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ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE STAFFING PATTERNS IN
CAMPUS ACTIVITIES DEPARTMENTS

BY

Tony R. Warner

The purpose of this study was to analyze the organizational structures and staffing patterns in campus activities offices or operations within selected institutions. These institutions were selected from the membership of the National Association of Campus Activities [NACA] during the 1994-95 academic year which are also public, Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II institutions. Focus was placed on identifying the sizes and types of the campus activities departments at the institutions surveyed. A survey was developed and administered to a population of 355 institutions. The data from 269 (76%) responses were then carefully analyzed.

Frequency analysis produced a number of revelations about dominant staffing patterns, titles, and size. Analysis indicated that there is a relationship between organizational structure and its staffing pattern in small institutions. A direct relationship was identified between the size and type of the staff and use of technology. There was no relationship between the funding base and staffing patterns or between organizational departmental structures and the size of the departmental budgets. Further, no relationships between organizational structure and funding bases or between the size and type of staff and the organizational structure.

Conclusions were drawn concerning organization and staffing patterns. These included the fact that most institutions have campus activities departments with a director as the head, reporting to a vice president or dean. Activity fees are a primary source of funding in nearly all institutions. Few institutions have more than 9 professional staff and 12 clerical staff. Currently there is little faculty involvement in campus activities offices. Basic, mainstream technology is used to support the efforts of the offices.

It is hoped that the study will be useful as a proactive management tool for those administrators in higher education who are structuring or restructuring administrative offices supporting the campus activities functions at institutions of higher education.
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"The school cannot be a preparation for social life except as it reproduces within itself typical conditions of social life" (Dewey, 1909, p. 14).

It is an obvious conclusion that with the approach of the year 2000, campus populations in the United States will reflect the increasingly multicultural and diverse characteristics of the nation. The higher education community must make the necessary changes and modifications from the status quo to meet the needs of these new constituencies on campus. The role of the Student Affairs practitioner is to assist institutions in responding to changing conditions by providing services and programs consistent with both students' needs and the institutional mission (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA], 1987). Great challenges face higher education, and student affairs can and should, help meet these challenges on campuses (NASPA). Student Affairs and its varied functions will be more essential in the future due to the increasing emphasis on retaining those students already enrolled (Whyte, 1989).

The term "campus activities" generally refers to the variety of programs and services offered under the student affairs or student life umbrella at institutions of higher education. These programs and services are sponsored by
either the institution itself or by student organizations for the benefit of the student body. These are often also described as the "out-of-class activities", "student activities", and "services" provided on college campuses. These programs, sometimes called extra-curricular or co-curricular activities, are seen as an extension of the educational role and mission of the institution (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Some of the frequent areas of campus activities programming include:

Table 1.
SPECIFIC PROGRAM AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts</td>
<td>Short Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>Comedy Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies/Video</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Concerts</td>
<td>Coffeehouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Diversity</td>
<td>Racial Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the years, campus activities have proven to be integral to the higher education process. The out-of-classroom environment, which is the campus activities
environment, is critical to the academic and personal success of students (Upcraft & Barr, 1990). This component of the educational process is an important element in the overall educational experience of the student and should not be ignored (Kuh, 1995).

Chickering (1969) posed as a hypothesis that "The student culture either amplifies or attenuates the impact of curriculum, teaching and evaluation, residence hall arrangements, and student-faculty relationships" (p. 155). Chickering stated that the student culture at an institution formed the working relationship, or interface, between the institution and the student. This student culture has substantial impact upon student development in its ability to foster and aid growth.

One of the most important arenas in which this culture interacts with students is in the many areas of campus activities (Chickering, 1969). There is evidence in several studies that campus activities, and the student involvement that it facilitates, has a positive impact on persistence in college, that is, those who get involved, stay enrolled (Brock, 1990).

Perry, in his 1970 monograph *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years*, developed a schema that described the growth and evolution of the student through the college experience. Based on both survey instruments and intensive interviews, he developed a theory
in which he described nine "positions", or levels, that
students passed through during their intellectual
development. Co-curricular activities and experiences are
one of the primary vehicles that students can use to move
through the nine levels (Perry, 1970).

Alexander W. Astin, a professor of Higher Education at
the University of California-Los Angeles, has also been a
leader in laying the current foundations of the student
personnel profession. In his studies and writings, he has
shown that if an educational institution was interested in
helping develop the complete individual and supporting the
well-rounded growth of its student body, then the campus
activities functions would occupy a central function at the

In 1984, Astin said both the quantity and quality of
student involvement and experiences are critical to
continued student involvements. Every action, policy, and
practice of an institution should be evaluated by the impact
it has on increasing or decreasing student involvement
opportunities. Staff can assess their own performance by
evaluating the degree to which they encourage or discourage
involvement by the students with whom they come in contact.

Higher education in America has historically prepared
students to be responsible members of society; however, the
increasing specialization in higher education has caused
this emphasis to be lost from the curriculum (Morse, 1989).
Morse (1989) defined responsible citizenship in a democratic society and the ways in which higher education can help develop the qualities and requirements of responsible citizens through teaching, governance, extracurricular activities, campus life, and community relations. Campus activities are the primary delivery vehicle of much of the experiential learning and skill development opportunities available on campuses.

Numerous higher education professional organizations have joined together to establish a set of standards for various functional areas within Student Affairs through the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). In a recent revision of its "Standards and Guidelines for Campus Activities", the role and mission of campus activities is described as:

- Campus activities programs should provide environments in which students and student organizations are afforded opportunities and are offered assistance to:
  - participate in co-curricular activities;
  - participate in campus governance;
  - develop leadership abilities;
  - develop healthy interpersonal relationships;
  - use leisure time productively;
  - explore activities in individual and group settings for self-understanding and growth;
- learn about varied cultures and experiences, ideas and issues, art and musical forms, and styles of life;
- design and implement programs to enhance social, cultural, multi-cultural, intellectual, recreational, community service, and campus governance involvement;
- comprehend institutional policies and procedure and their relationship to individual and group interests and activities; and
- learn of and use campus facilities and other resources (Arminio, 1993, p. 33).

Arminio (1993) noted a number of factors influence the viability and outcomes of the campus activity functions. The types and degree of effort the institution puts into supporting and assisting the campus activities functions have a direct impact on the degree of perceived success the functions have in reaching their objectives. One of the most critical areas of support an institution can give is that of personnel to provide direction and assistance to the student leaders and their organizations. The campus activities staff can consist of full-time or part-time, professional or clerical, graduate or undergraduate personnel. Many campus activities offices also incorporate the volunteer efforts of faculty, staff and students within their organizational structure. The number and type of staff, the organizational structure, types of supervision, the responsibilities assigned, and the charge or mission the
institution sets for them are critical to the determination of staffing patterns (Arminio, 1993). Equally critical is the structure of the campus activities office, if one exists, in the provision of programs and services (Arminio, 1993).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was the analysis of organizational structures in campus activities offices or operations within selected institutions. These institutions were selected from the membership of the National Association of Campus Activities [NACA] during the 1993-94 academic year and are public, Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II institutions. Focus was placed on identifying the sizes and types of the campus activities departments at the institutions surveyed.

These institutions represent a cross-section of American public higher education institutions that offer graduate education through at least one master's degree program with at least 20 or more degrees awarded annually. Their primary mission is undergraduate education, the primary target audience of campus activities programs and services. The data analysis based upon their survey responses should be generalizable to other campuses. Therefore, it is hoped that the study can become a proactive management tool for those administrators in higher education who are structuring or restructuring administrative offices.
which support the campus activities functions at institutions of higher education.

Higher education is continually in a state of change with redefinition of missions and goals, changing student demographics, and differing demands of society. During periods of austere budgets and funding cuts, those portions of the institution budget not directly related to the pure academic functions often receive much more scrutiny and review (Kuh & Nuss, 1990). The campus activities function is one of these areas. Reducing budgets and yet having a small negative impact is a difficult objective to achieve. As the revenues which states collect tend to level off or decrease and support for public funded higher education becomes increasingly controversial, the ability to deal with tight budgets in campus activities becomes increasingly important (Bedini, 1992).

Angel and DeVault (1991) suggested eight ways higher education institutions frequently use to deal with serious financial problems:

1. Hiring freezes
2. Across the board cuts
3. Increasing tuition and/or fees
4. Increasing class size
5. Curtailing services
6. Discontinuing programs
7. Delaying capital expenditures
8. Institution long-term productivity studies

In addition to these eight methods, several logical approaches to achieve budget cuts that strive to have as little negative impact as possible have been developed. These plans all involve logical reassessment and sequenced decision making (Meisinger & Dubec, 1984).

Staffing patterns in campus activities during periods of reorganization, mission changes, and funding cuts was an area addressed by this study. The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) to identify the various staffing patterns now in use in campus activities offices; (2) to identify which patterns occur the most frequently; (3) to determine if certain patterns occur more frequently in certain types of institutions.

Significance of the Study

According to Morse (1989), the challenge for education is to develop citizens. Civic skills and experiences in civic life can be developed in the formative years in which higher education takes place. Institutions of higher education, through their co-curricular activities, have the access, opportunity, structure, and environment to help transform students into responsible citizens by helping them define and develop individual skills and values.

McIntire (1990) indicated that the colleges that will be the leaders during the 21st century will be those that best address and balance the varied needs of the student.
bodies. Student affairs professionals play a crucial role in shaping the college experience and the overall academic process. The successful institutions of the future, and those on the cutting edge of higher education, will be those that address and effectively deal with five critical areas that are instrumental in the student development process of the campus activities office: (1) staffing, (2) operations, (3) philosophy, (4) modeling, and (5) survival.

Higher education is currently experiencing a period of declining traditional aged students (18-23), increasing non-traditional aged students (23+), and increasingly stringent funding. The staffing patterns institutions choose to implement in their campus activities areas have a direct impact on the effectiveness of their efforts. The results of this study will assist campuses in deciding the types and styles of staffing patterns and organizational structure they want to implement. It can be an important aid to furthering the role and mission of campus activities in higher education. This study has practical significance for educators involved in the organization or reorganization of campus activities departments and will provide assistance in their tasks.

Limitations

This study was limited to the campus activities departments at public institutions identified by the Carnegie Foundation (1994) as Master's (Comprehensive)
Universities and Colleges I & II that were members of the National Association of Campus Activities (NACA) during the 1993-94 academic year. This study was limited by the extent to which the membership of NACA accurately represents the nation's total compliment of higher education institutions matching the criteria of public Carnegie Classification Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I & II.

No attempt was made to define or measure the effectiveness of the organizational structures and staffing patterns identified. The amount, accuracy, and type of data submitted on the instrument depended on its being completed by the appropriate campus activities officer at the institution and upon the accuracy of the data to which they referred when answering the survey.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions are relevant to this study:

1) The campus activities component is in place on the campuses surveyed.

2) The surveys were completed by the individual campus activities staff identified as appropriate to participate in the study.

3) Accurate records are kept on the campuses surveyed.
Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure in the campus activities office and its staffing pattern?

2. Is there a relationship between the funding base in the campus activities office and its staffing pattern?

3. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure of the campus activities departments and the size of the campus activities departmental budget(s)?

4. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure in the campus activities office and its funding base(s)?

5. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the campus activities staff and the organizational structure of the campus activities departments?

6. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the campus activities staff and the use of technology within the office.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this document. They are based on the following definitions.

campus activities staff - the personnel within a campus activities office, both paid and unpaid, who assist it
in achieving its defined mission. The staff will be operationalized as the professional, faculty, support, graduate student, and undergraduate student both paid and unpaid.

Carnegie Classification Master's (comprehensive)
Universities and Colleges I - As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1994), these institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the masters degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Carnegie Classification Master's (comprehensive)
Universities and Colleges II - As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1994), these institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines.

Funding base - the size and source of the funds supporting the organization. In this study, funding base was defined as one of 8 categories identified by Arminio (1993).

Organizational structure - the administrative and staff organizational plan which defines reporting lines and
functional responsibilities. In this study, organizational structure was operationalized as one of four models of organizational structures. Additionally, an undefined option will be provided.

size of the campus activities departmental budget - the funds earmarked to support the campus activities department. This was operationalized as one of seven budget ranges, with $50,000 increments.

staffing pattern - the mix of full-time, part-time, professional, support, faculty, undergraduate, graduate, paid, and volunteer staff in an organization. This was operationalized by the rank and number of each type of staff identified.

