and the ranking of means of the 46 items. All questions were evaluated by using an independent sample t-test, when comparisons of the means were made between two groups, and a one-way ANOVA, when comparisons of the means were made between more than two groups.

Summary of Findings

Research Question One (RQ1)

Research question one stated, "Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) endorse an establishment of professional competences in student affairs?" This question was analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA. Eight questionnaire items pertained to this research question. The above statistics were conducted on these questions utilizing the questionnaire demographic categories: gender, ethnicity, highest degree earned, field of degree, type of institution, and size of institution. Questionnaire items #15-18, #20, and #21 showed no statistical difference in responses based on demographic information given. However, statistically significant independent t-test findings existed for items #14 (Graduate preparation programs should support the learning of professional competencies for their graduates.) and #19 (Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to students attending college by having better informed practitioners.) as they pertained to research question one (RQ1).

Male practitioners more strongly agreed (M = 1.46, SD = 0.526) that graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies learning by their graduates than did female practitioners (M = 1.68, SD = 0.683). Another statistically significant independent sample t-test finding resulted in different responses between white practitioners and practitioners of color. Question #19 stated, "Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to students attending college by having better informed practitioners". This item produced a wide range of responses from white practitioners and practitioners of color (t = 2.050, p = 0.042). Practitioners of color (M = 1.61, SD = 0.592) expressed stronger support for professional development based on ACPA/NASPA established competencies would be beneficial to students attending institutions of higher education, than did white practitioners (M = 1.85, SD = 0.592). This question produced similar results pertaining to the importance of professional development as did the Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) study. These two different research studies with similar findings showed that CSAOs and student affairs practitioners as a whole support the need for the establishment of professional competencies. Overall research question one was evaluated on seven survey questions. The means of these eight questions were as followed: a) Graduate preparation programs should support professional competencies (M = 1.51, SD = 0.598), b) Professional competencies can serve as a tool to map out professional development plans (M = 1.66, SD = 0.615), c) Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the practitioners (M = 1.70, SD = 0.578), d) Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the profession (M = 1.70, SD = 0.591), e) Professional competencies should serve as a

foundation (M = 1.73, SD = 0.593), f) Professional development based on the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful by having better informed practitioners (M = 1.79, SD = 0.591), g) The profession has an obligation to help practitioners organize their professional development (M = 1.91, SD = 0.717), and h) Professional competencies set by ACPA/NASPA should represent the profession (M = 1.92, SD = 0.664).

The CSAOs of NASPA responded in a positive manner to the establishment of professional competencies. This was no surprise to the researcher who expected most professionals to believe that a set of competencies would give practitioners a way-finding map for their own professional development.

Research Question Two (RQ2)

Research question two examined the question, "Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) believe that they would sanction hiring only new professionals from graduate preparation programs in student affairs, higher education, counseling, or a related program?" Descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA were employed to analyze the participants' responses as they related to research question two (RQ2). Similar to research question one (RQ1), the questionnaire demographic categories were used for the analysis: gender, ethnicity, highest degree earned, field of degree, type of institution, and size of institution. One item from the questionnaire, #12 "Endorse hiring only practitioners who have completed graduate-level preparation in student affairs, counseling, or higher education", was used to investigate this research question. After the completion of all SPSS analysis, no statistically significant results were found based on the questionnaire's demographic categories.

The result for this research question was actually expected by the researcher. This question was asked to measure the perceptions of CSAOs and to conduct a complete research project. The researcher does not believe that the hiring of only practitioners that completed their graduate degrees in student affairs, higher education, counseling, or a related program is feasible for a field such as student affairs. The division of student affairs can encompass many different areas, some of which require specialized training and credentialing/licensure: health centers, police departments, counseling centers, and disability resource centers for example. While not practical to hire preparation program graduates for all positions, generalist roles would benefit from a common educational core.

Research Question Three (RQ3)

Research question three, "will Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) champion the participation of practitioners in professional competencies and a voluntary certification system?" was examined through descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA to compare the participants' responses. The researcher compared questionnaire items #22- #28 with demographic information. No statistical differences existed for items #22-25, #27, and #28. Question #26, "CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance," revealed a significant difference in responses in three demographic categories.

Practitioners of color ($M = 2.32$, $SD = 1.077$) more strongly agreed ($t = 2.657$, $p = 0.009$) that a continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system would have a direct impact of practitioners work performance than did white practitioners ($M = 2.76$, $SD = 0.740$). This finding was similar to the results published by Dean, Woodard, and

Cooper (2008). An additional statistical significance (t = 2.102, p = 0.038) was discovered between the responses of practitioners with a Masters or Specialist (M = 2.89, SD = 0.649) degree and those practitioners with a Doctorate or Professional (M = 2.55, SD = 0.906) degree. Practitioners who hold a Doctorate or Professional degree support the idea that CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance more than do practitioners with a Masters or Specialist degree.

The analysis of Questionnaire item #26 also found a statistical difference in the responses of practitioners at public institutions (M = 2.66, SD = 0.939) and practitioners at private institutions (M = 2.78, 0.643). Practitioners at public institutions more strongly agree with the statement about CPECs having a direct impact on job performance than their counterparts at private institutions (t = 2.025, p = 0.045). These findings could be the result from public institutions having larger divisions and budgets, thus more opportunity for professional development. The result of more professional development and experiencing the results of these opportunities may have led the CSAOs from public institutions to more strongly agree with CPECs direct impact than CSAOs from private institutions.

According to the data, CSAOs of NASPA believe that a CPEC system would increase the productivity of practitioners, but they did not support the establishment of a certification system. Because the CSAOs of NASPA state that CPECs increase work performance, but that they would not support a certification system, the researcher concludes that CSAOs have concerns about other stipulations that they have to follow in this budget-cut era. The researcher concludes that some of their concerns involved the cost of the program to their division; the recruitment of qualified individuals to their

institutions, especially to small rural institutions; and the resources that would be required to aid all practitioners in their division.

