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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background for Study

Preparing graduate students for careers in the higher education student affairs profession is the goal of academic programs listed in college catalogs under such titles as Higher Education, Education Administration, Adult Education, Student Affairs, and Postsecondary Education. However, they can generally be categorized into two major areas referred to as higher education as a field of study (Cooper, 1986; Crosson, 1983; Dressel and Mayhew, 1974; Ewing and Stickler, 1964; and Williams, 1984) and student affairs or student personnel preparation programs (Meabon and Owens, 1984; Miller, 1967; O'Banion, 1969; Rhatigan, 1968; and Williamson, 1958).

Titles are not the only diverse aspect of these programs. Each may take a different educational approach such as emphasizing counseling, administration, student development (Sandeen, 1988) or research, the latter more frequently at the doctoral level.

Faculty and staff might belong to and participate in activities of one or more of the four major national professional organizations: National Association of Student
Personnel Administrators (NASPA), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC), and the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE); or the many specialty associations such as those concerned with residence halls, academic advising, career development, minority students, commuter students, recreation, or other specific interests.

Higher education as a field of professional graduate study reputedly began with a course taught by G. Stanley Hall at Clark University in 1893. It included topics on university work and technical education.

Student affairs preparation, for all practical purposes, began in 1920 and grew steadily until 1945 when the yearly rate of growth of new institutions offering the graduate program increased to approximately four institutions per year (Ewing and Stickler, 1964). For purposes of this study the terms "higher education" and "student affairs" preparation programs will be used interchangeably.

Beginning in 1956 centers and institutes for the study of higher education were established that attracted financing from outside the university (Ewing and Stickler, 1964). Dressel and Mayhew (1974) reported that by 1974
higher education as a degree granting program had reached "significant dimensions in offerings, specialties provided, degrees available, in faculty, in degrees already awarded, and in current enrollments" (p. 71).

Throughout the history of student affairs programs at colleges and universities in the United States three major attempts to define the student affairs field have affected the preparation programs of student affairs professionals. The first, the Student Personnel Point of View was written as a report of a 1937 Conference on the philosophy and development of student affairs work sponsored by the Committee on Problems and Plans in Education of the American Council on Education (ACE, 1937). The major philosophy of this document emphasized the development of the student as a total person as opposed to emphasizing only the student's intellectual development (ACE, 1937). The original statement was reaffirmed in a revision published in 1949 (ACE, 1949).

The second major attempt to define the college student affairs profession and make recommendations for professional preparation occurred in the early 1960s by the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA). The report, written by representatives of eight national organizations, took an interdisciplinary approach to
preparation programs with recommendations in three areas: a required professional core, core extension areas designed to deepen and broaden the core work, and specialty options (Emmet and Sheldon, 1965).

The third, and most recent, major influence on preparation programs was created when a joint task force of NASPA and ACPA invited interested professional associations to a meeting in Alexandria, Virginia in June, 1979 (CAS, 1986). The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) was formed representing twenty-two professional associations. After six years of study and negotiations, the Council published standards and guidelines to establish criteria to guide the professional practice and preparation of student services, student affairs, and student development program personnel in postsecondary institutions of higher learning (CAS, 1986).

In spite of these attempts to define and set standards for the student affairs preparation field, there continue to be questions regarding the quality of these training programs, whether or not they should be accredited, and if a widely accepted accrediting organization exists.

The literature revealed concern about the quality of student affairs preparation programs (Dressel and Mayhew, 1974; Hyman, 1985; Sandeen, 1988; and Stamatakos, 1981).
After examining relevant literature on student affairs preparation programs, their admissions requirements, and a random sample of course syllabi, Stamatakos (1981) warned that the profession cannot be assured that all students graduating successfully are "adequately or reasonably well-prepared to carry out the variety of responsibilities particular to job-entry positions or that they have the leadership potential and depth of understandings necessary for upward mobility" (p. 203).

Concern was also expressed about the quality of community college preparation programs. Richardson (1987) observed that, among other problems, university faculty in community college leadership programs are aging and therefore may not have recent community college field experience thus creating a credibility problem in preparation programs. He proposed a partnership between a group such as the Presidents Academy of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) and the Council of Universities and Colleges to define program standards and to evaluate existing programs against those standards.

Accreditation is another alternative suggested to improve quality of preparation programs. However, before accreditation can be seriously considered there needs to be
discussion about the diversity of interests in the field and whether or not a common knowledge base exists.

Sandeen (1988) noted that because of so much diversity among practitioners' responsibilities, staff in financial aid, counseling, recreation, health programs, child care or admissions probably do not need the same kind of graduate program.

Stamatakos (1981) reported that a review of a random sample of the descriptive information and course syllabi of preparation programs revealed a "glaring lack of specificity regarding the knowledge to be learned and the skills students are expected to develop during the duration of their graduate program of studies" (p. 202). The lack of a common knowledge base for all students in preparation programs was also noted by Cooper (1986).

In discussing program standards, Stamatakos (1981) summed:

This absence of standards has been lauded, aided, and abetted by some members of our profession who firmly believe that variety is necessary for assuring flexibility and diversity of process and outcome to supply the profession with diverse talent to match its equally diverse practices. This is an interesting, circular dialectic that fails to recognize or ignores the recommendations of the profession's chosen leaders, writers, and commissioned position papers on the topic of professional preparation standards. (p. 202)
Canon (1982) referred to the student affairs arena as a collection of professions. He suggested that the diversity represented a "rich fabric of resources" while it also contributed to a lack of common purpose and barriers to communication (Canon, 1982).

A plea was made by J. Robert Penn (1974) for the professional organizations to improve the quality of professional education in the area of student development services by establishing a national accrediting board or commission designed to protect the basic integrity of each program specialization. The major professional associations have a responsibility to join forces and draft a set of standards of good practice that will be acceptable to most institutions for the accreditation process (Sandeen, 1981).

One agency has moved toward accrediting student affairs preparation programs. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP), formed in 1981 in conjunction with the American Association for Counseling and Development, accredited seven student affairs preparation programs with full approval for the master's degree level by 1983 (Steinhauser and Bradley, 1983). As of May 1, 1989 twenty-three student affairs programs were either accredited or conditionally accredited by CACREP (CACREP, 1989). CACREP uses the CAS standards and
guidelines to accredit three different program emphases: student development, administration, and counseling. However, of the twenty-three CACREP accredited programs, twenty had a counseling emphasis or were connected with a counseling emphasis.

Of the six top ranking programs identified by student affairs administrators and preparation faculty in a recent study by Beatty (1989) the University of Georgia was the only CACREP accredited program. CACREP accreditation does not appear to be a priority for the other top five programs.

The CAS standards and guidelines were established to develop and assess programs of professional preparation at the master's degree level by state, regional, national, or specialty agencies that accredit these academic programs (CAS, 1986). But the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs did not itself intend to be an accrediting agency.

Another specialized accrediting organization sometimes referred to in discussions of student affairs accreditation is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). This organization accredits a professional education unit as a whole and selected certification programs within that unit. However, the focus is more on teacher or administrative personnel preparation at the elementary and secondary levels.
Need for Study

Concern exists about the quality of student affairs preparation programs. Specialized accreditation of these programs has been proposed as a method to ensure their quality. However, there is limited research available about attitudes toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs and existing or potential accrediting organizations. Therefore, a study is needed to identify attitudes toward the preparation programs and toward specialized accreditation of the programs, as well as, to determine what organization(s) should do the accrediting, assuming accreditation is recommended.

There is also a need to know if the CAS standards and guidelines for master's preparation programs have been met in the professional preparation programs. The CAS standards are the most current guidelines available for student affairs preparation programs.

Statement of Problem

The student affairs professional associations do not know what the attitudes of their memberships are toward preparation programs, their accreditation, and toward existing and potential accrediting organizations. Collecting this information is currently very relevant for
them to use in discussing ways to improve the quality of the preparation programs.

Also important to that discussion is knowledge of whether or not the CAS standards and guidelines for master's preparation programs are currently being met.

**Purpose of Study**

There were four major purposes of this investigation:

1. to determine the difference in attitudes of (1) chairs of student affairs preparation programs, (2) deans of education, and (3) chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) on campuses that have student affairs preparation programs toward the status of those programs.

2. to determine the difference in attitudes of respondents toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs.

3. to learn which professional organization, if any, would be acceptable to the respondents as an accrediting organization assuming accreditation of student affairs preparation programs is desired.

4. to assess to what extent the CAS "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for Student Services/Development
Professionals in Postsecondary Education" are being met in student affairs preparation programs.

Data collected from the three respondent groups included biographic data, attitudes toward student affairs preparation programs, attitudes toward accreditation of these programs, and attitudes toward existing and potential accrediting agencies. In addition, information was gathered on the institution and the student affairs program.

To determine if the CAS standards and guidelines were met, the researcher chose criteria from the CAS Preparation Standards and Guidelines required for all three program emphases--student development, administration, and counseling.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this study may be defined as follows:

**Accreditation** - in this study used to mean specialized accreditation of a program within an institution as opposed to institutional accreditation; a voluntary process which involves self-study, visitation by a review team, and evaluation according to agreed upon standards.

**Attitude** - a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic
influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related (Allport, 1967).

**Certification** - the nonstatutory process by which an agency or association grants recognition to an individual for having met certain predetermined professional qualifications (American Personnel and Guidance Association definition in Fretz and Mills, 1980).

**CSAO (Chief Student Affairs Officer)** - the individual who is responsible for a student affairs division or department that provides student services and educational programs for a college or university campus.

**Chair of student affairs preparation program** - the designated faculty person or administrator in charge of a student affairs preparation graduate program at a higher education institution.

**Licensure** - the statutory process by which an agency of government, usually of a state, grants permission to a person meeting predetermined qualifications to engage in a given occupation and/or use a particular title and to perform specified functions (American Personnel and Guidance Association definition in Fretz and Mills, 1980).

**Student affairs preparation program** - a graduate program of study to prepare student affairs professionals, researchers, faculty, and administrators of higher education
institutions. In this study unless otherwise noted student affairs preparation programs will be synonymous with higher education preparation programs, student personnel preparation programs, and student development preparation programs.

Variables

Academic and student affairs professionals comprised the independent variable in this study. The three levels were: (1) chairs or program leaders of student affairs preparation programs, (2) deans of education in the institutions that have these preparation programs, and (3) chief student affairs officers in the same institutions. A secondary independent variable was CACREP accreditation.

The dependent variables were: (1) attitudes toward the status of student affairs preparation programs, (2) attitudes toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs, and (3) attitudes toward existing and potential accrediting organizations of these programs.

Attitudes in this study were measured by responses to a set of opinion items. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) described opinions as verbal expressions of attitudes and therefore useable to measure attitudes.
Research Questions

The research questions were:

1. What are the differences in attitudes of CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs toward these programs at their institutions?

2. What are the differences in attitudes toward accreditation of these programs?

3. In the opinion of CSAOs, deans of education colleges, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs, what organization or agency, if any, should accredit student affairs preparation programs?

4. To what extent are the CAS "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for Student Services/Development Professionals in Postsecondary Education" met?

Limitations of the Study

The researcher attempted to determine attitudes toward student affairs preparation programs and accreditation of those programs. Allport (1967) warned that attitudes change and therefore may not present a true picture over a period of time. Therefore, the results obtained in this study may not be accurate in the future.
There is debate about whether or not attitudes influence or predict behavior. Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) stated that "beliefs influence attitudes and subjective norms; these two components influence intentions; and intentions influence behavior" (p. 80). It is inappropriate to go directly from attitudes and subjective norms to behavior. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the results of this study will necessarily predict behavior.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

A selected literature review of books, journal articles, dissertations, unpublished manuscripts and an ERIC computer search using appropriate descriptors revealed that the two concepts "student affairs preparation programs" and "higher education preparation programs" overlapped and that both needed to be considered for purposes of this study. The first part of this chapter summarizes their historical development. The literature depicted different beginnings for higher education preparation programs and for student affairs preparation programs. These are presented in the first section along with the different emphases preparation programs have taken over the years and the development of higher education centers or institutes.

In the second section the 1937 Student Personnel Point of View, the COSPA Proposal For College Student Personnel Preparation, and the CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development Programs are highlighted as major influences in attempting to standardize student affairs preparation programs. General information about accreditation is discussed as well as the organization currently accrediting some of the student affairs
preparation programs, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is introduced as an organization which accredits a professional education unit as a whole and selected certification programs within that unit. Other alternatives to accreditation such as certification are briefly covered.

The relationship of preparation programs to student affairs is addressed in the third section with a discussion of how theory and practice are linked in an applied field such as student affairs. Several studies of how well the profession meets the educational needs of practitioners are reviewed. These include the recommendations from the ACPA/NASPA Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice.

**Historical Development of Higher Education and Student Affairs Preparation Programs**

**Emergence as a field of study**

Higher education as a field of professional graduate study and research reputedly began when the first course was offered in 1893 by G. Stanley Hall at Clark University (Dressel and Mayhew, 1974 and Ewing and Stickler, 1964). Hall, the first president of Clark University, initiated the
course, which he taught annually until 1910 when he turned it over to his associate, Edmund C. Sanford (Cowley, 1954).

The higher education course as described in the Clark University Annual Register by Cowley (1954), included topics on university work and technical education. The description read "Training in Law, Medicine, and Theology; Recent Progress, Present State and Prospects of the Most Advanced Education in Different Countries including our own" (p. 404).

During the years that followed there were a few other isolated course offerings such as the Organization of Higher Education at the University of Minnesota taught by Dean James. But for all practical purposes, Ewing and Stickler (1964) attributed the starting date as 1920 for regular coursework in higher education preparation programs. They reported programs of study initiated that year at the University of Chicago, The Ohio State University, and Teachers College, Columbia University.

Student personnel preparation programs, on the other hand, began professionally about 1913 when Teachers College, Columbia University, offered a program to train deans and advisers of women (Lloyd-Jones, 1949). [Mueller (1961) listed the date as 1916.] The first Master of Arts degree and Diploma of Dean of Women was granted there in 1914
The program relied on and brought together professors from several disciplines such as psychology, sociology, medicine, education, religion, and philosophy. A practicum was also offered in which concrete problems confronted by the dean of women were discussed. Sturtevant (1928) emphasized the importance of a practice period or internship in addition to academic courses. She explained that "professional subject matter is treated with reference to its usefulness in a practical situation" (p. 260). Men were permitted to enter this course for deans and advisors and in 1928 the department name was changed from "Deans and Advisers of Women and Girls" to "Student Personnel Administration" (Lloyd-Jones, 1949).