Overview of the Study

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the significance of the study, limitations, assumptions, definition of terms, and overview of the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of relevant literature and research. Chapter 3 is a description of the methods and procedures used in the study. Chapter 4 is the analysis of data and presentation of the research findings. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

The role and value of campus activities in the overall education of students is frequently the topic of discussion in higher education (Kuh & Schuh, 1992). Since 1950 numerous studies have been conducted regarding the effects and benefits of student involvement in campus activities. Within the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) index covering the period of January, 1982 through December, 1996, there are 535 listings for articles relating to extracurricular (activities) and higher education.

One of the most frequently cited works is Perry's (1970) Student Developmental Theory, which involves nine positions or levels of development. He clearly indicates that campus activities and the environment it creates is a critical element in the educational mission of the institution.

Another frequently cited work indicates that campus activities are an essential element of the higher education experience (Astin, 1977). The presentation and support of campus activities events and services by colleges and universities require significant staff support.
The literature on staffing, organizational patterns, and key support functions of campus for the developmental efforts of the institution is reviewed in this chapter.

**Staffing Patterns**

According to the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) (1986), no matter the type and size of institution, the campus activities functions will probably require several support staff. These staff are often a mix of undergraduate students, graduate students, professional staff, faculty, support staff, and volunteers. Whether the institution has a formal campus activities support structure or not, there will be members of the institution's personnel supporting some of the components of the campus activities function. Few institutions can realistically exist without in some providing at least some of the services of a traditional campus activities office. The exact composition of the organizational structure and staffing patterns vary greatly, depending on many variables. However, a number of basic structural patterns are commonly seen in institutions. Several of these common organizational structures, their staffing patterns, and other details are presented in Table 2.
### TABLE 2

**TYPICAL STAFFING PATTERNS & STRUCTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Size</th>
<th>Student Pop.</th>
<th>Chief Student Affairs Officer</th>
<th>Campus Activities Office Staffing</th>
<th>Number of Student Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1,500 - 4,000</td>
<td>Dean of Students or Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Prof. 0-1, Clerical 1, Other 0</td>
<td>Gov. 1-3, Activities 1-2, Other 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>Dean of Students or Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Prof. 1-3, Clerical 1-3, Other 1-2</td>
<td>Gov. 1-3, Activities 1-3, Other 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15,000+</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Prof. 2-6, Clerical 2-5, Other 1-5</td>
<td>Gov. 1-6, Activities 1-5, Other 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches &amp; Centers</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Director or Coordinator</td>
<td>Prof. 0-1, Clerical 0-1, Other 0</td>
<td>Gov. 1, Activities 1, Other 1-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The categories were developed from the following two documents: (1) National Association for Campus Activities (NACA), (1990), *NACA Membership Study*, Columbia, SC: Author; and (2) Association of College Unions-International, (1982), *College unions: fifty facts*, Bloomington, IN: Author.
The importance and value of the educational role of campus activities in higher education, even if not fully understood and appreciated by faculty and administration, means that some staff time is allocated to its traditional services on almost all campuses (Fenske, 1980a). Institutions can enhance the student's experiences in higher education by presenting a unified web of educational experiences both inside and outside the classroom through linking programs and services across the academic and out-of-class dimensions of their campus lives (Kuh, 1994).

Even if there is no campus activities department or division, there are individuals on the campus who perform the functions normally associated with campus activities. Some type of accommodation or support for such basic programs as new student orientation, limited social activities, special interest groups, athletic activities, and other such functions is universally provided at almost 100% of the nation's colleges and universities by a variety of staff and in many diverse ways (Upcraft, 1988).

If these basic functions have not been gathered under a single organizational unit at an institution, they are usually divided among several staff and faculty members as in the early years of student affairs (Fenske, 1980b). These would probably include the areas of admissions, counseling, housing, deans, faculty, and other staff (Fenske 1980b). Often, there are a number of faculty and staff who
accept campus activities related responsibilities voluntarily. This volunteer commitment results from the individual's personality, values, and beliefs. If they stay at the institution for any length of time, they continue to collect more and more such responsibilities (Meyer, 1967).

Students at these types of institutions are normally left to themselves to plan and seek out most of their activities. They often have contact with staff only when directly related to an activity that has an official link with the institution or when there has been some type of rule or policy violation (National Institution of Education [NIE], 1984).

Staffing for the student affairs and campus activities functions are frequently changing. During the 1980s student affairs officers surveyed indicated that 64% of them had experienced both positive and negative changes in their levels of staffing (Whyte, 1989). More recent data from the National Center for Higher Education Statistics shows continued staffing fluctuations but only minor changes in the overall level or types of services offered (Lewis, 1995).

**Personnel**

The personnel or staff of the campus activities offices are the critical elements. They are the vehicles through which the institution provides the services and programs. These individuals include professional staff, clerical
staff, graduate staff, faculty advisors, and student staff; with all these types including both paid and unpaid staff.

**Professional Staff**

Typically the staffing support for campus activities involves a mix of faculty, professional staff, support staff and students (Winston, Miller, & Mendenhall, 1983). Except for the rare campuses that have no designated individual(s) or offices, the support for campus activities is usually assigned along basic, functional lines. Thus, there is someone designated to be responsible for the business affairs related to the area (Mills, 1989). Typically, there is also an individual designated to work directly with the students themselves. This direct student contact role varies from being one of asserting 'control' over the students to being a friend and assistant to the students (Wilson, 1976). These two basic functions, business and advising, have to be covered whether on a small private campus of 250 students or on the large, urban campuses of 60,000+. The difference is simply a matter of staff size and budget. On the relatively small campus both functions are frequently filled by the same individual(s). On the larger campus, campus activities offices of over a dozen professional staff members are not uncommon (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS), 1986).
The typical responsibilities and functions of a campus activities area in campuses of over 4,000 are normally spread between several staff. These include a chief administrator, one or more professional staff, one or more clerical staff, a few student workers, and perhaps a few graduate assistants. The frequently identified functional areas include (CAS, 1986): Social (Programs), Cultural (Programs), Intellectual (Programs), Recreational (Programs), Governance (Organizations), Leadership (Development), Group Development Lecture (Programs), Campus and Community Service Concert (Programs).

In addition to those listed in the CAS Standards, the following functional areas are frequently associated with campus activities offices (Indiana University Southeast [IUS], 1985) (East Tennessee State University [ETSU], 1990):

- Box Office Operations
- Student Government Advising
- Student Union/University Center
- Organizational Advising
- Publicity and Promotion
- Event Calendaring
- Program Committee(s) Advising
- Policy Interpretation and Enforcement

- Budget Control
- Contract Negotiation
- Greek Advising
- Volunteer Opportunities
- Registration
- Clerical Support

The background and education level of professional staff members range from individuals whose only basic qualification is a strong personal commitment to the concept.
of student development to individuals with graduate degrees in college student personnel, counseling, or higher education administration. Many campus activities professionals were actively involved in campus activities as undergraduate students. In addition, these individuals frequently held graduate assistantships in campus activities offices throughout their graduate studies (Plakidas, 1986).

The staff must have an array of skills and competencies. Preisinger and Wilson (1992) describe the campus activities staff member as having a variety or composite of skills that include the ability to:

Articulate the college union-student activities role to constituent groups
Apply the general concept of union to each unique campus situation
Use strategic planning, research, and assessment techniques
Implement new technologies in communication, security, and utility systems
Communicate effectively with a wide range of campus and community constituencies
Facilitate smooth transitions and adapt to frequent changes
Teach and develop human potential
Design and renovate facilities
Manage human, financial, and physical resources
Develop familiarity with artistic media
Design new programming methods and create alternative opportunities for student involvement
Seek and create new models of community that embrace diversity (p. 63).

Faculty

In the early days of higher education, faculty members assumed all the responsibilities related to campus activities (Chickering, 1969). Often these were 'add on'
responsibilities that were considered "above and beyond the call of duty" but were also things that simply needed to be done. In time, faculty were given release time to allow them to take on additional campus activities related responsibilities. Finally, full-time staff began to be hired to assume these responsibilities. This series of events led to the emergence of the campus activities profession as a reality (Butts, 1971).

Student affairs administrators have been concerned that faculty members give time spent on research activities a higher priority than time spent with students (Collison, 1990). Some institutions have actively worked on creating programs to foster increased student-faculty interaction (Collison, 1990).

Faculty continue to be involved with campus activities, both in terms of giving philosophical support and by accepting responsibilities which require a commitment of their time. The level of commitment and involvement of these faculty advisors range from being an "advisor in name only" to being truly active and involved with the leadership and organization (Emmett, 1983). Truly involved faculty advisors reported that their campus activities involvements bring them joy and satisfaction. Many see it as an extension of their role as an educator. This was especially true when they have chosen to become involved with a student
organization(s) which was in some way related to their academic discipline (Biernat & Klesse, 1989).

The role that many faculty play in supporting and assisting campus activities is dependent on whether their efforts are being viewed as a part of their employment responsibilities or are being viewed as simply personal volunteerism (Emmett, 1983). Faculty participation is usually looked upon somewhere between these two extremes, except in rare cases. This was heavily influenced by the philosophy of the academic leaders on campus.

Faculty often become involved in campus activities after voluntarily accepting the role of faculty advisor to a campus student organization. This type of involvement has been encouraged both formally and informally. Campus academic leaders often deal with this acceptance of responsibility by giving profuse verbal praise and expressions of appreciation. Yet, some may choose not to recognize it when evaluating performance for tenure or promotion decisions (NIE, 1984).

Recruitment of faculty advisers has been an important and often difficult task. The decision to accept a role as a faculty adviser is influenced by a variety of factors. These range from teaching load, research requirements, family involvements, concerns of liability, lack of university support, other volunteer commitments, and numerous other issues (Floerchinger, 1992). This
recruitment and identification process was one which must be a priority for campus activities departments (Floerchinger, 1992).

**Student Employees**

Student employees are also a source of valuable aid and assistance in campus activities. Many campuses use student employees to perform many of the functions involved in supporting the events and services offered to assist campus activities. These responsibilities include not only basic secretarial duties but also ticket sales; publicity and promotion; set-up and operational support of sound, light, and other AV equipment; computer operations; and a host of other crucial responsibilities. Uniquely, these students may have been hired due to their previous involvement in campus activities or conversely, they may have simply applied for a job. Whatever their background, student employees are a critical source of aid and assistance in campus activities functions.

On many campuses, some of the actual officers of key student organizations are in paid positions. This pay may be in the form of scholarships, tuition remission, or simply regular student employee wages. Frequently the justification for such pay is that in order for these student leaders to adequately fulfill their responsibilities, they will not have the free time to also take on a part-time job. For those students who must pay
all or part of their education expenses, part-time employment is a necessity. The only way many of these students could ever become involved in campus activities leadership positions would be only if the positions paid wages comparable to other part-time jobs. Additionally, active student leaders provide a great service to the campus and surrounding community by providing leadership and direction to campus service organizations (Mills, 1989).

The practice of paying student leaders is a point of controversy on some campuses. Detractors say that students should not be paid for volunteer leadership positions. Supporters say that we should not systematically exclude a segment of the student population who must work and we should not abuse students leaders by exploiting their leadership skills for the campus's advantage (Mills, 1989).

**Student Volunteers**

The role of student volunteers is that of serving as officers and members of the many student organizations involved in campus activities. This volunteer effort, for many students, becomes a major focal point for their campus life. The individual educational growth and development that these students derive is felt, by many educators, to be as important as the more formal benefits they receive in the classroom (Astin, 1977, 1993). Volunteerism provides a tremendous vehicle for continued development, both intellectually and socially (Astin, 1984).
An organization cannot exist without membership. Whatever its purpose, the group will depend on the volunteerism of students to provide it with the basic organizational building block - membership. It is through membership recruitment processes that students continually enter the channel to become the leadership of groups on campus.

Organizational Structure

The organizational structures of student organizations require that they be treated differently and serviced in different ways. These services and programs are provided to the students and their organizations from a variety of administrative organizational structures.