Research Question Four (RQ4)

Research question four (RQ4) stated, "What are Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAOs) perceptions of the functionality of participation in a continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system?" Once again this research question was analyzed using the demographic information from the questionnaire given to participants and was compared utilizing descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA procedures. Items from the questionnaire that related to research question four (RQ4) were #29-34, #36, and #39. No statistically significant results were found for items #29-34 and #39. Item #36, "The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs system would require is desirable," had significantly different responses from practitioners of color and white practitioners ($t = 2.292$, $p = 0.024$). Practitioners of color ($M = 2.03$, $SD = 1.016$) more strongly agreed with the concept that a voluntary CPECs system would be worth the additional effort for the profession than did white practitioners ($M = 2.40$, $SD = 0.778$). The above results were echoed in the 2008 study by Dean, Woodard, and Cooper.

Similar to the research question three (RQ3), research question four (RQ4) results present some of the same concerns presented by CSAOs of NASPA. They stated that they believe that the additional effort that a certification process would require is desirable but they do not believe that the profession is ready to move forward with a CPEC program. The researcher believes some of their apprehension about the functionality of a certification system comes from how to maintain the process not the process itself. All CSAOs want their practitioners to be as qualified as possible and

desire all professionals to stay abreast of the newest topics that face higher education. The cost of maintaining a certification program would be more of a burden on the smaller institutions than the larger institutions. The researcher believes strongly that in this era of budget reductions, all CSAOs are concerned with adding anything new to deficit budgets and packed workloads.

Research Question Five (RQ5)

The final research question investigated was "Do Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) have the perception of marginalization on their campuses as a result of the lack of a voluntary certification system in the profession of student affairs?" Descriptive statistics, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA procedures were performed to compare items #35, #37, and #38, based on demographic responses from the participants of the study. The completion of the SPSS analysis revealed no statistical significances between the responses for the questionnaire items that related to research question five (RQ5).

The researcher surveyed CSAOs of NASPA on this question because of a desire to know if they felt any shortcomings of the student affairs profession when compared to other professions on campus. NASPA's chief student affairs officers stated that they did not feel they were being marginalized on their respective campuses by not having a certification process. Due to reduction in both federal and state funding to higher education, increased scrutiny on accreditation, and recent tragedies on campuses, the researcher believes the outside public, including Washington, D.C., are more critical about how colleges and universities operate. This is evident in the Spelling Report of 2006 where the report presented six recommendations. One of the recommendations was

for an increase in transparency and communication by all colleges and universities in reference to cost, price and student success outcomes. Student affairs as a whole and individual functional areas in student affairs have been key in relieving some of the public's concern about issues on college and university campuses. Also, in recent years student affairs divisions have become more relevant in the eyes of other senior administrators on campus. This continued recognition is a key sign that student affairs is making a difference not only for the students but also for the university community as a whole.

Discussion of Findings

This study reveals a general support by chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) for the establishment of professional competencies in the field of student affairs. While CSAOs support professional competencies, they do not sanction the hiring of graduates from only student affairs, higher education, counseling, or related field programs. CSAOs also do not believe that the lack of a continuing professional education credit (CPEC) system makes them or any other student affairs professional feel marginalized by others on campus who do participate in a certification process. Overall, CSAOs are skeptical about the need for a CPEC system in the profession, but they do feel that a CPEC system would have positive impact on the practitioners' work performance and that the additional effort would be desirable.

This study also utilizes information presented by the NASPA Board of Directors (Janosik, 2002), information inferred by the ACPA's Task Force on Certification (Janosik, Carpenter, and Creamer, 2006), and a recent research study performed by Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) titled "*Professional Development Credits in Student Affairs*

Practice: A Method to Enhance Professionalism." Results presented by these documents and the literature review reveal consistent support for a more systematic professional development method and the implementation of a CPEC system in the profession. With these three independent projects revealing the need for a more systematic professional development process, one must ask, why does this study not replicate the same results?

Notably this particular study only includes chief student affairs (CSAOs) from one of the two prominent national associations for the student affairs profession. The NASPA Board of Directors, the ACPA Task Force on Certification, and the Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) projects included members from multiple associations and at multiple levels in those associations. The lack of strong support for a CPEC system in this current study may be related to the singling out of one particular group within one association. Another aspect to consider is that most of this study surveyed only practitioners and no faculty members. After taking a closer look at the literature, it is apparent that most of the student affairs professionals who are supporting the idea of a CPEC system are faculty members. In all of the literature, not many practitioners are strong proponents of this system, nor are they willing to put in the effort to investigate why the profession has no such system as a CPEC system.

The researcher of this study is a mid-manager level practitioner who is an enthusiastic supporter of professional competencies and the development of a CPEC system. Having previously worked in the K-12 teaching field, the researcher has become familiar with a well established form of professional competencies and a systemic professional development method. In the K-12 field, members of that profession had at least minimum qualifications and an understanding of what was expected of him or her at

work. The researcher also knew that after the first two years in the field, a certain number of continuing education credits (CEUs) would be required to maintain a position. These CEUs would serve as an outward, public gesture of obtaining a certain skill in a particular area.

The idea of CEUs or CPECs is related to the profession of student affairs in a various ways. One of the major concerns is that student affairs units are responsible for a broad spectrum of ideas and functions job areas. The diversity of skills necessary for practitioners to continue to be effective in their positions supports a requirement that encourages professionals to further update their skills; this process would also give hiring officials a history of the individuals' competencies (Miller & Sandeen, 2003).

Janosik, Carpenter, and Creamer (2006) recommended that:

> The major national student affairs associations should work collaboratively to develop criteria for a continuing professional education credit (CPEC) program for professional development. This is an absolutely critical need. If the national associations in student affairs do not do this soon, they will find themselves irrelevant, because some organizations, perhaps a for-profit will. It is equally essential that no one association come to "own" professional credentialing and professional development. This owning has to be a profession wide function. (p.233)

For nearly half of the items in this study, a significant difference was found between responses of practitioners of color and white practitioners about professional competencies and a CPEC system. It should be noted that practitioners of color

comprised 22.4% of the respondents. These results were also evident in the 2008 study by Dean, Woodard, and Cooper. Both studies had similar participation of practitioners of color and more practitioners of color supported professional competencies and a certification system than did white practitioners. Based on the two different studies producing similar outcomes, the results seem to be reliable and in need for further investigation. The major difference in the studies was that this study surveyed only CSAOs of NASPA, while the 2008 study surveyed members of all levels, including faculty members of the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA).