After 1920 a period of postwar growth increased enrollments in all areas of higher education and according to Ewing and Stickler (1964) intensified problems in organization, staffing, management, financing, teaching, physical plants, housing, and the student personnel services. In response to this expansion, a continued growth of course work and programs of study in higher education occurred bringing the total number to twenty-seven programs by 1945 (Ewing and Stickler, 1964).

The student affairs preparation programs of the 1920s and 1930s were isolated and took different emphases such as
vocational guidance, counseling, research, or selection (Wrenn, 1949). No attempt was made nationally to consider student affairs work as a cohesive field of study until The Student Personnel Point of View was produced in 1937. This report was the result of a conference on the philosophy and development of student affairs work sponsored by the Committee on Problems and Plans in Education of the American Council on Education (American Council on Education [ACE], 1937). The Student Personnel Point of View, revised in 1949, is respected as the document defining the importance of educating the whole person, rather than concentrating only on the student's intellectual development. It imposed upon educational institutions an obligation to consider the student's "intellectual capacity and achievement, his emotional make-up, his physical condition, his social relationships, his vocational aptitudes and skills, his moral and religious values, his economic resources, and his aesthetic appreciations" (p. xvii ACE, 1937).

Even with The Student Personnel Point of View and a recognized need to set standards for training personnel workers (Lloyd-Jones, 1949), early attempts to strengthen graduate preparation programs were not systematic.

One major problem for the preparation programs was that the nature of student affairs work itself was not clear.
For some it was synonymous with education. For others it was essentially the same as guidance or counseling. Cowley (1936) attempted to define personnel work as: "all activities undertaken or sponsored by an educational institution, aside from curricular instruction, in which the student's personal development is the primary consideration" (p. 218). He felt that coordination in the field was not possible until an understanding of the unity of the several fields of activity was recognized as personnel work.

In a discussion as to whether or not student personnel work was a profession or not, Wrenn (1949) labeled student personnel work as a "collective term for a number of specialized vocations having a common goal in the optimum extraclassroom adjustment of the student" (p. 279). Although he did not call student personnel work a profession, he stated that the various vocations did have a common basic psychological training.

Another and larger growth in higher education occurred after World War II along with a larger increase in the number of colleges and universities offering graduate work in higher education preparation programs. Between 1945 and 1963, 64 additional programs were initiated (Ewing and Stickler, 1964). In a 1962-63 study, Ewing (1963) identified 91 institutions offering courses in higher education.
Besides the overall growth in higher education, Dressel and Mayhew (1974) described other forces affecting the emergence of higher education as a field of study: (1) a need for trained administrators in a more complex higher education system and for the newly created junior college systems; (2) a demand for more precise planning in higher education; (3) the inadequate quality of college teaching; (4) the student protest movements of the late 1960s; (5) the revolt of minority groups and their demands for full-scale entry into higher education; (6) availability of outside funding for higher education research; and (7) the expansion of publication outlets for research studies.

**Emphases of preparation programs**

Graduate student preparation programs have taken different emphases depending on the institution, the perceived training needs, the resources available, the background of the faculty, and societal and higher education trends.

Early educational personnel work developed as an adjunct to other administrative and teaching duties. Consequently, while college training, even on the graduate level, was a prerequisite for those engaged in personnel activities, it was training directed toward academic instructional proficiency rather than toward personnel work
as such (LaBarre, 1948). Most of the early personnel workers such as E. G. Williamson and Esther Lloyd-Jones were trained in programs such as education, psychology, sociology, or mental hygiene.

According to LaBarre (1948), the early concepts of educational personnel work and its training were limited to guidance or vocational guidance. This included graduate training for student or educational personnel work in high schools, colleges, or universities. Such training was offered at Teachers College, Columbia University in the 1920s.

Often personnel training in industry, government, rehabilitation and other noneducational programs was offered by many institutions in the 1940s either with or without offering educational personnel training such as student personnel training. Those that did offer student personnel programs were frequently from a counseling viewpoint.

Cowley (1936) attempted to broaden the idea of student personnel work rather than limiting it as others had to placement, research, or counseling. He proposed the following definition: "Personnel work constitutes all activities undertaken or sponsored by an educational institution, aside from curricular instruction, in which the student's personal development is the primary consideration" (p. 218).
Wrenn (1949) contrasted Cowley's attempt to view the field as a whole with the 1926 Hopkins survey which overemphasized vocational guidance and Williamson and Darley's 1937 volume which was primarily concerned with the counseling function.

Burnett (1954) lumped school and college personnel workers together in describing the kinds of training required regardless of what particular job they were preparing for. He promoted the counseling emphasis.

In his 1962-63 study, Ewing found diversity in the higher education field with the variety of courses preparation programs offered. He divided the courses offered in higher education at that time into seven major areas: general description, analysis; administration, organization; curriculum; student personnel; teaching; junior college; and special miscellaneous areas. He built on a previous study by Young (1952) that used the first five areas (minus junior college and special miscellaneous areas).

In an appraisal of degree programs of academic administration in higher education, Travelstead (1974) identified seven purposes of the programs in the study of higher education: higher education in general, academic administration, student personnel administration, college
teaching, institutional research, professorship in higher education, and community college leadership. A specific institution may have listed one or more of these as major purposes or objectives.

Early in the 1970s, student development theories and concepts began to appear and be emphasized in some preparation programs. Crookston (1972) distinguished between the student personnel philosophy used previously and the new student development idea:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Personnel</th>
<th>Student Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Encountering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>Preventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Confrontive (p. 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to student developmental theory the entire academic community is a learning environment, not just the classroom. Student development theory is not merely complementary or supplementary to the instructional program, it is a central teaching function of the college (Crookston, 1972).

In the 1970s faculty in preparation programs began using resources that stressed student development theory.
such as Chickering (1969), Coons (1971), Prince (1973), and Prince, Miller, and Winston (1974). Others stressed moral
development (Craig, 1974; Galbraith and Jones, 1975;
Kohlberg, 1970, 1975; and McBride, 1973), ego development
(Loevinger, 1970) or intellectual and ethical development
(Perry, 1970).

Student development addressed the whole person. It was
not limited to cognitive development alone, but represented
an educational approach concerned with the emotional,
ethical, esthetic, spiritual, and physical growth of
students as well.

Higher education centers and institutes

Availability of outside funding after World War II
allowed the development of centers and institutes for the
study of higher education. Beginning in 1956, higher
education centers or institutes were formed that were
attached to a university allowing them the use of university
resources such as libraries and physical facilities, but
receiving most of their funding from foundations. Having
financial independence from the university permitted
activity that was not bound by limited budgets or restricted
interests of the parent institution.

The first three major centers established were: the
Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia
University; the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley; and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan (Ewing and Stickler, 1964). Other universities established centers in the following years. They proved to be important new agencies for study and research in the higher education field. But according to Ewing and Stickler (1964) the security and permanence of the less well established centers were uncertain for the following reasons: (1) a question of significant financing consistently year after year; (2) a vulnerability of the center if outside subsidy should fail; (3) effectiveness of the center too dependent upon personal and professional forcefulness of the chief executive; and (4) the ability to remain objective while dependent upon foundation money for existence.

The centers and institutes that survived were able to attract significant money from philanthropic foundations which provided an extra capability to perform research.

Standardization and Accreditation of Preparation Programs

Search for standards

A need for the field of student affairs work to study, evaluate, and set up standards for the training of its own workers was recognized early. Probably the first attempt to
standardize the training resulted in the Student Personnel Point of View (ACE, 1937) and its revision in 1949. In 1949 Lloyd-Jones called for standards for preparation programs. But she realized that it would take many years before institutions would be licensed, like medical schools, to offer training in personnel work.

In 1948 Anderson listed a number of questions related to the problem of training standards. They still seem relevant today:

1. Should we concern ourselves with the common training which all personnel workers should be expected to have, or should training for specialties within the field of work be defined as well?

2. Should different standards be set for various types of college personnel positions?

3. What recommendations should be made with respect to the possession of advanced degrees?

4. Should experience requirements be established, including experience in non-academic work?

5. Can standards be set in such a way that persons will be selected for and survive in training programs who possess the personality characteristics generally considered desirable?

6. How should standards which are agreed upon be handled administratively? (p. 453)
In the 1960s with the greatly increased growth in higher education and the accompanying demand for student personnel preparation programs came a renewed need to establish standardization or agreed upon objectives or learning experiences for graduate training programs. The Commission on Professional Development of the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA), consisting of eight national organizations, met in 1963 and 1964 to develop recommendations for the preparation of college student personnel workers. The resulting 1964 document, COSPA Proposal For College Student Personnel Professional Preparation, (Emmet and Sheldon, 1965) listed recommendations for graduate programs of professional preparation. The proposal took an interdisciplinary approach dividing the program into three areas: a required professional core, core extension areas designed to deepen and broaden the core work, and specialty options in residence halls administration, college union administration, foreign student advising, and administration of admissions and registrations.

The core topics recommended to be included in the preparation of college student personnel workers were:

1. The study of the college student, his nature, characteristics, and needs and differing life patterns of men and women; history, setting, and objectives of colleges and universities as social institutions; counseling principles and techniques; principles of administration and
decision-making, including theory and practice or organization and fiscal management; selection and in-service training of staff, and communication and relationships with college departments and constituencies; group dynamics and human relations skills.

2. Also student personnel work in higher education, including an overview of: Administration of student personnel services, admission, registration and records, orientation, college union programs, student activities, financial aids, housing and food service, health services, counseling services, foreign student programs, religious programs, fraternities and sororities, athletics and intramural programs, placement, alumni relations, current social and legal issues, and professional ethics and standards.

3. Practicum, internship or field work with college students (required in the core, but may be taken in a field of specialization). (p. 46)

Another student personnel organization, the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), currently known as the American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD), established an interdivisional committee in 1965 to study personnel workers in higher education. A third professional group, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), prepared a document in 1966 for a position on training. Representing ACPA, Robinson (1966) analyzed the three documents (from COSPA, APGA, and ACPA) relative to: (1) substantive areas of responsibility and authority, (2) purposes and goals, (3) proposed curriculum and training experiences, and (4) emphasis and unique
characteristics. He concluded that persons and groups within the profession generally do agree on the nature of the field, and with but minor variation what ought to be included in programs preparing individuals for college student personnel work.

In a later study to verify Robinson's findings, O'Banion (1969) selected a sample of student personnel professionals and an expert panel of professionals recommended by past presidents of ACPA and APGA to react to a suggested list of experiences essential for all college and university student personnel work. Those courses he found important for a core were: psychology, counseling principles and techniques, a practicum, an overview of student personnel work, the study of the college student, and sociology and anthropology. The expert panel rated higher education as essential, but the selected sample did not. The expert panel's results were consistent with the three major reports of the 1960s developed by COSPA, ACPA, and APGA that also rated higher education as important.

In 1968 APGA and COSPA cooperatively prepared a statement on guidelines for graduate programs in the preparation of student personnel workers in higher education for the purposes of evaluating the existing preparation programs and assisting in the development of new programs.
The statement recommended four areas: (1) philosophy and objectives, (2) curriculum, (3) responsibilities to students, and (4) institutional support ("Guidelines for Graduate Programs", 1969).

Noting that there were numerous national permanent commissions working on standardization of professional preparation programs, Rhatigan (1968) focused on one aspect of the problem by studying the preparation of chief student personnel administrators in large four-year colleges and universities. He compared the degree of agreement of practicing administrators in large colleges and the faculty from graduate programs designed to prepare such administrators on various training recommendations for chief personnel administrators. He found no significant differences in the recommendations of administrators and faculty trainers. He concluded that about three-fourths of a doctoral program for preparing student personnel administrators could be agreed upon by administrators and faculty trainers. But he also pointed out the continuing institutional practice of appointing deans who had no special training in the student personnel area, thereby admitting no special requirement for the skills and knowledge provided by preparation programs.
Penney (1969) challenged the entire concept of a student personnel profession. He argued that the field was composed of a number of relatively separate and distinct specialties linked largely by organizational contiguity. He observed that the field of student personnel work was becoming increasingly fragmented and diversified as time went on.

Part of the diversification was due to the educational climate of the 1960s. Enrollments of students in higher education increased dramatically. Needs increased for workers in housing, the college union, foreign student advisement, admissions and registration, placement, financial aid, orientation, health services, counseling, administration, placement, fraternities and sororities, alumni relations, and other sub-fields of college student personnel work. The issue was whether or not workers in all these sub-fields required the same training and who should determine standards for training.

The possibility of forming a single professional organization that could establish standards was discouraged in an investigation (McEwen and Shertzer, 1975) of the attitudes and beliefs of three major organizations, The American College Personnel Association (ACPA), The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors
(NAWDAC), and The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). McEwen and Shertzer (1975) found significant differences among these organizations regarding basic issues related to the student personnel profession. Respondents did not support the formation of a single professional organization or merger of the three existing organizations for the purpose of establishing standards.

However, a plea to give shape and direction to student personnel preparation programs by the professional organizations was made by Penn (1974). He called for a national accrediting board or commission to meet the challenge of improving the quality of professional development.

Besides the previously mentioned professional organizations trying to define standards for preparation programs, several authors offered suggestions for models of student personnel education (Arner, T. D., Peterson, Arner, C. A., Hawkins, and Spooner (1976); Brown, 1985; and Rentz, 1976); for skills and knowledge needed by student personnel professionals (Greenleaf, 1968; Miller, 1967; and Newton and Richardson, 1976) or administrators in higher education (Haynes, 1985); and for a core seminar in higher education (Crosson, 1983).
Acknowledging the diversity in student affairs, Canon (1982) proposed a core curriculum as a common base for practice to include the "environment of institutions of higher education, knowledge of student characteristics and their behavioral correlates, and mastery of the developmental literature" (p. 470). Miller (1967) and Sturtevant (1928) also encouraged establishing a core for strengthening the training offered graduate students in preparation courses.

The development of the whole student as a mission and task of the entire college was the basis of the T.H.E. (Tomorrow's Higher Education) model for the practice of student personnel work (Miller and Prince, 1976). Developed at an invitational ACPA conference in June, 1974, the model had four dimensions:

1. domains of student development
   - cognitive
   - affective
   - psychomotor

2. target populations
   - individual
   - groups
   - organizations

3. intervention competences or functions
   - goal setting
   - assessment
   - change strategies

4. evaluation (p. 23)
Flexibility to meet the varying backgrounds of student personnel graduate students and to prepare persons to work in a variety of positions in a variety of settings of higher education was suggested by Greenleaf (1977).