Student Organization

Almost universally, college campuses have a variety of formally organized student organizations. These can be generalized as special interest groups and range from hobby-oriented special interest groups (e.g. Ham Radio), to sports groups (e.g. Ski Club), to social organizations (e.g. Greeks), to academic related (e.g. Chemistry Club), to academic honor societies (e.g. Phi Kappa Phi), to service groups (e.g. Alpha Phi Omega), to religious special interest (e.g. Baptist Student Union), and finally to governing bodies (Craig & Warner, 1991). In addition to all these organizations, there is often another special category or
type of student organization. This is the handful of student organizations that receive some portion of their funding in some way from the institution and usually are of service to or representative of some, or all, of the student body (Barr, 1988a). Examples of these institutionally funded groups include such student groups as Student Government organizations and Student Program Boards. Both of these two basic divisions of student organizations have a distinct, direct impact on the campus activities office(s) at any institution.

The vast majority of student organizations fall into the special interests category. As such, these organizations, as a group, receive a number of services made available to them by most campus activities offices. In general, these groups must actively request or seek out the services and benefits of which they wish to take advantage. Depending on the size of the institution, and thus the size of the campus activities support offices, there may be anywhere from one to several staff members who have responsibility to assist and service these special interest groups.

The other general category of student organizations are those that have a special status on campus. They usually have one or more of the following characteristics:

- representative of at least a portion of the student body,
- provide services for the student body, and/or
- receive at least partial funding from the institution.

Those student organizations usually identified as special status groups are:

Student Government: Normally a representative organization whose membership is elected to represent the needs and wishes of the student body.

Program Board: An organization whose primary purpose is to plan and produce programs for the student body. The program content may be entertainment or educational.

Student Newspaper: A campus newspaper published to inform and entertain the student body and frequently affiliated with the journalism or communication department.

Yearbook: An annual publication to provide a pictorial history of the year.

Judicial Board: A committee, selected in a variety of ways, who form a student court to hold hearings and pass judgements on students accused of violating campus personal conduct policies.

Band/Musical Groups: One or more musical groups, usually coordinated through an academic department that represents the institution and also supports academic degree programs.
Radio/TV Station: Small broadcasting stations, usually coordinated through an academic department which serves as campus information and entertainment sources but also supports academic degree programs.

Literary Publication: Publications, usually coordinated through an academic department, which provide forums for student and faculty writing efforts.

Cheerleader/Pep Squad: Spirit organizations, coordinated through either athletics or campus activities which provide athletic team support and represent the school in the community.

On-campus Housing Organization: Normally a representative organization whose membership is elected to represent the needs and wishes of the students living in on-campus housing.

Often there are institutional staff members who are specifically assigned to work with and assist these organizations. This may be in the form of a dedicated, full-time staff advisor(s) or part of the FTE (full-time equivalent) of several staff members. On large campuses, the Program Board alone may have the assignment of several full-time staff advisers while on small campuses one, or at the most two, staff may fulfill the needs of all the special status groups (Barr, 1988a).

One group of organizations does not fit easily within the framework of the two broad categories just
described. These are Greek organizations, that is social fraternities and sororities, which may or not have affiliations with other Greek organizations on a national basis. Because of the long standing special status of these organizations, the traditional strength of their membership, and a frequent affiliation with powerful, affluent alumni; these groups often have special staff assigned to assist and support their activities on college campuses (Sutherland, 1983).

This special attention to Greek organizations frequently elicits concerns of unfair treatment and charges of favoritism. By their very nature, Greek organizations demand considerable time from any Campus Activities Office. Their demands for time include: rush coordination, leadership training, academic grade checks, officer advising, meetings with national organizational representatives, campus policy explanations, and discipline/conduct problems (Milani & Nettles, 1987).

While nearly all these tasks also relate to all student organizations, the time and effort spent on them with Greek organizations is often described as more than three times that of all other student organizations combined. This apparent imbalance in allocation of staff time often causes concern for both the administration and the student leaders of other student organizations (Barr & Albright, 1990).
Administrative Organization

To provide the services and support for all the student organizations, institution administrations have developed a variety of structures and organizations. In the last 40 years, the student personnel worker has been the primary delivery vehicle of student support services and these have most frequently been provided under a department or division of student affairs or student services (Knock, 1985). These organizational structures traditionally have one individual as the administrative head and then a number of professional staff, support staff, and student employees to fulfill the mission of the area. Several of the typical organizational structures were presented in Table 2.

Staff Support

The level of commitment the institution has to support the campus activities effort on its campus can often be measured by the amount and type of staff support they provide to the campus activities functions of the institution. This not only means full-time professional staff but also clerical/technical support staff, graduate assistants, and student employees. It also includes the level of support and cooperation that can be expected from other university departments.

One of the keys to a successful campus activities operation is to be available as much as possible, have the answers to all types of questions, be able to produce
complicated projects at the drop of the hat, and be pleasant while doing all this. Students will almost universally say that the secretary(s) in the campus activities office is one of the most valuable assets an institution can offer student leaders. An active, well-informed, helpful clerical staff can greatly assist the office professional staff (Winston, Mendenhall, & Miller, 1983).

The use of graduate assistants and/or graduate interns is a cost-effective source of high quality help in the area of campus activities. There are many graduate programs whose subject matter has a direct relationship with the programs and services of campus activities. The Index of College Majors by The College Board (1993) lists 433 master's level programs in student counseling and personnel services offered at graduate institutions within the United States. The involvement of students in these graduate programs gives the campus activities function access to the skill and abilities of young professionals who have already made a commitment to the profession, are in academic courses related to it, and are eager to have the opportunity to have hands-on experience in the field (Collins, 1982).

Employed student staff are another key component in the support of the campus activities function on most campuses. These student employees are paid in a variety of ways from the federal College Work Study Program to scholarships to simple part-time jobs paid from regular institution budgets.
On many campuses, student organizations themselves pay the wages of student employees. Student staff members are sometimes selected because of their special skills and abilities but are just as often assigned in a random manner. Whatever their background these student staff members are invaluable members of the team. Over the years these student workers have posted flyers, stuffed mailboxes, setup stages, moved tables and chairs, run projectors, picked up trash, adjusted lights, mowed grass, strung lights, cleaned rooms, met planes, carried boxes, and performed countless other thankless tasks to enable events and services to go on as scheduled. It is also a further accomplishment of the role and mission of higher education that these student workers are continuing to learn and grow as they perform their responsibilities. Most of the student personnel professionals graduating from related graduate programs have begun by working in campus activities during their undergraduate years as a part of their education (Dutton & Rickard, 1980).

Another key role that students play is that of peer advisor. More and more institutions are employing a peer advisor program within their campus activities programs. This is being done in recognition of increasing demands for services, budget constraints, and with an understanding of the developmental benefits of peer advising. The typical program takes upper-class undergraduate students and
graduate students and puts them through some type of structured training program and then uses them as advisors to student leaders and organizations. Usually this is done under the direct supervision of a professional staff member who is also an advisor (Ender, 1985).

If there is a training program for these student peer advisors, it is usually a sophisticated program involving selected readings, group work, workshop attendance, and a close association with a mentor (Wilson, 1976). If there is no structured training program, then the student peer advisor is usually an out-of-office organization officer who was quite successful or a fifth year senior with a successful record of organizational leadership.

**Institutional Support**

In addition to the many and varied types of staff support that institutions supply to the campus activities functions, they also provide many other types of institutional support. Without these accommodations, services, and other types of support the success of campus activities efforts would not be possible in most cases. The level of commitment of support and cooperation from throughout the institution community often has a direct relationship on the level of success of the campus activities programs (Arminio, 1993).

Access to facilities and the conditions of that access are an important factor in most campus activities programs.
Which institution facilities are available, their cost, and the setup and cleanup are all questions to which the answers will have tremendous impact on the types and quality of programs offered on campus. The ease of access the students and their organizations have to auditoriums, theaters, ballrooms, and other such areas and whether they have to pay a usage fee is critical. An unfortunate problem on some campuses is that the facility managers and custodial staff do not see the student use of such areas as a normal part of campus life and accept it as such. Instead, they make each use difficult and place road blocks in the way of students. In a like manner, the easy use of outdoor areas, without undue constraints, is another facility access that is equally important. The creation and nurturing of a supportive attitude among all levels of the campus community and its employees should be a priority on all campuses (Butts, 1971).

Many programs and activities on campuses depend on some type of audio/visual equipment. The quality and availability of projectors, public address systems, stereo systems, VCR's, TV's and other such systems is another critical area of support. Access to this type of equipment, with low or no usage fees, becomes another important ingredient in campus activities. In addition to the equipment itself, access to the staff to knowledgeably set-up, operate, and maintain the equipment is also important.
Many aspects of campus activities are business-like and thus must be handled in this way. Office support equipment such as copy machines, computers, typewriters, fax machines, desks, file cabinets, and other items are necessary. Many campuses provide several offices with basic equipment and have some type of an evaluation process in which organizations apply for the offices and those deemed most appropriate are assigned the spaces for a specific period of time. Some campuses have secretarial pools, graphic arts departments, print shops, and other support operations that are available to student organizations (Yates, 1992).

One of the difficulties all campus activities programs have is the actual scheduling of the dates and times of events. Finding the correct date and time for a program or event can be most difficult. Campuses often have a master calendar maintained by the campus activities office or one of the other key administrative offices. The process to secure a date on the calendar, and whether or not it is secure once formally placed on the calendar, are significant points. How frequently events are bumped, moved, or otherwise forced to change is a good measure of the priority the campus places on the campus activities component. Many major campuses place key campus activities events at the top of their scheduling priorities, thereby forcing other key campus events to be scheduled around them. The use and priorities an institution sets for its facilities are clear
indicators of how the institution chooses to meet the needs of its students (Hallenbeck, 1983).

Two other offices at an institution are also often very involved in supporting student organizations. These are the financial support offices and legal services. These two highly technical functions are important to keeping things running smoothly. Keeping track of expenses, encumbrances, income, ticket sales, state sales tax, entertainment taxes, payroll, and numerous other financial issues is a task that is best done by professionals. The necessity of seeking new funding sources will continue to be a critical issue for campus activities. Whether these be grants, corporate sponsorships, auxiliary services, income producing events, or other new sources, careful coordination with the financial and legal areas of the institution is necessary (Bookman, 1992). The assistance of the institution accounting staff is a most important support function that can be provided to campus activities.

Contract issues, copyright requirements, liability, travel, sales tax, unrelated business income tax, hazing and many other legal matters are dealt with daily in campus activities. The support, assistance, and advice of the legal staff of an institution is a key service for offices of campus activities and campus student organizations. Of course, it is also prudent for the institution to be involved in these legal matters. By recognizing and
allowing student organizations to exist and campus activities functions to occur, the institution assumes a certain amount of responsibility and liability. The assumption of this responsibility and liability is a risk the institutions must manage and control. Being actively supportive and involved with campus activities is thus a great service and a wise precaution. Being readily available for consultations is an invaluable service (Levitan & Osteen, 1992).

**Funding Bases**

Campus activities are traditionally funded from one or more of eight sources:

1. State appropriations,
2. Institutional budgets (general university funds),
3. Activity fees,
4. User fees,
5. Membership and other specialized fees,
6. Revenues from programming or fund-raising projects,
7. Grants, and/or

State appropriations are direct budget allocations from the state. Institutional budgets are funds within the normal university budget and thus come from the same source as those funds directly supporting the academic functions of the university. The activity fees are funds students usually pay in conjunction with tuition that are
specifically dedicated to funding campus activities programs and services. User fees are charges assessed to students who use or have access to specific, identified services or facilitates. Specialized fees would include membership dues and other narrowly defined fees. Generated revenue is the income from ticket sales and other campus activities fundraising events. Grants are funds given by outside agencies to support specific campus activities. Foundation support includes funds provided out of the general or non-dedicated funds within the institution's foundation (Arminio, 1993).

It is also possible that some funding could also come from campus auxiliary enterprises. These operations are those parts of the university that are run as a business and generate income from sales or services. Auxiliary enterprises are normally self-supporting enterprises (Barr, 1988b).

Declining enrollments, decreasing state revenues, and falling attendance at income-producing events are all probable outcomes of the current financial status of many institutions of higher education. As institutions are forced to set priorities and make hard choices, campus activities functions are often targeted for budget reductions. This can thus directly translate into decreased funding for campus activities (Floerchinger & Young, 1992).