Implications for Practice

Dean, Woodard, and Cooper (2008) completed a study on professional development and continuing professional education credits (CPECs) which surveyed practitioners who were members of the Southern Association for College Student Affairs (SACSA), a regional professional organization. Although this study surveyed CSAOs of NASPA, some similar results were found in both studies. This study determined that chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) support the idea of professional competencies but are skeptical of to the idea of a voluntary certification system.

Having set of minimal competencies and an organized plan for professional development would assist the field of student affairs in staff recruitment and selection processes of qualified professionals. The researcher concurs with Carpenter (1998) that once there is an agreed-upon standard of professional development “a lack of consensus about what constitutes appropriate professional practice, the question of controlling or prescribing practices on individual campuses, the proper roles of professional associations, jurisdictional disputes among professions and professional organizations,

and diversity, among others will be alleviated" (p. 162). Finally, an agreed upon set of professional competencies and the establishment of a voluntary continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system would create a strong foundation on which to examine the accomplishments and differences among practitioners in the field. Creamer et al. (1992) suggested that a system for the "assessment of professional competencies and needs, continuing professional education, and recognition and reporting system" is a must for practitioners (p. 3).

An establishment of professional competencies and a voluntary continuing professional education credits (CPECs) system would aid practitioners by having a systematic plan to base their professional development on a set criterion. ACPA and NASPA, along with other national organizations, have set aside time and resources for the development of professional competencies and research into a possible certification system. A proposed professional development curriculum by Janosik (2002) included a variety of techniques for professional competencies in student affairs. Professional competencies in conjunction with a voluntary certification system would aid the profession in credentialing practitioners. While the two overseeing national organizations are investigating the possibility of professional competencies some of the functional organizations are moving forward with these ideas.

Association of College Unions, International (ACUI) conducted a member survey in early 2009, and the membership overwhelmingly noted that they were in favor of a certification system. ACUI charged the educational chairs to outline a process for a certification system for the association. Of all of the educational chairs, four are specifically charged with compiling research, developing an outline, and writing a report

to the ACUI national office about how to enact a certification system for the profession. Once the national office receives the report, they will develop a business plan that along with the report from the educational chairs will be forwarded to the ACUI board for approval.

Need for Future Research

After the completion of this study, a need for further research exists on the topics of professional competencies and a continuing professional education credit (CPEC) system. A few of the areas that need to be researched more in depth are the following: a) qualitative study and a different delivery methodology, b) isolated different demographic groups, i.e., practitioners of color and white practitioners, c) different professional levels, i.e., new professionals, mid-managers, and faculty members, d) differences between small institutions and large institutions, and e) the leadership of different student affairs professional organizations/associations.

Additional research should include a different delivery method to inquire if there would be an increase in the return rate by sending out hard copy questionnaires to the participants. On-line research studies have certain limitations such as having difficulty with incorrect email addresses. Incorrect email addresses automatically reduce the possible return rates, and in the end the return rate figures are not absolutely correct because one can only assume that everyone has received the invitation to participate. Also, more in-depth information may be provided with a qualitative methodology. In qualitative research the researcher can have leading questions that advance to more detailed questions, which in turn may produce richer results in the perceptions of practitioners as the study deals with professional competencies and CPECs.

Another important factor that should be considered in future studies is using a sample group that is more inclusive of all practitioners in the field rather than just chief student affairs officers (CSAOs). The sample size was limited due to the following: a) only CSAOs were surveyed, b) only members that chose to register with the NASPA listserv as CSAOs, and c) the practitioners that chose to participate in the study; a better rounded participant pool would give the study more credibility across the profession. After reviewing the results of this study, which stated that CSAOs were skeptical of the idea of a CPEC system, the researcher went back into the literature to compare the results to previous studies or taskforces. Currently, all of the literature that has been published about a certification system in student affairs has been authored by student affairs faculty members and not practitioners in the field.

As noted before, the researcher has a personal bias on this subject and is very much for the establishment of a CPEC system in the profession. Miller and Sandeen (2003) wrote about the idea of professional competencies and a more systematic process of professional development, but they have never actually written about a certification system in the profession. After all of the research, student affairs faculty members are the ones who have championed the idea of a certification system and not practitioners. Perhaps the researchers who have written about certification also need to evaluate more closely the impact that certification will have on practitioners and listen to their voices, as they state that they may not be ready for a certification process. As further research is completed on this topic, researchers should listen more to the practitioner's point of view and relay that to the profession as a whole.

Another avenue for additional research would be the “class” system between small and large institutions. The researcher believes that CSAOs of smaller institutions are more apprehensive because of fewer resources and the fear that they would not be able to attract qualified practitioners to their institutions. Some of the smaller institutions may not only have fewer resources, but they may also be located in areas that are not desirable for the most qualified practitioners. This is not always the case; just because an institution is larger in size (enrollment) does not necessarily translate into more resources for the recruitment and retention of qualified practitioners. Research needs to be completed on the perceptions of CSAOs from small institutions and CSAOs from large institutions.

Research should also be conducted by gathering input from the leadership of professional organizations such as NASPA, ACPA, ACUI, NODA, etc… NASPA and ACPA have already conducted research and spent resources on ideas their associations believe are important on these topics. Association of College Unions, International (ACUI) has educational councils that are currently working on a plan to implement a certification process based on the results of a member survey. A current study by their national office found an overwhelming response from their membership asking for a certification system for the association. They plan on having something in place with a business plan to the Board of Directors by early 2010. Receiving input from these professional organizations would aid in determining each individual organization’s current status on this topic and their plans, if any at all, to discuss it with their members. Student affairs functional areas are taking more of leadership role in the area of

certification because the two national umbrella organizations, ACPA and NASPA, are shying away from actively pursuing this topic.

Scholars in the profession have written on different points of view focused on a certification process that may be feasible in the profession (Janosik, 2002; Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer, 2006). More research would also include a broader range of practitioners in the profession such as new professionals, mid-managers, senior level members, and graduate preparation faculty. In addition, a better representation of ethnicity in the profession would be sought. A complete research project a) would overlap many different practitioners, b) would have information presented both qualitatively and quantitatively, and c) would conduct a study that utilized the top ten student affairs professional organizations' listserv or member base to gain input from the widest range of practitioners.