Trueblood (1966) outlined ten propositions for the educational preparation of the college student personnel leader of the future. According to him the best educational preparation

"highlights the bringing together of the knowledge of the behavioral sciences and the context of the institution of higher education, focusing on the college student, and utilizing the philosophic framework of the student personnel point of view--the wholeness of the student, the individual differences of students, and starting with the student where he is—with the skills of counseling, group work, administration, and research." (p. 84)

One of the most recent and comprehensive attempts to standardize student personnel preparation programs resulted in the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development Programs (1986). This document represented over six years of concerted effort by several hundred higher education student services and student developmental program professionals representing twenty-two professional associations. CAS pursued three goals:

1. ...to establish, adopt, and disseminate two types of standards and guidelines, one for student services and student development programs, and the other for
the preparation of professional practitioners for the field;

2. ...to assist professionals and institutions in the utilization and implementation of these standards and guidelines for evaluation and improvement of student services and development programs and professional preparation programs;

3. ...to establish a system of regular evaluation of standards and guidelines to keep pace with the changing needs and practices of the profession. (p. 1)

An independent section entitled "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for Student Services/Development Professionals in Postsecondary Education" is especially relevant for preparation programs. The standards represent what leaders in the field considered as performance areas highly related to effective professional practice. The standards recognized three basic dimensions of professional practice which were addressed by three major emphases of professional preparation: student development, administration, and counseling. Any single institution need not address all three areas of emphasis although any combination may be intentionally designed. According to the standards a particular programmatic emphasis should be offered only when the necessary talent and resources are available. Within each emphasis required coursework is delineated:

1. Student Development Emphasis
Human Development Theory and Practice, Organization Behavior and Development, American College Student and College Environment, The Helping Relationship and Career Development, Higher Education and Student Affairs Functions, Research and Evaluation, and Specialized Coursework

2. **Administration Emphasis**


3. **Counseling Emphasis**


Supervised experiences such as course assignments, laboratory, practicum, and/or internship dimensions must also be provided. However, no such standards or guidelines were prepared for doctoral programs.
Beatty (1989) found that student personnel preparation faculty and student affairs administrators collectively identified the following knowledge and experiences provided by a doctoral preparation program that are not provided by a master's degree program: (1) quality assistantships and internships, (2) a high level of scholarship, (3) refined research skills, and (4) the study of advanced theory. Faculty member respondents also identified the following items: the preparation of leadership roles, general program of preparation, the ability to conduct research, publish, and work with faculty members, the opportunity to obtain advanced knowledge of organizational theory and development, and the ability to integrate cognate studies into a program of study. Student affairs administrators also identified: a high level of specialization, the development of a sense of professionalism, the development of critical thinking, the opportunity to translate theory into practice, and the opportunity to obtain instructional experiences.

NASPA chose the fiftieth anniversary of The Student Personnel Point of View to present "A Perspective on Student Affairs" (NASPA, 1987), a statement providing basic philosophy for the profession and simultaneously for preparation programs. The document discussed assumptions and beliefs of student affairs professionals and the current role of student affairs in colleges and universities:
Student affairs has a diverse and complicated set of responsibilities. As a partner in the educational enterprise, student affairs enhances and supports the academic mission. In addition, student affairs professionals must advocate for the common good and champion the rights of the individual; encourage intelligent risk taking and set limits on behavior; encourage independent thought and teach interdependent behavior. (p. 12)

Accreditation

Accreditation began as a relatively simple idea in the early part of the twentieth century—a voluntary effort by a small group of educational institutions to agree on standards for distinguishing a college from a secondary school (Young, Chamber, Kells and Associates 1983). Since then accreditation has matured and changed into a sophisticated process for evaluating and improving quality in educational institutions.

Young et al. (1983) defined accreditation as:

a process by which an institution of postsecondary education evaluates its educational activities, in whole or in part, and seeks an independent judgment to confirm that it substantially achieves its objectives and is generally equal in quality to comparable institutions or specialized units. (p. 21)

He identified four essential elements in the accreditation process: (1) a clear statement by the institution of its educational intentions; (2) the conduct of a directed self-study focused on the achievement of these intentions, (3) an on-site evaluation by a selected group of
peers, and (4) a decision by an independent accrediting commission that, in light of its standards, the institution or specialized unit is worthy of accreditation. All four of these elements are important, not just the last two as is many times assumed.

That accreditation is voluntary is an important concept in American education. Rather than being regulated by the government, as in European educational systems, American educational institutions apply for accreditation by private accrediting agencies. The accreditation process is essentially one of choice although for many institutions it is linked to licensure or eligibility for federal funds. Historically the accreditation process relied on the services of volunteers to do self-studies and to serve on accrediting review teams, commissions, and association boards. Most volunteers receive no compensation for their services except remuneration for travel expenses or token honorariums (Harcleroad, 1983).

There are basically two different types of accreditation at postsecondary institutions. The first is general accreditation of institutions through six regional associations. The second type which is more pertinent to this study is the specialized accreditation by professional associations of programs within institutions or in some
cases in free-standing professional schools. The most well-known of these professional associations is the American Medical Association. In 1979 Petersen found there were thirty-nine professional agencies recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) to accredit programs or units in their specialized fields.

These professional agencies which accredit primarily units within a college or university generally define standards or criteria for accreditation in several areas: (1) goals and objectives, (2) governance, administration, and organization, (3) instructional staff, (4) educational program, (5) students and student services, (6) library, (7) facilities and equipment, and (8) financial resources (Petersen, 1979).

According to Crosson (1988) an accrediting body is necessary in an evaluation process to meet the public's responsibility by having the beginning and the end process of evaluation open—the setting of the standards and the final judgment about whether or not they are met. He explained that all institutions need the help of external discipline, laws, sanctions, and public opinion.

Accreditation recognizes those various education programs within institutions as meeting a level of performance, integrity, and quality that inspire confidence
in the education community and the public it serves (Stoodley, Jr., 1987).

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), established in 1975 to replace the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA) and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) (Orlans, 1975) recognizes two accrediting organizations related to student affairs preparation programs: The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

CACREP was established in 1981 to implement the Standards for Preparation in Counselor Education as the criteria for validating graduate counseling programs with emphases in school counseling, student personnel services, community and agency counseling, and counselor education (Wilcoxon, Cecil and Comas, 1987). Mental health counseling has since been added.

CACREP was formed after the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) submitted a set of standards to the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) for use in accrediting programs in counseling and student affairs. The American College Personnel Association (APCA) quickly established a committee with the expectation
to write into the ACES document standards more appropriate to student affairs preparation. CACREP resulted from a consortium of major student affairs organizations preparing these standards (Stamatakos, 1981).

Following CAS Standards and Guidelines, CACREP accredits three program emphases in student affairs practice in higher education: counseling, developmental, and administrative emphases. Specific studies, also following CAS Standards and Guidelines, are recommended for each emphasis.

As of May 1, 1989, twenty-three programs were either accredited or conditionally accredited by CACREP at the master's level in student affairs practice in higher education (CACREP, 1989). Of these, twenty had a counseling emphasis or were connected with a counseling emphasis.

A recent study (Cecil, Havens, Moracco, Scott, Spooner, and Vaughn, 1987) of CACREP accredited programs revealed the following advantages associated with CACREP accreditation: (1) increased student pride in program, (2) contributed to a stronger and more mature program, (3) contributed to stronger professional identity for students and graduates, (4) improved overall quality of academic program, (5) contributed to faculty pride in and satisfaction with program, (6) increased licensure and certification.
opportunities for graduates, and (7) improved administrative support.

**NCATE**  NCATE accredits a professional education unit as a whole and selected certification programs within that unit. The professional unit was defined as "the college, school, department, or other administrative body within the institution that is officially responsible for the preparation of students who seek state certification as teachers and of other professional education personnel" (Roth in Gollnick and Kunkel, 1986, p. 312). In the 1970s NCATE experienced problems that were brought to the forefront in 1978 by the deans of land-grant colleges and universities requesting NCATE to make major changes within five years or they'd establish a new voluntary national accrediting association (Warner, 1986). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) released a report in 1983 also calling for major revisions. Their concerns included:

- ambiguous standards that could not be applied uniformly;
- the fact that the standards in use ignored factors essential to the quality of teacher education programs;
- a failure to apply standards consistently which caused judgments to lack reliability;
- redundancy in program reviews for national accreditation and for state approval;
- the fact that accreditation of program categories often masked the health of the total education unit;
• the inability of NCATE to rate the importance of different standards in making accreditation decisions; and
• the uneven application of standards and the fact that the accreditation process was sometimes biased against certain types of institutions. (Gollnick & Kunkel, 1986, p. 310)

NCATE responded to these general concerns in June 1983 by adopting six principles to direct its redesign. Hearings were held, questions raised, and much discussion ensued. On July 1, 1986 the NCATE system of governance went into effect undergirding six reform principles. Four NCATE boards now have responsibility for different aspects of the agency's activities: (1) fiscal matters and overall direction, (2) accreditation of professional education units at colleges and universities, (3) recognizing state systems of program approval, and (4) curriculum guidelines (Gollnick & Kunkel, 1986).

The redesigned NCATE Standards were intended to provide the means for not only regulating the basic quality of teacher education, but also stimulating the teacher education profession in seeking increased levels of excellence (Roames, 1987).

Other alternatives

Concern over the effectiveness of the outcomes of specialized accreditation was expressed by Uehling (1987).
She asked, "How can we assess the effectiveness of accreditation when so little data and analysis of the process exist?" She proposed that three different accreditation functions—certification, state analysis, and self-improvement—be conducted as three separate processes rather than as the one process currently used. She further explained that the process designed to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable performance is different in character from one directed toward helping a program improve.

Young et al. (1983) recommended that newer fields of specialization consider alternatives to establishing separate accrediting bodies such as developing guidelines and offering at-cost consultation services, sponsoring a program approval service (such as the American Chemical Society), or joining allied groups in sponsoring a collaborative accreditation service.

A national study by the American Council on Education (Andersen, 1987) revealed that seventy percent of the college and university chief executive officers surveyed agreed that most programs subject to specialized accreditation could benefit from the scrutiny required by the accrediting process. However, nearly one-half of the respondents agreed that specialized accreditation activity required too much faculty and staff time.
Besides accreditation, licensing and certification are used in the education and psychology fields to define and upgrade the profession and to ensure more competent professionals. However, Fretz and Mills (1980) found that in the psychological literature, much more appears to have been published against licensing than in favor of it. Just as student affairs professionals represent many diverse interests, professionals in psychology and counseling also represent a diversity of skills and interests. Fretz and Mills explained that diversity created tension in the mainstream of the counseling and psychology professions which has resulted in increasing specification of the training and experience necessary for licensure. Many counselors and psychologists perceived these specifications as a threat to their careers.

State licensure or certification may create a problem when a professional moves to another state and has to meet different standards. National and regional standards facilitate inter-state reciprocity and contribute to quality control, but they also stifle differences and hamper creative programming.
Relationship of Preparation Programs to Student Affairs

Theory vs practice

It is important that a field of study have a theory/research base. Debate as to whether or not student affairs preparation programs have a unique theory/research base or whether they draw on the theory and research of other disciplines was revealed in the literature. Dressel and Mayhew (1974) depicted writing and experimentation in higher education as resting on theoretical considerations idiosyncratic to a given individual or other fields of study.

Canon (1982) challenged the assumption that there is a student affairs profession, recognizing that student personnel work has historically been an amalgam of the traditional academic disciplines. In a study of the introductory courses offered in preparation programs, Meabon and Owens (1984) concluded that the student personnel field is still in search of an academic identity.

On the other hand, Newell and Morgan (1983) compared two studies of higher education professors conducted in 1972 and 1980. They found increased scholarship and respect for theory over the eight-year span. Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1980) presented a framework of five theory clusters relevant to the student development field: psychosocial
theories, cognitive development theories, maturity models, typology models, and person-environment interaction models. A student development theory based on student involvement was developed and described by Alexander Astin (1984).

In an applied field such as student affairs a linkage of the theory/research base to practice is essential for professional effectiveness. Strange (1987) listed four reasons why the incorporation of a theory/research base in the professional preparation of practitioners is problematic:

1. the inherently imperfect correspondence between theory and reality, (2) the difficulties of translating theory to practice, (3) the nature of applied fields, and (4) the nature of individuals attracted to people-oriented, applied fields. (p. 5)

A dilemma regarding the linkage of theory and practice identified by Parker (1977) is that good research and theory building require the abstraction of a few elements from the whole of human experience. Practice, on the other hand, requires concrete and specific behavior in complex situations. The paradox is that theory dealing with abstractions from the general case cannot be applied in concrete and specific situations. Yet concrete and specific action flows from the personal theories of the actor. The problem is learning how to transform formal theory into personal theories of action. (p. 419)

Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) in a study of the Student Personnel Point of View and COSPA's Student Development Services in Post Secondary Education concluded that until
the profession agrees on a basic philosophy its attempts to develop standards for professional preparation programs is premature. They proposed that concerted attention must be directed toward such issues as: 

(a) What does the profession believe and consider important about the purpose of higher education, the nature of students, and the learning process? 

(b) What then should be the profession's role and function? 

(c) Who then is the profession?" Once these are clarified then the profession will know what preparation standards are appropriate, as well as, ethical and performance standards.

Since the Stamatakos and Rogers' (1984) study, the CAS Standards (1986) and "A Perspective on Student Affairs" (1987) were published and circulated. The latter outlined assumptions and beliefs that professionals in student affairs share that shape their work.

Experiential learning supplements theory in most student affairs preparation programs. The CAS standards recommended a series of supervised experiences including laboratory, practicum or internship dimensions. From a study of graduates of doctoral programs in higher education at twelve universities Dressel and Mayhew (1974) reported that forty-nine percent of those respondents giving comments or suggestions advocated "more practically-oriented experiences: internships; practicums; field work;
management techniques; close contact with operating programs, community services, and legal and financial problems; and the use of visiting experts including recent graduates" (p. 103).

Hedlund (1971) described two interrelated processes which she proposed as necessary elements of an experiential learning design:

First is the movement from experiencing to conceptualizing to relating to oneself, which usually leads to a new cycle beginning with experiencing through application of skills. Second is the movement from myself, to other people with whom I am interacting, to the larger group that is present, to the "real" world which defines realities of action, and finally back to myself. (p. 326)

Relating theory to practice involves maintaining effective communication between practitioners and training programs as urged by Newton and Richardson (1976) and Hyman (1985). Because most student services training programs are at large institutions, linkages with small colleges and community colleges were recommended by Fryer (1984), Matson (1977), and Richardson (1987). Matson (1977) observed that societal functions of the community college differ from those of the senior institutions and therefore the tasks performed by the student personnel specialists in the community college differ substantively from a university. She encouraged a maintenance of the unique quality of community colleges by student personnel staffs.
Meeting educational needs of practitioners

The extent to which student affairs preparation programs are meeting the professional needs of student affairs practitioners at large and small, public and private, or 2-year and 4-year institutions was the object of research and debate by Dressel and Mayhew (1974), Hyman (1985), Matson (1977), Richardson (1987), Sandeen (1988), Shaw (1985), and Stamatakos (1981).

