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The National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association’s (NIRSA) collaboration with the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education and in the publication of Learning Reconsidered II provides impetus for collegiate recreational sports professionals to join the community of educators in providing a learning rich environment in which to educate the whole student. This study examined various personal, institutional and organizational attributes affecting a recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance, application, and satisfaction with the CAS standards for recreational sports. The study also identified potential sources of awareness and perceived barriers to the use of the standards. A survey consisting of 12 demographic and 76 scaled questions was distributed to recreational sports directors \(N=571\) from four-year colleges and universities that are members of the NIRSA. A total of \(n=400\) directors responded to the study for a 70% response rate. Data were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples \(t\)-tests. Results indicated recreational sports directors that were members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) or American
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CHAPTER ONE

“We have come to understand that learning is far more rich and complicated than some of our predecessors realized when they distinguished and separated learning from student life” (Learning Reconsidered, 2004, p. 5)

Introduction

The National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association’s (NIRSA) collaboration in the publication of Learning Reconsidered II and with the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education places collegiate recreation professionals at a crossroads; either continue down the path of simply providing recreational sport activities and services or join with other student service professionals in focusing their efforts on student development and learning (Keeling, 2006). Learning Reconsidered II and its predecessor Learning Reconsidered, as well as other publications and position statements dating back to 1993, provide a rationale for focusing on learning throughout all aspects of the college experience. The standards established by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education provide guidelines and direction for collegiate recreation professionals to join the community of educators in providing a learning rich environment in which to educate the whole student (Dean, 2006).

The journey towards a learning focus in recreational sports began in 1994 when the NIRSA, the professional organization for recreational sports professionals, published a position statement regarding the Rationale for Independent Administration of Collegiate Recreational Sports Programs (Bryant, Anderson, & Dunn, 1994). The purpose of the statement was to add validity to the concept of relocating recreational sports programs
away from their historic roots within intercollegiate athletic and/or academic physical education programs to some type of independent administrative structure. *Rationale for independent administration of collegiate recreational sports program* revealed that the predominant organizational location of recreational sports programs was student affairs (Bryant, et al. 1994) and not in physical education and intercollegiate athletic departments where the focus had been on sport service opportunities for the general student populations (Bryant, et al., 1994; Rudolph, 1990). *Rationale* did not identify any preferred organizational location, but emphasized the importance of “student leadership development, appreciation of differences, group development, self discipline, conflict resolution skills and safety awareness” (Bryant, et al., 1994, p.1). These elements provide a common foundation between collegiate recreation and student affairs programs.

*Athletic Business*, a leading vendor publication for sport, conducted a survey of 993 recreational sports directors to determine the predominant organizational location of college recreation programs (Cohen, 1995). A total of 288 directors or 29% responded to the survey, which revealed the three primary organizational locations for recreational sports programs were student affairs/student services, academics, and intercollegiate athletics. The results were differentiated somewhat by geographic region and institutional size with 46% of small and 65% of large institutions ascribing to the student affairs model. The next most prevalent reporting structure, with 14% of small and 31% of large schools, was intercollegiate athletic programs. The academic programs had 6% of small and 12% of large schools using this reporting structure. Thirty four of the respondents were unsatisfied with their reporting lines. Of these directors, 59% indicated a desire to report to student affairs and 21% revealed a desire to report to business affairs.
A minimal shift of organizational location for student affairs aligned organizations occurred in the ten years between 1992 and 2002 (Schneider, Steir, Kampf, Haines, & Wilding, 2005). Their study of NIRSA recreational sports directors from 682 colleges and universities located in the United States and Canada had a 39% return rate and revealed 62% of recreational sports programs were located in student affairs, 24% in intercollegiate athletics, and 6% in academics. The most significant change in reporting structure between the 1992 and 2002 was the drop from 16% to 6% of the programs reporting to academic units.

The prevalence of student affairs based recreational sports programs raises issues of program purpose and focus. Student affairs based programs like those at Auburn University, James Madison University, and the Ohio State University suggest a program focus on holistic student development and learning as this is the primary focus of student affairs (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998; Nuss, 2003; Dunn & Forney, 2004).

The concept of student development and learning in recreational sports is supported by a variety of professional statements and collaborations with other higher education related professional associations. In 1996, the NIRSA asserted seven primary goals for inclusion into the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Professional Standards for Higher Education. The statements: “to provide value to participants by helping individuals develop and maintain a positive self image, stronger social interactive skills, enhanced physical fitness and good mental health” as well as “to provide extracurricular education opportunities through participation in recreational sports and the provision of relevant leadership positions” (Miller, 2003, p. 247) speak directly to the member driven organization’s commitment to the concepts of student development.
Specific standards outlined in the recreational sports section of the CAS standards include student learning and development and establishes several areas of individual maturation (p. 285). These areas include intellectual growth, effective communication, enhanced self-esteem, realistic self-appraisal, clarified values, career choices, leadership development, healthy behavior, meaningful interpersonal relationships, independence, collaboration, social responsibility, satisfying and productive lifestyles, appreciating diversity, spiritual awareness and personal educational goals as important characteristics of student development (Dean, 2006).

The NIRSA activities that support student development and learning are manifested through committee work, including the development and implementation of a national registry for recreational sports professionals, the NIRSA/CAS recreational sports standards project and the curriculum work team (NIRSA, 2006a). The national registry project was developed by a task force of seasoned recreational sports professionals and serves to identify, encourage, guide and recognize purposeful professional development for recreational sports professionals. The tasking statement cites student development and student development theory among an array of valued topics (D. Corrington, personnel communication, October 2006). The NIRSA/CAS recreational sports standards project team is tasked with recommending revisions to the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards (1996) and to combine those standards with standards in the CAS Book of Professional Standards for Higher Education (K. Bayless, personnel communication, January 26, 2007). The curriculum work team is developing standards for undergraduate and graduate academic preparation and conducting a research project of recreational
sports professionals to determine key skills and knowledge necessary in the field of collegiate recreation (W. Sells, personnel communication, September 2006).

There is a paradigm shift (Covey, 1989; Kuhn, as cited in Healy, 2006) for the field of collegiate recreation which is manifested by recent collaboration between the NIRSA and other student affairs service professional associations in the publication of *Learning Reconsidered II* and its accompanying website. This focus on student development and learning provides the backdrop and impetus for this study. While the NIRSA diligently works to develop professional standards, professional preparation curriculum and professional development opportunities, the empirical study of standards for recreational sports professionals, particularly in the area of student learning appears to be non-existent. This study begins to fill the void and provides the basis for a more directed and scholarly approach to developing the profession.

*Statement of the Problem*

This study addressed differences in the awareness, perceived importance, application, and satisfaction of CAS standards for recreational sports by various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports directors. The following specific null-hypotheses are:

**HO<sub>1</sub>:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by professional affiliation;

**HO<sub>2</sub>:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by organizational report lines;

**HO<sub>3</sub>:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by academic preparation;
HO4: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on professional affiliation;

HO5: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on organizational location;

HO6: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on academic preparation;

HO7: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards based on their professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO8: There are no significant differences in a recreation director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by organizational report lines;

HO9: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by academic preparation.

HO10: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO11: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines;

HO12: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation;
HO\textsubscript{13}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s affiliation with other professional organizations.

HO\textsubscript{14}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s organizational location.

HO\textsubscript{15}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s academic preparation.

HO\textsubscript{16}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO\textsubscript{17}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines;

HO\textsubscript{18}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation;

\textit{Purpose of the Study}

The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports directors and their awareness, perceived importance, application, and satisfaction with CAS standards for recreational sports, and to identify potential sources of awareness and perceived barriers to the use of the standards.
A profession is a distinct form of employment with unique requirements for expertise, extensive academic preparation, commitment, and social responsibility and seeks to regulate itself through a consistent knowledge base of its practitioners (Cogan, 1953). This is accomplished by developing a system to ensure the transmission of that knowledge and skill (Wise, 2005). Standards, which are essential to both individual and overall success of a profession (Wise, 2005; DiGiacamo, 2004), are deemed important enough by the NIRSA to warrant a standing committee and participation in the CAS standards for student services areas within higher education (NIRSA, 2005d). This study is unique in that it fills the void for standards research, particularly in the areas related to student employment and learning in the field of recreational sports.

The concepts of student development and learning are essential for student affairs programs (Evans, et al., 1999; Keeling, 2004; Komives, Woodward & Associates, 2003). The fact that over 62% of all recreational sports programs are organizationally housed within a student affairs operation (Schneider et al., 2005; Bryant; 2000, Cohen, 1995) coupled with the commitment to student learning through the NIRSA mission, standards and statements suggests knowledge of student development and learning by recreational sports professionals is essential. As was the case with standards research, there is a lack of empirical studies related to student development and learning within recreational sports programs. This study appears to be the first of its kind to investigate collegiate recreation professional’s awareness, application, perceived importance and satisfaction of student development and learning standards.

Several committees and work groups within the NIRSA are working on curriculum to support the preparation of collegiate professionals. William Sells, retired
Director of Intramural and Club Sports at Ohio University, past president of the NIRSA and curriculum committee chair-person indicates the curriculum committee is tasked with making recommendations and suggestions, to academic units, regarding content and skills for preparing aspiring collegiate recreation professionals (W. Sells, personal communication, September, 2006). Dennis Corrington, Director of Recreational Sports at Texas A&M, past president of the NIRSA and chair-person of the professional registry committee indicted his committee is tasked with developing content areas for professional development of current NIRSA members and student members to enhance skills and knowledge of existing recreational sports professionals (D. Corrington, personal communication, October 2006). Several experienced recreational sports professionals, including Benjamin White, Bob Barcelona, Cher Harris, Danell Haines, Dian Belz, Douglas Franklin, Sarah Hardin, Elizabeth Davis, Erin Rausch, Gary Pogarian, Gerald Fain, Ian McGregor, Jennifer Gudaz, Johnathon Hart, Joshua Norris, Kathryn Bayless, Lisa Stuppy, Mila Padgett, Nancy Rapp, Nicole Olmeda, Paul Milton, and Vicki Highstreet, have been involved in developing Essentials in Recreational Sports which will be published in 2007 and will serve as a textbook for students majoring in the field of recreational sports (M. Callender, personnel communication, November, 11, 2006).

The common bond for all of these efforts is a commitment to professional preparation which is stifled by a lack of empirical research. In an effort to provide guidance for the development of standards and curriculum for new professionals and development opportunities for existing professionals, this study suggests differences in
academic preparation, and degree attainment play a role in the awareness, application and of professional standards.

Finally, the NIRSA/CAS Recreational Sports General Standards Project is currently reviewing the professional standards for recreational sports. The committee undertook the challenge of reviewing the NIRSA General Standards and the CAS professional standards for recreational sports in order to provide a single comprehensive set of standards for the profession. (K. Bayless, personal communication, September 5, 2006). This study is broad enough in scope to generalize recreational sports directors awareness, perceived importance, application and satisfaction of the CAS standards, and reveals the impact of specific findings relative to the effect academic preparation, degree attainment, organizational location and professional affiliation has on those variables.

Significance of the Study

Recent job announcements for entry level positions in recreational sports programs, Appendix B, provide examples of the growing importance for the knowledge of and ability to apply student development and learning outcomes in collegiate recreation programs. A common theme in these announcements is that in addition to the more typical requirements of facility scheduling and sports programming, successful candidates will possess knowledge of student development theories and current practices. The knowledge of student development theory and the ability to implement these theories in practice is critical to student affairs professionals and undergirds the CAS standards (Burkard, Cole, Ott & Stoflet, 2005; Hamrick, Evans & Schuh, 2002; McEwen, 2003; Strayhorn, 2006).
The organizational location of recreational sports programs to student affairs operations (Bryant, 1994; Cohen, 1995; Mowery, 2000; Schneider, et al., 2005) reinforces the importance of recreation professionals having knowledge of and the ability to apply student development and learning theories in order to maximize the impact of their programs. The NIRSA has demonstrated a desire to enhance its relationship between recreational sports and student affairs professionals, and higher education as a whole through its participation in the CAS standards (1996), Learning Reconsidered II (2006) and as a member of the Council of Higher Education Management Associations (CHEMA) (2005). The importance of student development and learning in student service organizations, including recreational sports, is reinforced through the development of standards and outcomes (Miller, 2003) and in the publication of Learning Reconsidered II. Key questions for the NIRSA membership and informed by this study are, (a.) to what extent are recreational sports aware of the CAS standards, (b.) how do they gain awareness of the standards, (c.) how do they perceive the standards (d.) to what extent do they apply the standards, (e.) are they satisfied with standards related to student development and learning, particularly for student employees and (f.) what barriers preclude the use of the standards?