Chapter Summary

This study focused on the perceptions of chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) who are members of NASPA and the responsibilities that practitioners and professional organizations alike should bear in regards to professional development. Janosik, Carpenter, and Creamer (2006) stated that professional organizations have the obligation to aid their members in improving their skills and knowledge base. Many practitioners in the field who have researched professional competencies and a voluntary certification system feel as though professional organizations have been too passive in their study of these topics and note the leadership has the ability to impact the future of the profession (Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer). Even in the Spellings Report of 2006 one of the six presented recommendations was, "the development of a national strategy for lifelong

learning designed to keep our citizens at the forefront of the knowledge revolution (p.26)." Most practitioners, especially CSAOs of NASPA, are skeptical about the process of certification in the profession. This study has shown that chief student affairs officers support a more structured system for professional development, which includes professional competencies but not a certification system. CSAOs also stated that having a history of practitioners' professional development activities would be a beneficial to in the hiring process. Currently, with budget reduction and an increase in accountability, active work needs to begin on a systematic form of professional development designed to include professional competencies and a voluntary certification system that is profession driven and accessible to all.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G. (1993). Student: Interests, culture, and activism. In A. Levine (Ed.), *Higher learning in America: 1980-2000* (pp.203-221). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Amber, D. A. (2000). Organizational and administrative models. In M. Barr, & M. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., 121-134). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Association of Community Colleges (2008). Historical Information. Retrieved Sept. 3, 2008 from http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/default.aspx

American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning*. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

American College Personnel Association (1994). *The student learning imperative.* Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

American College Personnel Association (2006). *Task force on certification: preliminary report*. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

American College Personnel Association (2007). *Professional competencies: a report of the steering committee on professional competencies*. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

American College Personnel Association (2008). ACPA Professional Competencies. Retrieved Oct. 12, 2008 from http://www.myacpa.org/au/governance/docs/ACPA_Competencies.pdf

American Council on Education (1937/1994a). *The student personnel point of view*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

American Council on Education (1949/1994b). *The student personnel point of view*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. (1976). Model for state legislation concerning the practice of counseling, 1976, draft no. 4. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. (1979). Licensure Committee Action Packet. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Appleton, J. R., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). *Pieces of eight: The rites, roles and styles of the dean by eight who have been there*. Portland, OR: NASPA Institute of Research and Development.

Asher, B. T. (1994). *A president's perspective on student services delights and debits*. Greensboro, NC: Educational Resources Informational Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 366855)

Association of College Unions International. (2008). Task Force Report on Development of Core Competencies. Retrieved June 24, 2008 from http://www.acui.org/uploadedFiles/About_ACUI/taskforce_report_corecomp.pdf

Barr, M.J., & Associates. (1993). *The handbook of student affairs administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, M. J., & Desler, M. K. (2000). Leadership for the future. In M. Barr, & M. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., 629-642). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bashaw, C. T. (1992). We who live "off on the edges": Deans of women at Southern coeducation institutions and access to the community of higher education, 1907-1960. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Baskett, H.K.M., & Marsick, V.J. (1992), Confronting new understandings about professional learning and change, *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, Vol. 55 No. Fall, pp.7-15.

Baxtor-Magolda, M. B. (2001). Enhancing learning. In R. B. Winston, D. G. Creamer, T. K. Miller, and Associates (Eds.), *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, and manager*. New York: Taylor Francis.

Baxter-Magolda, M. B., & Terenzini, P. T. (1999). Learning and teaching in the 21st century: Trends and implications for practice. In C. S. Johnson & H. E. Cheatham (Eds.), *Higher education trends for the next century: A research agenda for student success* (pp. 20-27). Washington, DC: ACPA.

Bickel, R. D., & Lake, P. T. (1994). Reconceptualizing the university's duty to provide a safe learning environment: A criticism of the doctrine of *in loco parentis* and the restatement (second) of torts. *Journal of College & University Law*, *20*, 261-293.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blimling, G. (2004). *Proposal for the establishment of the national institute for student affairs certification.* Unpublished manuscript.

Blimling, G. S., & Whitt, E. J. (1999). *Good practices in student affairs: Principles to foster student learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloland, P. A. (1983). Ecumenicalism in college student personnel. In B. A. Belson & L. E. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Thus we spoke: ACPA-NAWDAC, 1958-1975* (pp. 237-254). Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association.

Bloland, P. A., Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R. (1994). *Reform in student affairs: A critique of student development*. Greensboro, NC: ERIC Counseling and Student Services Clearinghouse.

Border, L. L. (1990). Taking diversity seriously: New developments in teaching for diversity. In M. Svinicki (Ed.), *Teaching and learning on the edge of themillennium: Building on what we have learned* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 80, pp. 83-89). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1990a). Foreword. In Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Campus life: In search of community* (pp. xi-xiii). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990b). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyer, E. L. (1993). Campus climate in the 1980s and 1990s: Decades of apathy and renewal. In A. Levine (Ed.), *Higher learning in America: 1980-2000* (pp.322-332). Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Brint, S.G., 1993. Eliot Friedson's contribution to the sociology of professions. *Work and Occupations,20*(3),259–278.

Brown, R. D. (1972). *Student development in tomorrow's higher education: A return to the academy* (Student Personnel Series No. 16). Washington, DC: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Brown, C. L. (1997). The chief student affairs officer and leadership effectiveness: Five areas for thought. *College Student Journal*, 31 (4), 545.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities*, 1636-1976. New York: Harper & Row.

Bryan, W. A. (1996). What is total quality management? In W. A. Bryan (Ed.). *Total quality management: Applying its principles to student affairs* (New Directions for Student Affairs No. 76, pp. 3-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryan, W.A. and Mullendore, R.H. (1990). Professional development strategies. In R.B. Young, (Ed.), *The invisible leaders: Student affairs mid-managers*. Washington, D.C.: NASPA.