After studying student personnel preparation program admissions requirements and a random sample of course syllabi, Stamatakos (1981) alerted readers that the professional preparation in student affairs is inconceivably inconsistent in entry, nature, quality, scope, skill development, support systems, expectations, and outcomes.

Shaw (1985) found in a review of 26 catalogs from institutions offering preparation program doctorates that the graduate programs do not systematically address small college issues and concerns, although he found almost all of those programs offered specialized courses addressing community college concerns. Richardson (1987) agreed that leadership programs emphasize history and philosophy of the community college, but that fewer provide solid background in planning, finance, law, and collective bargaining.
Studies of the extent to which student personnel preparation programs meet the needs of practitioners are inconclusive. In a study of the professional preparation of chief student personnel administrators in large four-year institutions, Rhatigan (1968) found no significant differences regarding training recommendations between faculty members of doctoral preparation programs and chief personnel administrators.

Using a modified T.H.E. (Tomorrow's Higher Education) model, Hyman (1985) surveyed chief student affairs officers (CSAOs), directors of housing (DOHs), and faculty of preparation programs to determine the relative importance of the T.H.E. competencies and the perception of the extent to which master's degree graduates of preparation programs received these competencies in training. The results showed that the two practitioner groups (DOHs and CSAOs) perceived doubt as to whether recent master's graduates of preparation programs possessed the competencies. Faculty perceived a significantly greater possession of the competencies by recent graduates. All three groups did agree that the competencies in all categories of the T.H.E. model were important for assuming an entry level position in student affairs.
Another project done by Holmes, Verrier, and Chisholm (1983) studied retrospectively the work history of 1971–1981 graduates of a preparatory program at an eastern university. Ninety-two percent of the graduates agreed that their training prepared them to be competent professionals in the field.

Challenges of meeting educational needs of practitioners have also been influenced by an increase in number of preparation programs with an accompanying decrease in full-time faculty (Keim, 1987).

Greenleaf (1977) noted a dramatic increase in both the number of student personnel preparation programs and the number of students in each program in the 1960s and 1970s. She pointed out that between 1960 and 1975 one preparation program expanded from 25 master's degree students to 120 students with no increase in teaching faculty. She alluded that institutions added preparation programs when that college or university recognized an opportunity to use graduate students as part of their student personnel staff especially in residence halls.

However, there appeared to be a decrease in preparation program enrollments in the 1980s. In the spring of 1987, Stamatakos wrote Larry Ebbers, then president of NASPA, and Marvalene Styles Hughes, president of ACPA, expressing his
concern for the declining enrollments in the profession's graduate preparation programs and the corresponding reductions in faculty members and other resources devoted to these programs (ACPA and NASPA, 1989). These two presidents subsequently appointed a Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice charged to examine all aspects of the problems associated with preparing new professionals for the field with particular attention to the status of graduate preparation programs, the skills and competencies needed in the profession, and the needed relationship between practitioners and graduate preparation faculty.

After eighteen months of study the Task Force, chaired by David Ambler, issued the following findings:

Over the past fifteen years, there has been a steady decline in the number of individuals who have elected to enter the field of student affairs through its graduate preparation programs. A shameful reduction of the resources devoted to the graduate preparation programs threatens the quality of the education of the new professional. Additionally, the profession has ignored changing societal attitudes about work, working conditions and compensation and now finds its activities unattractive to many young people. The profession has been slow to develop an intentional and comprehensive program to attract competent individuals to the field. It has seen a continual erosion of its salary levels and now finds that it is "uncompetitive" with other professions or occupations. Finally, it has minimized the need for a continuous dialogue between those who teach and those who practice the profession. (pp. 2-3)
The Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice recommended that:

- ACPA and NASPA continue strong support of the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Program (CAS) given its record of success in enhancing the quality of professional preparation and practice.

- ACPA and NASPA conduct joint and continuing studies of student affairs professional employment conditions, satisfactions, and advancements.

- ACPA and NASPA establish a study group to make recommendations on the accreditation of preparation programs and credentialing or establishing a registry of professionals in student affairs.

- ACPA and NASPA jointly sponsor the establishment of an interassociation Student Affairs Council on Professional Preparation and Practice and empower the Council to present activities and programs to advance the profession.

- The Interassociation Council on Professional Preparation and Practice, or other appropriate mechanisms, implement activities to enhance the recruitment and retention of new professional talent, graduate preparation programs, professional
development, and the interface between practitioners and faculty.

In a previous study of doctoral level preparation programs in college student affairs administration, Rockey [(1972) as reported by Stamatakos, 1981] found that the most outstanding programs had the largest number of full-time faculty, strong supporting academic departments, graduate student support systems, well-conceived curricula, depth and breadth of course requirements, required and sufficient internships, and substantive course work outside the field of education.

Summary

Student affairs/higher education preparation programs for the most part began in the 1920s and grew steadily until after World War II when the number of programs increased more rapidly as a result of the overall growth in college student enrollment and the special needs of the times. In 1962 Ewing (1963) identified 91 institutions offering courses in higher education.

The literature reviewed described several emphases that student personnel preparation programs have taken over the years such as guidance, counseling, placement, research, administration, student development, teaching, and junior
college leadership. Three of these emphases (counseling, administration, and student development) were identified by the CAS "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for Student Services/Development Professionals in Postsecondary Education" in 1986 as basic dimensions of professional practice. The CAS standards recommended that preparation programs emphasize one or more of these three areas at the master's level and they provided standards and guidelines for training programs in each area.

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling, and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) uses the CAS standards for accrediting student personnel preparation programs at the master's level. As of May 1, 1989, twenty-three student affairs programs were either accredited or conditionally accredited by CACREP. Most of them had a counseling emphasis.

Because of the diversity within the student affairs field and the different emphases of student affairs preparation programs, the national associations have reached no consensus on whether or not preparation programs should be accredited nor on an accrediting organization.

The report of a NASPA/ACPA Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice proposed among other things that a study group be established to make recommendations on the accreditation of preparation programs.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures used to investigate attitudes of chief student affairs officers (CSAOs), deans of colleges of education, and chairs or leaders of student affairs preparation programs toward these programs of study and their accreditation. This research will seek to answer four questions:

1. What are the differences in attitudes of CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs toward these programs at their institutions?

2. What are the differences in attitudes of respondents toward accreditation of these programs?

3. In the opinion of CSAOs, deans of education colleges, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs, what organization or agency, if any, should accredit student affairs preparation programs?

4. To what extent are the CAS "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for
Student Services/Development Professionals in Postsecondary Education" met?

The Institutions with Preparation Programs

The total population of higher education/student affairs preparation programs was used from a list compiled from the *Directory of ASHE Membership and Higher Education Program Faculty* (ASHE, 1987), *Peterson's Graduate Programs in Business, Education, Health and Law* (1989), the American College Personnel Association *Guide to Preparation Programs for Careers in Student Affairs*, and a NASPA list of *Preparation Programs*. Mason and Townsend (1988) found that obtaining an accurate listing of higher education doctoral programs was quite difficult. They found inaccuracies and incomplete and out-dated information in the directories of student affairs preparation programs. Therefore, it was important to use a variety of sources for this list.

The chairs or leaders of the student affairs/higher education preparation programs were asked questions regarding their institutions and their programs. Of 75 responding chairs 62 or 83 percent were from public institutions and 13 or 17 percent were from private institutions. Table 1 reports the size of the institutions by student enrollment.
TABLE 1. Student enrollment at institutions with preparation programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 to 58,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve of the 75 institutions had a higher education center or institute on campus. Sixty-four or 84 percent were reportedly located in a school or college of education. One fourth were in their own department such as a department of higher education, department of student affairs, or similar department. The variety of graduate degrees offered by the programs are presented in Table 2.

The numbers of part time and full time master's and doctoral students in each higher education/student affairs preparation program are summarized in Table 3. Fifty-six percent of the programs offering doctorates reported five or fewer full time doctoral students; seventy-seven percent had ten or fewer.
### TABLE 2. Degrees offered by the preparation programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Offered</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doc. level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3. Number of institutions by number of students in preparation programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Master's Part time</th>
<th>Master's Full time</th>
<th>Doctoral Part time</th>
<th>Doctoral Full time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0^b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aN = Number of institutions.

^b0 = Those institutions that do not have part time or full time students in their respective programs.
Subjects

Three individuals were surveyed from each institution having a student affairs/higher education preparation program: (1) the chair of the student affairs preparation program, (2) the chief student affairs officer (CSAO), and (3) the dean of the college or school of education or other appropriate dean. An examination of Tables 4, 5, and 6 reveals that women were more frequently chairs than they were CSAOs or deans, that CSAOs and deans were more frequently minorities than were chairs, and that the deans generally were older than the CSAOs and chairs.

TABLE 4. Respondent gender by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Chairs</th>
<th></th>
<th>CSAOs</th>
<th></th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reports the professional memberships of the respondents. Chairs tended to join ACPA more frequently than the other associations. Most CSAOs were members of NASPA and deans belonged more frequently to AACTE.
TABLE 5. Ethnic background of respondents by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Chairs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CSAOs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6. Birthdate of respondents by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Chairs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CSAOs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1929</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8 CSAOs were more likely to be teaching faculty members in the area of student affairs/higher education than were deans of education. Normally education deans come from a background in elementary or secondary education as opposed to higher education and therefore would tend not to be on the higher education faculty.
TABLE 7. Professional membership of respondents by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>Deans N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AACJC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACTE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAWDAC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8. Membership on student affairs graduate faculty by CSAOs and deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>Deans N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of the Instruments

Based on the literature, three instruments (Appendix A) were designed by the researcher for this study, one for CSAOs, one for deans of colleges of education, and one for chairs or leaders of student affairs preparation programs.
Three different instruments were developed so that questions could be asked that were more specific to each type of position. For instance, program chairs and deans are more academically oriented, while CSAOs are more practitioner oriented. The American Council on Education (ACE) gave permission (Appendix B) to use questions from the Council's 1986 survey on attitudes toward accreditation as published in HEP Report No. 74, *Survey of Accreditation Issues, 1986* (Anderson, 1987).

The instruments were constructed to collect biographic data, attitudes toward student affairs preparation programs, attitudes toward accreditation of these programs, and attitudes toward existing and potential accrediting agencies. In addition, the instrument designed for the chairs of the preparation programs was constructed to collect data concerning the size and affiliation of the institution and details about the student affairs preparation program itself. The latter dealt with the size of the student affairs preparation program as determined by the number of full time and part time graduate faculty and the number of students in the program; the graduate degrees offered; the location and autonomy within the university structure, including whether or not a higher education center or institute existed on campus; courses required or offered; and program admission requirements.
A series of questions to collect information concerning attitudes was formulated with responses to be checked on a Likert-type agreement scale. The scale consisted of five points ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree with a sixth category titled "not applicable/insufficient information." The "not applicable/insufficient information" category was included because some of the respondents were not acquainted with specific professional organizations or acquainted with other student affairs preparation programs. The major reason for having several questions aimed at a single attitude was instrument validity (Henerson, Morris, and Fitz-Gibbon, 1978). Results from the various questions asking about each attitude were combined to yield a scale (an average score) indicating the degree of presence of that particular attitude.

A small national group of selected CSAOs, chairs of preparation programs, and education deans critiqued the three instruments. (See Appendix C for sample letter to these leaders.) These professionals selected for their leadership in student affairs as practitioners or academicians represented Bowling Green State University, Florida International University, Indiana University, Iowa State University, Michigan State University, the University of Florida, the University of Iowa, and the University of the Pacific.
After adjustments were made to the instruments following their suggestions, the revised instruments were returned to the panel for a second critique. Changes were again made before the final instruments were printed.

Information about whether or not student affairs preparation programs were CACREP accredited was found in the Directory of Accredited Programs (CACREP, 1989).

Hypotheses

Hypotheses of this study stated in the null form were:

1. There is no difference in attitude toward student affairs preparation programs among CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs at their institutions.

2. There is no difference in attitude toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs among CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs.

3. CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs agree on an organization appropriate to accredit student affairs preparation programs.
Procedures

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this study in September, 1989 and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, that risks were outweighed by potential benefits, that confidentiality of data was assured, and that informed consent was obtained (Appendix D).

The survey instruments were printed in booklet form and sent along with a cover letter (Appendix E) in October of 1989 to the three identified subjects at the 159 United States institutions of higher education that reportedly had graduate preparation programs in student affairs/higher education. The booklets were designed so they could be returned postpaid without an envelope. A follow-up postcard reminder (Appendix F) was sent in late November to those who had not responded.

In the cover letter, participants were requested to return the blank survey instrument if they did not have a student affairs/higher education preparation program at their institution. At least one respondent from 27 of the 159 institutions returned the survey instrument stating that their institution did not have such a program. However, there was disagreement at 13 of these institutions because
other respondents from the same institution returned the completed instrument. Fifteen of the institutions were dropped from the study because either one or more of the respondents reported not having a program and no one from that institution filled out the survey. The 12 institutions at which there was disagreement about whether or not they offered a student affairs/higher education program were included in the analysis. Appendix G lists the 144 institutions used in the study.

By January 31, 1990, 60 percent or 284 of the 477 subjects responded in some way, saying they didn't have a program, filling out the questionnaire, or refusing to fill it out. After eliminating the 15 institutions not offering a student affairs preparation program the overall response rate of the three respondents at the remaining 144 institutions was 257 or 59 percent with 241 surveys (56 percent) being usable. The return rate by groups is shown in Table 9.

Data Analysis

Data collected were coded according to the three categories of respondents, that is, deans of education, chief student affairs officers, and chairs of preparation
TABLE 9. Return rate of respondents by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>returned N</th>
<th>returned percent</th>
<th>usable N</th>
<th>usable percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

programs. The information was key punched for statistical analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSx) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975) was used to analyze the data.

Scales of attitudes toward programs and accreditation

Eight scales were created by adding together means of a series of questions regarding the following perceived attitudes for each of the three groups of respondents:

1. attitudes toward the perceived status of the student affairs preparation program.
2. attitudes toward accreditation of these programs.
3. attitudes toward whether or not there is agreement on an agency to accredit the programs.