The NIRSA also recognizes the importance of empirical research to inform curriculum development for aspiring collegiate recreational sports professionals, development opportunities for those working in the field, and standards development (National Research Institute for College Recreational Sports & Wellness, 2007). Much of the existing curriculum is designed around a sports management or recreational sports model (Barcelona, 2001; Jamieson & Toh, 2001; Jamieson, 1990; Milton, 2002). The
primary focus of the recreational sport management model is sports related theory and foundations, programming and business, administrative procedures and communication (Barcelona, 2001). Absent from Barcelona’s competency-based model for academic and professional development (2001) or within the preceding studies (Jamieson, 1980; Toh as cited in Barcelona, 2001), was the aspect of student development and learning. A Delphi Study of 104 mid- and senior-level student affairs administrators indicated the need for the knowledge of student development theories by entry-level student affairs professionals, including intramural and recreational facilities coordinators (Burkard et al., 2005). Ultimately this study’s outcome will inform curriculum for academic programs in preparing new collegiate recreational sports professionals as well as provide professional development guidance for those current NIRSA professionals, with an inadequate knowledge and understanding of standards related to student development and learning.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

Delimitations

A key delimitation of this study is the selection of recreational sports directors from four-year college and university campuses that are members of the NIRSA. This group was selected because of its predominant focus on providing services to traditional aged undergraduate students on residential campuses. Collegiate recreational professionals employed at two year schools were purposefully omitted from the study due to the predominance of non-traditional age students attending those schools and the lack of a practical residential component. The results of this study should not be construed to be applicable for all collegiate recreational sports professionals.
Limitations

The primary academic preparation for recreational sports directors is a master’s degree in one of the health, physical education, and recreation or sport fields (Milton, 2002). This academic preparation limits a common vocabulary about student development and learning and is exacerbated by the fact that while the NIRSA is the best representative body of collegiate recreational sports professionals, the organization represents only 40% of the nation’s colleges and universities (Cohen, 2001).

The relative newness of the field and the disparate reporting structures associated with program administration creates different missions and purpose. Academic and athletic based programs, disconnected from their student affairs counterparts, may not be privy to a student development focus. The business and service or experiential learning aspects of some programs may also override the interest in and focus on student development.

Application of student development and learning is self reported and it is beyond the capability of this study or of the researcher to ascertain if the outcomes are applied to the level in which the study participants are reporting.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this research study and are clarified to provide a common vocabulary and framework for discussion.

Recreational Sports: A term describing a program of recreational activities on a college or university campus, military, correctional or secondary institution with the purpose of administering recreational and sport related facilities and programming for a unique clientele (NIRSA, 2006b).
Recreational sports/Collegiate recreation professional: A person working within campus recreation or recreational Sports program (NIRSA, 2006b).

Learning: “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development… a complex, holistic, multi-centric activity that occurs throughout and across the college experience” (Keeling, 2004, p 4).

National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA): the primary professional organization for collegiate recreational professionals (NIRSA, 2006b)

Student development: Theories and actions related to the psychosocial, cognitive, moral growth, race and involvement of college students (Evans, et al., 1998, p. 3; Hamrick et al, 2002, p. 31).

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into five chapters, a reference section and appendices.

Chapter One provides an introduction to the problem and some background information regarding the relationship between recreational sports and student affairs and the rationale for the importance of standards for a professional organization. This chapter includes the statement of the problem, purpose and significance of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study, definition of terms and the organization of the study.

Chapter Two provides a review of the literature and identifies existing studies and information related to the study. The flow of the information begins with a general discussion of the conceptual framework of professions, and the importance of standards, including the CAS Standards related to student affairs and specifically in recreational sports. A brief discussion of the fields of recreational sports and student affairs, including their history, stated purposes, professional organizations, and relevant academic
disciplines follow. The importance of student development and learning, and its relevance to student affairs, and in particular, to recreational sports follows. Because the primary focus of the study is on standards associated to learning outcomes related to student employment, a brief survey of literature related to student employment, experiential learning and informal learning is also provided. A description and statement of relevance of the dependent and independent variables completes the chapter.

Chapter Three describes the methodology used in the study. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-tests were used to assess the differences in the dependent variables of awareness, perceived importance, application and satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning by the independent variables of personal, institutional and preparation attributes of recreational sports professionals. Frequencies and descriptive analysis was used to determine the sources of awareness to the standards and the barriers to the use of the standards. The population is identified and a discussion of how the instrument was developed and distributed is provided. This section also includes a brief discussion of how the instrument was developed and the pilot study used to ensure validity and reliability of the final instrument. Data collection procedures and data analysis, including the general null-hypothesis and the sub-hypotheses, are located in this chapter.

Chapter Four presents the data analysis and findings. The data is presented in text, tabular and graphic form and follows the order of the research questions and the null-hypotheses.

Chapter Five includes the summary, conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions are contrasted with research studies identified in the review of the literature.
Recommendations include application for practice, research and action items for the NIRSA, its curriculum, professional development and standards committees, and institutions of higher education currently providing professional preparation for future recreational sports professionals.

A reference section citing the literature reviewed and utilized in this study is provided. Appendices include the CAS standards and guidelines, example job announcements, a cover letter to participants, survey instrument, a follow-up survey and letter to participants and appendix tables related to the data collected.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

“To become an able and successful man in any profession, three things are necessary, nature, study and practice.” Henry Ward Beecher, 1813-1887 (Quotations Page, 2005)

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance, application and satisfaction of Council for the Advancement of Standards for Higher Education (CAS) standards related to student learning outcomes for student employees in recreational sports programs. This chapter provides relevant information and research related to professionalism and standards, and how they relate to the fields of collegiate recreational sports and student affairs. Supportive topics include student learning, informal and experiential learning, and student employment, as they relate to the study. The flow of the information begins with a general discussion of the conceptual framework of professions, the importance of standards, and specifically, the CAS Standards related to student affairs in general and specifically in recreational sports. A brief discussion of the fields of recreational sports and student affairs, including their history, stated purposes, professional organizations, and relevant academic disciplines is followed by information relative to student learning, and its relevance to student affairs, particularly in recreational sports. Because the primary focus of the study is on standards associated to learning outcomes related to student employment, a brief survey of literature related to student employment, experiential learning and informal learning is provided.
Professions

“…professions are intellectual in character; for in all intellectual operations, the thinker takes upon himself a risk.” Abraham Flexner (Flexner, 1915 p.154)

Early discussions of professions can be traced to Abraham Flexner’s address to the National Conference on Charities and Corrections regarding the question of whether social work was a profession. Flexner’s essay is the first document to discuss the elements of a profession and formed the basis for most future positions, opinions, and research regarding professions (Iwabuchi, 2004). In answering the question, Flexner (1915) provides the following criteria: professions are essentially intellectual operations with large individual responsibility; derive raw material from science and learning; work up to a practical and definite end; possess an educationally communicable technique, self-organize; and are increasingly altruistic in motivation. Flexner took the position that neither social work nor business related occupations or vocations, would qualify as a profession. The debate as to what constitutes a profession went on throughout the 20th century with others providing more flexible views.

Cogan (1953), addressing the business community, suggested that a profession is cyclical and stressed the continuing influence practice has on the theoretical foundations of the discipline. Cogan also indicates that a profession serves the vital needs of man, requires an ethical base, and provides altruistic service.

In the social transformation of medicine, Starr (1982) suggests a profession is a self-regulating occupation based on technical specialized knowledge, requiring systematic training through collegial discipline which focuses on service rather than profit. Parsons (1968), in writing of professionalism in the social sciences, indicates a
profession is distinguished by core criteria including intellectually based technical training which leads to the development of skills and the means to ensure that professional competence is used for the social good. Feeg (2001) suggests a profession is a “calling, vocation or form of employment that provides a needed service to society and possesses characteristics of expertise, autonomy, long academic preparation, commitment and responsibility” (p. 220). He also suggests thoughts, attitudes, and actions, buttressed by philosophies of altruism, idealism or goodness, constitute professional behavior in service professions.

DiGiacomo, (2004) in writing about professionalizing physical therapists, suggests the link between societal benefits and responsibilities, and suggests professionals apply evidence, advocate and adhere to a code of ethical behavior, and standards of practice. Wise (2005), in discussing teaching, suggests a profession is an occupation that seeks to regulate itself through consensus of practitioner knowledge through accreditation and licensure, also known as standards, to ensure the transmission of that knowledge and skill. He suggests an occupation becomes a profession when outside entities such as institutions of higher education, governments, and the public, in general, accept that system.

Standards

“Once a standard takes hold, people start to focus on the quality of what they are doing as opposed to how they are doing it.” Thomas L. Friedman from The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century (Friedman, 2006, p. 83)

A standard is something established by authority, custom or general consent as a model or example; something set up and established by authority as a rule for the
measure of quantity, value or quality. Standards related to professions are linked to Flexner’s 1910 report, *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* where the lack of standards for the professional schools is cited as the cause of problems in medical education (Flexner, 1910; Iwabuchi, 2004). In his report, Flexner calls for the development of more rigorous entrance requirements and a standardization of the curriculum for medical education.

Standards and best practice have become the foundations of many professional fields. The American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) sets the standards for certifying professionals involved in health and fitness programs in clinical applications as well as for the management of fitness facilities (ACSM, 1997). The Medical Fitness Association develops standards to shape and foster the growth of the medical fitness industry (Herbert, 2006). McGhee, (1986) cited the importance of professional standards for therapeutic recreation educators as part of a cluster of competencies. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2006) identifies standards and benchmarks for teacher education programs. In reflecting the progression of the recreation management discipline toward professionalism, the American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration for the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) developed standards based on input from practitioners and educators to allow agencies to measure effectiveness and efficiency in meeting leisure and recreation needs of its constituents (Riley, Gaskill, & Weiss, 2002). Lewis, Barcelona, and Jones (2001) suggest there is no conclusive method to assess the recreational sports profession without a viable assessment methodology, which would be based on standard knowledge.
Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education

The first Council for the Advancement of Standards and Guidelines was published in 1986 and addressed nineteen functional areas of higher education programs related to student services including standards for academic programs related to student affairs preparation (Nuss, 2003). The publication provides “a comprehensive and valid set of criteria to judge support program quality and effectiveness” (p. 3) by setting best practice standards. Student learning standards are found in the program section of the general and specific standards for each area. The statement “each program and service must incorporate student learning and student development in its mission and must enhance the overall educational enterprise” (p. 18) emphasizes the importance of student learning in recreational sports.

Early research regarding the CAS standards focused largely on the Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) and his or her awareness, perceptions, and use of the standards. Meyer (1986) conducted a study of CSAO’s as part of an analysis of the history and evolution of the CAS standards. Marron (1989) also surveyed CSAO’s and found public institutions more likely than private institutions to implement standards but institutional size was not a significant factor. Grant (1990) examined perception of relevancy and indicated 89% of CSAO’s surveyed found the standards most or moderately relevant to their work, and 60% were using the standards. Grant also found no statistically significant relationship between perception and use of the standards. Mann, Gordon and Strode’s 1991 (as cited in Ratcliffe, 2004) surveyed 250 CSAO’s perception’s of change in student affairs at four-year colleges and universities. Responses from 130 CSAO’s revealed CAS standards were being used for change implementation.
Other research regarding the CAS standards focused on both issues of perception and application. Bradford (1999) found counseling services at Colorado community colleges intertwined with other activities within the division of student services and that CAS standards provided a clear and thorough method to measure program effectiveness. Cooper and Saunders (2000) examined the perceived importance of the “must statements” (p. 71) within the standards and found the primary areas of concern were financial management, legal and ethical issues and collaboration. Least important were the areas of assessment, written ethical statements and intern hiring policies (Cooper et al., 2000). Love (as cited in Ratcliffe, 2004) surveyed graduate faculty in the area of student affairs preparation programs and found faculty were concerned with the potential regulatory rigidity, technology requirements, control issues, and frequency for self assessment brought about by implementing the standards.

In a key study, particularly relevant to this research, Arminio and Cochenauer (as cited in Ratcliffe, 2004) surveyed a random sample of 5,506 student affairs practitioners and faculty members from the professional associations belonging to the CAS consortium. Based on 1,481 responses they found 24% of the survey respondents measured learning outcomes and 41% reported a connection between the standards and the learning outcomes (p. 28, 29).

Rizzo (2005) undertook a study to determine the usability of the CAS standards for campus activities programs as benchmarks. Using a 126 item instrument, Rizzo surveyed forty three campus activities personnel working at twenty university campuses of the Pennsylvania State University, to determine the applicability and importance of the 13 component areas of the standards. The survey was administered electronically and
thirty two respondents replied resulting in a response rate of 74%. Rizzo found the standards to be, in general, important and useful and provided a suitable framework for benchmarks.

In a study of the CAS standards relative to career services, Ratcliffe (2004) explored the awareness, use, and perceived barriers to use of standards by career services directors. Ratcliffe’s population consisted of 480 career services directors at four-year public colleges and universities holding membership in the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). Ratcliffe used descriptive research approach and collected data through the distribution and collection of questionnaire. Surveys, cover letters and self addressed envelopes were mailed to all NACE member directors and 72.1% or n=346 surveys were returned for analysis. Demographic variables included institutional size, as determined by undergraduate enrollment, years of experience in the field of career services, years of experience as a director of a career services unit, and educational degree. The dependent variables for study were CAS standards awareness, barriers to CAS standards use, CAS standards possession, use of the CAS standards, type and extent of CAS standards use and satisfaction with the CAS standards. Data was subjected to a series of analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine if there was a relationship between the aforementioned independent and dependent variables. Ratcliffe found significant differences in awareness and perceived barriers of CAS standards by years of experience and by size of the institution. Key barriers to the use of CAS standards included awareness, lack of helpfulness, and a fear of being found to be non-compliant.
Recreational Sports

“Athletics as conducted now in our larger universities is but for the few picked teams while the very students who most need physical development become stooped-shouldered rooting from the back of the bleachers…” Unknown student from the University of California in 1904, (Rudolph, 1990, p. 387).