Bryan,W. A., & Mullendore, R. H. (1991). Operationalizing CAS Standards for program evaluation. In W. A. Bryan, R. B., Winston, Jr., & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *Using professional standards in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 53, pp.29-44). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bryan, W.A., & Mullendore, R.H. (Eds.), (1992). *Rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of students* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryan, W. A., & Schwartz, R. A. (Eds.) (1998). *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century* (New Directions for Student Services No. 84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Callan, P. S. (1993). Government and higher education. In A. Levine (Ed.), *Higher learning in America: 1980-2000* (pp.3-19). Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Carpenter, D. S. (1991). Student affairs profession: A developmental perspective. In T. K. Miller, R. B. Winston, Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 253-279). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development, Inc.

Carpenter, D. S. (1998). Continuing professional education in student affairs. In N. Evans & C. Phelps, (Eds.), *The state of the art in preparation and practice in student affairs* (pp.159-179). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Carpenter, D. S. (2001). Student affairs scholarship (re?)considered: Toward a scholarship of practice. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*(4), 301-318.

Carpenter, D. S. (2003). Professionalism. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, and Associates (Eds.). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp.573-592). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carpenter, D. S., & Stimpson, M. T., (2007). Professionalism, scholarly practice, and professional development in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 44 (2), 265-284.

Clifton, D. O., & Anderson, E. C. (2002). *StrengthsQuest*. Washington, DC: The Gallup Organization.

Commission of Professional Preparation of COSPA. (1975). Student development services in post secondary education. In A. L. Rentz & G. L. Saddlemire (Eds.),

Student affairs: A profession's heritage. (1994) (pp.428-437). Lanham, MD: University of American Press.

Conte, A. E. (2000). In loco parentis. Alive and well. *Education, 121,* 195-200.

Cooper, D. L., & Saunders, S. A. (2000). The perceived importance of the CAS Standards: Implications for practice. *College Student Affairs Journal, 19,* 71-81.

Cottingham, H. F., & Warner, R.W., Jr. (1978). APGA and counselor licensure: A status report. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56,* 604.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2006). *CAS standards and guidelines*. Washington, DC: Author. (Standards originally published 1986).

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009). History of CAS. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from www.cas.edu/CAS%20History/History.html

Cowley, W. H. (1936). The nature of student personnel work. Reprinted in G. Saddlemire & A.Rentz (Eds.) (1986), *Student affairs: A profession's heritage* (pp.47-73). Media Publication, 40. Alexandria: American College Personnel Association.

Cowley, W. H. (1994). Reflections of a troublesome but hopeful Rip Van Winkle. In A. L. Rentz (Ed.), *Student affairs: A profession's heritage* (American College Personnel Association Media Publication No. 40, 2nd ed., pp. 190-197). Lanham, MD: University Press of America, (Original work published 1964).

Cowley, W. H., & Williams, D. (1991). *International and historical roots of American higher education.* New York: Garland

Creamer, D. G., & Claar, J. (1995). *Report of the Interassociation Committee on Continuing Professional Education to the NASPA and ACPA Boards.* Unpublished paper available from the authors.

Creamer, D. G., Janosik, S. M., Winston, R. B., & Kuh, L. (2001). *Quality assurance in student affairs: Role and commitments of NASPA*. Policy statement published by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Washington, DC.

Cramer, D. G., Winston, R. B., Schuh, J. Gehring, D. McEwen, M. L., Forney, D., Carpenter, D. S., & Woodard, D. B. (1992). *Quality assurance in student affairs: A proposal for action by professional associations*. Report published by the American College Personnel Association and the National Student Personnel Association, Washington, DC.

Creamer, D. G., & Woodard, D. B. (1992). *Accrediting and credentialing in college student affairs: The role of ACPA and NASPA Boards*. Unpublished paper commissioned by the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Washington, DC.

Dean, L. A., Woodard, B. R., & Cooper, D. L. (2008). Professional development credits in student affairs practice: A method to enhance professionalism. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 27(1), 45-56.

DeCoster, D. A., & Brown, S. S. (1991). Staff development : Personal and professional education. In T. K. Miller, R. B. Winston, Jr., & Associates, *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 563-614). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Deegan, W. L. (1981). *Managing student affairs programs*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

Dewey, J. (1971). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier. (Original work Published 1938).

Edgerton, R. (1997). *Education white paper*. Retrieved Oct. 28, 2008, from http://www.pewundergradforum.org/wp1.html

Fley, J. (1979). Student personnel pioneers: Those who developed our profession. *NASPA Journal, 17*(1), 23-39.

Gangone, L. (1999). *Navigating turbulence: A case study of a voluntary higher education association*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teacher College, New York.

Garland, P. H., & Grace, T. W. (1993). *New perspectives for student affairs professionals: Evolving realities, responsibilities, and roles* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: Georgia Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Gehring, D. D. (2000). Understanding the legal implications of student affairs practice. In M. J. Barr & M. K. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd. ed., pp. 347-376). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Geiger, R. L. (2000). College as it was in the mid-nineteenth century. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *The American college in the nineteenth century* (pp.80-90). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Gilroy, M. (1987). *The contributions of selected teachers of college women to the field of student personnel.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York.

Grace-Odeleye, B. (1998). A Model for Staff Development in Student Affairs. In W.A. Bryan & R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century. (*New Directions for Student Services, 84, 83-93).

Hayes, W. (2003). *So you want to be a college professor*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Herdlein, R.J. (2004). Thyrsa Wealtheow Amos: the dean of deans. *NASPA Journal, 41*(2), 336-355.

Hosie, T.W. (1991). Historical antecedents and current status of counselor licensure. In F.O. Bradley (Ed.), *Credentialing in counseling* (pp. 23-52). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Huck, S. W. (2000). *Reading statistics and research* (3rd Ed.). New York: Longman.

Jackson, L. (2000). The rites of man and the rites of youth: Fraternity and riot at 18th century Harvard. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *The American college in the nineteenth century* (pp. 46-79). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

James, H. (1910). *Charles W. Eliot.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Janosik, S. M. (2002). *The development of a national registry for student affairs administrators*. Report published by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Washington, DC.