Questions for a scale about dean's attitudes toward agreement on an accrediting agency were not asked because
very few deans were members of the two major student affairs professional associations, NASPA (1.6 percent) and ACPA (4.8 percent).

Negative questions used in these scales were recoded so their scores could be combined with the scores from other questions.

Reliability

The reliability of each of the eight multi-item attitude scales was assessed using the Cronbach alpha coefficient. The alpha coefficient assesses the reliability of the sum across variables as an estimate of a case's true score. To raise the alpha coefficient, one question was eliminated from two of the scales and the tests were re-run.

Because of low reliability the scale of attitudes about agreement on an accrediting organization was dropped and each of the individual questions was analyzed individually. Table 10 shows the reliability results.

Figure 1 lists the questions used in the three scales (one scale for CSAOs, one for deans, and one for chairs) of attitudes toward the status of preparation programs. Each scale consisted of a variety of questions appropriate to each group of respondents. Therefore, some questions were asked of all three groups of respondents and some were asked of only one group, depending on applicability to that
professional position. For instance, a question regarding how well preparation programs address relevant student affairs issues was asked of all three respondent groups, while the question about the possibility of financial cuts in the education college was asked only of the deans.

Figure 2 lists the questions used in the scales of attitudes toward accreditation of preparation programs. One scale was formed with the questions asked of CSAOs, one scale from questions asked of deans, and one from questions asked of preparation program chairs or leaders.

Figure 3 shows the two questions that originally formed the scales of attitudes of chairs and CSAOs about agreement on an accrediting organization. The questions were analyzed individually because of low scale reliability.

TABLE 10. Reliability of attitude scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Scale</th>
<th>Accreditation Scale</th>
<th>Organization Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scale dropped because of low reliability.
Graduates of the higher education/student affairs preparation program at my institution are well prepared for professional responsibilities.

The student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution does not address relevant issues in student affairs.

Compared with other graduate programs of study in my college, the program that prepares student affairs professionals rates above average.

Compared with other student affairs/higher education preparation programs nationally, the program at my institution rates above average.

Full-time faculty in the student affairs/higher education preparation programs at my institution are well qualified.

If financial cuts were to be made in my college, student affairs/higher education preparation programs would be given high priority for funding.

L = chairs or leaders, C = CSAOs, D = deans

FIGURE 1. Questions regarding attitudes toward status

ANOVA

One-way ANOVAs were run for each of the remaining six scales and for those questions analyzed individually that
All areas of graduate study in education should be accredited by a professionally based accrediting agency.  

Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will improve their quality.  

Being accredited is necessary to recruit and retain faculty.  

Accreditation assures that the program is relevant to current practice in the field.  

Courses and course sequences required by accreditation make it difficult for the program to achieve the breadth of knowledge its faculty want their graduates to possess.  

Accreditation of the student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution would not make it (did not make it) a stronger program.  

The fees associated with accreditation and visitation are too great.  

Nationally, guidelines should be provided by higher education/student affairs preparation programs to conduct self-appraisal and implement program improvement.  

The amount of faculty and staff time required for the accrediting self-study and visitation is too great.  

Courses and course sequences required by specialized accreditation are too prescriptive.  

Accreditation assures me that the standards and quality of my programs are generally acceptable in the post-secondary education community.  

Most programs on my campus subject to specialized accreditation benefit from the scrutiny required by accrediting agencies.  

L = chairs or leaders, C = CSAOs, D = deans

FIGURE 2. Questions regarding attitudes toward accreditation
Professionals can agree on an organization to accredit student affairs/higher education preparation programs.  

One accrediting organization can represent all of the interests in student affairs (e.g., administration, counseling, and student development).

L = Chairs or leaders, C = CSAOs

FIGURE 3. Questions regarding attitudes toward an accrediting organization were on the Likert-type scale. When significance was found a Scheffé test was used to determine where the significance was located.

Chi-square tests were conducted on questions producing nominal data. These included information on who should conduct accreditation, which organization best represents student affairs interests, and which organization would best accredit preparation programs.

Since the $X^2$ value is computed over all categories, a significant $X^2$ value did not specify which categories were major contributors to any statistical significance. To determine which of the categories were major contributors,
the standardized residual was computed for each of the
categories by dividing the observed frequency minus the
expected frequency by the square root of the expected
frequency. When a standardized residual for a category was
greater than absolute 2.00, the category was said to be a
major contributor to the significant $X^2$ value (Hinkle,
Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988).

**Descriptive analysis for CAS standards**

To answer the fourth research question about whether or
not the programs met the CAS standards and guidelines, a
descriptive analysis was used. The researcher chose for
this study the following criteria from the Council for the
Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development
Programs to use in determining whether or not the CAS
standards were met: number of full-time faculty, faculty-
student ratio, coursework offered, and supervised
experiences.

The CAS standards require at least two full-time
faculty members with primary responsibilities directed to
the student affairs preparation program. A faculty-student
ratio of 1:16 on a full-time equivalent basis is also
recommended. To determine the faculty-student ratio the
number of full-time master's and doctoral students were
added and divided by 16. This number was then compared to
the number of full time faculty.
The CAS standards and guidelines require that professional preparation programs contain one or more of three emphases: student development, administration, or counseling. Coursework is required for each emphasis (Figure 4). In this study the researcher chose the three courses (human development theory and practice, higher education and student affairs functions, and research and evaluation) required for all three emphases as being necessary for an institution to have met the coursework criterium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>CN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human development theory and practice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization behavior and development</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. college student &amp; college environment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The helping relationship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher ed and student affairs functions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and evaluation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance appraisal &amp; supervision</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative uses of computers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group counseling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life styles &amp; career development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of individual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SD = student development, AD = administration, CN = counseling)

FIGURE 4. Coursework required by CAS standards
Supervised experiences including course assignments, laboratory, practicum, and/or internship dimensions must be provided according to the CAS standards. Figure 5 delineates those experiences required for each emphasis. For purposes of this study the researcher used the student affairs practica or internship required for all three emphases as the measure for institutions having met the supervised experiences requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>CN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling prepracticum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling practica</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs practica or student affairs internship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised field experience in organization development</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised field experience in human development</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SD = student development, Ad = administration, CN = counseling)

FIGURE 5. Supervised experiences required by CAS Standards

For an institution to have been counted as meeting the CAS standards, it would have had to meet all four of the above criteria: (1) at least two full time faculty members, (2) a faculty-student ratio of 1:16, (3) required coursework
in human development theory and practice, higher education and student affairs functions, and research and evaluation, and (4) supervised experiences in student affairs with either a practicum or internship.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analyses of the data collected via mail survey from the three groups of respondents regarding attitudes toward student affairs preparation programs and their accreditation. The results are organized according to the hypotheses tested and information related to each hypothesis. A final section addresses the research question about the extent to which the CAS standards were met.

Hypothesis One and Related Information

Null Hypothesis One stated, "There is no difference in attitudes toward student affairs preparation programs among CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs." This hypothesis was tested by computing a mean scale score from a series of questions for each of the three groups of respondents (Table 11). A one-way analysis of variance was then used to see if there were any significant differences among the groups. When differences were found, the Scheffé test was conducted to determine where those differences existed. Significant differences in attitudes toward preparation programs were
found between all possible pairs in the three groups, that is, between CSAOs and deans, between CSAOs and program chairs, and between deans and program chairs. The null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 11. Mean score of attitudes toward preparation programs by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,232)=30.116, p<.01

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

These differences were attributed to the perspectives of each group. The program chairs would naturally tend to rate their programs high because they are responsible for them. Deans, who are also academically oriented, generally rated the preparation programs positively, but not as positively as program chairs. The CSAOs, who hire preparation program graduates, look for well-trained graduates. They are more concerned about whether or not the
graduates can do the job. The CSAOs were least pleased with the student affairs preparation programs and their responses were most variable.

Other information related to Hypothesis 1 concerning attitudes towards preparation programs was also requested. CSAOs were asked to respond to two questions about whom they would hire. As a group they preferred that both entry-level and middle management employees have a background in student affairs/higher education preparation as opposed to a background in related areas such as sociology, psychology, communications, or the humanities (3.97 for entry-level professionals and 3.82 for middle management professionals on a 5-point Likert type scale).

All three groups of respondents were asked to evaluate the relationship between the student affairs/higher education preparation program at their institution and the division of student affairs. Table 12 reports the results of their responses on a scale of 1 - 10 with 1 being "unrelated" and 10 being "integrally related." When a significant difference was found with one-way analysis of variance, a Scheffé test was run which determined that there was a significant difference between chairs and CSAOs. The chairs were more satisfied with the relationship of their preparation program and the student affairs division than the CSAOs.
TABLE 12. Attitudes toward relationship of preparation program and student affairs division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,227)=5.0189, p<.01

Hypothesis Two and Related Information

Null Hypothesis Two stated, "There is no difference in attitudes toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs among CSAOs, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs." Testing this hypothesis was done first by computing a mean scale score from a series of questions for each of the three groups of respondents (Table 13). To test if there were any differences in attitudes toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs among the three groups, a one-way analysis of variance was run. When differences were found, a Scheffé test was conducted to determine where the differences existed.
### TABLE 13. Mean score of attitudes toward accreditation of preparation programs by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,237)=20.531, p>.01

*(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)*

Significant differences were found in attitudes toward accreditation of student affairs preparation programs between CSAOs and deans and between CSAOs and program chairs, but not between deans and program chairs. The null hypothesis was rejected. Attitudes of CSAOs toward accreditation of the preparation programs were on the average positive. However, attitudes of chairs and deans were on the average neutral (between 2.5 and 3.5 on a 5-point scale). Chairs and deans who are academically oriented have more direct control over the preparation programs and their quality than do the CSAOs. They would tend not to be in favor of losing that control to an accrediting agency. They may already be actively involved in institutional preparation for other accreditations such
as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Eighty-three percent of the deans responding reported that their school or college was NCATE accredited. Deans are ultimately the ones responsible for meeting the standards necessary for NCATE accreditation.

Independent t-tests found significant differences in attitudes toward accreditation between chairs from CACREP accredited programs and chairs from programs not CACREP accredited, between deans from CACREP accredited programs and deans from programs not CACREP accredited, but not for the CSAOs as a group (Table 14).

TABLE 14. Attitudes toward accreditation by groups and CACREP accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs from programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not CACREP accredited</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs from programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not CACREP accredited</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans from programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP accredited</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not CACREP accredited</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.
Other information relating to this hypothesis on accreditation is also reported.

Since a basic question of this research was to ascertain the extent to which attitudes of the respondents would be more positive toward the quality of preparation programs if they were accredited, the single question, "Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will improve their quality" was considered separately. A significant difference was found only between CSAOs and deans (Table 15). CSAOs and chairs on the average felt that accrediting the preparation programs would, indeed, improve their quality. Deans, however, as a group were neutral (between 2.5 and 3.5). The relatively high standard deviations show that all three groups had varied opinions. This meant that the mean score for the deans was neutral, not necessarily individual attitudes.

As shown in Table 16 both chairs and CSAOs on the average responded negatively to the question, "Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs is not necessary if the College or School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)." Deans as a group were neutral (between 2.5 and 3.5). Both chairs and deans had relatively
TABLE 15. Mean score of attitudes toward accreditation improving quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,235)=5.456, p≤.01

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

high standard deviations. Using the Scheffé procedure, significant differences were found between chairs and deans and between CSAOs and deans, but not between chairs and CSAOs. Again, the deans are the ones with the major responsibility for preparing their school or college for NCATE accreditation. They are more likely to feel that additional specialized accreditation is not necessary.

Chairs and deans differed significantly responding to whether or not there was sufficient support/resources at their institution to warrant seeking accreditation of their student affairs preparation program (Table 17). Although both means were between 2.5 and 3.5, the neutral area, the deans on the average felt there was less institutional
TABLE 16. Mean score of attitudes toward other specialized accreditation if program is already NCATE accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,222)=6.296, p≤.01

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

support while the chairs as a group expressed more support, but their responses varied more.

TABLE 17. Attitudes toward institutional support for accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)
Both chairs and deans were on the average in the neutral range regarding the amount of staff time required for the accrediting self-study and visitation (Table 18). An independent t-test showed no significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups. (CSAOs were not asked this question because they are not directly involved with allocation of faculty time.)

**TABLE 18. Attitudes toward amount of staff time required for accreditation being too great**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

Chairs and deans were in the neutral range (2.5 - 3.5) regarding whether accreditation contributes to faculty members taking more interest in their programs or discipline than in their institution (Table 19). An independent t-test showed no significant differences in their responses.

As shown in Table 20 all three groups of respondents in this study were on the average in the 3.4 range on a 5-point
TABLE 19. Attitudes toward accreditation contributing to taking more interest in discipline than in institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

scale regarding whether accreditation of student affairs preparation programs would standardize requirements for curriculum planning and evaluation. The results of a one-way analysis of variance showed there were no differences among the three respondent groups on this item.

Both chairs and deans on the average disagreed with the statement that it is more important that master's preparation programs be accredited than doctoral programs (Table 21). An independent t-test showed no significant difference in their responses.

Certification of practicing professionals is another alternative proposed to improve the quality of potential practitioners. Table 22 reports the results of the responses as to whether or not practicing professionals in student affairs should be certified. Generally, there was
TABLE 20. Attitudes toward accreditation standardizing curriculum requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(2,233)=.024, p=.9763

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

TABLE 21. Attitudes toward whether accreditation of master's programs is more important than accreditation of doctoral programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

not support for certification. Chi-square, a nonparametric statistical test, was used to compare the "yes" and "no" responses. No significant difference was found. Those who responded positively to certification were asked if
certification should be based on graduation from an accredited preparation program. Responses to this question were generally positive and are reported in Table 23.

### TABLE 22. Frequencies of whether professionals in student affairs should be certified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>Deans N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(2)=1.314, \ p=.5185$

### TABLE 23. Frequencies of whether certification should be based on accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>Deans N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis Three and Related Information

Hypothesis Three stated, "CSAOS, deans of education, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs agree on an organization appropriate to accredit student affairs preparation programs." All three groups responded to a general question asking if student affairs preparation faculty, student affairs professional associations, or both jointly should accredit preparation programs (Table 24).