In 1994, the NIRSA published a white paper regarding the organization and administration of recreational sports programs on college campuses. The *Rationale for independent administration of collegiate recreational sports programs: A position paper* recommended recreational sports programs have a degree of autonomy in matters of budget, facilities, and personnel to facilitate the achievement of objectives and enhance program effectiveness (Bryant, Anderson & Dunn, 1994). In achieving autonomy the authors suggested recreational sports programs have grown to a point where they can no longer be considered part of an academic or athletic program but should be considered an independent organization within the campus community and should be focused on the holistic needs of students (Bryant, et al., 1994). A brief understanding of the history, purpose and development of the profession is provided in order to understand the relevance and importance of this position statement and its relationship to the study.

Recreational Sports History and Purpose

Physical activity and sport have been a part of student life since the earliest days of the colonial colleges. There is evidence of competition between individual students as early as 1760 when a foot race was recorded in the memoirs of Pennsylvania University student, Alexander Graydon in his 1811 memoirs (Pennsylvania University, 2007). In 1780, the sophomore class at Harvard College challenged the freshman class to a
wrestling match (Harvard University, 2006) in what might be considered the first true recorded intramural contest on a college campus. These activities were part of a well established college life which operated alongside the official world of the college (Thelin, 2004). While these activities appear benign by today’s standards they often clashed with institutional mores of the day and in some instances were forbidden by institutional leaders (Rudolph, 1990).

The first formalized program for physical conditioning and exercise was the gymnastics program led by Carl Follen, a German instructor at Harvard in 1826. Follen, with support of his fellow faculty members, had a goal of “work(ing) the devil out of the students” (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002, p. 49) through strict and rigorous physical exercise. While not widely popular with the students, the success of Follen’s program led Harvard and others to construct the first collegiate gymnasiums (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002). The gymnastics movement stalled when it collided with the Puritan ethic which found these activities too frivolous and playful (Rudolph, 1990) and when students balked at the strict regimentation (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002).

The gymnasium movement would return in the 1840s with a new group of German immigrant faculty and a renewed interest on the part of the students and alumni to provide organized sporting activities (Rudolph, 1990). This focus would ultimately lead to the first organized physical education and health programs as well as the initial intercollegiate sporting events in crew, baseball, and ultimately football (Rudolph, 1990). Many of these student led programs were eventually taken over by the alumni, physical education faculty, and eventually by the institutions themselves, as they began to serve the critical function of marketing the institution (Rudolph, 1990).
The growth of intercollegiate sports had unexpected consequences. Programs that had been originally designed by students for students had given way to alumni controlled intercollegiate competition (Thelin, 2004, p. 178). Physical activity for the general student population had become non-existent by the end of the 19th century and students were complaining about the lack of sport activities (Rudolph, 1990).

Early intramural sport programs, interwoven with physical education, recreation and varsity sports, were the response to that outcry (Rudolph, 1990). Grounded in the educational philosophies of Dewey (Hyatt, 1977), and emphasizing fun and exercise (Rudolph, 1990), intramural sports programs provided activities for the general student body ‘within the walls’ of the institution (Mitchell, 1939).

The University of Michigan and Ohio State University instituted the first intramural sport departments (Mitchell, 1939). By 1916 over 140 institutions of higher education, including the University of Illinois and the University of Texas had developed intramural sports departments (Hyatt, 1977). A 1933 survey of 90 small colleges revealed 50% of the intramural sports programs were located in Physical Education departments (Clarke, 1978) and had goals of providing opportunities to enhance health, and develop an appreciation of sports for life (Brammell, as cited in Mitchell, 1939).

As intramural sports grew throughout the middle of the 20th century the research and scholarly work reflected a growing focus on physical fitness, psychological aspects, and sociological factors. The benefits of developing good habits, knowledge and attitudes toward leisure, while enhancing the education of the student (Hackensmith, & Miller 1938; Mitchell, 1939) were also a focus of scholarly effort. Administrative (Grambeau,
1959; Nordley, 1939) and organizational issues (Tully, 1968) were common topics of interest for scholars of the day (as cited in Hyatt, 1977).

With the professionalizing of the field research began to focus on academic preparation (Jamieson, 1980; Preo, 1973), principles and standards for program stability (Hyatt, 1977), philosophical statements (Jones, 1971, as cited in Hyatt, 1977; Mull, 1982,) and the relationship between participation and attitude change on social conscience (Jones & Finnell, 1972, as cited in Hyatt, 1977).

By the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the focus of recreational sports moved away from its traditional roots in intramural sport and physical education, towards a multifaceted approach of recreational service to students, including providing experiential learning opportunities for majors related to recreational sports programs and creating a balance between service and learning (Mull, 1982). Programs now centered around a variety of on-campus physical related activities and pursuits, and in addition to intramural and club sports offerings, included fitness programming, drop in or informal recreation, extramural competition and outdoor pursuit programs, including challenge courses and equipment rentals (Lewis, Jones, Lamke & Dunn, 1998). Intramural sports had evolved into recreational sports programs, and professionals sought to define the purpose of their programs in more holistic ways. The focus of the field changed from mere physical activity to the broader social, mental, and leisure awareness as well as holistic developmental benefits (Mull, 1982).

During much of the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, recreational sports scholarship was produced from informed opinions, presented by well intentioned and experienced recreational sports directors, using anecdotal evidence or research studies with weak
methodology. Much of this scholarship focused on perceived student development gains (Bloland, 1987; Bryant & Bradley, 1993; Todaro, 1990), personal meaning (Smith, 1995) and moral growth and development (Theodore, 1999) gained from participation in activities related to recreational sports.

When research was conducted the studies often consisted of samples taken at single institutions and produced results not generalized to all students. A study of moral development, using step-wise regression to predict aggression, was undertaken at a large mid-western American university using a sample of 441 intramural sports participants involved in the sports of softball, basketball and floor hockey. The study found that team norm for aggressive behavior was the strongest predictor of self-described aggressive behavior (Stephens, 2004). A qualitative research study, using interviews from 16 highly involved students, examined social and emotional development through sport club participation and found involvement in these organizations provided valuable experiences for participants (Nesbitt, 1998). A study of 65 full-time, who completed a series of paper pencil tests and journals, found participation in recreational sports was a moderator of stress (Kanters, 1999). An earlier study of 343 university and community college students revealed higher rates of participation and greater rates of the satisfaction in recreational sports activities the lower academic stress was perceived by students (Ragheb & McKinney, 1993). Greater levels of participation in recreational sports programming led to greater levels of health and quality measures was the conclusion of a study conducted at a large western institution using a cluster sample of 342 students (Ellis, Compton, Tyson & Bohlig, 2002). A convenience sample of 198 students at a large public four year institution found participating recreation programs offered students
an opportunity to develop and enhance physical, mental or emotional capacity which led
to higher levels of self-esteem (Collins, Valerius, King, & Graham (2001). A random
sample of 233 students from a single Canadian university were used to link self-esteem
with participation in recreational sports programs through the development of student’s
physical and spiritual self (Kanters & Forrester (1997). Leisure interests at a large mid-
western institution using the institution’s annual engagement survey of 3,454 students
found that 54% of intramural sports participants had fun and suggested developing more
opportunities in student organizations to develop skills in leadership, decision making,
consensus building, and organizational ethics (Handel, 2004).

The growth and diversification of programs resulted in the need for larger and
more complex recreation centers. From the first dedicated collegiate building for
intramural sports, constructed at the University of Michigan in 1928, to the incredible
growth of the 1980’s and 1990’s (Taylor, Canning, Brailsford, & Rokosz, 2003), the
student recreation center has become the focal point for recreational sports professionals,
the NIRSA, and the public (Belch, Gebel, & Maas, 2001; Friel, 2003). The NIRSA’s
interest and focus on facilities is manifested by its formation of a facility management
committee, a National Recreation Facilities Institute, annual awards for outstanding
facilities, publication of planning principles for college and university recreation
facilities, the Facilities Management Proposal and the Facility Construction Report
(NIRSA, 2007b). The construction report reveals the status of renovation or new
construction projects at over 325 institutions of higher education and the *Value of
Recreational Sports in Higher Education* (NIRSA, 2004) estimated $4.9 billion dollars
would be spent over the next five years on 700 indoor and outdoor construction projects.
Much of this growth and interest in facilities can be attributed to studies indicating the importance recreation facilities have on recruitment and retention (Belch, Gebel, Maas, 2001; Bryant, & Bradley, 1993; Haines, 2001; Kovac, & Beck, 1997; Turman & Hendel, 2005; Turman, Morrison, & Gonsoulin, 2004) as well as institutional satisfaction (Kovac, & Beck, 1997). Other research suggest these facilities create community (Dalgarn, 2001), and build the concept of team (Barcelona, 2002). However, Cohen (1997) refutes the recruitment portion of these studies suggesting college attendance patterns have not changed at institutions with new or renovated facilities.

As recreational sports ended its first 100 years and approached the 21st century the profession’s focus appeared to be changing. The *Rationale for independent administration of collegiate recreational sports programs* (Bryant, et al., 1994) suggested recreational sports programs be operated independently from athletic and academic programs, a situation already underway as evidenced by the fact that over 62% of programs were housed in student affairs in 1995 (Cohen, 1995; Schneider et al, 2005). The profession’s affiliation with student affairs and the focus on student development and learning fulfilled recreational sports professional’s expectations “to be educators of and for life…to be accepted as a vital, undeniable and irrevocable component of the educational process” (Smith, 1995, p. 24). The manifestation of this commitment was the NIRSA member involvement in the publication of *Learning Reconsidered II* a practitioner’s handbook for implementing a new model of transformative student learning that pointed to the codependency of academic life and student life (NIRSA, 2005b). Other indications of an enhanced alignment with student affairs are the association’s membership in the Council of Higher Education Management Associations (CHEMA),
and the publication of the recreational sports section of the *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* (NIRSA, 2005e)

*Professionalism and Standards in Recreational Sports*

The growth and specialization in recreational sport departments created a need and desire to grow professionally. McGuire (1969) suggested intramural sports needed to meet the required criteria for a profession, including possessing a distinct and permanent social function of using sport as a means to an end, having a specialized body of knowledge requiring formal or professional preparation, develop standards, a code of ethics, and a professional organization.

The formation of a national professional organization for intramural sports directors first occurred in 1950 when William Wasson and twenty African-American men and women directors from eleven Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) formed the National Intramural Association (NIRSA, 2006e; Clark, 1978). This organization changed its name in 1975 to the National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA, 2006e; Clarke, 1978). The NIRSA represents over 750 institutions (Cohen, 2001) and has over 4,400 professional members providing recreational sport services for over 5 million students (NIRSA, 2006b). The association “is the leading resource for professional and student development, education, and research in collegiate recreational sports” (NIRSA, 2006b p. 1), but represents less than a third of all colleges and universities in the United States (Cohen, 2001).

Professionalizing the field began with the formation of the research committee in 1960 and a discussion of professional preparation during the 1969 NIA annual conference (Clarke, 1978). The following year an entire section of the annual conference was
dedicated to professional preparation and in 1976 a comprehensive plan for professional preparation was presented to the executive committee (Clarke, 1978). The 1976 professional preparation plan led to the formalization of a suggested curriculum and the development of the NIRSA sponsored document *Recreational Sports Curriculum: A Resource Guide* (1984; 1991; 1992). This document indicates the need for the knowledge of foundations and philosophy, programming techniques, management, risk management and legal concepts, facility supervision, governance, public relations, exercise science and fitness management, officiating, computer applications, certifications and recreational sport skills acquisition as fundamental to the undergraduate curriculum of the recreational sport professional (NIRSA, 1992). In addition to this knowledge base, budget and finance, marketing/public relations, facility management and design, technological applications, psychology and sociology of sport and research are essential for the graduate curriculum (NIRSA, 1992). Research supporting this curriculum is based in sport management and focuses on theory and foundations to professional competencies for recreation sport managers (Barcelona, 2001; Jamieson, & Toh, 2001; Jamieson, 1980; Parks, & Zanger, 1990) as well as communication, budget and creative management (White, 2004).

A certification program was developed in 1981 to “take a critical look at the professional qualifications…and to develop a system that aids in the training and selection of those who meet the standards associated with quality performance” (Daniels, 1982, p. 263). Certification through the Certified Recreation Sports Specialist (CRSS) test was instituted in 1982 but abandoned in 2006 with the development of the registry (NIRSA, 1982).
In its drive toward professionalism, the NIRSA ascribed to the notion that an outstanding characteristic of a profession is the continued striving to improve the quality of life for the population served by setting standards for conduct for its members. In striving to develop professional standards, the association adopted a *Professional Code of Ethics* (1984) and the *NIRSA General Standards* (1986). A decade later, the NIRSA participated in the development of CAS Standards for recreational sports in 1996 and two subsequent revisions in 2001 and 2003. The standards committee is currently working on a standards project to consolidate the *NIRSA General Standards* and the *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* for recreational sports (K. Bayless, personnel communication, January 26, 2007).