Other issues facing higher education institutions place additional financial strains on campus activities
departments. These include the cost of new forms of technological hardware, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), concerns for legal liability in various programs and services, and requirements of gender, ethnicity, and religious equity in programs and services.

**Technology**

The world of high-tech equipment and services has come to campus activities. Computers have become a vital part of campus activities just as they have for the rest of society (Heller & Warner, 1987). An impressive 77% of the student affairs officers surveyed indicated that the computer age has had an impact on their operations (Whyte, 1989). Their far reaching impact includes the staff. A substantial impact on "people time", record keeping, forecasting, word processing, desk-top-publishing and tracking was reported (Whyte, 1989).

Television, campus cable systems, telephone based teleconferencing, and satellite-based teleconferencing have all become part of the campus activities world. Using these new campus media to educate students about the programs and services available to them is becoming increasingly important. Campus activities programs are regularly sponsoring teleconferences on date rape, racism, suicide, and other topical issues that are made available to them by a host of sponsoring groups and organizations (Poll & McManness, 1989).
Another growing trend on campuses is the use of campus-wide ID/Access Cards. Newman and Ignelzi (1991) described these photo ID cards that would carry one or more magnetic stripes on the back that could be encoded with information. Such things as their account balance, meal plan, major, part-time job, on campus address, student leadership position, could all be recorded on the card. They point out that students could use their ID Card to purchase food and drink from vending machines without the need to put coins in vending machines, run copiers and laundry machines without change, gain access to cafeterias, enter locked areas for which they had been granted access, gain access to ticketed events they had paid for, and many other similar uses.

Other features important to campus activities are that the students could then vote in elections at any ID card access point around campus and not be allowed to vote anywhere else. The systems are even being used to take instant polls of student opinion by having the card reader machine ask a specific question each time the student uses her/his card.

Familiarity with, and the ability to use, these new types of emerging technology has become an additional requirement for today's student affairs staff (Poll & McManness, 1989). Some offices have added staff to meet this need; others have reassigned existing staff. In either case additional staff development training in this area is
an ongoing necessity in student affairs offices today (Poll & McManness, 1989).

Summary

Campus activities is clearly a valuable element in the successful educational experience of students in higher education. While students may indeed obtain diplomas with little involvement with the campus activities component at a college or university, research has shown that the quality of the education, individual growth and development, and hands-on experience are greatly enhanced by such involvement (Astin, 1993).

The level and types of support that higher education institutions provide to the campus activities function vary widely. The staffing patterns, organizational structures, advising philosophies, organizational services, and types of technological support are all key variables in defining an institution's efforts.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is the analysis of the staffing patterns and organizational structure used in campus activities office or operations within selected institutions of higher education. The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) To determine the relationship between the organizational structure in selected campus activities offices and their staffing patterns; (2) To determine the relationship between the funding base and staffing patterns in selected campus activities offices; (3) To determine the relationship between the type of organizational structure of selected campus activities offices and their departmental budget; (4) To determine the relationship between the type of organizational structure and the funding base of selected campus activities offices; (5) To obtain a measurement of the size and type of the campus activities staff and the organizational structure of the office; (6) To identify to what extent a relationship exists between the size and type of the staff and the use of technology within the office.

Population

The population of the study was institutions classified as public, Carnegie Classification Master's (Comprehensive)
Universities and Colleges I & II in the 1994-95 academic year. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1994), these institutions offer baccalaureate programs and graduate education through the masters degree.

An additional criteria for the target population was membership in the National Association for Campus Activities. NACA is made up of 1,342 institutions from all 50 states and includes public and private institutions, large and small, 4-year and 2-year institutions. Of these, a total of 355 institutions meet the criteria defining the target population of the study. NACA is one of the more prominent professional organizations within student affairs that serves the member institutions and individuals with careers in the college student personnel profession in higher education. These member institutions are, in general, a cross section of higher education institutions within the United States (NACA, 1993).

**Instrumentation**

A multi-part survey was mailed to a campus activities staff member of all institutions in the sample. The staff member contact was the key contact listed on the NACA membership records. The initial part of the survey collected demographic data on the institution and the individual completing the survey.
The remainder of the survey was comprised of forced choice questions. No open-ended questions were asked. The survey focused on the staffing pattern and organizational structure of the campus activities office.

In this study the validity of the survey instrument was established through the use of an expert panel. The panel consisted of individuals selected to serve based on their extensive experience and service within campus activities departments of institutions within the population. They were either serving as heads of campus activities departments or had served in those roles during their careers. Their advice was sought on the clarity and scope of the instrument as well as the layout, design, and face validity of the instrument. Upon receipt, the reviewers' suggestions and comments were discussed with my major professor. Clarification and follow-up comments were solicited, by telephone, when needed. Suggestions, as deemed appropriate, were incorporated into the pilot instrument.

The survey instrument was piloted to a group of institutions selected from a pool of public, Carnegie Classification Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I & II but not members of the National Association for Campus Activities. They were asked to complete the survey instrument and to make comments about content, structure, design and face validity of the instrument.
Based on the recommended changes of the reviewers and of the individuals participating in the pilot study, the research instrument was redesigned.

Research Design

The study was a descriptive study using survey methodology. The purpose of this design was the description of the relationships between the demographic data collected and the current patterns of staffing found in the institutions surveyed.

Data Collection and Procedure

During March, 1995, the data collection instrument was mailed to the sample. The instrument was printed double-sided to keep it to no more than two sheets of paper. It was mailed by first class mail with a cover letter describing the purpose of the survey. The respondents were given the opportunity to request a copy of the study results.

To aid in analyzing the responses, the surveys were numbered in sequential order. Then, as the surveys were returned, they were logged in on a record. Ten working days after the initial mailing, a postcard reminding each individual of the survey and the need for its return was mailed.

After another ten working days, an analysis of the returned surveys was done to determine if an adequate number
of the instruments had been received. At the end of this period it was determined that an adequate number of responses had been received and no further action was necessary.

Data Analysis

Frequencies were calculated on all the variables in conjunction with the various variables that have been identified.

The primary purpose of the design was the description of the relationships between the variables. The data gathered were analyzed using the chi-square test for independence. This test is a nonparametric test and is used when the data are nominal and is in the form of frequencies placed in two or more categories (Borg, 1989). Given the classification of the chi-square test as nonparametric, it is limited in its ability to detect Type II errors (Gay, 1987).

The data gathered in this study were primarily nominal level data. The term "nominal data" indicates that the respondent is specifying which categories are the most appropriate descriptors or classifications for the specific question (Gay, 1987). A factorial chi square was used when frequencies were categorized along more than one dimension in order to determine the independence of the variables under consideration.
For each of the six research questions, frequencies were calculated on the responses to the relevant questions in the survey instrument. The mode, as a measure of central tendency, can then be determined, where appropriate, for each section of survey responses. Then the variables were analyzed using the chi-square test for significance, which is used when comparing group frequencies to determine if certain responses occurred more frequently in one group than another (Gay, 1987).
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationships of staffing patterns, organizational structure, budgets, and other demographics within Carnegie Classification I & II, comprehensive masters institutions of higher education. Demographic information collected in the membership database of the National Association for Campus Activities on the institutions surveyed were also examined.

Data was obtained through the administration of a detailed survey to the heads of campus activities/student activities departments at the institutions of the selected population. The majority of the data was nominal level. Budget and staffing data were ordinal level.

Data Collection

The first administration of the surveys to the 355 campus activities/student activities department heads, identified in the population, resulted in 212 (59.7%) responses. A second mailing of the surveys to the 143 non-respondents resulted in an additional 57 responses. A total of 269 (75.8%) responses were received. The institutions surveyed are listed in Appendix E. The responses received by state are detailed in Appendix F.
Population

To assist in the data analysis, the states were collapsed into 6 logical geographical regions. The distribution of the states among the geographical regions is presented in Appendix G. The responses by geographical region are detailed in Appendix H. The six regions are named: Northeast (NE) Southeast (SE) North Central (NC) South Central (SC) Northwest (NW) Southwest (SW).

Figure 1. Six Geographic Regions

A chi-square goodness of fit test was run to determine if the responses received were representative of the population. The number of instruments mailed by geographic region and the responses by region were used because of the importance of achieving a representative geographic distribution while avoiding an over-representation of any particular region. The chi square analysis of the proportions of respondents by geographic region, resulted in
a value of 24.00, df = 20, p > .05. The null hypothesis was
retained. No geographical region was significantly over-or-
under represented in the sample. Based on the goodness of
fit analysis, it was determined that additional follow-up
was not needed.

The following 14 states had a 100% response rate:

Alaska Mississippi
Colorado Nebraska
Hawaii Nevada
Idaho Rhode Island
Iowa South Carolina
Kansas Tennessee
Michigan West Virginia

Others with large percentages of respondents, respectively, were Wisconsin (92.9%), Kentucky (87.5%), and
Illinois (85.7%), see Appendix F. No respondents were from
Maine or North Dakota. The states with the next lowest
response rates were New Hampshire (33.3%) and New Jersey
(37.5%), the response rates of all others were above 50%.
There were no institutions in the population in the states
of Delaware, Montana, Wyoming, or Arizona.

A total of 355 institutions made up the population from
46 states and a total of 269 (75.8%) were returned from 44
states. Eighty-six institutions (24.2%) did not respond.
Appendix F contains the number and percent of respondents by
state and that state's percentage of the total response.

Characteristics of Respondents' Institutions

The majority of respondents' institutions (N=142;
52.8%) had enrollments of 1,001 - 5,000, and the second most
common size was 5,001-10,000 (N=71; 26.4%). Additional enrollment data are presented in Figure 2.

**Institutional Enrollment**

![Institutional Enrollment Graph](image)

**Figure 2. Institutional Enrollment**

The majority of responding institutions (N=152; 56.5%) identified themselves as public institutions, rather than as private institutions (N=112; 41.6%). Additional information is presented in Figure 3.

**Public - Private Institution**
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**Figure 3. Public - Private Institutions**
The largest segment of respondents (N=123; 45.7%) identified themselves as commuter institutions. The second largest group was that of residential institutions (N=87; 32.3%). Approximately 20% of respondents chose not to respond to this question.

The majority of respondents’ institutions (N=197; 73.25%) were non-church affiliated institutions rather than church affiliated institutions (N=71; 26.4%). One institution did not respond.

Staffing Patterns of Department Head

In student services the terms “campus activities”, “student activities”, and “student life” are often used interchangeably. In addition, the terms “University Center”, “Student Union”, and “Student Center” frequently refer to the same facility. Thus titles with these phrases in them commonly reflect similar responsibilities. The most frequently identified title of the individual who is the department head of the institutional respondent was “Director of Student Activities/Campus Activities/Student Life” (N=139; 51.7%). The second most common was “Director of Student Activities /Campus Activities/Student Life and Director of Student Union/University Center” (N=25; 9.3%). The remaining 39% of respondents had department head titles distributed over approximately a dozen titles (see Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total Responses N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Activities or Campus Activities or Student Life</td>
<td>139 (51.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Activities or Campus Activities or Student Life AND Director of Student Union or University Center</td>
<td>25 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Dean of Student Activities or Campus Activities or Student Life</td>
<td>21 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Union or University Center</td>
<td>18 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students or Student Life</td>
<td>13 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Student Activities or Campus Activities</td>
<td>13 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Director of Student Union or University Center</td>
<td>8 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs or Student Life</td>
<td>8 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Director of Student Activities or Student Life or Campus Activities</td>
<td>5 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Associate Vice President of Student Affairs or Student Life</td>
<td>1 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266 (99.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[no response - 2 - 0.7%]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[invalid response - 1 - 0.4%]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Oversight

"Vice President for Student Affairs" was the most frequently identified title of the office of administrative oversight (N=121; 45%). The second most common was "Dean of Students" (N=80; 29.7%). Other oversight positions reported are presented in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total Responses N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(45.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>(29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center or Student Union Director</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Assistant Vice President/Dean</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President/Chancellor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[no response - 2 - 0.7%]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office Staff

The institutional respondents provided information on the types and numbers of staff used to support the Student Activities functions on their campuses. These staff were defined as professional staff and clerical staff.
Professional Staff

Overall the number of professional staff available to support the student activities function is limited. Over 60% of the institutions (n=167) reported between 1 and 3 professional staff members. An additional 76 institutions (28.3%) had between 4 and 6 professional staff members. Only one institution reported having no professional staff. Having 4 to 6 staff members is the level reported by the largest single group of institutions as is presented in figure 4.
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Figure 4. Total Professional Staff per Institution

Educational Levels of Professional Staff

Educational level of professional staff is an important criterion when evaluating staffing in campus activities offices. It is used as a direct measurement of skill and knowledge level as well as an indicator of pay level. It can also be an indicator of level of student service.
Within the category of professional staff, the survey sought information on educational level, and type of employment (volunteer, part-time, full-time). In general, most professional staff have master's degrees and work in offices with 2-6 other professionals.