Janosik, S. M., Carpenter, D. S., & Creamer, D. G., (2006). Beyond professional preparation programs: The role of professional associations in ensuring a quality workforce. *Journal of College Student Affairs.*

Johnson, C. S. (1985). The American College Personnel Association. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 63*, 405-410.

Joint Task Force on Student Learning. (1998). *Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning* retrieved from http://www.aahe.org/teaching/tsk_frce.htm.

Kent May 4 Center. (2008). Description of Events. Retrieved August 2, 2008 from http://www.may4.org/

Kerr, C. (1990). Higher education cannot escape history: The 1990s. In L. W. Jones & F. A. Nowotny (Eds.), *Agenda for the new decade* (New Directions for Student Services No. 83, pp. 5-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knefelkamp, L. L. (1992). *"Is this good for our students?" Two papers from the 1991 CIC deans institute.* Washington, DC: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED356720)

Kolling, A. T. (1998). Student affirmative action and the courts. In D. Gehring (Ed.), *Responding in the new affirmative action climate* (New Directions for Student Services No. 83, pp. 15-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Komives, S. R., & Woodard, Jr., D. B. (1996). Building on the past, shaping the future. In s. Komives, D. Woodard., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 536-555). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Lyons, J., Miller, T. K. & Trow, J. (1995). *Reasonable expectations.* Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associations (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leonard, E. A. (1956). *Origins of personnel services in American higher education*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lloyd-Jones, E. M., & Smith, M. R. (1954). *Student personnel work as deeper teaching*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Lovell, C. D., & Kosten, L. A. (2000). Skills, knowledge, and personal traits necessary for success as a student affairs administrator: A meta-analysis of thirty years of research. *NASPA Journal, 37*, 553-572.

Mable, P. (1991). Professional standards: An introduction and historical perspective. In W. A. Bryan, R. B. Winston, Jr., & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *Using professional standards in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 53, pp. 45-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mech. T. (1997. May/June). The managerial roles of chief academic officers. *Journal of Higher Education. 68*(3). 282-298.

McClellan, G. S., & Barr, M. J. (2000). Planning, managing, and financing facilities and services. In M. Barr, M. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McDade, S. A., & Lewis, P. H. (1994). Developing administrative excellence: Creating a culture of leadership. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 87, 1-3.

Miller, T. K. (1991). Using standards in professional preparation. In W. A. Bryan, R. B. Winston, Jr., & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *Using professional standards in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 53, pp. 45-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, T. K. (2006). *The CAS book of professional standards in higher education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

Miller, T. K., & Sandeen A., (2003). Staff development: A systematic process for student affairs leaders. *NASPA Journal, 21*, 55-63.

National Museum of American History. (2008). Retrieved August 2, 2008 from http://americanhistory.si.edu/timeline/index.cfm

Nidiffer, J. (2001). Crumbs from the boys' table: The first century of coeducation. In J. Nidiffer & C. T. Bashaw (Eds.), *Women administrators in higher education* (pp. 157-182). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Nuss, E. M. (2000). The role of professional associations, In M. J. Barr & M. K. Desler (Eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (2nd ed., pp. 492-507).

Ottinger, D. C. (2000). Student development: Its place in the academy. In A. M. Hoffman & R. W. Summers (Eds.), *Managing colleges and universities: Issues for leadership* (pp.139-159). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pope, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (1997). The student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development*, *38*, 266-277.

Rentz, A. L. (Ed.). (1994). *Student affairs: A profession's heritage* (American College Personnel Association Media Publication No. 40, 2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Rhatigan, J. J. (2001). NASPA history. In *NASPA member handbook* (pp.6-8). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Rudolph, F. (1965). *The American college and university: A history*. New York: Knopf.

Sandeen, A. (1985). The legacy of values education in college student personnel work. In J. Dalton (Eds.), *Promoting values development in college students* (Monograph Series, No. 4, pp. 1-16). Washington: NASPA.

Sandeen, A. (1991). *The chief student affairs officer: Leader, manager, mediator, educator*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sandeen, A. (2004). Educating the whole student: the growing academic importance of student affairs. *Change*, *36*(3), 28-33.

Sandin, R. T. (1992). To those who teach at Christian Colleges. In D. S. Gurthrie & R. L. Noftzger, *New directions for higher education: Agenda for church-related colleges & universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Scharre, E. W., Jr., (1996). Chief student affairs officers in the southeast: A profile (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58, 684.

Schoper, S. E., Stimpson, R., & Segar, T. C. (January 29, 2006). *ACPA Certification Taskforce Synthesis: A Professional Development Curriculum*. Unplublished internal report.

Schroder, C. C. (2003). Using the lesson from research to develop partnerships. In S. Komives & D. Woodard (Eds.), *Student Services: A handbook for the Profession* (4th ed.) (pp. 618-636). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, R. A. (2001). *The disappearing deans of men ----- Where they went and why: A historical perspective*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Seattle, Washington.

Schwartz, R. A. & Bryan, W. A. (1998). What is professional development? In W.A. Bryan & R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21st century.* (New Directions for Student Services No. 84, pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sloan, D. (1980). *Education and values*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education in america*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Stewart, G. M. (1985). *College and university discipline: A moment of reflection, a time for new direction*. Unpublished manuscript, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

Strange, C. C. (1994). Student development: The evolution and status of an essential idea. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 399-412.

Sturdvant, S. M., & Hayes, H. (1930). *Deans at work: Discussion by eight women deans of various phases of their work*. New York: Harper.

Swanson, C.L. (1988). Historical perspective on licensure for counselors. In R.L. Dingman (Ed.), *Licensure for mental health counselors* (pp.1-3). Alexandria, VA: American Mental Health Counselors Association.

Taylor, J. (2001). *Finding the right stuff in chief student affairs officers.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri.

Teachers College. (1914). Columbia University School of Education Announcement. New York: Author.

The Library of Congress (2008). Retrieved August 10, 2008 from http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/browse/ListSome.php?category=War,+Military

Thelin, J. R. (1996). Historical overview of American higher education. In S. Komives, D. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 3-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Traylor, J. G. (1998). *A heritage of service: The history of the National Association of Student Affairs Professionals (NASAP)*. Jackson, MS: NASAP.