### CAS Standards for Recreational Sports

Each professional association represented in the *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education* conforms to the same organizational structure which consists of 13 parts including: mission; program; leadership; human resources; financial resources; facilities, technology and equipment; legal responsibilities; equity and access; campus and external relations; diversity; ethics; and assessment and evaluation (Dean, 2006). A full set of the CAS standards and guidelines for recreational sports (2006) is located in Appendix A. The current standards most relevant to this study are as follows:

**Part 1: Mission** - The Recreational Sports Program (RSP) must incorporate student learning and student development in its mission. The program must enhance overall educational experiences… (p. 285)

**Part 2: Program** - The formal education of students consists of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, and must promote student learning and development that is
purposeful and holistic. The RSP must identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes and provide programs and services that encourage the achievement of those outcomes. Specific learning outcome domains include intellectual growth, effective communication, enhanced self-esteem, realistic self-appraisal, clarified values, career choices, leadership development, healthy behavior, meaningful interpersonal relationships, independence, collaboration, social responsibility, satisfying and productive lifestyles, appreciating diversity, spiritual awareness, and personal and educational goals. The RSP must be (a) intentional, (b) coherent, (c) based in theories and knowledge of learning and human development, (d) reflective of developmental and demographic profiles of student population, and (e) responsive to special needs of individuals, special populations, and communities… (p. 285)

Part 3: Leadership - Effective and ethical leadership is essential to the success of all organizations. RSP leaders must be selected on the basis of formal education and training, relevant work experience, personal skills and competencies, relevant professional credentials, as well as potential for promoting learning and development in students, applying effective practices to educational processes, and enhancing institutional effectiveness. RSP leaders must promote student learning and development… (p. 287)

Part 4: Organization and Management – Guided by an overarching intent to ensure student learning and development, the RSP must be structured purposefully and managed effectively to achieve stated goals… (p. 288)
Part 5: Human Resources – The RSP must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals. RSP professional staff members must hold an earned graduate degree in a field relevant to the field of study and relevant experience. Student employees and volunteers must be carefully selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated… (p. 288).

Implementing a standards approach to the profession may prove difficult. In a recent unpublished report from the chair of the NIRSA standards committee reveals only 33% of the memberships are aware of the standards (Bayless, 2005).

There is growing evidence for the need for student development and student learning components in the collegiate recreation curriculum. Several recent positions advertised by the NIRSA career placement center as well as HigherED Jobs.com have indicated the need for knowledge and understanding of and the ability to implement student development theory (Appendix B). Consequently, the recreational sports curriculum resource guide is currently under review and being revised by NIRSA’s curriculum committee (W. Sells, personnel communication, September 2006). The chair of the committee has indicated the document will be greatly influenced by the growing importance of the CAS standards, *Learning Reconsidered* (2004), *Learning Reconsidered II* (2006) and the anticipated publication of the *Essentials in Campus Recreation*.

The *Essentials in Campus Recreation* text will be produced by professionals in the field and for the first time holistic student development, student learning theory and the CAS standards will be among the topics presented (Franklin & Hardin, in press).
Recreational Sports and Student Affairs

Studies revealed that between 61% (Bryant et al., 1994) and 65% (Cohen, 1995) of recreational sports departments report to student affairs offices, and 59% of directors reporting to academic or athletic programs would like to report to student affairs (Cohen, 1995; Bayless, 2005). Mowery (2000) found in a study of senior student affairs officers that 95% indicated professional recreational sports personnel were considered part of student affairs at their respective institutions and that 96% represented recreational sports interests at the senior staff level. While none of the senior student affairs officers had a recreation background, 98% agreed with the statement “campus intramural, club and recreational sports programs provided meaningful opportunities for student development and leadership” (p. 57). Schneider et al (2005) reported that 62% of recreational sports directors reported to student affairs as opposed to 24% reporting to intercollegiate athletics and indicated recreational sports directors housed in student affairs had highest levels of satisfaction within their organization and with other departments.

The positive impact recreational sports has on the overall development of students (Bloland, 1987; Bryant & Bradley, 1993), and specifically their social, mental, and physical development (Mull, 1982), understanding of personal meaning (Smith, 1995), moral growth and development (Theodore, 1999; Stephens, 2004), and social and emotional development (Nesbitt, 1998) has been documented.

Current research in recreational sports focuses on broadening understanding of the developmental aspects of the collegiate recreation experience. As it is with most recreational sports research, the population for these studies is taken from single institution which is a limiting factor to generalizing the results. A study of 349 intramural
sports participants, using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-tests, found on-campus students received more social benefits through their participation than off-campus students and first-year students benefited more than fourth year students (Artinger, Clapman, Hunt, Meigs, Milford, Sampson & Forrester, 2006). A doctoral dissertation involving a sample of 290 University of Pacific students found recreational sports participation provided a sense of belonging, self confidence, group cooperation skills, time management skills, weight control and increased physical fitness (Hall, 2005). Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted using a convenience sample of 181 intramural sports participants, from two campuses in different parts of the country, to support the notion that a relationship existed between intramural sports and values clarification (Rothwell & Theodore, 2006). A qualitative study of 8 recreational sports participants found personal development through the establishment of codes of friendship, meeting new people, forging relationships, and socialization (Hall, 2006). A study of a random sample of 400 students from 20,000 respondents from 314 institutions using the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) over the period of 1990 to 1998 found involvement in recreational sport programs including clubs and student organizations and the use of recreational facilities, were significant predictors of gains in team functioning (Barcelona, 2002). A sample of 94 students, surveyed over two years, was used to determine the impact of student club officers interacting with the club advisor. The results of the self reported data found a correlation between leadership and student development and recreational sports (Hall-Yannessa, & Forrester, 2005)
“Somewhere along the way, for many reasons, we lost our focus on the fundamental role of higher education, which is—the education of the whole person” (Komives et al, 2003, p. 642)

The current focus on student development in recreational sports programs is evident by mission statements from a sampling of the internet websites of collegiate recreation programs at the University of Tennessee-Martin, 2006; University of Detroit-Mercy, 2006; Northeastern University, 2006; Slippery Rock University, 2006; and Stephen F. Austin University, 2006. Student development is prominent for the professional organization, as evidenced by the tag line on the NIRSA website “NIRSA is the leading resource for professional and student development, education, and research in collegiate recreational sports” (NIRSA Website, 2006, ¶1). Consequently, a brief understanding of the history, purpose and development of the student affairs profession and its relationship to student development and the field of collegiate recreation is provided.

**Student Affairs History**

The concept of student activities can be traced to the early colonial colleges with student introduced literary societies and debating clubs (Rudolph, 1990, p.137) and the realization that “a curriculum, a faculty, and students were not enough to make a college” (Rudolph, 1990, p. 87). The first literary society, Children of Enlightenment began at Yale in 1753 with societies at Harvard and Princeton soon to follow (Rudolph, 1990, p.137). While student led literary societies and debating clubs were the first and primary form of extra-curricular activity until the middle of the 19th century, Greek letter and
social fraternities were found on most New England campus in the early part of that century (Brubacher & Rudy, 2001, p. 47). Activities, organized by students, were informal and unstructured, and used as a method of stress relief (Komives, et al., 2003, p. 66). Intercollegiate varsity teams of crew, track and field, baseball and football were also beginning to form during this period (Thelin, 2004).

The confluence of several phenomena altered the landscape of higher education in regards to student affairs. During the period of colonial colleges and throughout the first part of the 19th century student discipline, was the responsibility of the president and faculty (Rudolph, 1990). As campuses grew so did increased student unrest and rebellion. Student discipline, expanded responsibilities for institutional leaders, and the diversification of college attendees, primarily women, created a greater need for designated student personnel administrators and as the 19th century closed, institutions began to hire administrative personnel to take over the disciplinary role from the president (Komives, et al., 2003).

It was not until Charles William Eliot’s curriculum reform resulted in the need for academic advising, that the growth of student personnel administrators would begin in earnest (Komives, et al., 2003). By 1925, student personnel functions related to vocational guidance (Evans, et al., 1998), and health and psychological services were becoming prevalent on college campuses and professional organizations were formed (Brubacher & Rudy, 2002).

In 1925, the American Council on Education (ACE) undertook a study of student personnel practices which ultimately resulted in the document the Student Personnel Point of View (1937). This document is foundational to modern student affairs
organizations as it provides the underlying principle of charging institutions with educating the whole student including his/her intellectual, emotional, physical, social, vocational, moral, economic and aesthetic appreciations (American Council on Education, 1937; Chambers, 1987). This position statement was revised in 1949 and supported through the commemoration document, *A Perspective on Student Affairs*, by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The commemoration document calls for student affairs staff to be experts in college environments and stresses the importance of knowledge of human growth and development, and how environments shape student behavior (1986, p. 11).

**Student Affairs Purpose**

As stated in the Student Personnel Point of View (ACE, 1937), student affairs practitioners are focused on educating the whole person and that education extends beyond the classroom and into other parts of student life (Dunn, et al., 2004; Nuss, 2003; Evans, et al., 1998; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2004). Specifically, student affairs personnel provide co-curricular programs involving activities and learning opportunities that contribute to student quality of life by meeting academic, social, recreational, physical, emotional, and moral developmental needs and promote self-direction and leadership among those students who become involved in managing these programs and activities (Javinar, 2000).

Student affairs personnel help students define character and move toward an ethical orientation, assist with student understanding of academic integrity standards and conduct, and aid in the understanding of ethical responsibilities of community (Dalton, as cited in Blimming, 1999; Evans, 1987). Manning (2001) states student affairs is about
development of soul while Young (2003) suggests student affairs practitioners are the
“gardeners of the flowers of human values and valued humans that stand above the roots
of thought on college campuses” (p. 89).

Research reveals students benefit from out-of-class experiences and suggests
involvement in curricular and co-curricular activities lead to higher levels of college
success and learning (Astin, 1999). Specific benefits from these experiences range from
gains in critical thinking to relational and organizational skills (Kuh, 1995). Leadership
programs provide gains in self esteem (Salerno, 1999) and the formation of life dreams
through the identification of personal and vocational goals are critical to positive
transition to adulthood (Thomas & Kuh, 1982).

Knowledge related to student affairs often begins with academic programs
steeped in student development theories, which are essential to good practice (Bliming &
Whitt, 1999). Knowing and understanding theory provides a method of communication
and understanding among student affairs professionals (McEwen, 2003). Linking these
theories to practice is fundamentally important to the success of student affairs (Hamrick,
et al., 2002). Professionals should use theory as a theoretical basis for knowledge,
expertise, and practice as a foundation for the profession (McEwen, 2003). The
knowledge of theory is fundamental to the understanding of developmental standards
related to learning outcomes which are a focus of this study.

*Professionalism and Standards in Student Affairs*

The earliest student affairs professionals came from the ranks of the deans of men
and women and as a consequence, there is some debate as to when the field began to
professionalize. Robert Schwartz, in his article *How Deans of Women Became Men*
(1997), puts forth an argument that because the first deans of women, dealt with non-academic issues related to life and health of women on campus, and coupled with the fact that they were the first to professionalize through the formation of the National Association of Dean’s of Women (NADW) in 1904, that women were the first student affairs personnel to professionalize. Schwartz also offers the other side of the argument revealing that the first true student affairs professionals were deans of men because of their dealings with disciplinary and student life issues. Additionally, the National Association of Dean’s of Men (NADM) was the precursor to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), which was the first professional organization for student affairs (Schwartz, 1997). Schwartz also suggests that the student personnel movement brought about the demise of both deans of women and deans of men, but because there were more men on college campuses in the early twentieth century, men were in a better position to become the new dean’s of student personnel or deans of students.


According to Schwartz and Bryan (1998) professional standards for student affairs were developed and based on the Abraham Flexner's 1915 statement on medical education and professional requirements. They link the relevance of continuous
professional development to Flexner’s views of the importance of education in providing knowledge and understanding of the theoretical underpinnings and the practical skills for the field.

As student affairs moved from an apprenticeship model to a profession, a strong educational base through practical preparation was needed. This preparation was focused on developmental theories, campus environments, organizational theories, and student characteristics (Stage & Dannells, 2000). In supporting Knefelkamp (2003) suggestion that theory serves as a common language within a community of scholars (1982), student development theory now represents the cornerstone of the student affairs profession (Stage, Downey, & Dannells, 2000; King & Howard-Hamilton, 2000). The use of developmental theory as a theoretical basis for knowledge, expertise, and practice provides a medium of communication and understanding among student affairs professionals (McEwen, 2003).

Student Affairs professionals have followed a similar track as those in recreational sports by developing standards for their profession. Standards of practice are necessary for professionalizing the field of student affairs (Blimling, & Whitt, 1999). Fried (2003) indicates ethical beliefs and standards for student affairs are the most deeply held and widely accepted values and therefore, are inseparable from the communities that create them. In 1996, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) developed *Principles for Good Practice in Student Affairs*. These practices include, engagement of students in active learning, helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards, setting and communicating high expectations for student learning, using systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance, using resources
effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals, forging educational partnerships that advance student learning, building supportive and inclusive communities. ACPA also developed the Statement of Ethical Principles and Standards which provides standards of ethical conduct and behavior for members and aligns ethical and professional standards.

**Student Learning and Employment**

“...work experience can provide an opportunity to develop personal, social and behavioral skills that support personal and organizational learning.” Guile & Griffiths, from *Learning through Work Experience* (2001, p. 117).

A key component of this study is the relationship between learning through student employment in the co-curricular activity of recreational sports. Therefore, a discussion of learning and the role student affairs professionals play in student learning will be explored.