**Professional Staff with Doctoral Degrees.**

A majority (88.5%) of the respondents reported having no full-time staff with doctoral degrees. Respondents from 31 institutions reported full-time professional staff holding doctoral degrees (11.6%). A these 31 institutions, 26 have 1 staff with a doctorate, 4 have 2 staff with doctorates, and 1 has 5 professional staff members with doctoral degrees.

Nearly all of the respondents (99.3%) reported having no part-time professional or volunteer staff with doctoral degrees.

**Professional Staff with Masters Degrees.**

A majority of institutions (75.1%) reported having between 1 and 3 full-time staff at the masters level. Twenty-seven institutions (10%) reported having no masters level full-time professional staff members.

Over 90% of institutions (90.3%) reported having no part-time masters level professional staff. Approximately 10% had between one and three part-time professional staff at the master's level.
Virtually all institutions (98.5%) reported having no master's level professional volunteer staff.

**Professional Staff with Bachelor's Degrees.**

A range of 1 to 3 full time bachelors level professional staff members was reported by the respondents of 112 institutions (41.6%). Over half of the institutions had no full time bachelor's degree-level professional staff (54.6%).

Only 35 institutions (13%) reported having between one and three part-time professional staff with bachelor's degrees. The remaining 234 institutions (87%) had no bachelors level part-time professional staff. The majority of respondents' institutions, 264 (98.1%), reported having no bachelor's-level volunteer professional staff.

The majority of institutions (62.1%) reported having between 1-3 professional staff members and only one institution reported having none. A total of 28.2% had 4-6 professional staff and one tenth of the respondents' institutions had more than 6 professional staff.

**Clerical Staff**

Just over one quarter (28.3%) of the respondents' institutions reported having 13 or more clerical staff members. A slightly smaller number (25.7%) had between 7 and 12 clerical staff members and (23.4%) had between 4-6 clerical staff members. Finally, just over one fifth
(21.2%) of the respondents reported having between 1-3. Those institutions with high numbers of clerical staff also had large numbers of student employees. This information is presented in Figure 5.
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**Figure 5. Total Clerical Staff by Institution**

Almost 80% of the institutions had no part-time clerical staff. The remaining respondents reported having 1-3 part-time clerical staff.

Nearly all departments, at all size institutions, had clerical support, most with two or more. A total of 28.3% had more than twelve clerical staff in their departments, another 49.1% reported having between 2-12 clerical staff, and 21.2% of the respondents reported having 1.

Over 90% of the respondents' institutions used student workers in their Campus Activities departments. However, over 90% (247) reported having no undergraduate volunteer
staff. The range of those that did was between 1 and 55. Graduate student volunteers were reported in only 14 (5.2%) of the respondents' institutions.

Over three fourths of the institutions (n=208) reported no graduate and undergraduate interns. Those institutional respondents who did report having undergraduate or graduate interns, had between 1 and 10.

**Faculty**

Various levels of involvement of faculty as part of the staff of the Campus Activities Departments was reported from institutions through the country. Data on faculty involvement were collected on two questions, involvement as a staff member in the campus activities department and involvement as a faculty advisor for student organizations. The respondents reported that at 109 institutions (40.5%) more than 16 faculty were involved with their offices. This large number includes 28 points at which only 1-3 institutions report a specific level of faculty involvement within the range. 39.8% (n=107) of the institutions no faculty were involved with their student activities departments. Nineteen institutions (7.1%) reported having 1 to 3 faculty involved with their student activities departments. Another 9 (3.3%) had 4 to 6 faculty involved and 6 (2.2%) had 7-9 involved. The involvement remained much the same for the next two levels, with 10 institutions reporting 10-12 faculty involved and nine institutions
reporting 10-15 faculty involved. This information is presented in figure 6.

**Figure 6. Total Faculty Involvement by Institutions**

This wide range of involvement is indicative of the spread of the number of faculty involved with the 109 institutions. Total staff members ranging between 16-102 were reported but each specific number had only 1-3 institutions reporting at that level. These faculty members were reported to have regular office hours in the student/campus activities office.

Faculty volunteers were not available in almost 90% (n=239) of respondents' institutions. The number of faculty volunteers ranged widely (between one and fifty). Twelve institutions reported having more than four or more faculty volunteers.
Full-time faculty joint appointments were also rare, occurring less than 5% of the time. Virtually no institutions reported faculty joint appointments (n=265). Less than 2% (n=3) of the institutions reported full-time faculty with release time working in their departments. And only 5% (n=8) reported using any part-time faculty.

Just over half (136, 50.2%), of the respondents' institutions reported no faculty volunteers serving as student organization advisors. The remaining institutions (49.8%) reported faculty who volunteer to serve as student organization advisors. The number of these faculty volunteers per institution ranged from 1 to over 100.

**Funding Bases**

Departments of campus activities have two basic types of operations, which may or may not be funding from the same funding bases. These two basic operational areas, for the purpose of the survey instrument, were designated as administrative/operational and student leadership development. Institutional respondents were asked to provide data on the sources and size of funding used in each of these two areas.

**Administrative/Operational Funding Bases**

There were 10 possible sources for the funds used for administrative/operational budgets in Student Activities Offices. Only four of the funding sources were reported as
being used with a frequency of 20% or more by all types of institutions, both public and private. See Table 5 for additional details on the top funding sources.

**TABLE 5.**

**TOP 5 SOURCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE/OPERATIONAL FUNDING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Responses N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Activity Fees</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>(49.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct State Appropriations</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(26.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Institutional Budgets</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(39.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Private Institutions Only]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from programming or fund-raising projects</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(23.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(20.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top source of almost half of all the institutions was reported as being standardized activity fees. These fees are normally charged directly to the student with regular tuition and other academic fees.

Both public and private institutions were included in the survey. In order to differentiate between the sometimes unique funding sources of these two types of institutions the survey was constructed to allow private institutions to designate their regular institutional budgets separately from direct state appropriations which all institutions might receive. (Even private institutions can receive some, limited types of state funding for specific programs and purposes.) Overall, the second most frequently identified
source of funding was regular institutional budgets (39.4%, n=106). This funding source occurred only in private institutions.

A comprehensive presentation of frequency of funding sources by amount is presented in Appendix I.

**Student Leadership Development Funding Bases**

Student Activities Offices also had ten possible sources of funding used for student leadership development budgets. Only three were indicated as being used with a frequency of 20% or more by both public and private institutions. These data are presented in Table 6.

**TABLE 6. TOP 4 SOURCES OF STUDENT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FUNDING.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Activity Fees</td>
<td>147 (54.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from Programming or Fund Raising Projects</td>
<td>61 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Institutional Budgets</td>
<td>61 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Private Institutions Only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees (tickets, subscriptions)</td>
<td>60 (22.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was indicated with the administrative/operational budgets, standardized activity fees represented the primary source of funding for all institutions for student leadership development funding. Generated revenue from individual events, fund raising projects, and dedicated user...
fees are the other sources heavily depended upon at all institutions. Private institutions again used their regular institutional budgets as the second most frequent funding source in a tie with programming or fund raising revenue. A comprehensive presentation of frequency of funding source by amount is presented in Appendix J.

**Use of Technology**

The use of various types of modern office technology is widespread in student activities/campus activities departments. This wide level of usage is detailed in Table 7. Although usage is pervasive, the tendency is to rely upon well proven, established technological systems. Technologies used are those that are clearly established in business. That is, the most used technologies are those that are in the current peak of acceptance within business and industry (i.e. desk top computers, e-mail, fax machines, desktop publishing, etc.). The results indicated that other, less mature and well publicized types of technology are used much less frequently (i.e. electronic ID systems, cellular phones, automated ticketing, etc.).

It is clear that computer related technology has fully permeated campus activities departments. The top five uses, which have a frequency of over 50% in all institutions, are all computer related and interdependent. This technology seems to have reached all types of institutions and become a part of the norm.
Departmentally operated video and audio equipment were next in usage levels with various types of communication aids following up in frequency of usage. Usage of technology data from the respondents' institutions is provided in Table 7.

TABLE 7.

USE OF TECHNOLOGY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Institutional Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop/Laptop Computer</td>
<td>236 (87.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Mail</td>
<td>195 (72.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax Machine</td>
<td>192 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Publishing</td>
<td>182 (67.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-wide Computer Network</td>
<td>177 (65.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Equipment</td>
<td>125 (46.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Equipment</td>
<td>105 (39.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Radios</td>
<td>75 (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Pagers</td>
<td>65 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconferencing</td>
<td>63 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic ID Card System</td>
<td>53 (19.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Phone</td>
<td>28 (10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Ticketing</td>
<td>19 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions

Six research questions were proposed and examined in this study. Close examination of the survey results indicated that statistical testing would not be appropriate. Rather, the frequencies of the data responses were analyzed for trends and preferences among the institutions. Conclusions drawn from the major findings related to these analyses and each of the six research questions will be presented in this section.

Question 1. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure in the Campus Activities Office and its staffing pattern?

The most frequently reported title for the position having administrative oversight of the student activities/campus activities area is that of "Vice President of Student Affairs" (45.0%). The second most frequently reported title is that of "Dean of Students" (29.7%). Both of the titles represent the traditional head of the Student Affairs division. These two titles are seldom found at the same institution and reflect the titling nomenclature used at the respective institutions. This is indicated by the chief officer's title being either president or chancellor. In most cases, a president has vice presidents and a chancellor has either vice chancellors or deans. Due to the predominant use of these titles, it is perhaps more appropriate to combine the two responses totaling 74.7% of
the respondents' institutions. Four other specific titles, along with a category of "other" were reported by just over a quarter of the respondents.

From these responses it is evident that the most common organizational structure for the campus activities department is reporting to a position directly responsible to the institution's chief executive officer. This structure represents almost 75% of all respondents' institutions.

The clear preference for the title of the department head of the student activities/campus activities department is "director of student activities" with 39% of the institutions preferring this title. This is over four times more frequently chosen than the next most frequently chosen title, "director of student activities or campus activities or student life and director of student union or university center". This second title is a combined position in which the management of the student activities function is combined with the management of the university center. This 39% response and its ranking with other options allows one to infer that the most common structure for campus activities offices is one in which there is a director managing the efforts of the department.

It is clear that the majority of institutions place their campus activities/student activities departments in similar locations within their structure. That is, the
campus activities/student activities departments are managed by a director and report directly to the vice president or dean who reports to the chief executive officer.

Reviewing the data gathered from the institutional respondents yields several interesting insights. Across all size institutions, the campus activities departments reported the use of the title of director of campus activities/student activities/student life as the most dominant. However there was an interesting split in the organizational structure they reported. The institutions with the smallest (501-1000) and largest enrollments (15,000+) indicated their campus activities departments report to a Dean as much or more frequently than a vice president. The middle three groups of institutions, between the largest and smallest enrollment campuses, describe their structure as one in which a vice president oversees their department.

The smallest group of institutions described themselves as predominately private and church affiliated. Over 50% of the institutions of this size reported the use of a vice president oriented structure.

Although the numbers of professional and clerical staff at the institutions studied varied, there appeared to be nothing more than proportional differences in the staff sizes. While the larger institutions reported they had more professional and clerical staff than the smaller ones there
appears to be no impact in relation to organizational structure and staffing patterns. The basic structure remains similar, only the size of the staff varies.

