

that those being selected to work in the field, those whom will someday take over for us, are the best people whom our current college and universities have to offer. By taking a personal stake in the selection and development of our new staff and faculty professionals, we are ensuring that our students are getting the best education available.

## References

- Cahn, S. (1986). Saints and scamps: Ethics in academia. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Evans, N. "Attrition of student affairs professionals: A review of the literature." Journal of college student development, 1988, 29, 19-24.
- Fortunato, R. and Waddell, D. (1981). Personnel administration in higher education: Handbook of Faculty and Staff Personnel Practices (2000). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harned, P. and Murphy, M. (1998). "Creating a culture of development for the new professional." New directions for student services, 84, 43-53.
- Mueller, K. H. (1961). Student personnel work in higher education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Tolbert, P. S. (1998). "Two-tiered faculty systems and organizational outcomes." New directions for higher education, 104, 71-80.
- Winston, R. B., Jr. and Creamer, D. G. (1997). Improving staffing practices in student affairs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## Credentialing the Student Affairs Professional: Another Point of View ©

Cody Arvidson  
John L. Baier  
University of North Texas, Denton, Texas

*This article begins by providing a summary of the historical context of the on-again/ off-again 'credentialing' movement in the student affairs profession. The authors then provide a rationale for creating a credentialing process within the profession, and conclude with a model for credentialing student affairs professionals*

© Copyright: Center for Higher Education, Univ. of North Texas

## Introduction

The question that perennially evades answer in many conversations about the student affairs profession is whether or not the people performing student affairs functions are professionals practicing the theories and tools of a profession or are they simply administrators performing managerial institutional tasks.

Student affairs, like the legal profession, is diverse, complex and changing (Canon, 1982; Woodward & Komives, 1990), and by establishing enforceable standards driven by ethics (Miller, 1991) through certification or accreditation, the ability of the naysayer to dissuade us about the legitimacy of our work as professionals is lessened.

Unfortunately, elected and appointed leaders in the profession have failed to reach consensus regarding accreditation, so student

Cody Arvidson can be reached at the Program in Higher Education, University of North Texas, PO Box 311337, Denton, Texas, 76203. John L. Baier can be reached at the Center for Higher Education, University of North Texas, PO Box 311337, Denton, Texas 76203. E-mail:baier@unt.edu

affairs may better be served by examining individual professionalism instead of seeking recognition as a unitary profession (Komives, 1992). Sandeen (1982) has noted that if student affairs leaders and associations do not establish criteria and systems for accreditation, some outside body will. Canon (1982) specifically stated that our profession would best be understood through the process of certification and Woodward and Komives suggested in 1990 that a national registry should be established to help recognize the professional status of student affairs administrators.

In light of the strong opposition expressed by the NASPA membership to the proposed pilot program that was developed Janosik (2002) to establish a National Student Affairs Registry administered by NASPA, we feel it is important to the student affairs profession to once again try to make the case for developing some sort of Professional Credentialing program that can be made available to those INDIVIDUALS who wish to seek 'certification' for the profession they practice. This article is intended to provide the historical context affecting the development of any credentialing scheme, justify its needed to both the field of practice and the individuals who practice within it, and to provide a model scheme for INDIVIDUAL practitioner consideration.

### **Revisiting the Criteria for a Profession**

Traditional criteria for assessing profession status have included the following eight standards (Stamatakos,1981).These are reconsidered as they apply in 2002 below:

**Application of standards of selection and training:** CAS standards and CACREP accreditation are both options for professional preparation programs. Regional accrediting bodies apply standards for student services personnel. Additionally, the development of a certification model will help improve the standards of the profession and enable those who enter via the "back door" to become legitimate members of the profession, just as those who do not attend law

school but pass the state licensing examinations become legitimate members of the legal profession.