**Student Learning**

Learning is defined as “a comprehensive, holistic, transformative activity that integrates academic learning and student development… a complex, holistic, multi-centric activity that occurs throughout and across the college experience” (Keeling, 2004, p. 4). Essential to this definition is the concept that transformational learning requires mature cognitive development, critical reflection, and rational discourse (Merriman, 2004). Marsick and Watkins (2001) differentiate learning stating formal learning is “typically institutionally sponsored, classroom-based and highly structured” (p.25) while informal learning is neither classroom based nor highly structured. Incidental learning, a form of informal learning rests with the learner and is often a byproduct of some other activity (p. 25). In addressing the entrepreneurial efforts in recreational sports programs,
Franklin (2002) suggests learning is fundamental to the basis of any organization and the improvement of personnel, through continuing education and experiential or service learning opportunities, forms the foundation for individual and organizational growth and development.

*Learning Reconsidered I* and *II* are the latest in a growing focus on learning dating back to *An American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education* published by the Wingspread Group on Higher Education (1993). The Wingspread Group report called for American higher education to focus on three things: taking values seriously, putting student learning first, and creating a nation of learners.

*An American Imperative* was followed by *the Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs* (American College Personnel Administrators, 1994). The purpose of the *Student Learning Imperative* was to “stimulate discussion and debate on how student affairs professionals can intentionally create the conditions that enhance student learning and personal development” (p. 1). The paper created a list of characteristics of student learning, which were exhibited by student affairs divisions. These characteristics included having complimentary missions to the institutional mission of student learning, allocating resources to encourage student learning and personnel development, collaborating with other institutional agents to promote student learning and development, providing experts on the student environment and the processes of teaching and learning, and providing research based practice relative to student learning (ACPA, 1994).

The *Student Learning Imperative* was followed by *Reasonable Expectations: Renewing the Educational Compact between Institutions and Students* (NASPA, 1995),
which called for a redefining the role and philosophical base of student services to concentrate efforts on student learning and personal development. Expectations helped qualify the learning environment by stating “learning is as much a social activity as a solitary endeavor. It best occurs in settings where learners are known by name and respected as individuals, feel comfortable, interact with people from backgrounds different than their own, feel free to take intellectual risks, assume responsibility for their learning and social welfare, and have opportunities to participate in community governance (p. 8).

*Principles of Good Practice* (ACPA, 1996) provides standards for student affairs professionals and although not totally focused on learning, identifies three standards related to learning. The first standard is to engage students in active learning by bringing their life experiences into the learning process and promoting self-reflection as a way of expanding the student’s viewpoints. The next standard suggests setting and communicating high expectations for learning and states “student learning is enhanced when expectations for student performance inside and outside the classroom are high, appropriate to students' abilities and aspirations, and consistent with the institution's mission and philosophy” (p. 3). The third and final principle related to learning is developing educational partnerships that advance student learning.

In an open letter to leaders of state universities and land-grant colleges, *Returning to our roots: the student experience*, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (1997) called for institutions to become learning-centered. “A student-centered approach compels changes in attitudes, orientation and responsibilities (and)… imposes additional expectations on all involved, in student life, and services and
extracurricular activities as much as in the classroom” (p. 25). The commission also called for “integrating the hidden curriculum, including co-curricular experiences, much more directly into the learning experience” (p. 36).

Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning was a joint project of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) and NASPA (1998). The document takes the position that all the educational mission of institutions of higher education is the shared responsibility of faculty, staff, and students have a responsibility for pursuing learning improvements. The document states learning takes place informally and incidentally, beyond the classroom and in casual contacts with faculty, staff, peers, campus life through active social and community involvements. Further, collaborations between academic and student affairs personnel and organizations have been especially effective in achieving this better learning for students.

Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as the Nation Goes to College (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002) proposes specific actions and collaborations to raise the quality of student learning in college to meet emerging challenges in the workplace, in a diverse democracy, and in an interconnected world. The report challenges institutions to be more holistic and intentional in their approach to learning by developing learning communities that foster closer interactions among students, professors and administrators.

Specifically relevant to this study is the student learning outcomes section in the program area of each set of standards in the CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education (2006). Through this publication student services personnel are provided a set of criteria to judge support program quality and effectiveness by setting best practice
standards. Standards relative to student learning are found in the program section of the general and specific standards for each area and will be further illuminated later.

The most recent documents, in the field of student affairs, focusing on student learning are *Learning Reconsidered* (2004) and *Learning Reconsidered II* (2006). These publications, developed by ACPA and NASPA in collaboration with other student services professional organizations, including the NIRSA, call for an institutional wide focus on learning and suggest the development of outcomes relative to: cognitive complexity; knowledge acquisition, integration, and application; humanitarianism; civic engagement; interpersonal and intrapersonal competence; practical competence; and persistence and academic achievement.

*Student Learning Research*

Student affairs professionals have, for some time, embraced the concept of student development and learning in an effort to enhance the quality of undergraduate education (Rogers, 1995; Nuss, 2003; Schroeder, 1996; Burkard, et al., 2005; Lovett, 2006). A study of involvement and expectations using regression and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to analyze surveys from 437 college sophomores, juniors and seniors. Statistically significant correlations were found between the intensity of involvement and perceived learning. Recommendations from the study included implementing policies and practices to promote increased student involvement as a method to impact learning in the co-curriculum (Beeny, 2003).

While there appears to be a clear focus on student learning for student affairs professionals, issues exist with the practical implementation of such a lofty goal. An ethnomethodological study of an exemplar division of student affairs at a comprehensive
southern school found that student learning is greatly impacted by required knowledge of learning and development theory as well as competing values with faculty culture (Smith, 2002). Another ethnomethodological case study of 36 student affairs educators, 3 faculty members and a university president at a comprehensive southern school found that while the senior student affairs officer was knowledgeable and supportive of the Student Learning Initiative and the Principles of Good Practice, a lack of knowledge by subordinates and a view that learning was secondary to their mission hindered implementation (Smith & Rogers, 2005). Calls for establishing a research focus on learning outcomes and barriers to implementing a student learning approach are especially relevant to this study.

**Experiential and Informal Learning**

Student work experience provides a context for both formal and informal learning (Carr, 2005; Guile & Griffiths, 2001; Hardin, 1999; Herling, 2005). The concept of experiential learning dates to John Dewey and the publication *Experience and Education* (1938). Dewey contends that the individual is greatly influenced by his/her environment and that experiences take place within specific situations in which individuals interact with the external world and undergo idiosyncratic personal experience which leads to learning. In 1981, Brozak (as cited in Infed, 2006) simplified the idea by suggesting experiential learning involved a direct encounter rather than merely thinking about the encounter and that learning occurs through direct participation in the events of life. Kolb (1984) suggests learning is the process of transforming experience to knowledge. Chickering (2006) proposes learning is built on experience, done informally as well as formally and should be tailored to students learning styles. These strategies provide
greater flexibility for learners, recognizes the social significance of learning from other people, and draws attention to the fact that learning takes place in the spaces surrounding activities and events with a more overt formal purpose (Eraut, 2004).

While usually intentional, informal learning contrasts with formal learning because of its lack of structure (Marsick & Watkins, 2001). Informal learning can be self-directed or accomplished through networking, coaching, mentoring, and performance planning (Eraut, 2004). A year long case study at six secondary schools was conducted to determine the impact of informal learning environments. The findings suggested students were better able to connect to traditional elements of school as a result of their informal experiences. Personal growth of students was manifested in increases in self-esteem, fieldtrip and classroom participation, as well as improved classroom behavior Schneider (2004).

**Student Employment**

There is considerable inconsistency and even contradiction in the literature regarding the impact of work on the college experience. Debate exists as to the importance of understanding the impact student employment has on 80% of the nation’s undergraduates (Riggert, Boyle, Petrosko, Ash & Rude-Parkins, 2006). Research suggests work during college, especially on-campus employment or employment related to a student’s major, positively influences and enhances the development of career-related skills, securing employment, earnings, academic involvement, cooperative learning and interactions with faculty (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Student employment also appears to contribute to intellectual and cognitive development (Baxter-Magolda, 1992; Terenzini, Pascarella, & Blimling, 1996) and the development of critical
thinking skills (Gellin, 2003). A sense of increased responsibility and independence (Baxter-Magolda, 1992) is also gained through these experiences. Student retention is enhanced, a fact that Bozick (2005) attributes to social integration in the work place. He suggests students who work on campus have stronger attachments to the social communities of the university than students who work off campus. This would support the view held by Terenzini, et al., (1996) that student peer interactions are important to student success and satisfaction with the collegiate experience.

Of particular importance to this study is the suggestion that when student work experience accounts for context, negotiation, and support for both formal and informal learning, and when the work takes place in a stable, unchanging and transparent environment, students learn and develop (Guile & Griffiths, 2001). Students learn both formally and informally, from their work experiences and learn more from positive experiences than negative ones (Herling, 2005).

Not all research was as positive in citing the benefits of college student employment. A study of pharmacy students found that non-working students demonstrated significantly higher levels of interaction with faculty and satisfaction with academic development, than students working in either an academically relevant or non-relevant job. While employment was not found to have significant negative influence on student's level of peer group interaction, employment status had no effect on the development of professional commitment, commitment to school, academic achievement or persistence (Fjortoft, 1994). Off-campus student term-time employment resulted in negative social disadvantages negating the positive monetary advantages leading to persistence (Hughes, 2001). A study of student employment and achievement of
educational outcomes, found that students involved in on-campus work-study programs had lower self-reported learning levels than did individuals who held regular paid positions or in combination of paid or work-study positions (Ketchum-Ciftci, 2004).

Student employment is a cornerstone of many recreational sports programs. A brief search of the internet produced innumerable hits regarding student employment opportunities in these programs. A sampling included the University of South Carolina (2006) which states “recreational sports is one of the largest employers of students on campus”; Arizona State University (2006) links employee experience to professional and personal growth; and Florida Atlantic University (2006) claims student employees are provided with valuable work experience, competitive wages, life-long learning opportunities and lasting relationships.

Research on student employment in recreational sports deals with demographic (gender, year in school, race) and operational need (training, work hours) and identifies the need for developing quality student employees (Gaskins, 1996). Keizer (1997) focused on the use of student employees as service agents and cited their importance in the implementation of Total Quality Management (TQM) in a recreational sports program. Riley (2005) focused on student employee development and the importance of integrating lifelong learning needs of employees into the experience. Carr (2005) conducted qualitative research using case study methodology of 14 students employed at an on recreational sports center. The students were full-time undergraduates and had at least one-semester of student employee experience. Carr found that students see employment as valuable extracurricular developmental experiences that provide a viable way to learn transferable skills activity. Kuh’s Taxonomy of Learning and Personal
Development (1993) and Astin’s (1984) theory of student involvement provided the framework for a mixed methods study of student workers from three student affairs departments, including the institution’s campus recreation department. The study found students believed they had attained valuable learning and personal development outcomes from their work experiences (Hardin, 1999).

Independent Variables Associated with Recreational Sports

“It’s important to recognize that you can’t be a unit when your missions are not similar,” (Byrant, as referenced in Cohen, 1995, p. 32).

The following section provides a rationale for the selection of the independent variables used in the study. Each of these variables has been used in other studies or has been under scrutiny within the recreational sports profession in the past.

Differing organizational locations for collegiate recreational sports programs suggest different mission emphasis and focus (Franklin & Hardin, in press). A 1992 NIRSA survey of recreational sports departments revealed 61% of the departments reported to student affairs, 18% reported to intercollegiate athletics, 16% reported to an academic unit and 4% reported to some other unit (Bryant, et al., 1994). Cohen (1995) reveals the primary organizational report lines for recreational sports are student affairs, intercollegiate athletics and academics. Schneider, et al., (2005) found that 62% of recreational sports director reported to student affairs, and 24% reported to intercollegiate athletics. Determining the organizational location and its relationship to implementing standards related to student development and learning is an essential part of this study.

Academic preparation of recreational sports professionals may impact knowledge and implementation of different theories and philosophies in the operation of a
recreational sports department (Franklin & Hardin, in press). The predominant academic
discipline for recreational sports managers is sports and recreation management
(Barcelona, 2001; Jamieson & Toh, 2001; Jamieson, 1990; Milton, 2002). Jamieson,
considered by many to be one of the leading scholars on recreational sports management
curriculum, suggests the need for a continual evolution of the curriculum by monitoring
its usefulness in the classroom (1990). What appears to be missing from recreational
sports management curriculum, and the preparation of future recreational sports
professionals, is the study of student growth and development.

There is a growing need for higher education and college student personnel
trained professionals as evidenced by various job announcements, See Appendix B for an
eexample of a job announcement. The practical nature of collegiate recreation and the
researcher’s observation of the field for 30 years reveal large numbers of people entering
into the field because of work performed as student employees in recreational sports
departments, and not as a result of academic preparation, suggests the importance of
collecting data regarding other academic majors. Types of academic disciplines used in
this study were selected from the traditional fields relative to recreational sports programs
including (a) physical education, recreation or sport management, (b) higher education or
college student personnel, (c) other, to be specified.

Professional development is a source of continuing education and consists of
obtaining and developing skills and knowledge relevant to one’s current or desired
employment and is accomplished through professional organizations. Based on the
researchers extensive experience and observations with various associations including
NIRSA, American College Personnel Administrators (ACPA), National Association of
College Auxiliary Services (NACAS) and others, professional organizations play an essential role in providing professional development to the organization’s membership.