Faculty involvement, as reported by all the institutions is difficult to analyze. The most frequently reported level of involvement of faculty at institutions of all sizes was zero indicating no involvement. These zero levels of involvement ranged from 36.6% at institutions with enrollments of 1,001 - 5,000 students to 50% at institutions with 15,000+ students. Yet the other schools in each size category reported involvement ranging from 1 to 111. Analysis of these responses indicates that a sizable portion of the respondents confused two items on the survey, therefore the wide range of responses are due to factors regarding survey construction. One survey item requested information on the number of faculty working in the campus activities departmental office, the other requested information regarding the number of faculty involved as advisors to student organizations. One would expect the involvement of faculty in office support to be slight; and the involvement of faculty in organizational advising roles to be quite high. This organizational advisor involvement could possibly rise as high as the number of student organizations at the institutions. Depending on which interpretation of the survey question they were using the
institutions had either a small involvement as staff or a large involvement as advisors.

The overall analysis of this information leads to the answer to research question one. There is a relationship between the organizational structure in the campus activities office and the reporting structure. There is a relationship between reporting structure and the staffing patterns in small institutions with enrollments between 501 - 1,000. In these institutions, they prefer to use the title of dean of students rather than vice president of student affairs. In larger institutions however, there is no discernable impact on the type of organizational structure by the staffing pattern at the institution.

**Question 2. Is there a relationship between the funding base in the Campus Activities Office and its staffing pattern?**

Data were collected about the funding bases used in the campus activities Offices in institutions within five size ranges with enrollments ranging between 501 to 15,000+. Across all sizes of institutions, activity fees were either the first or second most frequent funding source for both administrative/operational funding and for student/leadership development funding. Additionally, they identified the following funding sources as their other primary funding source: regular institutional funding, state appropriations, user fees, auxiliary services revenue. It

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
appears that activity fees are a basic, essential funding base and cross all staffing patterns.

As has been previously identified, the staffing pattern in all sizes of institutions was indicated by preference of the pattern in which the head of the department is titled director of student activities or campus activities or student life.

In light of these two facts there appears to be no relationship or impact between the staffing pattern indicated by the director title and the indicated funding sources.

Question 3. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure of the campus activities departments and the size of the campus activities departmental budget(s)?

As has been previously detailed, the organizational structure of the campus activities departments at almost 75% of all respondents' institutions is one in which it reports to a position title of either "vice president of student affairs", 45.0% or "dean of students", 29.7%.

Data on the size of two types of campus activities departmental budgets were collected in the study. The data on these two types (administrative/operational and student/leadership development) were difficult to translate into information on the total size due to the size of the range of each of the components. When the ranges of the
components are added, the potential size of the total balloons to the point it is unusable. The only absolute statement that can be made is that the smallest institutions had smaller budgets, but once enrollment increased to at least 5,000 the total possible budget ranges reached the maximum choice of the survey, $300,000. For example, in institutions with an enrollment of 1,001-5,000 they indicated they received funds for their administrative/operational budgets primarily from the regular institutional budget at a level of $1 - $300,000 (54.4%) and activity fees at a level of $1 - $300,000 (44.4%). To add these two sources together and thus arrive at a possible range of $2 - $600,000 would produce highly inaccurate data.

However, since the structures of all the institutions was one dominate type, it can be stated that the structure appears to have no direct impact on the size of the budgets. 

**Question 4. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure in the Campus Activities Office and its funding base(s)?**

Again, as was detailed previously, the organizational structure of the campus activities departments (almost 75% of all respondents' institutions) report to a position with the title of either "vice President of student affairs", (45.0%) or "dean of students", (29.7%).

Data were collected about the funding bases used in the campus activities offices in institutions of five size
ranges between enrollments of 501 to 15,000+. Across all size and types of institutions, activity fees were either the first or second most frequent funding source for both administrative/operational funding and for student/leadership development funding. Additionally, they identified the following funding sources as their other primary funding source: regular institutional funding, state appropriations, user fees, auxiliary services revenue.

All the institutions had a common structure and funding sources. In recognition of this, there appears to be no relationship or impact by having a vice president of student affairs or dean of students and activity fees as a primary funding source. It simply appears that activity fees are a basic, essential funding base and all organizational structures.

Question 5. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the campus activities staff and the organizational structure of the campus activities departments?

The size and type of the staff of the respondents' institutions was dependent on the size of the institutions, smaller institutions have smaller staff up to a size of 9-10 at the larger institutions. This information is detailed in Table 8.
TABLE 8.
RANGE OF PROFESSIONAL/CLERICAL STAFF EQUALING 50% OR MORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Professional Staff</th>
<th>Clerical Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1-2 = 59.4%</td>
<td>1-5 = 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 5,000</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1-4 = 57.8%</td>
<td>1-7 = 55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1-5 = 52.1%</td>
<td>1-10 = 53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6-9 = 60.0%</td>
<td>3-11 = 53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2-8 = 58.3%</td>
<td>4-12 = 58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category, "institutions with enrollments of 10,001 - 15,000", none of the respondents indicated fewer than 6 professional staff and 3 clerical staff. In largest institutions, "enrollments of over 15,000", the staffing size was close to that of the previous category. However, one institution indicated only 2 professional staff members, the next lowest respondent level was 5.

As has been previously detailed, the organizational structure of the campus activities departments (at almost 75% of all respondents' institutions) is one in which it reports to a position title of either "vice president of student affairs", 45.0% or "dean of students", 29.7%.

Thus there appears to no identifiable relationship between the size and type of staff and the organizational structure.
Question 6. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the campus activities staff and the use of technology within the office.

As was detailed previously, the sizes and types of the staffs of the respondents' institutions were dependent on the sizes of the institutions, with the smaller institutions having smaller staff up to a size of 9-10 at the larger institutions. This was detailed earlier in Table 8.

The use of technology was extensive across the entire population with 5 of the technologies being used in over 50% of the institutions studied (see Table 7). Since the use of technology requires the investment of budget funds its use would be related to the size of the administrative/operational budgets. The data also indicate that once institutional size reached 5,000 the budget ranges reached $300,000.

Thus the amount of technology used is related to the size of the staff in the same way the size of the staff is related to the size of the budget. There is a direct relationship, as staff size increases, the uses of technology increases.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Six research questions were proposed and examined in this study. Conclusions drawn from the findings related to these questions will be presented in this chapter along with recommendations for further study.

Summary

Currently, several kinds of structures exist for campus activities offices, yet little detailed research has been completed about their organization, staffing, programs, and services. A method of categorizing and analyzing the staffing patterns and organizational structures of campus activities departments needed to be developed. There were numerous ways that institutions approach the question of staffing. Approaches were dependent on the size of the institution, type of institution, funding base, and several other important factors. This study addressed the current vacuum that existed concerning the data on the organizational structures of campus activities departments in institutions of higher education.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the organizational structures and staffing patterns in campus activities offices or operations within 355 institutions selected from the membership of the National Association of
Campus Activities [NACA] during the 1994-95 academic year. Further, the institutions are classified as Carnegie public, Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II. Focus was placed on identifying the size and type of campus activities departments at the institutions surveyed.

A representative cross section of American public higher education, the 355 institutions offer graduate education through a minimum of one masters degree program with at least 20 or more degrees awarded annually. Their primary mission was undergraduate education, the primary target audience of campus activities programs and services. A total of 269 (75.8%) responses were received and used in the study. The data analysis based upon their survey responses is generalizable to other like campuses.

Higher education is continually in a state of change with redefinition of missions and goals, changing student demographics, and differing demands of society. Assistance and guidance in discovering the options of staffing patterns and data on the frequency and application of these patterns will allow more rational decision making when establishing or reorganizing campus activities departments.

This study addressed the staffing patterns in campus activities that are continuously changing due to reorganizations, mission changes, funding cuts, and other such factors. The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) To identify the various staffing patterns now in use in
campus activities offices; (2) To identify which patterns occur most frequently; (3) To determine if certain patterns occur more frequently in certain types of institutions.

It is hoped that the study will become a proactive management tool for those administrators in higher education who are structuring or restructuring administrative offices that support the campus activities functions at institutions of higher education.

Examination of the survey results indicated that statistical analysis and testing would not produce usable data. However, careful analysis and review of the frequency data produced by the survey allowed considerable analysis.

Two problems with the survey became apparent during the review of the data. Both these problems prevented some levels of analysis. First, the frequency data about faculty involvement appears to be flawed due to confusion between two related questions. One sought information about faculty involvement as staff members in campus activities departments in which responses would logically be rather low, (i.e. 1-12), the other sought information about faculty acting as student organizational advisors which could be rather large numbers, (over 100). The data suggest that some of the respondents confused the questions, since some indicated as many as 199 faculty as staff members rather than organizational advisors.
Secondly, the information gathered about budget sources and size proved to be difficult to summarize. The data received indicated sources and an indication of the size range. However, with multiple sources, adding the ranges together introduces the probability of considerable error when considering total size. Since each range covered a $25,000 span, adding multiple responses introduced the possibility of multiple $25,000 errors.

This study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure in the campus activities office and its staffing pattern?

   There is a relationship between the organizational structure and its staffing pattern in small institutions with enrollments between 501-1,000 but not in larger institutions. In smaller institutions, there is a preference to use the title "dean of students" rather than "vice president of student affairs".

2. Is there a relationship between the funding base in the campus activities office and its staffing pattern?

   There appears to be no relationship between the funding base and the staffing patterns.

3. Is there a relationship between the type of organizational structure of the campus activities
departments and the size of the campus activities
departmental budget(s)?
There was no relationship between the structure and the
size of the budgets.

4. Is there a relationship between the type of
organizational structure in the campus activities
office and its funding base(es)?
No relationship was found between the organizational
structure and its funding bases.

5. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the
campus activities staff and the organizational
structure of the campus activities departments?
There is no identifiable relationship between the size
and type of staff and the organizational structure.

6. Is there a relationship between the size and type of the
campus activities staff and the use of technology
within the office.

There is a direct relationship between the size and
type of the campus activities staff and the use of
technology within the office. As the size of the staff
increases the uses of technology increases.

Conclusions

Six research questions were researched and analyzed in
this study. Conclusions drawn from the major findings in
relation to these six questions and a general review of the
data will be presented in this section.
1. The majority of institutions in the nation, regardless of size, funding, and whether public or private, residential or commuter have campus activities departments with a Director as the head and report to a vice president or dean. Institutions in the process of reassessing their structures should carefully study this time-tested and proven structure to see if it will meet the needs of the organization.

2. Across all size and types of institutions activity fees are a base funding source for both the administrative/operational and program/leadership development functions of campus activities offices. As private funding and tax revenues level off or decrease and tuition rates increase in higher education institutions around the country, other sources of funding will be sought. Clearly, one that will be studied is student fees. As these fees have been identified as a basic source for campus activities offices, careful attention should be paid to actions related to student fees taken by the larger campus community to insure that this critical source is not jeopardized.

3. There appears to be a functional cap or ceiling on the size of the staff at the larger of institutions. This level is 8-9 professional staff and 10-12 clerical staff. These numbers hold true for all institutions over 10,000 students. For large campuses this has implications for expectations of continued staff growth. As increased
services and programs tend to indicate the need for more staff, other creative approaches may be necessary.

4. The level and type of involvement of faculty in the campus activities departments is essential. One of the current trends in higher education is to more fully involve the campus activities departments into the traditional academic curriculum. Providing out of classroom experiences to support the efforts in the traditional classroom has become an area of emphasis. To accomplish this obviously requires contact and involvement with faculty.

The study showed little involvement of faculty in support roles within the campus activities offices and in the traditional involvement role of faculty as student organizational advisors. Increased communication and contact with faculty must be nourished. In addition, collaborative relationships should be established to form partnerships in this newly defined area of service learning.

5. Technologies being used in the campus activities department are the types in the mainstream of contemporary business practice. Higher education is somewhat hesitant to spend limited resources to experiment with new types of office technology. The norm is to wait until it has been proven elsewhere, usually in the business community. Yet with changing student populations, communication with students is a primary concern and mission of the campus activities offices. The cutting-edge technologies currently
available are opening new channels of communication using new vehicles, yet they are not being used on many campuses. Campus-wide voice mail, e-mail, Internet Web pages, video teleconferencing, and other communication mediums are just beginning to be used on most campuses. This appears to be a problem and an area for improvement and growth.

**Recommendations**

Based on the conclusions cited in this chapter, the following recommendations are made for further research and study:

1. As the literature review demonstrated, campus activities are an important part of the educational process. Research and study to aid and improve this functional area of higher education is clearly justified and recommended.