**Defined job titles and functions**--Even though our profession do not necessarily have consistently similar professional titles in all areas, similar titling challenges have also plagued other professions at times, such as the self-identified volunteer administrative profession. Due to regional differences in accrediting standards and the unique histories of many institutions, titling may need to be regarded as more of an institutional matter than an issue for the profession. But by using nomenclature like Chief Student Affairs Officer, Director of Student Union, Director of Housing, Director of Financial Aid, Dean of Students, etc. it has become possible to standardize professional positions for salary comparisons between institutions and for recruiting staff members at professional conferences.

**Self-imposed standards of admission and performance** Engagement of individual credentialing programs will most likely improve the reputation of the profession and the "back door" phenomenon that plagues the field. Here, however, our various specialty associations must work in collaboration to ensure the legitimacy of the standards. We must also continue our efforts to 'standardize our Graduate Preparation Programs through the use of the CAS Standards and CACREP Standards for the administration/development emphases and counseling emphases respectively.

**Securing legal recognition of the vocation**--By establishing titling via a credentialing program and by securing legal recognition of such title, much like licensure ensures this for other professions, our profession can develop more formalized recognition. The availability of NASPA sponsored Liability Insurance has also reinforced the legitimacy of the profession and practicing professionals.

**Existing professional consciousness and professional groups**—The two major associations within the profession (i.e. NASPA and ACPA) have developed identities of professionalism and seem to house the collective consciousness of the profession. These associations can serve as the means for furthering the profession and skill development of their members. In addition, the specialty professional associations (i.e. ACU-I, NAFSA, ACUHO, ACRA, ACA, ACHA, NAFSA, NIRSA, NACA, NODA, etc.) have spent years enhancing their professional status through the sponsorship of national annual conferences, regional conferences and workshops, journals, web sites, training institutes, Guidelines for professional practice, professional standards, codes of ethics, etc.

**The performance of a socially needed function**-- Clearly, research on the 'effects of college on students' support the notion that student affairs professionals perform socially needed functions (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). We know, in practice however, that most faculty no longer want to do 'student affairs work' because each time they are asked to perform and/or acquire typical student affairs duties (such as mentoring students, advising students, recruiting students, working with students outside of the traditional classroom or lab, helping students with personal problems, disciplining students, helping students to learn how to lead, etc), they determine that their function is to teach and do research and 'somebody else' needs to do those things. Hence, the student affairs professional has been doing this important work for more than 100 years—developing college students' social, moral, spiritual, physical, and intellectual knowledge, abilities, and reasoning.

**Possession of a body of specialized knowledge and skills**-- We have made significant headway since 1981 when Stamatakos argued that we did not have such. Even though some of our literature is borrowed, it is valuable. Many in the field eclectically use theories and methods as appropriate. Richmond & Sherman (1991) reported that 83% of student affairs program graduates used student development theory knowledge regularly, found theories in

counseling were helpful in programming, individual and group work, and felt internships, practica, and assistantships fostered their use of theory in practice. Through our Graduate Preparation Programs and institutional staff development programs student affairs professionals are also becoming experts on 'student research', enrollment management techniques, software systems for obtaining, storing, retrieving, and utilizing large data bases to perform institutional analyses of college impacts on student performance and behavior, facility utilization, student satisfactions and preferences, learning assessment, and student attitudes and values.

We have also become experts in federal regulations pertaining to student rights, due process, privacy, disability accommodation, diversity education, non-discrimination practices, etc. Finally, our unique knowledge base has evolved over time so that we now know not only how to 'describe' our student populations, but we know how to fairly accurately predict their patterns of behavior based on regression studies, human development theories, and historical data analyses.

Finally, as our unique body of knowledge expands, we have also expanded our means of communicating what we know to each other, other disciplines, and the public. The number of referred journals serving our professionals has doubled in the past ten years (i.e. like the addition of this journal), professional regional conferences have grown so more staff members at various levels could attend, and staff development programs now exist at almost every institution to help our professional staff to keep abreast of the latest research studies and 'best practices' in the profession.