NIRSA “is the leader in recreational sports professional development. Professionals around the world participate in NIRSA conferences, workshops, symposia, and online classes to enhance their career” (NIRSA Website, 2006, ¶1), and selected members that serve as departmental directors will serve as the population for this study.

Other professional organizations may also play a part in transmitting knowledge to NIRSA professionals. The NASPA and the ACPA serve as the professional associations for student affairs professionals. NASPA (2006) provides a professional development planning guide and calendar which states “continuing education courses and professional development programs are meant to supplement formal degree programs in student affairs and higher education” (p. 2). ACPA (2006) provides members with opportunities to gain skills, knowledge and tools to be more effective in working with students.

Historically, collegiate recreation programs were housed in academic and athletic units. In addition to their NIRSA membership, these collegiate recreation professionals may also be members of the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAPHERD), the National Parks and Recreation Association (NRPA) or the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). AAPEHRD (2006) promotes and supports creative and healthy lifestyles through high quality programs in health, physical education, recreation, dance and sport, and provides members with professional development opportunities that increase knowledge, improve skills, and encourage sound professional practices. NRPA (2006) provides accreditation for
academic programs as well as certification for professionals working in the field of recreation. The NCAA (2006) is a membership driven organization that establish the programs that govern intercollegiate athletic programs.

Recent studies assessing the organizational location of recreational sports programs have included business and finance (Schneider, et al., 2005). The professional organizations most closely associated with business in higher education are The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and the National Association of College Auxiliary Services (NACAS). NACUBO provides a professional development department dedicated to sustaining excellence and supporting innovation in higher education business management and administration covers seven broad categories for administrators at the basic, intermediate, and advanced levels (NACUBO, 2006, ¶1). NACAS provides a variety of workshops and educational events for its members (NACAS, 2006, ¶1).

Recreational sports programs are organizationally housed in a variety of locations and it is likely that if the professional were to participate in another professional association, besides the NIRSA, the organization would be associated with function of the overall operational unit. Determining the relationship with professional associations, other than the NIRSA, and its relationship to obtaining knowledge to implement standards related to student development and learning is an essential part of this study.

Summary

This chapter provided relevant information and research related to professionalism and standards in the fields of student affairs, and, in particular, collegiate recreation. Learning, both experiential and informal, as well as student employment was
also addressed. Research in the field of recreational sports, especially pertaining to the professional aspects of the field, including the area of standards, is negligible. The primary research focus has been on program and facility satisfaction, recruitment and retention, as well as issues related to financial and risk management. While aspects of holistic development of students have been examined, research relevant to learning and its relationship with student employment in recreational sports is non-existent.

Neither recreational sports nor student affairs scholars have focused extensively on standards and particularly on CAS Professional Standards for student learning and development. However, the examination of standards as they relate to benchmarking (Rizzo, 2005), awareness, use and barriers (Ratcliffe, 2004), and learning outcomes (Armino & Cochenhauer, 2003, as cited in Ratcliffe, 2004) were presented and have particular relevance to this study. A brief exploration of student learning through experience and employment, as well as the benefits of that involvement (Astin, 1999) provides support for further study of this area.

The purpose of this study is to determine awareness, application and satisfaction with recreational sports standards related to student development and learning as applied to student employees in collegiate recreation programs. The outcome of this study will support “using student employment in campus services and auxiliary operations as the substrate for deeper learning experience” (Keeling,, 2006, p. 13.) If we believe that “student affairs professionals serve as the gardeners of the flowers of human values and valued humans that stand above the roots of thought on college campuses” (Young, 2003, p. 89) then involvement through student employment provides a fertile ground for recreational professionals to plant the seeds for personal development and learning.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The research design for the study includes a brief description and rationale for selected method, identification of the population, operational definitions of the independent and dependent variables, development of the instrument, including validity and reliability, data collection and analysis procedures, and a summary.

Research Design

This study addressed the differences in awareness, perceived importance, application, and satisfaction of CAS standards for recreational sports by various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports directors. Source of awareness and barriers to application relative to the student development and learning outcomes of the standards was also a focus of the study.

A survey approach was employed to determine the relationships and potential differences of personal attributes, academic preparation and professional affiliation and organizational location have on awareness and application of the standards. For directors aware of the CAS standards, satisfaction variables were identified and for directors aware but not using the standards, barrier variables were explored.

Identification of the Population

The NIRSA is the principal professional association for collegiate recreation professionals and serves as the primary source for the development of professional standards, research and sharing of ideas through its regional and national meetings (NIRSA, 2006b). This membership driven organization has the most complete and comprehensive database of collegiate recreation directors and as such provides the best
population representation. The NIRSA consists of 635 institutional members, 2464 professional members, 934 student members and 151 associate members (NIRSA Website, 2006, ¶1). Individuals surveyed in this research study were recreational sports directors employed at four-year public and private colleges and universities, and who were members of the NIRSA at the time of data collection ($N=579$).

**Operational Definition of Variables**

The primary independent variable associated with the personal attribute was professional affiliation with organizations other than the NIRSA. Professional associations were selected based on the researcher’s knowledge of and experience with organizations related to the function of the organizational unit housing the recreation program. The professional organizations associated with student affairs included the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and Association of College Personnel Administrators (ACPA). Professional organizations associated with business organizations included the National Association of College Auxiliary Services (NACAS) and the National Association of College University Business Officers (NACUBO). Academic related organizations included the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAPHERD) and the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA), the accrediting agency for recreation studies academic units. Other secondary personal independent variables include experience as a director and as a professional (Ratcliffe, 2004), and biological gender.

Organizational location of recreational sports programs has been a topic of the literature (Bryant, 1994; Cohen, 1995; Schneider, 2005) for some time now. Other than satisfaction (Cohen, 1995), no known study has offered empirical evidence for locating a
unit in any of the organizational units. The primary institutional attribute for this study consists of the independent variable of organizational location, which pertains to where the collegiate recreation program is housed within the institution. Locations include student affairs, an academic unit, intercollegiate athletics, business and other. Other institutional variables included institutional size as determined by undergraduate enrollment (Schneider, 2005; Ratcliffe, 2004), size of professional and student staff and institutional type.

Academic preparation is a component of the standards and has been identified as an important attribute of departmental directors (Ratcliffe, 2004) and particularly of recreational sports directors (Milton, 2002). The independent variables associated with academic preparation include highest level of degree attainment and academic discipline at the level. Highest degree attainment, selected from Ratcliffe’s study, was (a) Doctorate or other terminal degree, (b) Masters Degree, (c) Bachelors Degree, (d) Associates Degree (e) no degree. Academic disciplines, at the highest degree were selected from the traditional fields relative to recreational sports programs including (a) physical education, recreation or sport management, and a suspected field based on the literature (b) higher education or college student personnel. The category of (c) other education, please specify was offered for those recreational sports directors with academic backgrounds outside of the first two groups.

The basic tenet underlying this research is that awareness, perceived importance and application of the standards relates to satisfaction with the standards. The dependent variables measured in this study were awareness, perceived importance, application and
satisfaction of CAS standards, specifically related to student development and learning for student employees.

Awareness is defined as having or showing realization, perception or knowledge of something and respondents were asked the extent to which they are aware of the CAS standards, related to student development and learning. A five-point Likert scale ranging from Unaware (1) to Very aware (5) was used to determine the extent of that knowledge. The source of awareness was determined using a modified list of potential sources identified in Ratcliffe’s study of CAS Standards for career services directors (2004). These sources include: (a) graduate studies, (b) professional journals, (c) professional meetings or conferences (d) departmental director or senior student affairs officer (e) colleagues within the recreation department (f) institutional colleagues (g) professional colleagues. An open ended question was used to identify additional sources of the CAS standards awareness. Source contribution to awareness was measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from Not a contributor (1) to Major contributor (5).

Perceived importance of the CAS Standards is a recreational sports director’s self defined measure of significance of the standards and was measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Not important (1) to Very important (5).

Application is defined as an act of administering or superimposing. Application of student development and learning standards was measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from Never use (1) to Use frequently (5). Respondents indicating the use of the CAS standards were asked their level of satisfaction, which was measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Not satisfied (1) to Very satisfied (5). Respondents indicating awareness but no use of the standards were asked to identify barriers to
application. A barrier is an impediment and was determined by using a modified list employed in Ratcliffe’s study of CAS Standards for career services directors (2004). Types of barriers included (a) lack of funds, (b) lack of staff resources, (c) lack of time, (d) lack of training on how to use the CAS standards, (e) lack of perceived value, (f) lack of institutional support, (g) lack of perceived necessity, (h) not helpful based on past use, and (i) fear of finding non-compliance. Barrier types were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Not significant (1) to Very significant (5). An open ended question was used to identify additional types of barriers to CAS standards.

The interrelationships between many of the resources identified in the review of the literature suggested ownership of selected documents might have an impact on the aforementioned dependent variables. Independent variables, associated with ownership of CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, Learning Reconsidered, Learning Reconsidered II, and Principles of Good Practice, were designed to determine immediate availability of these vital documents to recreational sports professionals and their potential impact on a recreational sports director’s perceived importance and application of the CAS standards for recreational sports. Discrete categories of yes and no were used for these variables.

**Development of the Instrument**

A survey instrument was developed using existing questions from previously reliable instruments as well as questions that were validated by an expert panel of past NIRSA officials and seasoned professionals through a pilot study. Survey questions were worded in such a way as to be aligned with each sub-problem and null-hypotheses. Glasow (2005) suggests a written survey serves as the best method to eliciting
confidential information. A paper survey was used to avoid concerns with web based
survey. These concerns include the impact of browsers and monitors on the visual look
of the survey, computer expertise of the participants, perceived concerns with data and
privacy security, and potential sampling errors (Zanutto, as cited in Gunn, 2005). A
major concern for this research is the suspected inconsistent level of computer expertise.

The survey consisted of two sections and a total of 88 questions. Section one
included an explanation of the study and 12 demographic questions. The remainder of
section one consisted of 26 questions to determine the participant’s awareness and
perception of the CAS standards and other standards and learning related publications
was included in this section. Based on their awareness, participants were prompted to
return the survey or to continue on. Section two consisted of 50 questions regarding the
source of their awareness, satisfaction or barriers to the use of the standards.

Validity

Validity is the ability for the survey instrument to measure what it is supposed to
be measured (Salkind, 2004). Three types of validity include content, concurrent
criterion, and construct (Salkind, 2004) and was addressed in the development of the
survey instrument for this study.

Content validity, “the property of a test such that the test items sample the
universe of items of which the test is designed” (Salkind, 2004, p. 290), was reflected in
the research and vetted by professionals in the field including past NIRSA presidents, the
chairpersons of the curriculum and standards committees, the NIRSA research
committee, the executive director of the National Research Institute for College
Recreational Sports & Wellness and the current editor of the *Recreational Sports*
Specifically, the content for this survey is directly related to the CAS professional standards and NIRSA General Standards, which were developed by the NIRSA standards committee and vetted by the membership.

Construct validity, are ideas that underlie the study (Salkind, 2004 p. 291) and was achieved by using questions and suggested outcomes from CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, the “Delphi Survey of Entry Level Positions in Student Affairs” (Burkard, et al., 2005), the “2004 NIRSA Zoomerang Survey on Awareness of Standards” (Bayless, 2005) and Ratcliffe’s (2004) study of CAS standards for career services officers in higher education.

Reliability

Reliability is the “degree of consistency of a measure” (Aron, et al., 2005, p. 447) and pertains to whether the questions will produce consistent results if replicated. Using questions from a previously reliable survey suggest that if a question provided reliable data the first time, it will likely provide reliability in future studies. Ratcliffe (2004) conducted a pilot survey of 60 career services directors at selected four-year private institutions holding NACE membership. He received a 90% return on the pilot, adjusted his instrument and distributed the final survey to 450 public schools. With the Ratcliffe’s permission, and where applicable, portions of his survey were used, to collect awareness, application, satisfaction and barrier data. Questions used in the survey under girding Ratcliffe’s Use of the CAS Standards by Career Services Directors at Four-year Public Colleges and Universities (2004), produced reliable data regarding career services director’s awareness and application of CAS Standards, sources of awareness and
perceived barriers to the use of the standards. Similar questions were used in this study and provided reliable data for recreational sports professionals.

Additionally, a pilot survey was presented to a limited number of recreational sports professionals with extensive experience in the field. These professional members were experienced associate directors and are not eligible for the final study.

Data Collection

Professional members of the NIRSA, who at the time of the survey, were serving as departmental recreational sports directors were provided a survey instrument consisting of questions related to population demographics and variables previously discussed. The survey packet included a cover letter explaining the survey (Appendix C), a 4 page bi-fold survey and Scantron answer sheet Appendix D, and a self addressed envelope.

The NIRSA membership database served as the source of contact information for the population. The association provided a set of mailing labels and an Excel spreadsheet that was used to track returned surveys and mailing labels for follow-up surveys. Subjects were requested to respond to the first survey within two weeks of acceptance of the initial contact via e-mail. A follow-up letter was sent to those individuals who did not return the initial document after 2 weeks. A third and final follow-up card (Appendix E), with an abbreviated list of demographic, awareness and importance questions were sent to those directors failing to complete the initial surveys. A waiver of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, from Ohio University, was gained prior to mailing the initial survey.
Data Analysis

The survey data was entered into the computer software program Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), 14.0 and analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a significance level set at $\alpha < 0.05$. Post hoc tests using Bonferroni corrections were made to reduce Type I error. In situations requiring analysis of two means independent samples t-tests were conducted, with the significance level set at $\alpha < 0.05$. Frequencies and descriptive analysis was used to explain the categorical variables and demographics.