2. The role of faculty in the campus activities office is unclear. As campus activities offices refine their mission and objectives, the closer integration into the pure educational mission of the institution is frequently the focus. The roles, types of involvement, and levels of involvement of faculty into the campus activities function merits further investigation.

3. Funding is an ongoing, critical issue for all areas of higher education. The survey indicated a limited scope of funding sources for campus activities offices. Activity fees were either the first or second most frequent funding source for both administrative/operational funding and for
student/leadership development funding. Activity fees appear to be the universal, basic source of funds in campus activities offices. The respondents also identified the following funding sources as their other primary funding sources: regular institutional funding, state appropriations, user fees, auxiliary services revenue. As funding for both private and state supported higher education becomes more difficult, and the competition for these limited funds increase, the need for other funding sources will grow. Further research on alternative funding sources is recommended.

4. The staffing pattern in all size institutions was indicated by preference of the pattern in which the head of the department is titled director of student activities or campus activities or student life. Additionally funding sources were limited and consistent across all size institutions. This relationship is one which should be studied to more fully identify and define any relationship between funding bases and staffing patterns.

5. Limited points and types of contact with the faculty were identified in the study, yet current literature and trends indicate that more collaborative relationships are needed. Research and study into ways these partnerships can be established and fostered should be conducted.

6. A study to identify if there is any relationship between the amount of funds spent on campus activities
functions and the student retention rate would provide substantive data on the value of student activities.

7. The institutions included in this study were master's level comprehensive I & II level schools. A replication of this study on other types of higher education institutions could provide interesting comparison data.

8. The survey indicated that only the more well established technologies are regularly used in campus activities offices. Research on the ways that new and developing technology can assist with the mission of the campus activities area is recommended. The funding and acquisition of the technology as well as insuring proper training are also important areas for research.
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APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER AND THANK YOU LETTER
TO EXPERT PANEL REVIEWERS
October 24, 1994

Tony R. Warner  
Doctoral Candidate  
1701 Woodridge Drive  
Johnson City, TN 37604

Dear:

Thank you for considering my request to review and edit the enclosed, self-developed, research instrument for my dissertation. I hope my study on current staffing patterns in campus activities departments at public, Carnegie Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II, throughout the United States, will contribute to the future growth of the profession as well as to the body of higher education literature.

As we discussed on the telephone, you were asked to serve as a juror because you are a recognized expert administrator in higher education. I am requesting that you review my research instrument for clarity, ease of reading, and face validity. Suggestions, additions, or deletions in all areas of the instrument are welcomed. Please edit the research instrument as you deem appropriate. All recommendations will be discussed with my major professor, Dr. W. Al Knight, and, will be considered for incorporation into the final edition of the research instrument.

I greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in the development and refinement of this research instrument. My goal is to have all reviewer's comments returned to me on or before Monday, November 7, 1994.

I realize that this is a hectic time of year for higher education professionals and I thank you for your time and interest in this research on our profession. Again, please feel free to make any suggestions for improvements you deem appropriate. I may be contacted to answer questions or concerns by telephone at 1-615-929-4335 or by fax at 615-929-6825.

Sincerely yours,

Tony R. Warner, Doctoral Candidate  
Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
November 17, 1994

Tony R. Warner
Doctoral Candidate
1701 Woodridge Drive
Johnson City, TN 37604

Name
Address
Address
City, ST 12345

Dear:

My purpose in writing you is twofold: (1) to thank you for reviewing my dissertation research instrument, and (2) to provide you with a copy of the revised research instrument. The improvements you suggested were excellent and I appreciate your doing so within in a limited period of time.

This research instrument will now be pilot tested with a limited number of institutions and then eventually mailed to public institutions classified as Carnegie Classification (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I and II. My goal is to complete the research study by December, 1994.

Again, thank you for your interest in this research and in the advancement of student affairs as a profession. Best wishes for the remainder of the fall semester and the new year.

Sincerely yours,

Tony R. Warner, Doctoral Candidate
Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX B

LISTING OF

EXPERT PANEL REVIEWERS
Listing of Expert Panel Reviewers

1. Dr. Sara Boatman, Professor
   Nebraska Wesleyan University
   Student Center
   50th & St. Paul
   Lincoln, NE 68504
   402/465-2388

2. Dr. Bill Brattain,
   Asst. VP for Student Life
   Western Illinois University
   University Union
   Macomb, IL 61455
   309/298-1986

3. Dr. Tom Matthews,
   State University of New York - Geneseo
   3369 Elm Road
   Geneseo, NY 14454-9701
   716/243-1241

4. Ms. Myra Morgan, Chairperson elect
   NACA Board of Directors
   Associate Director of Reitz Union
   University of Florida
   303 J. W. Reitz Union
   Gainesville, FL 32611-2042
   904/392-1674

5. Ms. Linda Picklesimmer, Chairperson
   NACA Board of Directors
   Director of Student Activities
   West Georgia College
   Student Activities
   Carrollton, GA 30118
   404/836-6526

6. Dr. John Watson,
   Director of Student Activities
   University of North Carolina-Greensboro
   Elliott University Center
   University of North Carolina-Charlotte
   Charlotte, NC 27412-5001
   919/334-5800
January 3, 1995

Tony R. Warner  
Doctoral Candidate  
1701 Woodridge Drive  
Johnson City, TN 37604

Name  
Address  
Address  
City, ST 12345

Dear:

Thank you for speaking with me on the telephone on January 4, 1995, concerning pilot testing my doctoral study research instrument. I realize how hectic a time a year this is on any college campus and I am appreciative that you will take the time to assist me in validating my survey instrument.

I have enclosed a copy of the research instrument. Any comments you have may be written on the instrument itself or on additional pages you attach. I am requesting that you:

1. I am particularly interested in your evaluations of the clarity, comprehensiveness, and face validity of the research instrument. Please suggest any information you feel should be added, reworded, or deleted;

2. Complete both the short demographic and research portions of the instrument; and

3. Return in the self addressed, postage paid envelope enclosed.

Your suggestions will be discussed with my major professor and, where appropriate, incorporated into the final instrument. My goal is to finalize the instrument no later than January 18, 1995.

I will be happy to mail you a copy of the results of my study. Best wishes for the Spring semester and for the new year. Please feel free to contact me, with any questions, at (615)929-4335 or fax me at (615)929-6825.

Sincerely yours,

Tony R. Warner, Doctoral Candidate  
Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
February 25, 1995

Tony R. Warner
Doctoral Candidate
1701 Woodridge Drive
Johnson City, TN 37604

Name
Address
Address
City, ST 12345

Dear:

Thank you for taking the time and effort to complete the pilot test of my instrument to be used in my dissertation. As University Center Director I am well aware of the number of surveys and questionnaires that we receive each week. The fact that you took the time to assist me by completing my instrument is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Tony R. Warner, Doctoral Candidate
Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University
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LISTING OF PILOT TEST PARTICIPANTS
Listing of Pilot Test Participants

Ms. Jeane Rellege-Caveness
Senior Director of Student Services
California State University at Long Beach
1250 Bell Blower Blvd.
Student Life & Development - USU 212
Long Beach, CA 90840

Mr. Rees Hughes
Director of Student Activities
Humboldt State University
214 Nelson Hall East
Arcata, CA 95521

Mr. John Drinkwater
Director of Student Activities
Central Washington University
Student Union Building #214
Ellensburg, WA 98926

Mr. Bill O'Dowd
Director of University Union
Southern Connecticut State University
501 Crescent Street
New Haven, CT 06515

Dr. Hillary Gold
Vice President for Campus Affairs
City University of New York, Brooklyn College
Boylan Hall, Room 2113
2900 Bedford Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11210

Ms. Mary Roberts
Office of Student Activities
University of the District of Columbia
4200 Connecticut Avenue
Bldg. #39, Room #202, Cubical #70
Washington, DC 20008

Ms. Jean Holt
Director of Student Activities
University of Central Florida
P. O. Box 163240, SC Room 203
Orlando, FL 32816

Mr. Ken Bumgardner
George Mason University
Mail Stop IC #2
Fairfax, VA 22030-2884
Ms. Daffney Singleton  
Director of Student Activities  
Northeast Louisiana University  
SUB 201  
Monroe, LA  71209

Ms. Jan Hannish  
Director of Student Activities  
University of Northern Iowa  
Maucker Union  
Cedar Falls, IA  50614-0167

Mr. David Emmons  
Director of Student Activities  
Southwest Missouri State University  
901 South National  
Springfield, MO  65804

Ms. Kathy Satrum  
Director, Kilcawley Center  
Youngstown State University  
Youngstown, OH  44555

Ms. Susan Thompson  
Director of Student Activities  
University of Central Oklahoma  
100 North University Drive  
Edmond, OK  73034

Mr. Bill Siedlecki  
Assoc. Director Memorial Student Union  
University of Wisconsin at Stout  
302 10th Avenue  
Menomonie, WI  54751
Institutions Surveyed by State

Alabama (11)
Alabama A & M University
Alabama State University
Auburn University-Montgomery
Jacksonville State University
Livingston University
Samford University
Spring Hill College
University of Mobile
University of Montevallo
University of North Alabama
University of South Alabama

Alaska (1)
University of Alaska-Anchorage

Arizona (0)
none

Arkansas (6)
Arkansas State University
Arkansas Tech University
Henderson State University
Southern Arkansas University
University of Arkansas-Little Rock
University of Central Arkansas

California (20)
Azusa Pacific University
Bakersfield College
California Lutheran University
California Polytechnic State University-
San Louis Obispo
California State Polytechnic University
California State University-Dominguez Hills
California State University-Fresno
California State University-Fullerton
California State University-Hayward
California State University-Los Angeles
California State University-Northridge
California State University-San Bernardino
California State University-San Marcos
California State University-Chico
Chapman University
Mount Saint Mary's College
San Jose State University
Sonoma State University
Santa Clara University
University of Redlands
Colorado (2)
Adams State College
University of Colorado-Colorado Springs

Connecticut (9)
Central Connecticut State University
Fairfield University
Southern Connecticut State University
Quinnipiac College
Sacred Heart University
Saint Joseph College
University of Hartford
University of New Haven
Western Connecticut State University

Delaware (0)
none

District of Columbia (0)
none

Florida (8)
Barry University
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University
Florida International University
Jacksonville University
Rollins College
Seton University
University of North Florida
University of West Florida

Georgia (12)
Armstrong State College
Augusta College
Berry College
Brenau University
Columbus College
Georgia College
Georgia Southern University
Kennesaw State College
Mercer University
North Georgia College
Valdosta State College
West Georgia College

Hawaii (1)
University of Honolulu

Idaho (1)
Boise State University
Illinois (14)
- Aurora University
- Bradley University
- College of St. Francis
- Eastern Illinois University
- Illinois Benedictine College
- Lewis University
- Northeastern Illinois University
- Rockford College
- Rosary College
- Roosevelt University
- Saint Xavier University
- Sangamon State University
- Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville
- Western Illinois University

Indiana (9)
- Butler University
- Indiana University-Kokomo
- Indiana University-Northwest
- Indiana University-South Bend
- Indiana University-Southeast
- Purdue University-Calumet
- Saint Francis College
- University of Evansville
- Valparaiso University

Iowa (2)
- Drake University
- St. Ambrose University

Kansas (5)
- Baker University
- Emporia State University
- Fort Hays State University
- Pittsburgh State University
- Washburn University

Kentucky (8)
- Bellarmine College
- Cumberland College
- Eastern Kentucky University
- Kentucky State University
- Morehead State University
- Murray State University
- Northern Kentucky University
- Spalding University

Louisiana (9)
- Centenary College of Louisiana
- Louisiana State University-Shreveport
- Loyola University of New Orleans
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Nicholls State University
Northeast Louisiana University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern University and A&M College
Southern University at New Orleans

Maine (2)
University of New England
University of Southern Maine

Maryland (6)
Frostburg State University
Hood College
Loyola College in Maryland
Salisbury State University
Towson State University
University of Baltimore

Massachusetts (16)
American International College
Assumption College
Bridgewater State College
Curry College
Emmanuel College
Emmerson College
Fitchburg State College
Framingham State College
Suffolk University
Salem State College
Simmons College
Springfield College
University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth
Western New England College
Westfield State College
Worcester State College