**A code of ethics**--Codes of ethics are in place in the major associations (i.e. ACPA, NASPA) affiliated with student affairs. Many professional specialty associations also have established their own codes of ethics (i.e. NODA). And, in 1993 ACPA established procedures for addressing ethics complaints. Several specialty associations are also currently exploring ways and means for enforcing and monitoring ethical standards. We believe the credentialing system we propose below would further allow for the

promulgation, adjudication, and enforcement of ethics standards for 'credentialed' individuals.

### The Argument for Credentialing.

As illustrated above, the student affairs field in higher education has worked diligently in the last twenty years to appropriately define the "prescribed path of training and education" that characterizes a profession (Schwartz & Bryan, 1998 p. 3). Miller (1991) reminds us, in talking about professional preparation standards that "professional standards establish the norms for the profession" (p. 60). Then he adds, "they are the best vehicle for assuring students, institutions of higher learning, and society at large that the field of student affairs is a profession of character and high-quality practice" (p. 60).

Training and experience serve several functions for a profession and its new professionals, by ensuring "a basic understanding of the language, history, traditions, symbols, and artifacts of a profession," by acquainting them with "the basics of professional knowledge and skills," and by enabling them to "learn the expectations for professional standards of practice" (Schwartz & Bryan, p. 4). Standardization of programs has been examined and considered in-depth, but no consensus has been reached. Some professional preparation programs have been accredited through CACREP but not all student affairs paradigms are compatible with the CACREP model and therefore are not involved in such accreditation. The Council for the Advancement (CAS) standards for student affairs education provide a baseline for programs more compatible with an administration orientation and include elements that are considered crucial to the student development oriented paradigm as well. Diversity among professional preparation programs should be considered valuable to the profession, just as higher education in the United States is incredibly diverse and valuable to the nation. Nonetheless, because the leaders of the profession could not reach consensus on accreditation, then the time to certify the individual has arrived.

The next logical step, therefore, is to do as other professions have done, and establish a 'certification system' for individual practitioners. Credentialed professionals complete continuing education and re-certification or license renewal to maintain professional standing (Schwartz & Bryan, 1998). As Winston & Creamer (1997) point out, the majority of student affairs practitioners are members of at least one major association, and most of these practitioners initiate and maintain their own continuing education and professional development opportunities. Professionals in student affairs, probably unwittingly, adhere to Schwartz and Bryan's recommendations for viewing professional development as "an ethical responsibility and a necessary part of individual and organizational responsibility" (p. 12).

Harned & Murphy (1998) argue that the student affairs profession seems to show great commitment to preparing new professionals, but "the profession is less successful in the direct and ongoing support of young professionals at work" (p. 45). The second-class status of the profession, accompanied by the lack of adequate compensation, advancement opportunities (assuming all professionals seek such), and operational resources serve to dim the dedication and enthusiasm of new professionals too early. "Passion...is our greatest asset" (p 45). The authors ask if there is no infrastructure to support and maintain the new professionals in the field should we "create an infrastructure that provides opportunities for solid experience, responsibility and rewards so the long term viability of the profession can be a reality for many rather than a few" (p. 46). Certification could indeed help foster the development of the new professional as well as a more formal system for supporting the new professional's adaptation to full time practice.

Sandeen (1982) and Winston and Creamer (1997) have reported that chief student affairs officers (CSAOs) viewed hiring student affairs personnel with graduate degrees in student personnel services or student affairs as very important and that CSAOs with student personnel training were more likely to rate hiring trained personnel at this level of importance. It has typically been a minority of CSAOs who hold degrees in other disciplines and who do not value

hiring trained professionals as highly. The desire of CSAOs to hire trained student affairs professionals further enhances the potential support for a professional credentialing model.