The individual independent variables associated with personal, institutional and preparation characteristics were assessed against the dependent variables of awareness, perceived importance and application of the standards. Positive responses to the awareness question were segregated and respondents were examined for source of awareness and satisfaction with the standards. Barriers to the use of the standards were asked of all respondents.

Survey questions were aligned with each sub-problem and null-hypotheses. The general null hypothesis for this is study is that there will be no statistically significant difference in the awareness, perceived importance, application and satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning as applied to student employees, by recreational professionals. The following specific null-hypotheses are:

HO$_1$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by professional affiliation;

HO$_2$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by organizational report lines;
HO3: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by academic preparation;

HO4: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on professional affiliation;

HO5: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on organizational location;

HO6: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on academic preparation;

HO7: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards based on their professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO8: There are no significant differences in a recreation director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by organizational report lines;

HO9: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by academic preparation.

HO10: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO11: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines;
HO_{12}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation;

HO_{13}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s affiliation with other professional organizations.

HO_{14}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s organizational location.

HO_{15}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards, based on a recreational sports director’s academic preparation.

HO_{16}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by professional affiliation other than NIRSA;

HO_{17}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines;

HO_{18}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation;

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports professionals and their awareness, application, and satisfaction with CAS recreational
sports standards related to student development and learning by student employees, and to identify potential perceived barriers to their use. The results of the study should influence the academic preparation of future professionals through recommendations for curriculum development and the professional development of current professionals by identifying differences in methods of obtaining relevant knowledge based on preparation, organizational location and participation in professional organization variables of the NIRSA membership.
CHAPTER FOUR

“As more and more colleges place recreational sports under the auspices of Student Affairs...the need becomes apparent for linking programs with the beneficial outcomes of involvement in these programs” (Artinger et al., 2006, p. 70).

Findings

Population

The population for this study consisted of recreational sports directors from four year institutions and members of the NIRSA, at the time of data collection. This population has been surveyed previously and has varied in size each time. Leadership Attitudes and Behaviors of Effective Recreational Sports Leaders (Milton, 2002), Reporting Structure and Job Satisfaction of Collegiate Campus Recreation Directors (Schneider et al., 2005) and Characteristics, Attributes and Competencies Sought in New Hires by Campus Recreation Directors (Schneider, Stier, Kampf, Haines & Wilding, 2006) provided comparative data for this study. The population size has varied from Milton’s study of leadership attitudes \((n=616)\) to Schneider’s study of reporting structure satisfaction \((n=682)\) and their study of characteristics, attributes and competencies \((n=560)\). The population for this study was \(N=579\). The discrepancy in population size is likely due to a director’s membership status and the time of the year the study took place.

A packet of labels and an Excel spreadsheet with the names and addresses of 581 directors were received from the NIRSA national office located in Corvallis, Oregon in October, 2006. Prior to distribution of the survey the list was reduced by seven directors of recreational sports programs at Mid American (athletic) Conference (MAC) institutions who participated in the pilot study, the researcher, the Executive Director of
the NIRSA and a director from Guam. The remaining directors were sent a survey consisting of 93 questions in early November, 2006. A second mailing was sent in early December, 2006 to those directors not responding to the first survey. A total of 305 recreational sports directors responded to the initial mailings which resulted in a 53.2% response rate for the full version of the survey. A final abbreviated survey, requesting demographic, awareness, perceived importance and standards ownership data, was sent in the middle of December, 2006, to all directors not responding to the first two requests. The modified questionnaire was responded to by an additional 96 directors, increasing the total response to 400 for a response rate of 70.05%. Data analyses from the third group of surveys were limited to those abbreviated variables and results were identified when a substantial difference was revealed. The rate of return for this study appears to be good as compared to the rates for previous studies. Milton’s 2002 study had a return rate of 54.3% while Schneider, et al., had return rate of 39% for their 2005 study and 43% for their 2006 study.

Independent Variables

Organizational location, academic preparation and membership in professional organizations other than the NIRSA are the primary independent variables associated with this study. Frequencies and descriptive analysis of these and other variables provide a broad view of the collegiate recreational sports profession.

Organizational location.

The population demographics data from this study provided a somewhat different view than previous studies regarding organizational location of campus recreation programs. The primary location of recreational sports programs at 4 year colleges and
universities is in student affairs ($n=286$) and the second most common location is intercollegiate athletics ($n=76$). Academic ($n=14$), business ($n=11$) and other ($n=13$) locations made up a total of 10% of the responses. Comparative data from this and other studies are provided in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

*Number and Differences in Organizational Location of Recreational Sports Program*

*Over 13 Year Period from 1994-2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org Location</th>
<th>Bryant ‘94</th>
<th>Cohen ‘95</th>
<th>Schneider ‘05</th>
<th>Franklin, ‘07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Return Rate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors Responding</td>
<td>$n=NA$</td>
<td>$n=288$</td>
<td>$n=269$</td>
<td>$n=400$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values represent percentages of population and were rounded. NA indicates data was not collected for these groupings.

There appears to be an 11% increase in student affairs based recreational sports programs from the NIRSA data used in Bryant’s 1994 paper to the current study. Athletic based programs have reached a plateau after a modest increase between Cohen’s 1995 study and Schneider’s 2005 study. There has been a 12 percentage point drop in
programs housed in academic units. Data regarding recreational sports programs housed in other areas as well as business affairs is inconclusive because earlier studies did not track this organizational location.

Figure 4.1 provides a graphical representation of the current population of recreational sports programs based on organizational location.

*Figure 4.1 Organizational Location*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N=400$ and percentages are rounded.

Cross tabulation revealed organizational location varied modestly by institutional size. Institutions with extra large enrollments of more than 25,000 ($n=35$), the smallest group, were primarily housed in student affairs ($n=30; 85.7\%$). This contrasted with small schools of less than 5,000 ($n=97$) where student affairs ($n=62; 63.9\%$) and
intercollegiate athletics \( (n=26; 26.8\%) \) were the key locations of programs. Table 4.2 provides a breakdown in percentage of organizational location by enrollment.

Table 4.2

*Undergraduate Enrollment and Organizational Location of Recreational Sports Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>S. Affairs</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Athletic</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&lt; 5,000)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 5001-15,000)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 15,001-25,000)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 25,000 &lt;)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only directors completing the full survey provided data on enrollment \( n=305 \)

Organizational location was cross tabulated with regional data to determine if geographic location impacted where recreational sports programs were housed. With the exception of programs located in the NIRSA Region 1, northeastern United States, organizational location was fairly consistent across the country. This anomaly is likely caused by the preponderance of small private schools located in the region and the lack of large to extra large public institutions.
Figure 4.2 Organizational Locations by NIRSA Region

Note: N=400, Region 1 had a disproportionate number of small private institutions as compared to other regions.

*Academic preparation.*

The predominant academic preparation for recreational sports directors, at their highest degree, was from the health, physical education, recreation and sport management fields (HPER) \((n=277; 69.3\%)\). The other category, a mixture of academic disciplines not typically related to recreational sport programs, was the next largest group \((n=62; 15.7\%)\), which was followed closely by higher education and college student personnel (HE/CSP) \((n=58; 14.5\%)\). Cross tabulation (Table 4.3) of these fields reveal the largest proportion of the doctoral prepared recreational sports directors have academic preparation in the area of HE/CSP \((n=15; 60\%)\) while the predominant academic discipline for masters prepared directors is in the HPER areas \((n=236; 74.2\%)\).
Table 4.3

*Highest Degree and Academic Discipline of Recreational Sports Directors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>HPER</th>
<th>HE-CSP</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=400, other academic disciplines are unrelated to traditional roles of recreational sports.

*Membership in other professional associations.*

Recreational sports directors were asked to indicate their membership in professional organizations related to various functions within higher education and specifically related to recreational sports programs. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) are two professional associations related to student affairs and were selected because of the organizational relationship between recreational sports and student affairs. The organizations were combined into a single item because of their similar mission focus on student development and learning. The American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, (AAPHERD) is a major professional association for academic professionals and practitioners in the area of exercise, dance, health, physical education, recreation, and leisure studies. AAPHERD was selected because of the relationship between recreational sports programs and academic units. The National
Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) serves as an association for many recreation practitioners and faculty, and serves as the accrediting agency for academic departments of recreation. This association was also selected because of its relevance and relationship to recreational sports programs housed in academic units. The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and the National Association of College Auxiliary Services (NACAS) are two professional associations related to business activities within an academic community and were selected because of the organizational relationship between recreational sports programs and business units. The organizations were combined into a single item because of low response and because of their similar focus on business. The last item within the variable of professional association was “other, please specify.” The most identified other organizations included the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) (n=4) and the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) (n=3).

The original question “other than the NIRSA, I am affiliated with the following professional organizations” did not limit the response to a single association. The assumption was that in order to be in the surveyed population the recreational sports director was a member of the NIRSA. The question was an attempt to determine if memberships in other professional organizations had an effect on the recreational sports director’s awareness, perceptions and application of the standards. The results of this question were transformed and used to develop yes/no variables for each association, for other associations not specified, and for NIRSA only membership.

In addition to belonging to the NIRSA, a large number of recreational sports directors (n=228; 57%) indicated holding membership in other professional associations.
Membership in the other category, which included memberships in any other organization, was most common \((n=109; 27.3\%)\), while membership in NASPA/ACPA was the most common single group association \((n=66; 16.5\%)\).

**Figure 4.3 Memberships in Professional Associations Other Than the NIRSA**
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**Other Independent Variables**

Data were also analyzed to determine if other professional, personal, and institutional variables had a relationship with a recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance, application of and satisfaction with the CAS standards. Variables associated with personal, institutional and regional were used to collect data in an attempt to replicate elements of previous CAS studies (Marron, 1989; Ratcliffe, 2004; Rizzo 2005).
Biological gender.

There are significantly more male (n=278; 69.5%) than female (n=122; 30.5%) directors leading recreational sports programs. This distribution was consistent across institutional size, as determined by undergraduate enrollment, professional staff size and student staff size as well as by NIRSA region. The most even distribution of male (n=23; 65.7%) and female (n=12; 34.3%) directors was in the extra large institutions with an enrollment of greater than 25,000 students. The largest percentage of male directors (n=40; 78.4%) was located in large schools with an enrollment of 15,000-25,000 while the largest number of female directors (n=40; 32.8%) occurred in the medium sized institutions of between 5,001 and 15,000 students. The NIRSA Region 3 had the most even distribution of male (n=39; 63.9%) and female (n=22; 36.1%) directors. The largest number of male directors (n=78; 73.6%) are located in Region 2.

Experience.

The number of years the respondent was in the position of director and the number of years as a NIRSA professional was limited to those completing the first or second mailings of the survey (n=304). The largest number of directors have been in the field for between 1 and 5 years (n=104; 34.2%), followed by those in the position for 16 or more years (n=68; 17%) and 6-9 years (n=62; 20.4%). Directors in the 1-5 year category were located at the small (n=34; 35.1%) and medium (n=48; 39.7%) sized schools while directors with 16 or more years tended to be at large institutions (n=20; 39.2%). Years in position data was fairly evenly distributed in all NIRSA regions.

Years as a NIRSA professional (n=303) revealed the greatest number of directors had more than 16 years of experience (n=140; 46.2%) and were located at medium sized
institutions with enrollments between 5,001 and 15,000 (n=58; 47.9%). Table 4.4 provides a cross tabulation view of years as a NIRSA professional and undergraduate enrollment.

Table 4.4

*Undergraduate Enrollment and Years as a NIRSA Professional*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in NIRSA</th>
<th>&lt; 1</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-9</th>
<th>10-15</th>
<th>16 &lt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt; 5000)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (5001-15,000)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (15,001-25,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Large (&gt;25,000)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only respondents of the first two mailings of the survey completed enrollment and experience data (n=305)

*NIRSA region.*

NIRSA regional information was collected for use in cross tabulation. The six regions cover every state in the United States. Region 1 consists of the states in the Northeast, Region 2 consist of the Mid-Atlantic and southeastern states, Region 3 is predominantly the mid-western states, Region 4 consists of states in the southwest, Region 5 consists of the northern plain states, and Region 6 consists of the west coast states, Alaska and Hawaii.
With the exception of Region 5 the response rate was fairly balanced between the remaining five regions. Region 2 \((n=106; 26.6\%)\) had the greatest response and Region 5 \((n=30; 7.5\%)\) and Region 4 \((n=44; 11\%)\) had the poorest response. Region I \((n=86; 21.5\%)\), and Region 4 \((n=73; 18.3\%)\) were fairly evenly distributed. The subset, Region 3 \((n=61; 15.3\%)\) was reduced by the 7 MAC directors who participated in the pilot study and the researcher.