Michigan (11)
Aquinas College
Calvin College
Central Michigan University
Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State University
Grand Valley State University
Lake Superior State University
University of Michigan-Dearborn
Northern Michigan University
Oakland University
Saginaw Valley State University
Minnesota (9)
  Bemidji State University
  College of Saint Catherine
  College of Saint Scholastica
  Mankato State University
  Saint Cloud State University
  Saint Mary's College
  University of Minnesota-Duluth
  University of Saint Thomas
  Winona State University

Mississippi (1)
  Delta State University

Missouri (10)
  Avila College
  Central Missouri State University
  Drury College
  Lincoln University
  Maryville University
  Northeast Missouri State University
  Northwest Missouri State University
  Rockhurst College
  Southeast Missouri State University
  Webster University

Montana (none)

Nebraska (5)
  Creighton University
  Chadron State College
  University of Nebraska-Kearney
  University of Nebraska-Omaha
  Wayne State College

Nevada (1)
  University of Nevada-Las Vegas

New Hampshire (3)
  Keene State College
  Plymouth State College
  Rivier College

New Jersey (8)
  Kean College of New Jersey
  Montclair State College
  Monmouth College
  Rowan College of New Jersey
  Rutgers University-Camden
  Saint Peter's College
  Trenton State College
  William Paterson College
New Mexico (2)
  Eastern New Mexico University
  Western New Mexico University

New York (26)
  Alfred University
  Canisius College
  College of New Rochelle
  Elmira College
  Iona College
  Ithaca College
  Long Island University-CW Post Campus
  Long Island University-Southampton
  Manhattan College
  Marist College
  Niagara University
  Nazareth College of Rochester
  Pace University-Pleasantville/Briarcliff
  Queens College
  Rochester Institute of Technology
  Russell Sage College
  Saint Bonaventure University
  Saint John Fisher College
  State University of New York-Brockport
  State University of New York-Cortland
  State University of New York-Fredonia
  State University of New York-Geneseo
  State University of New York-Institute of Technology at Utica/Rome
  State University of New York-Oneonta
  State University of New York-The College of New Paltz
  Wagner College

North Carolina (14)
  Appalachian State University
  Campbell University
  East Carolina University
  Elon College
  Gardner-Webb University
  Lenoir-Rhyne College
  North Carolina A & T State University
  North Carolina Central University
  Pembroke State University
  Pfeiffer College
  Queens College
  University of North Carolina-Charlotte
  University of North Carolina-Wilmington
  Western Carolina University

North Dakota (1)
  Minot State University
Ohio (11)
Ashland University
Baldwin-Wallace College
Capital University
College of Mount St. Joseph
John Carroll University
Lake Erie College
University of Dayton
University of Franciscan-Stubenville
Walsh University
Xavier University
Youngstown State University

Oklahoma (3)
East Central University
Northeastern State University
Phillips University

Oregon (4)
Linfield College
Southern Oregon State College
University of Portland
Western Oregon State College

Pennsylvania (28)
Beaver College
Bloomsburg University
Cabrini College
California University of Pennsylvania
Chestnut Hill College
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
College Misericordia
East Stroudsburg University
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Gannon University
Gwynedd-Mercy College
Kutztown University
La Roche College
La Salle University
Mansfield University
Marywood College
Pennsylvania State University, Behrend College
Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science
Saint Francis College
Saint Joseph's University
Shippensburg University
Slippery Rock University
University of Scranton
West Chester University
Widener University
Wilkes University
Villanova University

Rhode Island (2)
Rhode Island College
Salve Regina University

South Carolina (5)
College of Charleston
Converse College
Francis Marion University
Lander College
Winthrop University

South Dakota (2)
Northern State University
South Dakota State University

Tennessee (8)
Austin Peay State University
Belemont University
Christian Brother's University
East Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
Tusculum College
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga
University of Tennessee-Martin

Texas (23)
Angelo State University
East Texas State University
Incarnate Word College
Midwestern State University
Our Lady of the Lake University
Saint Edward's University
Saint Mary's University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Sul Ross State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A & M University-Kingsville
Texas A & M University- Corpus Christi
Texas Wesleyan University
Trinity University
University of Houston
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
University of Texas-El Paso
University of Texas-Pan American
University of Texas-Permian Basin
University of Texas-San Antonio
University of Texas-Tyler
Utah (2)
   Weber State University
   Westminster College

Vermont (3)
   Castleton State College
   Norwich University
   Saint Michael's College

Virginia (9)
   Averett College
   James Madison University
   Longwood College
   Lynchburg College
   Mary Washington College
   Marymount University
   Radford University
   Shenandoah University
   University of Richmond

Washington (5)
   Eastern Washington University
   Gonzaga University
   Pacific Lutheran University
   Saint Martin's College
   Western Washington University

West Virginia (3)
   Marshall University
   University of Charleston
   Wheeling Jesuit College

Wisconsin (14)
   Carthage College
   Edgewood College
   Marian College
   University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
   University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
   University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
   University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
   University of Wisconsin-Parkside
   University of Wisconsin-Platteville
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls
   University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
   University of Wisconsin-Stout
   University of Wisconsin-Superior
   University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Wyoming (0)
   none
March 21, 1995

Tony R. Warner  
Doctoral Candidate  
1701 Woodridge Drive  
Johnson City, TN 37604

Dear Colleague,

As the Director of a University Center/Student Union facility, with 21 years of experience in the campus activities profession, I have often struggled with the lack of detailed information on the staffing and structure of our offices around the country. Often important administrative decisions are made based on what we think is happening nationally, or based on the situation at nearby institutions. As a doctoral candidate, I have decided to do my dissertation research on the area of campus activities staffing patterns and organizational structure. Your institution was selected to be a part of this study based upon its Carnegie Commission classification and membership in the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA).

My dissertation study will address the staffing patterns in campus activities' offices which are continuously changing due to reorganizations, mission changes, funding difficulties, and other such factors. The objectives of my study will the identification of: (1) the various staffing patterns now in use in campus activities offices; (2) the most frequently occurring patterns; and (3) recurring relationships between institutional type and certain staffing patterns.

It is hoped the study can become a proactive management tool for those administrators in higher education who are structuring or restructuring administrative offices supporting the campus activities functions at institutions of higher education. I would appreciate your completing the survey and returning it in the enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope. Your response to the survey is crucial to the success of this study. If desired, I will be glad to send you a summary of the results of the study when it is completed. Simply indicate 'yes' to that question on the survey.

Please return the survey by April 7th. Your assistance is truly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Tony R. Warner,
Doctoral Candidate
# Instructions for completing this instrument
- Please carefully read and fully complete each section with the most appropriate answer. Completion of this survey is voluntary.

## Part I - Size and Type of Office Staff
Indicate the number of persons meeting each descriptive criteria in the most appropriate categories below. Do not list any individual more than once or in more than one place on the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Professional Staff</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Support/Clerical Staff</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Support of Office or Student Organizations by Faculty/Instructor</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Educational Background (highest degree held)
- with doctoral degrees
- with master's degrees
- with bachelor's degrees

## Part II - Staffing Pattern
Insert the titles of the staff within your campus/student activities department [attach a separate sheet if necessary]. If any titles need an explanation of function, please attach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of department head</th>
<th>Title(s) of additional professional staff (in order of rank)</th>
<th>Title(s) of additional support staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Part III - Organizational Structure

To what office or division (not individual) does the campus activities department report? Please check the appropriate responses.

President/Chancellor
President for Student Affairs
Dean of Students Life
University Center/Student Union
Dean of Student Life
Assoc/Ass. Vice President/Dean

Other

Part IV - Funding Base

This part has two sections: (1) administrative/operational and (2) programming/leadership development.

If your organization has a combined administrative/programming budget, then complete Section One only and skip Section Two.

--- Section One

Indicate, in the space provided, the letter code for the dollar range of the sources from which all or part of your student campus activities administrative/operational budget(s) is derived.

A — none
B — $25,000 or less
C — $25,001 — $50,000
D — $50,001 — $75,000
E — $75,001 — $100,000
F — $100,001 — $150,000
G — $150,001 — $200,000
H — $200,001 — $250,000
I — $250,001 — $300,000
J — over $300,000

Primary Funding Sources for Administrative Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Funding Sources for Administrative Budget

1. Direct state appropriations
2. Regular institutional budgets
3. Standardized activity fees
4. User fees (tickets, subscriptions)
5. Grants
6. Institution's Foundation resources
7. Revenues from programming or fund-raising projects
8. Auxiliary enterprises
9. Other

--- Section Two

Indicate in the space provided the letter code for the dollar range of the sources from which all or part of your campus student activities programming/leadership development budget(s) is derived.

A — none
B — $25,000 or less
C — $25,001 — $50,000
D — $50,001 — $75,000
E — $75,001 — $100,000
F — $100,001 — $150,000
G — $150,001 — $200,000
H — $200,001 — $250,000
I — $250,001 — $300,000
J — over $300,000

Primary Funding Sources for Programming/Leadership Development Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Funding Sources for Programming/Leadership Development Budget

1. Direct state appropriations
2. Regular institutional budgets
3. Standardized activity fees
4. Student activity fees (tickets, subscriptions)
5. Grants
6. Institution's Foundation resources
7. Revenues from programming or fund-raising projects
8. Auxiliary enterprises
9. Other

Part V - Technology

Please indicate which types of equipment and/or services are used within the campus activities department. Please check the appropriate responses.

1. Desktop/Laptop Computers
2. Campus-wide Computer Network
3. Fax Machine
4. Electronic Mail
5. Teleconferencing
6. Personal Pager
7. Desktop Publishing
8. Dept 2-Way Radio
9. Dept. Video Equipment
10. Dept Audio Equipment
11. Automated Ticketing
12. Electronic I.D. Card System
13. Cellular Phone
14. Other

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX G

RESPONDENTS BY STATE
## Respondents by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of ST</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>355</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

SIX GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS
ESTABLISHED FOR RESPONSE ANALYSIS
### Six Geographical Regions
Established for Response Analysis

#### Region 1 - Northeast
- CT - Connecticut
- DE - Delaware
- MA - Massachusetts
- MD - Maryland
- ME - Maine
- NH - New Hampshire
- NJ - New Jersey
- NY - New York
- OH - Ohio
- PA - Pennsylvania
- RI - Rhode Island
- VT - Vermont

#### Region 2 - Southeast
- FL - Florida
- GA - Georgia
- KY - Kentucky
- MS - Mississippi
- NC - North Carolina
- SC - South Carolina
- TN - Tennessee
- VA - Virginia
- WV - West Virginia

#### Region 3 - North Central
- IA - Iowa
- IL - Illinois
- IN - Indiana
- MI - Michigan
- MN - Minnesota
- ND - North Dakota
- NE - Nebraska
- SD - South Dakota
- WI - Wisconsin

#### Region 4 - South Central
- AL - Alabama
- AR - Arkansas
- KS - Kansas
- LA - Louisiana
- MO - Missouri
- OK - Oklahoma
- TX - Texas

#### Region 5 - Northwest
- AK - Alaska
- ID - Idaho
- MT - Montana
- OR - Oregon
- WA - Washington
- WY - Wyoming

#### Region 6 - Southwest
- AZ - Arizona
- CA - California
- CO - Colorado
- HI - Hawaii
- NM - New Mexico
- NV - Nevada
- UT - Utah
APPENDIX I
RESPONSES BY SIX GEOGRAPHICAL REGIONS
Responses by Six Geographical Regions

The states were divided into 6 logical, geographical regions with the following results:

Northeast . . 114 mailed . 78 returned . 68.4% response rate
Southeast . . 68 mailed . 57 returned . 83.8% response rate
North Central 67 mailed . 56 returned . 83.6% response rate
South Central 67 mailed . 52 returned . 77.6% response rate
Northwest . . 11 mailed . 7 returned . 63.6% response rate
Southwest . . 28 mailed . 19 returned . 67.9% response rate

Total . . . . 355 mailed . 269 returned 75.8% response rate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Operational Funding Base</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 State Appropriations</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regular Institutional Budgets</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Activity Fees</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 User Fees</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Foundation Resources</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Specialized Fees</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Revenues</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

STUDENT LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FUNDING BASES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Operational Funding Base</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State Appropriations</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Regular Institutional Budgets</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Activity Fees</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 User Fees</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Foundation Resources</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Specialized Fees</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Revenues</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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