Winston & Creamer (1997) question hiring practices that seek out the most qualified or experienced in inconsistent or unethical ways. Since little money is allocated for adequate staff searches, according to the authors, the trend over several decades has been to hire people "with strong, directly related graduate-level degrees" (p. 140). "When circumstance require employing someone without graduate professional preparation, it is incumbent upon the employer to provide the necessary educational experience (on par with that offered in good master's degree preparation programs) to ensure full qualifications in the staff member in the near term" (p. 140); however, the authors note that most divisions do not have the staff, funds, or time to provide adequate basic knowledge and competency training.

Canon (1982) notes that transferable educational knowledge and practical experience may allow 'back-door' entrants to function in the field, but providing them with relevant background and theory would enable them to appreciate and "value [the] systems that serve to guide the thrust and priorities of student services and programs" (p. 469). Competency and the status of the field are improved when "our colleagues [have] a more substantive and rigorous exposure to the various methodologies...gained directly through formal study in the academic disciplines in question" (p. 469). Blimling (2000) further argued that chief/senior student affairs officers must have training, education, and experience that relate directly to their work with student affairs administration. He believes that the staff and students suffer when a CSAO has to learn on the job and implies that the university fails in its ethical responsibilities to staff, students, and families when the CSAO has less an appropriate direct experience with student affairs functions.

Both Winston & Creamer and Blimling provide fodder for the notion that as the credentialing of student affairs professionals grows in popularity and practice, CSAOs may find themselves needing to prove themselves as professionals in student affairs as well. With

credentialing in place, a system where employers establish professionally oriented selection standards and efforts to promote the skills and competencies of 'back-door' entrants who may not have background or training directly tied to the field. The preferred formal professional preparation education route simply does not produce the numbers of qualified individuals whom are needed in the field, organizations find themselves regularly hiring 'back-door' entrants in need of professional training and credentialing to enhance their performance and legitimacy.

Canon (1982) recommends that credentialing be directly tied to degree attainment with CAS serving as the credentialing body to accredit the program, but in the twenty years since that recommendation, no credentialing mechanism has been introduced. The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) has consistently rejected the notion that it should be the agency charged with such a function. They have neither the resources, staff, or facilities to establish and sustain such a service. It also is considered outside the scope of the Council's mission by its executive board.

In addition, NASPA's failed recent attempt at creating a NASP sponsored Professional Registry and ACPA's consistent opposition to the concept have convinced us that the credentialing agency must be part of academe and neutral of all professional associations to ensure fairness, objectivity, and legitimacy. An independent body designed to fully credential the individual professional seems more appropriate now. In an interview with Cooper & Dean (1998), the authors asked CAS President Ted Miller what he thought the emerging trends for the next 10 years would be. The first trend he predicted was the emergence of a certification mechanism for student affairs professionals!

### Credentialing Benefits

First and most importantly, credentialing certification procedures would potentially ensure a baseline of competency for all professionals working in the field. A credentialing body could provide a means of assessing the competencies and knowledge

required by practicing student affair professionals and would serve to standardize the knowledge imparted by professional preparation programs, as recommended in the 1992 NASPA/ACPA report on student affairs credentialing (as reproduced in Winston & Creamer, 1997). The amount of conflict that supervisors face regarding assessing new employees skills would be reduced, and they would be able to focus more on growth and development needs beyond the established baseline (Woodward & Komives, 1990; Winston & Creamer).

Because of the wide variety of staff development opportunities sponsored by student affairs divisions (Winston & Creamer, 1997), it is imperative that any continuing education unit (CEU) model includes and values intra-organizational opportunities. Grace-Odeleye (1998) points out that not only does staff development help individuals staff members gain skills and understanding that may be institutionally specific, if not professionally valuable, but the institutions and students benefit from goal achievement and pursuit of the institutional mission. Development positively affects student welfare. Staff development opportunities help staff cope with change, become a part of the dynamics of the institution in an active manner, and provide assurance of staff competency.