TABLE 24. Frequencies of who should conduct accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>Deans N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both faculty and prof. assoc.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. assoc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2)=17.657, p \leq 0.01$

Chi-square, a nonparametric statistical test, was used to investigate the hypothesis. To reduce the number of cells with an expected frequency less than five, the two alternatives of "professional associations" and "other" were
not considered in the chi-square test. A significant difference was found. The hypothesis was rejected. Standardized residuals were calculated to determine which categories were major contributors to the significant $X^2$ value. Four categories (faculty/chairs, faculty/CSAOs, both/chairs, and both/CSAOs) were found to be major contributors to the statistical significance.

Because chairs and CSAOs are more involved with the student affairs professional associations than the deans are, they were asked specifically if professionals agree on an accrediting organization for the profession. Responses of chairs and CSAOs were on the average neutral on this question (Table 25). An independent t-test showed no significant difference between the two groups at the .05 level. When asked if one accrediting organization can represent all of the interests in student affairs, the average responses of the chairs and CSAOs were again in the neutral range of 2.5 to 3.5 (Table 26). But a two tailed t-test for independent means showed a significant difference in these attitudes at the .05 level.

Chairs and CSAOs also responded to questions about specific professional organizations. Chi-square was used to see if there was a significant difference in the responses of the chairs and CSAOs regarding which professional
TABLE 25. Attitudes toward agreeing on an accrediting organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

TABLE 26. Attitudes toward one organization representing all student affairs interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>2-tail Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAOs</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.

(A Likert-type scale of responses was used with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.)

association best represents the interests of the majority of the persons in the student affairs profession. Those cells with expected frequencies of less than five (ASHE, NAWDAC, other, and don't know) were dropped. A chi-square test on the three remaining options, ACPA, NASPA, and both NASPA and
ACPA, was conducted (Table 27). A significant difference was found regarding which professional association best represents their interests. When standardized residuals were calculated, the four categories that were found to be major contributors to the statistical significance were ACPA/chairs, NASPA/chairs, ACPA/CSAOs, and NASPA/CSAOs. Fifty-eight percent of the CSAOs preferred NASPA, while fifty-seven percent of the chairs preferred ACPA. This may reflect membership in these professional associations. Sixty-eight percent of the chairs reported belonging to ACPA and 57 percent belonged to NASPA. Forty-nine percent of the CSAOs belonged to ACPA while 94 percent belonged to NASPA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X²(2) = 32.664, p < .01
Table 28 reports results of chair and CSAO responses regarding which organization would best accredit higher education/student affairs preparation programs (AACJC, ASHE, and "other" were dropped because of low expected frequencies). Using chi-square a significant difference was found. Standardized residuals were calculated to determine which categories were major contributors to the significant $X^2$ value. All of the CSAO categories except the CAS/CSAO category were major contributors to the statistical significance. CSAOs were not in favor of CACREP or NCATE accreditation for preparation programs.

**TABLE 28. Frequencies of who would best accredit preparation programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assoc</th>
<th>Chairs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>CSAOs N</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACPA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2(5)=52.994, p<.01$
CAS Standards

To answer the question, "To what extent are the CAS "Preparation Standards and Guidelines at the Master's Degree Level for Student Services/Development Professionals in Postsecondary Education" met, the following criteria were used:

1. There should be at least two full-time faculty members whose primary responsibilities are directed to the student affairs preparation program.

2. Generally, faculty should be available according to a 1:16 faculty-student ratio on a full-time equivalent basis.

3. Coursework should be offered in human development theory and practice, higher education and student affairs functions, and research and evaluation.

4. A student affairs practicum or internship must be offered.

For this study an institution will have met the CAS Standards by meeting all four of the above criteria.

Table 29 shows the number of preparation institutions reporting fewer than two full-time faculty (FTF) in student affairs and those with two or more FTF. Seventy-six percent of the institutions met this first criterion.
Fifty (67 percent) of the 75 institutions responding to questions about numbers of students and faculty had a ratio of one full-time faculty person for every 16 full-time students in their graduate preparation program.

Fifty-nine institutions offered or required coursework in human development theory and practice, higher education and student affairs functions, and research and evaluation. This meant that 79 percent of the institutions met this criterium.

Of the 75 institutions responding, 67 or 89 percent reported requiring either a student affairs practicum, a student affairs internship, or both.

When considering all four of the above criteria, 38 (51 percent) institutions met the CAS standards.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, SIGNIFICANCE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a brief summary of the study, discuss the results and significance of the study, and provide recommendations for future research.

Nationally, there is discussion about the quality of student affairs/higher education preparation programs. One of the suggested methods to improve the preparation programs is to accredit them. Currently the only agency which accredits student affairs preparation programs is the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Of the twenty-three preparation programs accredited or conditionally accredited as of May 1, 1989, twenty had a counseling emphasis or were connected with a counseling emphasis.

Summary

This study surveyed attitudes of chief student affairs officers (CSAOs), deans of education, and chairs or leaders of higher education/student affairs preparation programs toward the preparation programs at their institutions and toward accreditation of these programs. Another purpose was to examine attitudes toward current and potential accrediting organizations. The final major purpose was to
ascertain if the CAS standards and guidelines were being met in the master's preparation programs.

Three different surveys were developed and mailed to the three targeted respondents at the 159 institutions on a total population list compiled from four sources. Fifteen of the institutions (45 respondents) were dropped from the study because they did not have a student affairs preparation program. A return rate of 59 percent (56 percent usable) was achieved for the 144 remaining institutions or 432 respondents.

Data were analyzed by one-way ANOVAs, t-tests and chi-square tests. A descriptive analysis was made regarding the CAS standards and guidelines.

All three responding groups on the average expressed favor toward preparation programs at their institutions. However, using a Scheffé test, significant differences in attitudes toward them were found between all possible pairs in the three groups, that is, between CSAOs and deans, between CSAOs and program chairs, and between deans and program chairs. The chairs as a group were more positive about the preparation programs; the CSAOs were least positive.

CSAOs on the average reported that they preferred to hire both entry-level and middle management employees with a
background in student affairs preparation as opposed to a background in related areas such as sociology, psychology, communications, or the humanities.

All three responding groups evaluated the relationship between the student affairs/higher education preparation program at their institution and the division of student affairs. On a scale of 1 - 10 with 1 being "unrelated" and 10 being "integrimly related," the chairs were highest with an average of 7.42, followed by the deans with 6.55 and the CSAOs with 6.24.

Attitudes of CSAOs toward accreditation of preparation programs were on the average positive. However, attitudes of chairs and deans were on the average neutral (between 2.5 and 3.5 on a 5-point Likert-type scale). A Scheffe test showed significant differences in attitudes toward accreditation between CSAOs and deans and between CSAOs and program chairs, but not between deans and program chairs.

CSAOs and chairs on the average felt that accrediting preparation programs would improve their quality. Deans as a group, however, were neutral. In a related study Beatty (1989) found that administrators (including CSAOs) felt more strongly than preparation faculty that the CAS standards would improve the quality of doctoral preparation programs by encouraging them to at least meet the minimum standards recommended for the master's level.
To determine more specific attitudes about accreditation, questions were asked concerning faculty interest in their institution with specialized accreditation, if accreditation standardizes curriculum requirements, the amount of staff time required for accreditation, and institutional support for accreditation.

Chairs and deans were in the neutral range (2.5 - 3.5) regarding whether specialized accreditation contributes to faculty members taking more interest in their programs or discipline than in their institution. In a 1986 ACE study (Andersen, 1987) 46 percent of ranking administrative officials from 520 institutions responded to a similar question that specialized accreditation does contribute to faculty taking more interest in their discipline.

All three responding groups were on the average similar in their neutrality about whether accreditation of student affairs preparation programs would standardize requirements for curriculum planning and evaluation.

Chairs and deans were also on the average neutral regarding the amount of staff time required for the accrediting self-study and visitation. (CSAOs were not asked this question.) This compares to the 1986 ACE study (Andersen, 1987) in which close to one half of the respondents agreed that the amount of staff time required for accreditation was too much.
When responding to whether or not there was sufficient support/resources at their institution to warrant seeking accreditation, the chairs and deans were in the neutral range although a significant difference was found between the two groups. The deans on the average felt there was less institutional support than the chairs. Dressel and Mayhew (1974) observed that the growth of specialized accrediting agencies in other fields has already placed an enormous burden on universities while seemingly not reducing the number of inadequate programs.

All three responding groups had difficulty agreeing on an accrediting agency. Although the three groups on the average preferred that both preparation faculty and student affairs professional associations together conduct accreditation, a significant difference among their responses was found using a chi-square test. CSAOs most frequently preferred this option. When asked which organizations would best accredit student affairs preparation programs, chairs and CSAOs expressed differing responses. (Deans were not asked this question.) Program chairs most frequently mentioned CACREP (31 percent) or ACPA (22 percent). CSAOs most frequently mentioned a new organization representing one or more professional associations (38 percent) or NASPA (35 percent). No chief
The student affairs officer chose CACREP or NCATE as an accrediting organization for preparation programs.

The chairs and CSAOs were asked specifically if professionals agree on an accrediting organization. Both groups were on the average neutral in their responses. They were again in the neutral range regarding whether one accrediting organization can represent all the interests in student affairs. However, on the latter question a significant difference was found between the two groups. The chairs as a group were more inclined than the CSAOs to agree that one organization can represent all the student affairs interests.

When asked which organization best represents those student affairs interests, the CSAOs most frequently identified NASPA and the chairs most frequently ACPA.

Certification as another alternative to improve quality of preparation program graduates was favored by 29 percent of the chairs, 22 percent of the CSAOs and 28 percent of the deans. These percentages show that certification of student affairs professionals as an option was not favored by the majority of respondents.

A descriptive analysis was used to determine which preparation programs met CAS standards and guidelines. Thirty-eight (51 percent) of 75 institutions met the
following criteria selected by the researcher regarding the CAS standards and guidelines:

1. There should be at least two full-time faculty members whose primary responsibilities are directed to the student affairs preparation program.

2. Generally, faculty should be available according to a 1:16 faculty-student ratio on a full-time equivalent basis.

3. Coursework should be offered in human development theory and practice, higher education and student affairs functions, and research and evaluation.

4. A student affairs practicum or internship must be offered.

Significance of Study

One of the recommendations of the report of a joint ACPA and NASPA Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice (ACPA and NASPA, 1989) was that ACPA and NASPA "establish a study group to make recommendations on the accreditation of preparation programs and credentialing or establishing a registry of professionals in student affairs" (p. 37). This research provides background for such a study group.
Significant differences were found among CSAOs, deans of education, and program chairs in attitudes toward preparation programs at their institutions. Although all three groups were on the average positive, the CSAOs were least pleased with the preparation programs and most positive toward their accreditation. The CSAOs, as practitioners who hire and supervise preparation program graduates, also agreed, along with the chairs, that accreditation would improve preparation program quality. In the related 1986 ACE survey (Andersen, 1987), three quarters of the respondents reported that specialized accreditation provides a useful index of program quality.

However, based on the review of literature and this investigation, it appears that quality and an agreed-upon philosophy are hard to define in the student affairs profession and simultaneously in preparation programs. Stamatakos and Rogers (1984) mentioned discord and divisiveness within the profession when referring to incompatibilities, inconsistencies, and omissions that are implied within and between the Student Personnel Point of View (ACE, 1949) and the Student Development Services in Post Secondary Education (COSPA, 1975).

According to Sandeen (1984) there are many diverse interests in the profession. In what he referred to as a
partial list of career options, he named 32 job titles of student affairs professionals ranging from dean of students to director of veteran affairs. Shaffer (1984) predicted that in the future professionals will need to work in a number of functional areas at the same time. For instance, one professional might need to be knowledgeable in recruitment and retention of students, assessment of personnel, evaluation of programs and reallocation of resources.

The CAS standards attempted to give direction to preparation programs. They suggest three emphases in the master's programs: counseling, administration, and student development. Specific recommendations are given for each emphasis. Twenty-two percent of 69 institutions in this study reported having all three emphases in their preparation programs. Only 51 percent of the institutions met the voluntary CAS standards and guidelines. The consortium that identified the CAS standards did not intend to be an accrediting agency. Paterson and Carpenter (1989) suggested that the standards could serve as a model by which every preparation program should be evaluated. They did not suggest who should do the evaluating.

In this study there was inconsistency among respondents at individual institutions regarding whether or not the institution even had a student affairs preparation program.
If the dean of education or the CSAO at an institution isn't sure whether a student affairs preparation program exists on his or her campus, the program has an identity problem. In another case one potential respondent returned the blank survey instrument saying her program was a higher education program, not a student affairs program, even though every effort was made in the cover letter and instrument to use both terms--student affairs and higher education.

In recent literature there was little agreement about the distinction among terms such as student development, student personnel, student affairs, and higher education preparation programs. Whitt, Carnaghi, Matkin, Scalese-Love and Nestor (1990) concluded that "a single statement of professional philosophy cannot adequately represent the range of needs, experiences, values, and beliefs present among student affairs professionals."

In the opinion of the researcher, the profession itself must take responsibility for the quality of its preparation programs. If accreditation becomes a force that limits diversity and creativity among preparation programs, then it should not be recommended. Allowing preparation programs to experiment and to purposely focus on different identified needs of the profession should be encouraged. But that focus must not sacrifice quality of programs for lack of
sufficient resources including qualified faculty, scholarly research, rigorous coursework, assistantships, and other experiential opportunities. General guidelines must exist with some way to encourage their adoption.

If accreditation were recommended for professional preparation programs, agreeing on an agency to conduct the accreditation appears difficult. Based on the response to this study, any attempt to accredit student affairs preparation programs should be a joint effort of professional associations and preparation program faculty. Communication between these two groups is important for the profession not only for accreditation purposes. This need was supported by the ACPA/NASPA Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice.

Because chairs tended to more frequently belong to ACPA and CSAOs more frequently belonged to NASPA, both ACPA and NASPA must be involved in any attempt to discuss professional accreditation. These two organizations were identified most frequently in this study as representing student affairs interests. Paterson and Carpenter (1989) recommended that both NASPA and ACPA become more involved in the professional preparation of student affairs personnel. The ACPA/NASPA Task Force on Professional Preparation and Practice was a step in the right direction.
The CSAOs were not supportive of CACREP as an accrediting organization for preparation programs. Even though CACREP bases accreditation on CAS standards and guidelines it is more frequently thought of as related to the counseling emphasis. More chairs were in favor of CACREP as an accrediting agency. The varied responses regarding an accrediting organization point to the controversy that needs to be resolved before accreditation, if desired, can be successfully implemented.