Tuttle, K. (2004). *The historical perspective of women administrators in higher education*. 2004 NASPA Alice Manicur Symposium.

United States Army (2008). GoArmy. Retrieved July 8, 2008 from http://www.goarmy.com/benefits/education.jsp

Upcraft, M. L. (1994). The dilemmas of translating theory to practice. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 438-443.

Upcraft, M. L. & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Williamson, E. G. (1961). *Student personnel services in colleges and universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Winston, R. B., Jr., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R. B., Jr., Creamer, D. G., Miller, T. K., & Associates (2001). *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, and manager*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Woodard, D. W., Love, P., & Komives, S. R. (2000). *Leadership and management issues for a new century* (New Directions for Student Services No. 92 pp. 5-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yudof, M. G., Kirp, D. L., Levin, B., & Moran, R. F. (2002). Educational Policy and the Law (4th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Group.

Young, R. (1993). Essential values of the profession. In R. Young (Ed.), *Identifying and implementing the essential values of the profession* (New Directions for Student Services No. 61, pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Young, R. B. (1996). Guiding values and philosophy. In S. Komives, D. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 83-110). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Young, R. B. (2001). A perspective on the values of student affairs and scholarship. *Journal of College Student Development*, *42*, 319-337.

APPENDIX A: EMAIL INVITATION AND CONSENT FORM

3/30/09

Dear Chief Student Affairs Officer:

My name is Bobby Woodard, and I would like to invite you to participate in a research study being supported by NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. This study will be conducted under the direction of Dr. Diane Cooper, Professor, Counseling and Human Development, University of Georgia (706) 542-4120. All individually-identifiable information collected will be kept confidential.

You are invited to participate in a study titled "Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies." The purpose of this research is to determine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAO) thoughts and perceptions on the use and integration of a set of professional competencies. While this study will provide an opportunity for participants to self-reflect on their perceptions of professional competencies, the results may enhance how practitioners should strive to contribute to student learning and their own professional development. This may further allow practitioners to better serve themselves and the students at their institutions.

Your information was provided by NASPA, identifying you as a Chief Student Affairs Officer.

Completion of the survey is expected to take a maximum of 10 minutes. To participate in this study, please access the survey via the following link:

http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/bobbyw/bobbyw.htm

I plan to begin data analysis on DATE, so completion of the survey by then would be appreciated.

CONSENT INFORMATION:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. In addition, you may skip any questions that you do not feel comfortable responding to.

Completion of the survey instrument will be considered consent for participation. There are no foreseeable risks or discomfort associated with this research study, however, please note that while I can ensure confidentiality of the participant by utilizing standard confidentiality procedures during the completion of the final report, there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The web site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the Internet technology.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please do not hesitate to ask. You may contact me at (706) 542-7774 or bwoodard@uga.edu or my major advisor at (706)542-4120 or dlcooper@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to: The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706)542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Thank you for the valuable help that you are providing through your participation in this research study.

Sincerely,
Bobby R. Woodard
University of Georgia

APPENDIX B: EMAIL REMAINDER 1 AND CONSENT FORM

4/06/09

Dear Chief Student Affairs Officer:

This is a reminder to the initial invite to participate in this survey. I wanted to remind you that there is only one week left in your opportunity to participate in a research study being supported by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Your responses will provide valuable information to help inform and guide the future practices of the student affairs profession. If you have already completed this survey, I truly appreciate your support through your participation.

If you have not yet completed the survey, I ask you to consider participating in this research and to read on for more information.

My name is Bobby Woodard, and I would like to invite you to participate in a research study being supported by NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. This study will be conducted under the direction of Dr. Diane Cooper, Professor, Counseling and Human Development, University of Georgia (706) 542-4120. All individually-identifiable information collected will be kept confidential.

You are invited to participate in a study titled "Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies." The purpose of this research is to determine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAO) thoughts and perceptions on the use and integration of a set of professional competencies. While this study will provide an opportunity for participants to self-reflect on their perceptions of professional competencies, the results may enhance how practitioners should strive to contribute to student learning and their own professional development. This may further allow practitioners to better serve themselves and the students at their institutions.

Your information was provided by NASPA, identifying you as a Chief Student Affairs Officer.

Completion of the survey is expected to take a maximum of 10 minutes. To participate in this study, please access the survey via the following link:

http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/bobbyw/bobbyw.htm

I plan to begin data analysis on DATE, so completion of the survey by then would be appreciated.

CONSENT INFORMATION:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. In addition, you may skip any questions that you do not feel comfortable responding to.

Completion of the survey instrument will be considered consent for participation. There are no foreseeable risks or discomfort associated with this research study, however, please note that while I can ensure confidentiality of the participant by utilizing standard confidentiality procedures during the completion of the final report, there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The web site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the Internet technology.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please do not hesitate to ask. You may contact me at (706) 542-7774 or bwoodard@uga.edu or my major advisor at (706)542-4120 or dlcooper@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to: The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706)542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Thank you for the valuable help that you are providing through your participation in this research study.

APPENDIX C: FINAL EMAIL REMINDER AND CONSENT FORM

4/08/09

Dear Chief Student Affairs Officer:

This is a final reminder to the one previously sent from me within the past week. I wanted to remind you of an opportunity to participate in a research study being supported by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). Your responses will provide valuable information to help inform and guide the future practices of the student affairs profession. If you have already completed this survey, I truly appreciate your support through your participation.

If you have not yet completed the survey, I ask you to consider participating in this research and to read on for more information.

My name is Bobby Woodard, and I would like to invite you to participate in a research study being supported by NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. This study will be conducted under the direction of Dr. Diane Cooper, Professor, Counseling and Human Development, University of Georgia (706) 542-4120. All individually-identifiable information collected will be kept confidential.

You are invited to participate in a study titled "Examination of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) Perceptions of Professional Competencies." The purpose of this research is to determine Chief Student Affairs Officers' (CSAO) thoughts and perceptions on the use and integration of a set of professional competencies. While this study will provide an opportunity for participants to self-reflect on their perceptions of professional competencies, the results may enhance how practitioners should strive to contribute to student learning and their own professional development. This may further allow practitioners to better serve themselves and the students at their institutions.