Examples by Grace-Odeleye make an indirect argument for the value of CEUs as a part of a credentialing system. She gives the example of the Ball State model that provided CEUs to the staff. If institutions are not regularly going to ensure competencies using CEU requirements with their staff, whether for retention of job or merit based increases in salary, then a credentialing body must use CEUs to help staff maintain their professional status and their interest in growth. Such a strategy might indirectly force institutions that do not typically provide staff development to begin doing so. Examples of workshops for in-service credit (Wanzek & Canon, 1975) include departmental budgeting, affirmative action, host university history, nutrition and weight control, policies in higher education, self-awareness through group experience, life planning, and health and patient care.

44

A clearinghouse for recruiting promising students into graduate programs via a published descriptive guide with information comparing curriculums, internships, faculty, and the relationship for the preparation program to student affairs functions would also be a good component of this model (based on Sandeen, 1982). Identifying and directing students toward programs that meet the core knowledge and field experience requirements would help enhance the viability of certification. Identifying the unique characteristics of programs should provide the credentialing organization good opportunities to provide valuable information to prospective student affairs students (Richmond & Sherman, 1991).

### Problems with Credentialing

There are hurdles that must be overcome in establishing a body for credentialing student affairs professionals. First, current professionals have known no such system in the past and don't see the need for one in the future. This is essentially the argument that caused NASPA to withdraw its support for the Registry proposal. Thus, there is a need to address the lack of "felt" need for certification among some current practitioners.

Another problem that has been discovered via research by Winston & Creamer (1997) is that because of the loyalty to the profession that some in student affairs develop through professional association membership or activity and through their experiences in their graduate preparation programs, professionals are not primarily loyal to their institution. Institutions are not effective in their staff development programs, as a whole, and do not provide consistently productive supervision to newer professionals in the field. Credentialing would need effective institutional staff development programs to provide the necessary qualified CEUs for 'back-door' staff and staff seeking certification renewal.

Along a similar vein, 'back-door' entrants have been able to enter and work in student affairs without any need to possess and/or increase their knowledge and skills in student affairs. They have been advising students without any understanding of student

45

development models or without benefit of the ethical guidelines that guide professional practice. Heavy marketing and persuasion will be required over time for this group and the CSAOs who supervise them to help them see the value of participating in a professional credentialing program.

Lastly, sanctioning power is a major hurdle for student affairs in ensuring the value of the profession (Winston & Creamer, 1997). In the medical and legal professions, sanctioning bodies are viewed, at least within their respective professions, as effective. It is not well known in student affairs practice that at least one major association has procedures in place for hearing ethical complaints against its members (ACPA, 1993). However, its sanctioning capability is quite limited. It would behoove any credentialing body to foster a relationship with ACPA and NASPA regarding methods and agreements of handling serious ethics breaches by association members and credentialed professionals. If credentialing were to become more popular and prevalent, the credentialing organization could emerge as a very serious and potentially effective sanctioning body.

### **Model for Credentialing the Student Affairs Professional**

We propose the system of credentialing and monitoring for the Certified Student Affairs Professional (CSAP) ©. We have copyrighted the title and model and plan to also apply for a trademark so that only those with the appropriate background and authorization could call themselves a Certified Student Affairs Professional.

#### ***Degree requirements.***

The preferred educational status would be graduation with a masters degree from an accredited university with a major in student affairs administration in higher education, college student personnel, student services, etc. The minimum educational standard would be an earned bachelors degree and completion of the required minimum

graduate level courses relating to student affairs through an accredited university. If a candidate has an earned master's in different field, then he or she must have earned a twelve-hour minor in student affairs or completed the required four courses required for the core knowledge.

In this model, we have chosen not to address doctoral degree attainment, but we do believe that some higher tier of certification enabling the doctorate holder to pursue chief student affairs roles will in the future be warranted should a certification process take root among members of the profession.