Recommendations for Further Study

Chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) surveyed in this study were on the average positive about the preparation programs at their own institutions and about the need to accredit preparation programs. Further research needs to be conducted to survey the attitudes of other CSAOs located at institutions that do not offer student affairs preparation programs. Attitudes of these CSAOs toward the quality of preparation programs and their accreditation would add to the information the profession needs to address the accreditation issue. Care must be taken to survey CSAOs from institutions of varying sizes and from both public and private institutions. Attitudes of community college professionals toward preparation programs are also
important. Fryer (1984) suggested a regional consortium of community colleges with a major university for the purpose of leadership development of practitioners. A pilot project of this type should be developed and researched.

Other professionals whose opinions are important are the student affairs preparation faculty both part-time and full-time who are not chairs or leaders of preparation programs. They also have a responsibility for the quality of preparation programs and would be involved in an accreditation process if one existed at their institution. Also the faculty who are part-time practitioners and part-time instructors should be surveyed. They bring a recommended practitioner perspective to the classroom. If they participate in faculty meetings or curriculum planning, they may also contribute to bettering communication between faculty and practitioners and thereby improving program quality.

There has been discussion among professionals about theory-based vs. practical-based education and about generalist vs. specialist preparation. These issues need to be further studied as they relate to the diverse interests in the field of student affairs. Such research would assist in revising the CAS standards and guidelines, a process that is currently planned.
More knowledge is needed about why students enrolled in their respective preparation programs. How many chose the program because of its geographic location as opposed to its reputation or program quality? Did CACREP accreditation or would other accreditation influence their choice of preparation institution or program of study?

Research as to how the profession could improve the quality of preparation programs without accreditation would be helpful. Certification received limited attention in this study. Licensing is another alternative. Advisory boards for preparation programs have been suggested. Can the profession ensure quality preparation programs without accreditation? If so, how?

If accreditation is recommended by the professional organizations for the student affairs preparation programs, further research about a potential accrediting organization would be advisable. Creative ideas are needed to identify a new organization or combination of existing organizations that would be willing to accredit preparation programs and be acceptable to practitioners as well as faculty.

This study is only a beginning for discussing the controversial subject of accrediting student affairs preparation programs. More discussion and research are recommended to help professionals understand the complex
issue. Whitt, Carnaghi, Matkin, Scalese-Love, and Nestor (1990) stated that, "sharing values and philosophies about student affairs work and affirming professional commitments can be a very healthy process."
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APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
A NOTE TO RESPONDENTS

Approximately 160 higher educational institutions in the United States have a graduate program related to student affairs or higher education preparation. Throughout the history of these training programs attempts to set standards for the field were made several times. The Student Personnel Point of View, the reports of the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA) and the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) are results of attempts to clarify the philosophy and standards of the field. Currently concern exists by some practitioners about the inconsistent quality of preparation programs. Our research is meant to address this issue, as well as, study whether or not professionals in the field desire accreditation of graduate student affairs/higher education preparation programs.

We are asking your opinion toward the status of and accreditation of these programs. As noted in the accompanying letter, no respondent will be identified nor will any institution or individual program be singled out for comparison. Your input is very much appreciated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduates of the higher education/student affairs preparation program at my institution are well prepared for professional responsibilities.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All areas of graduate study in education should be accredited by a professionally based accrediting agency.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution does not address relevant issues in student affairs.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will improve their quality.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being accredited is necessary to recruit and retain faculty.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Compared with other graduate programs of study in my college, the program that prepares student affairs professionals rates above average.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Accreditation assures that the program is relevant to current practice in the field.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Courses and course sequences required by accreditation make it difficult for the program to achieve the breadth of knowledge its faculty want their graduates to possess.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Professionals can agree on an organization to accredit student affairs/higher education preparation programs.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Accreditation of the student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution would not make it (did not make it) a stronger program.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. One accrediting organization can represent all of the interests in student affairs (e.g. administration, counseling, and student development).</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will standardize requirements for curriculum planning and evaluation.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strongly Agree .......................... 5
Agree ...................................... 4
Neutral .................................... 3
Disagree ................................... 2
Strongly disagree ......................... 1
Not applicable/insufficient information  N

Please circle your response

13. The fees associated with accreditation and visitation are too great. 5 4 3 2 1 N

14. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs is not necessary if the College or School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). 5 4 3 2 1 N

15. At my institution there is sufficient support/resources to warrant seeking accreditation of student affairs/higher education programs. 5 4 3 2 1 N

16. Compared with other student affairs/higher education preparation programs nationally, the program at my institution rates above average. 5 4 3 2 1 N

17. Nationally, guidelines should be provided by higher education/student affairs preparation programs to conduct self-appraisal and implement program improvement. 5 4 3 2 1 N

18. Assuming student affairs/higher education preparation programs should be accredited, which professional educational agency accredits them is not important. 5 4 3 2 1 N

19. The amount of faculty and staff time required for the accrediting self-study and visitation is too great. 5 4 3 2 1 N

20. Full-time faculty in the student affairs/higher education preparation programs at my institution are well qualified. 5 4 3 2 1 N

21. It is more important that master's student affairs/higher education preparation programs be accredited than doctoral programs. 5 4 3 2 1 N

22. Courses and course sequences required by specialized accreditation are too prescriptive. 5 4 3 2 1 N

23. Accreditation contributes to faculty members taking more interest in their programs or disciplines than in their institution. 5 4 3 2 1 N

2
24. On a scale of 1 - 10, how would you evaluate the relationship between the student affairs/higher education preparation program at your institution and the division of student affairs?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 don't know
unrelated integrally related

25. Which of the national professional associations best represents the interests of the majority of the persons in the student affairs profession?

- ACPA (American College Personnel Association)
- ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education)
- NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators)
- NAWDAC (National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors)
- Other Please specify:
- Don't know

Please explain your response

26. If accreditation of student affairs/higher education preparation programs were recommended, it should be conducted by:

- faculty of college and university higher education/student affairs preparation programs
- student affairs professional associations
- jointly by preparation faculty and student affairs associations
- other Please specify:
- uncertain

Please explain your response

27. Which of the following organizations would best accredit higher education/student affairs preparation programs? (Check one)

- AACJC (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges)
- ACPA (American College Personnel Association)
- ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education)
- CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs)
- CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards)
- NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators)
- NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education)
- A new organization representing some or all professional associations listed above. Please identify:
- Other Please specify:
- Don't know
28. Should practicing professionals in student affairs be certified (such as school psychologists are certified)?

____ yes, _____ no, _____ don't know

29. If yes, should certification be based on graduation from an accredited preparation program? _____ yes, _____ no, _____ don't know

The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) Standards and Guidelines recommended one or more of three emphases (administration, counseling, and student development) for master's level student affairs/higher education preparation programs.

30. Should each student affairs/higher education preparation program at the master's level specialize in one or any combination of these emphases?

____ yes
____ no
____ don't know

31. If yes, should a different accrediting agency accredit each emphasis? (If you checked "no" or "don't know" in Question 30, go on to Question 32.)

____ yes
____ no
____ don't know

32. List any comments you have about the quality of student affairs/higher education preparation programs, accreditation of them, the relationship of accreditation to quality, or professional certification of graduates.
The following questions pertain to the student affairs/higher education preparation program at YOUR institution:

33. The Higher Education/Student Affairs Preparation Program is located in:
   (check ALL those appropriate)
   
   ____ College or School of Education
   ____ Its own department i.e., Department of Higher Education, Department of Student Affairs Preparation, etc.
   ____ Another department List department title:
   ____ Other Specify:

34. Is there a Higher Education Center or Institute on campus?

   ____ yes  ____ no  If yes, what is its title?

35. Number of faculty in Higher Education/Student Affairs Preparation Program:

   ____ Full time faculty
   ____ Part time faculty

   ____ Number of full-time student affairs staff with faculty rank
   ____ Number of adjunct faculty not directly affiliated with campus
   ____ Number of part-time faculty teaching core courses

36. In your Student Affairs/Higher Education Preparation Program are faculty improvement leaves, sabbaticals, or other experiential training:
(Check all appropriate)

   ____ required? If so, how often? ________________________________
   ____ encouraged? If so, how often? ________________________________
   ____ neither encouraged nor discouraged?
   ____ discouraged?
   ____ don't know

37. Total number of students currently enrolled in Higher Education/Student Affairs

   Master's  ____ part time  ____ full time  ____ number on assistantships
   Doctorate  ____ part time  ____ full time  ____ number on assistantships

38. Degrees offered:  ____ M.A.  ____ Ed.S.
   (Check all appropriate)  ____ M.Ed.  ____ Ph.D.
   ____ M.S.  ____ Ed.D.
   ____ Others, please list:
The following questions in this section relate to the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) Standards and Guidelines. Please respond as appropriate for your master’s program. (If you do not offer a master's program, go on to question 47.)

39. The CAS Standards recommended one or more of these three emphases. Check the one(s) emphasized in the master's program at your institution.
   __ student development
   __ administration
   __ counseling
   __ other Specify:
   __ don't know

40. Check the following areas that are required or regularly offered (either by your department or by a related department) in coursework for a master's degree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>required</th>
<th>offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>human development theory and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization behavior and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American college student and college environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the helping relationship (counseling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher education and student affairs functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business administration, human resource management, or public administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance appraisal and supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative uses of computers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appraisal of the individual (understanding the individual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history of higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other required courses, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Check the following supervised experiences required or regularly offered in your institution's master's program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>required</th>
<th>offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>counseling prepracticum laboratory experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counseling practica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student affairs practica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student affairs internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervised field experience in organization development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervised field experience in human development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. Does your institution’s master’s program emphasize preparation for employment at a (check all appropriate)

- 2 year institution
- 4 year small public institution
- 4 year small private institution
- 4 year large public institution
- 4 year large private institution
- no specified emphasis

43. Check the following that are admissions requirements for the master’s program at your institution:

- Graduate Record Exam (GRE) Minimum requirement? ____________________
- letter(s) of recommendation
- undergrad GPA Minimum? ____________________
- interviews
- transcripts
- statement of career interests, experiences, or goals (essay)
- Miller Analogies Test (MAT)
- Other Specify: ____________________

44. For the master’s degree do you require: (Check those required)

- a minimum length of full time study? If so, how long? __________
- a maximum length of time to get degree? If so, how long? __________

45. For the master’s degree do you require a thesis?

- yes ______ no ______ optional

46. How many credits are required for a master’s degree?

- M.A. degree? ______ semester credits ______ quarter credits
- M.Ed. degree? ______ semester credits ______ quarter credits
- M.S. degree? ______ semester credits ______ quarter credits
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

47. Institution name ____________________________

48. Institution is: ___ public   ___ private

49. Total student headcount at institution (both undergraduate and graduate)
    ______________________

50. Your title or position ________________________

51. Number of years in this position ____________

52. Education (list your terminal degree)
    Year    Degree    College or university    Major

53. Gender: ___ Female    ___ Male

54. Year of birth _________

55. Ethnicity: ___ Asian American
    ___ Black American/African American
    ___ Caucasian
    ___ Hispanic/Chicano/Latino
    ___ Native American/American Indian
    ___ Other Please specify:

56. Please check the professional associations of which you currently are a member:
    ___ AACJC    ___ ASHE
    ___ AAHE    ___ NASPA
    ___ ACPA    ___ NAWDAC
    ___ Other(s) Please specify:

57. Have you worked in student affairs?    ___ yes,    ___ no
    If yes, number of years? _________
    in what areas? ___________________________________
Thank you for taking time to complete the survey. Postage for the questionnaire is prepaid, so just tape it and drop it in a mailbox.

If you'd be willing, we'd appreciate your name and phone number for the purpose of follow-up or clarification of responses.

Name

Phone
SURVEY OF CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER
ABOUT ACCREDITATION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS/HIGHER EDUCATION
PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Strongly Agree ......................... 5
Agree .................................. 4
Neutral ................................ 3
Disagree .............................. 2
Strongly disagree .................... 1
Not applicable/insufficient information.. N

Note: Accreditation in this survey refers only to specialized accreditation of a specific program (as opposed to institutional accreditation)

Please circle your response

1. Graduates of the higher education/student affairs preparation program at my institution are well prepared for professional responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1 N

2. All areas of graduate study in education should be accredited by a professionally based accrediting agency. 5 4 3 2 1 N

3. The student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution does not address relevant issues in student affairs. 5 4 3 2 1 N

4. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will improve their quality. 5 4 3 2 1 N

5. Compared with other graduate programs of study at my institution the program that prepares student affairs professionals rates above average. 5 4 3 2 1 N

6. Professionals can agree on an organization to accredit student affairs/higher education preparation programs. 5 4 3 2 1 N

7. Accreditation of the student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution would not make it (did not make it) a stronger program. 5 4 3 2 1 N

8. One accrediting organization can represent all of the interests in student affairs (e.g. administration, counseling, and student development). 5 4 3 2 1 N

9. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will standardize requirements for curriculum planning and evaluation. 5 4 3 2 1 N

10. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs is not necessary if the College or School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). 5 4 3 2 1 N
11. Compared with other student affairs/higher education preparation programs nationally, the program at my institution rates above average. 

Strongly Agree .......................... 5
Agree ........................................ 4
Neutral ....................................... 3
Disagree ...................................... 2
Strongly disagree .......................... 1
Not applicable/insufficient information.. N

12. Accreditation assures that the program is relevant to current practice in the field.

13. Nationally, guidelines should be provided by higher education/student affairs preparation programs to conduct self-appraisal and implement program improvement.

14. Assuming higher education/student affairs preparation programs should be accredited, which professional educational agency accredits them is not important.

15. Full-time faculty in the student affairs/higher education preparation programs at my institution are well qualified.

16. I prefer to hire an entry-level student affairs employee with a background in related areas such as sociology, psychology, communications, or the humanities rather than in student affairs/higher education preparation.

17. I prefer to hire a middle management employee with a background in student affairs/higher education preparation rather than in sociology, psychology, communications, or the humanities.

18. On a scale of 1 - 10, how would you evaluate the relationship between the student affairs/higher education preparation program at your institution and the division of student affairs?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 don't know
unrelated integrally related
19. Which of the national professional associations best represents the interests of the majority of the persons in the student affairs profession?