Your information was provided by NASPA, identifying you as a Chief Student Affairs Officer.

Completion of the survey is expected to take a maximum of 10 minutes. To participate in this study, please access the survey via the following link:

http://vpsa4.vpsa.uga.edu/surveys/bobbyw/bobbyw.htm

I plan to begin data analysis on DATE, so completion of the survey by then would be appreciated.

CONSENT INFORMATION:
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. In addition, you may skip any questions that you do not feel comfortable responding to.

Completion of the survey instrument will be considered consent for participation. There are no foreseeable risks or discomfort associated with this research study, however, please note that while I can ensure confidentiality of the participant by utilizing standard confidentiality procedures during the completion of the final report, there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. The web site and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the Internet technology.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please do not hesitate to ask. You may contact me at (706) 542-7774 or bwoodard@uga.edu or my major advisor at (706)542-4120 or dlcooper@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to: The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706)542-3199; E-mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Thank you for the valuable help that you are providing through your participation in this research study.

APPENDIX D: EXAMINATION OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICERS (CSAOs) PERCEPTIONS OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

Directions:

Please indicate the most appropriate response to each question. This survey should take you 10 minutes to complete. Providing this information is voluntary and confidential. Thank you for your participation.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly Disagree**				
1. I have a strong personal commitment to enhancing my professional development.	1	2	3	4
2. My professional development is my own responsibility, not to be imposed by the institution.	1	2	3	4
3. My institution should aid in my professional development.	1	2	3	4
4. I have established a balance between my personal needs and professional expectations.	1	2	3	4
5. I read professional journals or periodicals to keep current in the field.	1	2	3	4
6. I attend professional state conferences yearly.	1	2	3	4
7. I attend professional regional conferences yearly.	1	2	3	4
8. I attend professional national conferences yearly.	1	2	3	4
9. I feel a sense of connection to the profession of student affairs.	1	2	3	4

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES: A specific range of skills, knowledge, or abilities related to the practitioner's understanding to use this knowledge as a basis for providing the highest quality of services (ACPA, 2007).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly Disagree**				
10. Practitioners must seek to develop their own professional skill sets.	1	2	3	4
11. The profession has and is likely to continue to attract individuals whose backgrounds do not include completion of formal study in this field.	1	2	3	4
12. The student affairs profession should endorse hiring only practitioners (in appropriate functional areas) who have completed graduate-level preparation in student affairs, counseling, or higher education.	1	2	3	4
13. The outcomes from graduate preparation programs can aid in the development of professional competencies.	1	2	3	4

14. Graduate preparation programs should support the learning of professional competencies for their graduates.	1	2	3	4
15. Professional competencies should serve as a foundation upon which professional development activities can be shaped.	1	2	3	4
16. Professional competencies set by ACPA/NASPA should represent the profession of student affairs.	1	2	3	4
17. Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to practitioners.	1	2	3	4
18. Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to the student affairs profession.	1	2	3	4
19. Professional development based upon the ACPA/NASPA competencies would be helpful to students attending college by having better informed practitioners.	1	2	3	4
20. Professional competencies can serve as a tool by which student affairs professionals map out professional development plans.	1	2	3	4
21. The profession has an obligation to help practitioners organize their professional development with professional competencies.	1	2	3	4

CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION CREDITS (CPECs): is a process of earning/assigning credits and record keeping for the completion of a specified activity such as a seminar, conference session, etc… (Janosik, Carpenter, & Creamer, 2006).

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? **1 = Strongly Agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly Disagree**				
		Agree	Disagree	
22. CPECs represent a mark of quality assurance for conference presentations or workshops.	1	2	3	4
23. CPECs can insure that practitioners remain current in the profession.	1	2	3	4
24. CPECs confirm that practitioners have attained the learning outcomes that were intended by professional development activities.	1	2	3	4
25. CPECs need to occur as a continuous method of updating professional knowledge.	1	2	3	4
26. CPECs have a direct relationship to the participating practitioners work performance.	1	2	3	4
27. CPECs have a direct impact on the growth of practitioners as individuals.	1	2	3	4
28. CPECs would provide a history of practitioners' professional development activities.	1	2	3	4
29. If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system then professional organizations such as ACPA/NASPA should establish the standards.	1	2	3	4
30. If student affairs enacts a voluntary CPECs system then	1	2	3	4

professional organizations such as CAS should establish the standards.				
31. CPECs should be available online to allow for easy accessibility.	1	2	3	4
32. CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the institutional level.	1	2	3	4
33. CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the regional level.	1	2	3	4
34. CPECs for student affairs professionals should be available at the national level.	1	2	3	4
35. Student affairs is still an "emerging" profession.	1	2	3	4
36. The additional effort that a voluntary CPECs system would require is desirable.	1	2	3	4
37. CPECs would give the profession more validity.	1	2	3	4
38. Lack of a CPECs system leaves student affairs practitioners at a disadvantage in that they are not viewed to be credentialed in the same way as some related professionals on campus (e.g., counselors).	1	2	3	4
39. There is a need for a CPECs system in the profession of student affairs.	1	2	3	4

DEMOGRAPHICS:

40. Gender
    ___Male
    ___Female
    ___Transgender

41. Ethnicity (please mark the one that best describes you)
    ___ American Indian or Alaska Native
    ___ Asian American
    ___ Black or African American
    ___ Hispanic/Latino/Latina
    ___ Native American
    ___ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    ___ Multiracial
    ___ White/Caucasian
    ___ Other (please specify: _____)

42. Highest Degree Earned
    ___ Associates
    ___ Bachelors
    ___ Masters
    ___ Specialist
    ___ Professional (Law, Medical, etc…)
    ___ Doctorate

43. What was the field of study of your high degree earned
___Student Affairs/Student Personnel
___Higher Education Administration
___Counseling
___Other (please specify _____)

44. How many years have you been employed full-time in the profession
Please specify_____

45. Type of Institution (where you are employed, please check all that apply)
___ Private
___ Public

___ Two-year Institution
___ Four-year Institution

___HBCU
___Religious Affiliated
___Single Sex

46. Institutional Enrollment
___ Small (0– 4,999)
___ Medium (5,000 – 9,999)
___ Large (10,000+)