#### ***Core knowledge requirements.***

As was mentioned earlier, for more than 50 years the two major leading professional associations, CAS, CACREP, and graduate program faculty have not agreed on the core knowledge areas required for competency in all specialty area of the student affairs practice (Stamatakis, 1981; Canon, 1982; Sandeen, 1982; Komives, 1992; Saunders & Cooper, 1999; Waple, 2000; Winston & Creamer, 1997). Based on an exhaustive review of the literature, the research and views of the authors above, a review of the CAS and CACREP standards for graduate preparation programs, and our own professional experience, we recommend the following four courses (i.e., 12 hours of core courses) to be minimally eligible for certification:

***Communication and leadership in group settings***, introducing communication and group dynamics in conjunction with leadership and organizational theory and providing the opportunity to apply concepts to case studies (CAS; Sandeen, 1982; Saunders & Cooper, 1999; Waple, 2000);

***Foundations of student affairs in higher education***, including historical, philosophical, and professional components (Canon, 1982; CAS; CACREP, 2001);

***Legal foundations and professional ethics in student affairs administration in higher education***, with opportunities to apply legal issues to practice (Sandeen, 1982; CAS; Madaus, 1997);

***College student development***, with consideration for the diversity in sub-populations, introduction to developmental models, evaluation of research on college's effects on students, and application of the models' manifestations in the environment and in students' behaviors (Stamatakos, 1981; Canon, 1982; Komives, 1992; CAS; CACREP, 2001).

#### ***Field experience requirement.***

Because CAS and CACREP and Richmond and Sherman (1991) have demonstrated that internships are an opportunity to translate theory into practice, we recommend that the supervised field experience occur beyond any experiences a candidate may have had during the undergraduate experience. The minimum number of supervised hours recommended are 300 clock hours for masters level and 600 clock hours for bachelors level candidates. Two distinct sets of experiences must be represented. Half of either set needs to be in the student affairs area in which the student affairs professional seeks certification. The ethical standards of ACPA, NASPA, or another related association must be adhered to during the supervised field experience by both the candidate and field supervisor. NODA and ACUHO-I are examples of associations currently sponsoring internship programs for higher education/student affairs students.

#### ***Outcome measurement***

We recommend that candidates for certification be required to write scholarly level papers on how to address *at least two complicated cases* from which they must be able to apply through evaluation and synthesis the core knowledge of the profession. We are compelled to recommend that some form of case assessment be included in our CSAP model. Otherwise we are simply the registry

service that Winston and Creamer (1997) speak about in *Improving Staffing Practices in Student Affairs and that NASPA just rejected*. We believe candidates cannot adequately demonstrate their knowledge and application of the requisite professional judgment for success in the profession with the Credentialing panel of reviewers having access to this evaluative tool.

We have chosen this case study approach because student affairs personnel tend to be cautious about mass testing, because we want no one to question our standards and credibility, and most important, because some form of measurement (typically via multiple choice tests) is required for certification across all fields investigated (i.e.. NBCC).

Also, since most graduate programs and competitions among graduate students at student affairs related regional and national conferences employ the case study approach, it seems only appropriate to incorporate this popular assessment tool into the credentialing model for the student affairs profession. As the number of CSAPs grows and as more chief student affair officers, mid-level student affairs administrators, and entry level student affairs professionals become indoctrinated with the certification process, it will be necessary to reexamine the possible use of a mass testing approach in addition to the case studies.

#### ***Continuing education requirements:***

First, record-keeping requirements would be the responsibility of the certified professional. Second, the certified profession would submit records, via a portfolio submission, during the original application process and at renewal. This procedure will ensure more credibility for the profession.

Secondly, we propose requiring 100 contact hours of continuing education (CEUs) per each five-year certification period. The CEU requirements could look like the following:

***Conferences, Seminars, and workshops***--unlimited (max per general conference 16 CEUs; max per pre-workshop conference 6



CEUs; may include placement exchange participation for those not run concurrently with a major conference).