___ ACPA (American College Personnel Association)
___ ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education)
___ NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators)
___ NAWDAC (National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors)
___ Other Please specify:
    Don't know
Please explain your response

20. If accreditation of student affairs/higher education preparation programs were recommended, it should be conducted by:

___ faculty of college and university higher education/student affairs preparation programs
___ student affairs professional associations
___ jointly by preparation faculty and student affairs associations
___ other Please specify:
___ uncertain

21. Which of the following organizations would best accredit higher education/student affairs preparation programs? (Check one)

___ AACJC (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges)
___ ACPA (American College Personnel Association)
___ ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education)
___ CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs)
___ CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards)
___ NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators)
___ NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education)
___ A new organization representing some or all professional associations listed above (Please identify them)
___ Other Please specify:
___ Don't know

22. Should practicing professionals in student affairs be certified (such as school psychologists are certified)?

___ yes, ______ no, ______ don't know

23. If yes, should certification be based on graduation from an accredited preparation program?

___ yes, ______ no, ______ don't know
The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) Standards and Guidelines recommended one or more of three emphases (administration, counseling, and student development) for master's level student affairs/higher education preparation programs.

24. Should each student affairs/higher education preparation program at the master's level specialize in one or any combination of these emphases?
   - [ ] yes
   - [ ] no
   - [ ] don't know

25. If yes, should a different accrediting agency accredit each emphasis?
   (If you checked "no" or "don't know" in Question 24, go on to Question 26.)
   - [ ] yes
   - [ ] no
   - [ ] don't know

26. List any comments you have about the quality of student affairs/higher education preparation programs, accreditation of them, the relationship of accreditation to quality, or professional certification of graduates.
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

27. Institution name ________________________________________________________

28. Your title or position ____________________________________________________

29. Number of years in this position __________________________

30. Education (list your terminal degree)
   Year   Degree   College or university   Major

31. Gender:    ___ Female    ___ Male

32. Year of birth __________

33. Ethnicity:
   ___ Asian American
   ___ Black American/African American
   ___ Caucasian
   ___ Hispanic/Chicano/Latino
   ___ Native American/American Indian
   ___ Other Please specify:

34. Are you currently a member of the student affairs/higher education graduate faculty at your institution?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

35. Please check the professional associations of which you currently are a member:
   ___ AACJC          ___ ASHE
   ___ AAHE          ___ NASPA
   ___ ACPA          ___ NAWDAC
   ___ Other(s) Please specify:

36. Is your institution a NASPA member?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ don't know

Thank you for taking time to complete the survey. Postage for the questionnaire is prepaid, so all you need to do is tape it and drop it in a mailbox.

If you'd be willing, we'd appreciate your name and phone number for the purpose of follow-up or clarification of answers.

Name __________________________
Phone _________________________
SURVEY OF EDUCATION DEAN
ABOUT ACCREDITATION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS/HIGHER EDUCATION
PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Strongly Agree .................... 5
Agree .................................. 4
Neutral ............................... 3
Disagree ............................. 2
Strongly disagree ................. 1
Not applicable/insufficient information.. N

Note: Accreditation in this survey refers only to specialized accreditation of a specific program (as opposed to institutional accreditation)

1. Graduates of the higher education/student affairs preparation program at my institution are well prepared for professional responsibilities. 5 4 3 2 1 N

2. All areas of graduate study in education should be accredited by a professionally based accrediting agency. 5 4 3 2 1 N

3. Being accredited is necessary to recruit and retain faculty. 5 4 3 2 1 N

4. The student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution does not address relevant issues in student affairs. 5 4 3 2 1 N

5. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will improve their quality. 5 4 3 2 1 N

6. Courses and course sequences required by accreditation make it difficult for the institution to achieve the breadth of knowledge it wants its graduates to have. 5 4 3 2 1 N

7. Compared with other graduate programs of study in my college, the program that prepares student affairs professionals rates above average. 5 4 3 2 1 N

8. Accreditation assures that the program is relevant to current practice in the field. 5 4 3 2 1 N

9. Accreditation of the student affairs/higher education preparation program at my institution would not make it (did not make it) a stronger program. 5 4 3 2 1 N

10. Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs will standardize requirements for curriculum planning and evaluation. 5 4 3 2 1 N

11. The fees associated with accreditation and visitation are too great. 5 4 3 2 1 N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Accreditation of higher education/student affairs preparation programs is not necessary if the College or School of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>At my institution there is sufficient support/resources to warrant seeking accreditation of our student affairs/higher education preparation program.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nationally, guidelines should be provided by higher education/student affairs preparation programs to conduct self-appraisal and implement program improvement.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Assuming student affairs/higher education preparation programs should be accredited, which professional educational agency accredits them is not important.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Full-time faculty in the student affairs/higher education preparation programs at my institution are well qualified.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If financial cuts were to be made in my college, student affairs/higher education preparation programs would be given high priority for funding.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Accreditation assures me that the standards and quality of my programs are generally acceptable in the postsecondary education community.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The amount of faculty and staff time required for the accrediting self-study and visitation is too great.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Courses and course sequences required by specialized accreditation are too prescriptive.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Most programs on my campus subject to specialized accreditation benefit from the scrutiny required by accrediting agencies.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>It is more important that master's student affairs/higher education preparation programs be accredited than doctoral programs.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Accreditation contributes to faculty members taking more interest in their programs or disciplines than in their institution.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. On a scale of 1 - 10, how would you evaluate the relationship between the student affairs/higher education program at your institution and the division of student affairs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unrelated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If accreditation of student affairs/higher education preparation programs were recommended, it should be conducted by:

- faculty of college and university higher education/student affairs preparation programs
- student affairs professional associations
- jointly by preparation faculty and student affairs associations
- other Please specify:
- uncertain

Please explain your response

26. Should practicing professionals in student affairs be certified (such as school psychologists are certified)?

- yes, no, don't know

27. If yes, should certification be based on graduation from an accredited preparation program?

- yes, no, don't know
28. List any comments you have about the quality of student affairs/higher education preparation programs, accreditation of them, the relationship of accreditation to quality, or professional certification of graduates.
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.

29. Institution name ________________________________________________

30. Your title or position ____________________________________________

31. Number of years in this position _____________________________

32. Education (list your terminal degree)
   Year   Degree   College or university   Major

33. Gender:  ___ Female  ___ Male

34. Year of birth _________

35. Ethnicity:
   ___ Asian American
   ___ Black American/African American
   ___ Caucasian
   ___ Hispanic/Chicano/Latino
   ___ Native American/American Indian
   ___ Other  Please specify:

36. Are you currently a member of the student affairs/higher education graduate faculty at your institution?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

37. Please check the professional associations of which you currently are a member:
   ___ AACTE    ___ ASHE
   ___ AAHE    ___ NASPA
   ___ ACPA    ___ NANDAC
   ___ Other(s)  Please specify:

38. Is your school or college NCATE accredited?   ___ yes,   ___ no

   If yes, when were you last approved?  ________________ (date)

Thank you for taking time to complete the survey. Postage for the questionnaire is prepaid, so all you need to do is tape it and drop it in a mailbox.

If you'd be willing, we'd appreciate your name and phone number for the purpose of follow-up or clarification of responses.

Name __________________________________________

Phone ____________________________
APPENDIX B. AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PERMISSION TO USE SELECTED QUESTIONS
Dr. C. J. Andersen
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Dr. Andersen:

As a follow-up to our telephone conversation on July 12, 1989, I'm writing to request permission to use questions from the American Council on Education's 1986 survey on accreditation for my doctoral research on attitudes toward accreditation of higher education/student services preparation programs.

I am particularly interested in the statements on specialized accreditation as reported in Table E of:


Thank you for your assistance with my research project.

Sincerely,

Beverly Kruempel
Doctoral Candidate
August 1, 1989

Ms. Beverly Kruempel  
Professional Studies  
N243 Lagomarcino Hall  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011

Dear Ms. Kruempel:

This is in response to your request to use questions from the Council's 1986 survey on attitudes toward accreditation as published in HEP Report No. 74, Survey of Accreditation Issues, 1986.

Thank you for your inquiry. This is to formally give you permission to use the questions and/or statements contained in the report. When you have completed your research, we would like to know the title of any resultant article or publication.

Best wishes for a successful project.

Sincerely yours,

Charles J. Andersen  
Senior Research Associate
APPENDIX C. SAMPLE LETTER REQUESTING INSTRUMENT CRITIQUE
June 26, 1989

Dr. Arthur Sandeen  
Vice President - Student Affairs  
University of Florida  
124 Tigert Hall  
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dear Art:

In preparation of a research study on accreditation of student personnel/higher education preparation programs, we would appreciate your critiquing the enclosed instrument. Please fill it out and note any suggestions you have for making it a better instrument.

The major purpose of our study will be to assess attitudes of chief student affairs officers, education deans, and chairs of preparation programs toward status of and accreditation of these programs.

Please return the instrument and your suggestions in the enclosed envelope. If it would be easier to give feedback on the phone, call one of us at a phone number listed below.

Thanks for assisting us in this research project. We hope to get the final instrument to you in August. Best wishes for a great summer.

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers  
Professional Studies  
N243 Lagomarcino Hall  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011  
515-294-4143

Beverly Kruempel  
2519 Timberland Rd.  
Ames, IA 50010  
515-292-5029
APPENDIX D. HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM
INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Attitudes of chief student affairs officers, deans of education colleges, and chairs of student affairs preparation programs toward the status of and accreditation of student affairs/higher ed; I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

2. Beverly Kruempel 8/28/89
Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date
204 Engineering Annex 294-2542 Campus Address Campus Telephone

3. Signature of others (if any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

   - Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   - Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   - Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   - Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   - Deception of subjects
   - Subjects under 14 years of age and/or Subjects 14-17 years of age
   - Subjects in institutions
   - Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

   - Signed informed consent will be obtained.
   - Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: Month Day Year
   Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: Month Day Year

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and/or identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments: Month Day Year

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects In Research:

   - Project Approved
   - Project not approved
   - No action required

   George G. Karas
   Chairperson of Committee

   Name of Committee Chairperson Date Signature of Committee Chairperson
APPENDIX E. SAMPLE COVER LETTERS
Dear Dr. Williams:

The quality of student affairs training programs and their accreditation are issues of concern to student affairs professionals. In an effort to address this issue, we are asking your opinion toward the status of and accreditation of student affairs/higher education preparation programs. A secondary purpose of our research is to determine the impact of the CAS Standards on master's preparation programs.

Would you please complete the enclosed survey and return to us by October 31. If you are not the chair or leader of the student affairs/higher education preparation program, please give this to the appropriate person. (If you do not have such a program, note that and return the blank instrument.)

The chief student affairs officer and the dean of the school or college of education at your institution are receiving similar instruments appropriate for their positions.

The identification number on the survey is for follow-up purposes only. No respondent will be identified nor will any individual preparation program be singled out for comparison. Your assistance is appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation. Best wishes for the rest of your fall term.

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers

Sincerely,

Beverly Kruempel
Dear Dr. Barnes:

Your institution has been identified as having a graduate level student affairs/higher education preparation program. We're conducting a survey of attitudes that chief student affairs officers have toward these programs and their accreditation.

Would you please complete the enclosed survey and return to us by October 31. If you are not the chief student affairs officer, please give this to the appropriate person.

The head of the student affairs/higher education preparation program and the dean of the school or college of education at your institution are receiving similar instruments appropriate for their positions.

The identification number on the survey is for follow-up purposes only. No respondent will be identified nor will any institution or individual preparation program be singled out for comparison.

Your assistance is appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation. Best wishes for the rest of your fall term.

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers

Sincerely,

Beverly Kruempel
Dear Dean Blackburn:

Your institution has been identified as having a graduate level student affairs/higher education preparation program. We're conducting a survey of attitudes that deans of schools or colleges of education have toward these programs and their accreditation.

Would you please complete the enclosed survey and return to us by October 31. If you are not the dean of the school or college of education, please give this to the appropriate person.

The head of the student affairs/higher education preparation program and the chief student affairs officer at your institution are receiving similar instruments appropriate for their positions.

The identification number on the survey is for follow-up purposes only. No respondent will be identified nor will any institution or individual preparation program be singled out for comparison.

Your assistance is appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation. Best wishes for the rest of your fall term.

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers

Beverly Kruempel
Dear Colleague:

We would like to include your responses in our study of accreditation of student affairs/higher education preparation programs. If you have mailed the questionnaire recently, we thank you. If you have not, we would appreciate your completing it and mailing it in the next week.

Please call (515)294-4143 if you've misplaced the instrument and we'll send you another one. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Larry H. Ebbers

Sincerely,

Beverly J. Kruempel
APPENDIX G. PREPARATION PROGRAMS CONTACTED
Auburn University
University of Alabama
University of Akron
American University
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University
* University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Central Arkansas
Azusa Pacific University
Ball State University
Baylor University
Boston College
* Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Bradley University
Brigham Young University
California State University
Claremont Graduate School
University of California - Berkeley
University of California - Los Angeles
University of Southern California
Clemson University
Colorado State University
Teachers College/Columbia University
University of Dayton
University of Denver
University of Northern Colorado
Southern Connecticut State
University of Connecticut
University of Delaware
* Duquesne University
Emporia State University
Florida Atlantic University
The Florida State University
University of Florida
The George Washington University
University of Georgia
Georgia State University
Glassboro State College
University of Hawaii
* University of Houston
Howard University
Idaho State University
University of Idaho
Eastern Illinois University
Illinois State University
Northern Illinois University
Southern Illinois University
University of Illinois, Champaign
Western Illinois University
Indiana State University
Indiana University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Iowa State University
University of Iowa
University of Northern Iowa
Kansas State University
The University of Kansas
The University of Kentucky
Kent State University
Western Kentucky University
University of Louisville
Loyola University of Chicago
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
University of Maine
Mankato State University
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
Memphis State University
Miami University
University of Miami
* Eastern Michigan University
Michigan State University
* University of Michigan
Western Michigan University
University of Minnesota
Mississippi State University
University of Mississippi
University of Southern Mississippi
Central Missouri State University
University of Missouri - Columbia
University of Missouri - Kansas City
Montana State University
Moorhead State University
University of Nebraska
University of Nevada - Las Vegas
University of Nevada - Reno
Montclair State College
New York University
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Brockport
* State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at Oswego
State University of New York at Plattsburgh
North Carolina State University
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
University of North Dakota
Northeastern University
University of Rochester
Ohio State University
* Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
Oregon State University
Peabody College of Vanderbilt University
* Portland State University
Pennsylvania State University
* University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Purdue University
University of Rhode Island
* Rutgers University
* Seton Hall University
Shippensburg University
University of South Carolina
Springfield College
St. Louis University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
University of Tennessee
East Texas State University
North Texas State University
Texas A & M University
University of Texas
* Texas Tech University
* Texas Southern University
University of Toledo
Tuskegee University
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Wayne State University
Washington State University
West Virginia University
Widener University
* College of William and Mary
University of Wisconsin - La Crosse
University of Wisconsin - Madison
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh
University of Wyoming

* Nonrespondents