**On-line or home study**—unlimited CEUs (i.e. Student Affairs On-Line Courses, graduate level on-line courses).

**Publications**--40 CEUs max.

**College Course Work earned since last certification**--Each semester hour equals one CUE—60 CEUs max.

**Presentations at a conference, workshop, or seminar**--20 CEUs max (local, statewide, regional, national, or as a consultant speaker at another campus).

**New Program Development**--20 CEUs max (may count these CEUs simultaneously with any publication CEUs that are outgrowths of the new program developed).

**Doctoral Dissertation**--45 CEUs max.

**Supervision/Consultation/Formal Mentoring**—30 CEUs (hopefully, this will serve as a way to foster and encourage much needed field experience supervisors and professional mentors).

**Leadership**--20 CEUs max (in associations, as journal editor or peer reviewer, or other leadership positions with justifiable professional learning experiences. CSAP must hold the position for a minimum of one year.)

**Unrelated programs**--20 CEUs . We recommend that all professional associations relevant to student affairs be approved as providers of continuing education in student affairs. The credentialing body should work closely with the relevant professional associations and other institutes to determine appropriate CEUs for each of their distinct workshops. Finally,

50

we will best serve the profession by encouraging chief student affairs officers (CSAO) to develop in-house or multi-campus professional development workshops (Winston & Creamer, 1997). We will need to develop a system for working with these diligent CSAOs to approve their workshops and accept their CEU allocations.

### ***Application Requirements, Evaluation Methods & Period of Certification.***

We propose that the candidate's initial application portfolio should include the required application form, a resume' or curriculum vitae, official copies of all academic transcripts, a 500 word philosophy statement, a form verifying their field experience, two letters of professional reference, one letter of reference from one of their field experience supervisors; and any required fees. *The candidate would not be eligible to receive and complete the case studies until the application is complete.* The applicant becomes a *candidate for certification* when their field experiences and academic core knowledge requirements are met.

The candidates would be able to select areas of specialty within the field from which the cases will be drawn, and a specific deadline for returning the cases studies would be provided. The case studies would be evaluated through the peer review process. If the candidate competently completes the case study examination, then he/she would submit any remaining fees for the credential. He or she is then eligible to be known as a Certified Student Affairs Professional (CSAP®). An attractive Certificate (suitable for framing), choice of paper weight or wooden wall plaque, and a wallet card will be issued to the CASP.

During our review of the related certification models, we noted the importance of value. We also noted that new knowledge is added to our knowledge base very rapidly and technology causes 'best practices' to also change very rapidly. We, therefore, recommend that each certification and renewal period last five years.

57

## Conclusion

The model that we have proposed was developed in parallel with the NASPA Registry model. The two models have significant similarities; however, NASPA's ill fated Registry model was portfolio based only. Our model is a 'credentialing' program, and although it uses portfolio assessment for the initial screening, it is actually a competency based model because Case Study solutions and evaluations of supervised professional practice are also utilized in the assessment.

Given the current state of the profession, formalizing student affairs as a respected profession will likely require a credentialing process that assesses the competencies and qualifications of the professionals working within it. We believe that the time has come for the student affairs field to establish itself as a full fledged **profession** and take its rightful place as an integral part of the teaching and learning mission of higher education.

However, it cannot achieve this goal unless it can assure students, their families, tax and tuition payers, faculty, and the administration that divisions of student affairs are staffed by competently trained and certified professionals who work under a rigorously reviewed and enforced set of ethical standards and remain current in the knowledge base and requisite skills required for effective and efficient professional practice.

## References

- American College Personnel Association, Standing Committee on Ethics. (1993). Statement of Ethical Principles and Standards, *Journal of College Student Development*, 34(2), 89-92.
- American College Personnel Association, Standing Committee on Ethics. (1993). Policies and Procedures for processing complaints of ethical violations. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34(2), 93-97.
- Blimling, G. S. (2000). Trusting student life and learning to a vice president with less experience. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(4), 377-379.
- Bryan, W.A., & Schwartz, R. A. (1998). Strategies for staff development: personal and professional education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *New Directions for Student Services*, 84. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

52

- Canon, H. J. (1982). Toward professionalism in student affairs: another point of view. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23(6), 468-473.
- Cooper, D. L., & Dean, L. A. (1998). The past, present, and future of student affairs: A professional profile of Theodore K. Miller. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 76(2), 198-201.
- Grace-Odeleye, B. (1998). A model for staff development in student affairs. In W. A. Bryan, & R. A. Schwartz, Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *New Directions for Student Services*, 84. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Harned, P. J., & Murphy, M. C. (1998). Creating a culture of development for the new professional. In W. A. Bryan, & R. A. Schwartz, Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *New Directions for Student Services*, 84. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Janosik, S. M. (2002) *The development and implementation of a national registry for student affairs administrators*. Un published manuscript. Washington, D.C.: NASPA Professional Standards Division.
- Komives, S. R. (1992). The middles: Observations on professional competence and autonomy. *NASPA Journal*, 29(2), 83-90.
- Madaus, J. W. (1997). The process: development of AHEAD professional standards. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, 12(3), 8-25.
- Miller, T. K. (1991). Using standards in professional preparation. In W. A. Bryan, R. B. Winston, Jr., & T. K. Miller, Using professional standards in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 53. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC). (n.d.) General Information-The National Certified Counselor (NCC) Credential. Retrieved April 4, 2002, from [www.nbcc.org/cert/ncc.html](http://www.nbcc.org/cert/ncc.html).
- Richmond, J., & Sherman, K. J. (1991). Student-development preparation and placement: a longitudinal study of graduate students' and new professionals' experiences. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32(1), 8-16.
- Sandein, A. (1982). Professional preparation programs in student personnel services in higher education: a national assessment by chief student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, 20(2), 51-58.
- Saunders, S. A., & Cooper, D. L. (1999). The doctorate in student affairs: Essential skills and competencies for midmanagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(2), 185-191.
- Schwartz, R. A., & Bryan, W. A. (1998). What is professional development? In W. A. Bryan, & R. A. Schwartz, Strategies for staff development: Personal and professional education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *New Directions for Student Services*, 84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stamatikos, L. C. (1981). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: recommendations for action, part 1. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(2), 105-113.

53

- Stamatakos, L. C. (1981). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: recommendations for action, part 2. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(3), 197-207.
- Wanzek, R. P., & Canon, H. J., (1975). Professional growth in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 16(5), 418-421.
- Waple, J. N. (2000). The preparation of new professionals in the field of student affairs administration: An assessment of skills and competencies necessary for entry-level student affairs work. (Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois State University, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61, 3493.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Woodward, D. B., Jr., & Komives, S. R. (1990). Ensuring staff competence. In M. J. Barr, M. L. Upcraft, and Associates, *New futures for student affairs: Building a vision for professional leadership and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

## **A Study of Fundraising Activities and Training within Student Affairs Divisions in Texas Colleges and Universities**

**Jan Hillman**

University of North Texas, Denton, Texas

*The primary focus of this study was to discover the depth of involvement with fundraising by student affairs professionals in Texas. It sought to determine the predominance of chief student affairs officers training in development and the types of training they have received. Also studied was cooperation between student affairs divisions and development offices and whether there was a positive correlation between a cooperative relationship and the number fundraising goals achieved.*

### **Introduction**

Development as a profession is a relatively new field in higher education, and the inclusion of student affairs needs into the culture of the development office is an even more recent change on many college campuses. It has only been since the 1960s and 1970s that many universities employed directors of development in order for resource development to be an on-going function. Prior to that time professional fundraisers conducted sporadic campaigns as directed by the institution's leadership.

The author can be contacted at Jan Hillman, Ed.D., Director of Assessment and Planning, Division of Student Development, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas, 76203 E-mail: [jan@dsa.admin.unt.edu](mailto:jan@dsa.admin.unt.edu)

57