*Institutional size and type.*

Undergraduate enrollment, size of professional staff, and size of student employment staff was also collected for cross tabulations. Undergraduate enrollment was divided into four institutional categories including small (less than 5,000), medium (5,001-15,000), large (15,001-25,000) and extra-large (more than 25,001). The categories within the variables for the number of professional staff and the number of student staff were transformed by collapsing the data from the two largest types of institutions. Recreational sports programs were classified as small (less than 5), medium (6-10), large (11-15) and extra-large (more than 16) based on the number of professional staff members. Programs were also classified as small (less than 50) medium (51-100), large (101 to 250) and extra-large (with more than 251) based on the number of student employees. Variables of institutional enrollment, pro-staff size and student staff size underwent a test of bivariate correlation. Institutional size was correlated with professional staff size \((r = .554)\) and number of student employees \((r = .642)\) and found to be statistically significant at \(p\leq .01\) (2-tailed).

Another institutional variable was institutional type and the categories consisted of public and private. Institutional type was completed by 305 respondents with directors
at public institutions \((n=208; 68.2\%)\) making up the majority of the responses. Private institutions \((n=97; 31.8\%)\) were from predominantly small and medium sized colleges or universities. Data were correlated \((r=-.492)\) for the variables enrollment and institutional type. Statistical significance \((p \leq .01, 2\text{ tailed})\) was found with undergraduate enrollment and public or private institution. Private colleges were found to be smaller institutions while public institutions were found to be larger institutions.

Ownership of standards and resources.

Data reflecting Ownership of the CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, as well as the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards, Learning Reconsidered, Learning Reconsidered II and Principles of Good Practice were collected to establish if ownership could be used to determine a recreational sports director’s perceived importance, application or satisfaction of the standards. Ownership of the CAS standards was completed by 400 respondents and 26.3\% \((n=105)\) owned the standards. This was slightly less than the 32.3\% \((n=129)\) that owned the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards. A total of 19.5\% \((n=78)\) of the directors owned both sets of standards and only 14 directors owned all 5 documents.

Research questions

Each hypothesis was subjected to an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if a relationship existed between the dependent and independent variables related to the specific question. When applicable, post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction was administered when multiple groups were analyzed. In the event homogeneity of variance was rejected the data were subjected to independent samples t-test.
Awareness of CAS Standards

A total of 397 recreational sports directors responded to the awareness of CAS standards question. Frequency data revealed 182 (45.84%) of the directors were very aware or aware of the CAS Standards and 134 (33.75%) of directors were unaware or somewhat unaware. Specific research questions regarding awareness of the standards included the relationship between professional association, organizational location and academic preparation.

Awareness and Professional Affiliation Other Than NIRSA

HO1: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by professional affiliation other than NIRSA.

Professional affiliation data were transformed to reveal member and non-member status. Independent samples t-test were then run between members and non-members of each professional association. NASPA/ACPA (n= 66) was the single largest membership group and had the greatest awareness of CAS standards (M=3.773). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.098) and membership in NASPA/ACPA was found to be statistically significant (p≤.05) between members and non-members (.001). No statistical significance was found for membership in AAPHERD (n=43; M=2.930), NRPA (n=22; M=3.091), NACUBO/NACAS (n=16; M=3.00), other (n=107; M=3.206) or with professionals only belonging to NIRSA (n=172; M=3.070). Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for NASPA/ACPA members only. Membership in AAPHERD, NRPA, NACUBO/NACAS, or any other professional association was not found to be a significant contributor to a director’s awareness of the CAS standards for recreational sports.
Awareness and Organizational Report Lines

HO$_2$: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by organizational report lines.

Responses for organizational location ($n=397$) revealed the two major units housing recreational sport programs were student affairs (71.5%) and intercollegiate athletics (19.0%). Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the independent variable of organizational location and dependent variable awareness of the CAS standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected (.005). The data were transformed into two variables, student affairs ($n=283$) and other ($n=114$) and the data were subjected to an independent samples t-test. Student Affairs based programs were the largest group ($n=283$) and had the highest level of awareness ($M=3.502$). Other based programs ($n=114$) were substantially less aware ($M=2.360$). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected (.029) and statistical significance ($p<.05$) was found between student affairs (.000) and other locations with equal variances not assumed. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for recreational sports directors of programs housed in student affairs.

Awareness and Academic Preparation

HO$_3$: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by academic preparation.

Academic preparation data was collected using two variables, highest degree ($n=394$) and academic discipline at highest degree ($n=394$). Recreational sports directors responding to this survey hold doctoral, master’s and bachelors degrees. There were no directors with an associate’s degree and only one director with no degree. This case was
eliminated from the analysis. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the independent variables of highest degree with the dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Doctoral prepared directors ($n=25$) were the most aware ($M=3.640$), and master’s ($n=317$) were the most similar ($LM=3.070; HM=3.415; SD=1.56$). Bachelors prepared directors ($n=52$) were the least aware ($M=2.500$). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance for highest degree was not-rejected (.098), and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found at (.002) between groups. Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between directors holding doctorates and bachelors (.008), and directors holding masters and bachelors (.004).

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the independent variables of highest degree with the dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Directors with academic preparation in HE/CSP were the most aware ($M=3.319$) and the directors with an academic preparation in HPER were the most similar group ($LM=3.118; HM=3.479; SD=1.47$). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance for academic discipline was also not rejected (.318), and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found at (.005) between groups. Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between HPER (.004) and other prepared directors and between HE/CSP (.042) and other prepared directors. Based on this data analysis, the hypothesis was rejected by both variables and suggesting HE/CSP doctoral and HPER master prepared directors were significantly more aware of the CAS standards than their lesser prepared counter-parts.
**Other Findings for the Dependent Variable of Awareness**

Data were also analyzed to determine if other professional, personal, and institutional variables had a relationship with a recreational sports director’s awareness. The variables included NIRSA region, professional experience, institutional size and type and biological gender.

**Awareness and NIRSA region.**

$H_{O1}$: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by NIRSA region.

The professional variable of NIRSA region ($n=397$) provided some insight on awareness of the standard. Region 6 ($M=3.523$) and Region 2 ($M=3.452$) had the highest awareness of the CAS standards and Region 1 ($M=2.628$) was the only region with an awareness below neutral. Region 1 ($LM=2.306; HM=2.950; SD=1.50$) and Region 2 ($HM=3.156; HM=3.747; SD=1.51$) were slightly more homogeneous than other regions. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of NIRSA region and the dependent variable of awareness of CAS standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.954). Statistical significance ($p<.05$) was found at (.005) between regions. Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between Region 2 and 1 (.004) and between Region 6 and 1 (.028). In both cases Region 1 directors were significantly less aware of the standards. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis is rejected for recreational sports directors located at institutions in NIRSA Regions 1, 2, and 6.
Awareness and personal variables.

HO$_{a2}$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by professional experience.

Experience variables consisted of the director’s time in the position ($n=303$) and time as a professional member of the NIRSA ($n=302$). Both of these variables consisted of categories of less than 1 year, 1-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-15 years, and 16 or more years. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the independent variable of years in the position and the dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Directors with 16 or more years of experience ($n=68$) had the highest awareness ($M=3.706$) of the standards. The largest group of directors had 1-5 years in the position ($n=103; M=2.990$). The newest directors, those with less than one year in the position, were the most similar group ($LM=1.560; HM=2.588; SD=1.298$) and were the least aware ($M=2.074$). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.194) and years in the position was found to be statistically significant ($p=.05$) between groups (.000). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed recreational sports directors with less than one year of experience in the job were less aware of the CAS standards than any other experience group. Directors with more than 16 years experience as a director were more aware than both of the director groups with less than 1 year (.000) and 1-5 years (.024). Directors with less than 1 year in the position of director were found to be less aware than all other groups.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the independent variable of years in the profession and the dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Directors with 16 or more years as a NIRSA professional was the largest ($n=140$) and
most aware ($M=3.807$) group. Directors with less than one year as a NIRSA professional were the smallest ($n=20$) and most similar ($LM=1.453; HM=2.547; SD =1.169$) group. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.320) and years as a NIRSA professional was found to be statistically significant ($p\leq .05$) between groups (.000). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed recreational sports directors with 16 or more years in the profession were more aware of the standards than the director groups with 6-9 years (.000), 1-5 years (.000) and less than 1 year (.000). Directors with 10-15 years were more aware than directors with 1-5 years (.005) and less than 1 year (.009).

Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis is rejected for recreational sports directors based on their experience in the position for recreational sports directors with 10 or more years as a NIRSA professional.

$H_{O_3}$: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by biological gender.

Biological gender was completed by $n=397$ respondents. Female directors ($n=122$) had a slightly higher awareness ($M=3.287$) than male directors ($n=212; M=3.124$). Male directors were a more homogeneous group ($LM=2.945; HM=3.302; SD=1.504$). An independent sample t-test was conducted for the independent variable of biological gender and dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Levene’s test of homogeneity was rejected (.002) and no statistical significance was found between groups (.338). Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was not rejected for biological gender.
Awareness and institutional variables.

HOₜₜ: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by institutional size.

Variables of institutional enrollment, the number of student employees and professional staff provided institutional size data. Enrollment (n=304) was originally categorized as small, medium, large and extra-large institutions. Due to the relatively small number of large (n=35) and extra-large (n=51) the data from this variable was transformed, combining these two groups into a single large group (n=86). Medium sized institutions (n=121) had the largest number of directors. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of undergraduate enrollment and dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. The newly formed large group had the highest mean (M=3.767) and were the most similar group (LM=3.465; HM=4.070; SD=1.411). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.134) and statistical significance (p<.05) was found between groups (.000). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between large institutions and both small (.000) and medium sized (.014) institutions.

The variable number of student employees (n=304) originally had 5 categories. The variable was transformed, combining the two largest groups into the extra-large (53) category. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of number of student employees and the dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Institutions with 101-250 student employees (n=88) was the largest group and had the highest awareness (M=3.679). Institutions with less than 50 student employees (n=80) was the most homogeneous group (LM=2.084; HM=2.691; SD=1.364) and had
the lowest awareness ($M=2.388$) of all groups. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.055) and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between groups (.000). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between extra-large and both small (.021) and medium (.000) institutions, and between the large and both small (.000) and medium (.026) institutions.

The size of professional staff variable ($n=303$), also had 5 categories and was transformed into 4 categories by combining the two largest groups into a single extra-large ($n=22$) category. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of professional staff and dependent variable of awareness of the CAS standards. Programs with more than 16 professional staff members ($n=22$) was the smallest group and had the highest awareness ($M=4.045$). Institutions with less than 5 professional staff members ($n=188$), had the lowest awareness ($M=2.926$) and those with 11-15 ($n=37$) were the most similar group ($LM=3.078; HM=4.003; SD=1.386$).

Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.099) and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between groups (.001). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections found statistical significance between the extra-large and the small (.007) group. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for recreational sports directors of programs found in large and extra-large institutions.

$H_{06}$: There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s awareness of CAS standards by institutional type.

Responses for institutional type ($n=304$) revealed greater than twice as many public ($n=207$) as private ($n=97$) colleges and universities are represented in the NIRSA. Independent samples t-tests were conducted and revealed public institutions had the
highest awareness \((M=3.372)\) and were slightly more similar \((LM=3.164; HM=3.580; SD=1.517)\) than private institutions. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.966) and statistical significance \((p \leq .05)\) was found between groups (.002). Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected and recreational sports directors at public institutions were significantly more aware of the standards than directors at private colleges and universities.

**Source of Awareness**

Source data was completed by 168 of the directors. Data revealed the number one source of the CAS standards was professional meetings and conferences \((M=3.905; SD=1.179)\) and the least used source was graduate studies \((M=1.946; SD=1.256)\). See *Figure 4* for full results on sources of awareness.
Independent samples t-test and were used to determine if possible differences existed between the source of awareness and the variables associated with professional organizations, organizational location and academic preparation.

Source of Awareness and Professional Affiliation

HO4: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on professional affiliation.

Independent samples t-test was run for members and non-members of NASPA/ACPA. Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the sources of graduate studies (.033), professional meetings (.048) and departmental director or senior student affairs officer (.002). Analysis of these sources was therefore limited to equal
variances not assumed. All other sources were assumed to have equal variance. Statistical significance ($p < .05$) was found with the source of departmental director or senior student affairs officer (.011) and institutional colleagues (.010).

Independent samples T-tests were also run for other professional associations and only membership in AAPHERD was found to have statistical significance on the recreational sports director’s source of awareness. For the AAPHERD group, Levene’s test for equality of variances was not rejected for any of the sources and statistical significance ($p < .05$) was found with the source graduate studies (.035). Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for NASPA/ACPA members, for the source of awareness from departmental director or senior student affairs officer, and by AAPHERD members for the source of awareness from graduate studies.

**Source of Awareness and Organizational Location**

$H_{05}$: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on organizational location?

Independent samples t-test was conducted with the independent variable of organizational location, using student affairs and the transformed group of other, and the dependent variables related to the source of awareness of the CAS standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected for all sources. Specifically, homogeneity of variance was not rejected for the source department director or senior student affairs officer (.179) and statistical significance ($p < .05$) was found between groups (.001). Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for student affairs based programs and the source of awareness from departmental directors and senior student affairs officer.
Source of Awareness and Academic Preparation

HO₆: Among those recreational sports directors aware of CAS standards, there are no significant differences in the source of awareness based on academic preparation. The relationship between academic preparation and sources of awareness of CAS standards provided varied results. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of highest degree attained and the source of awareness. No statistical significance was found between any of the degree levels and sources of awareness. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also conducted for the independent variable of academic discipline, and the source of awareness. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances was not rejected for any of the source areas and academic discipline. Specifically, Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance for graduate studies (.705) was not rejected and statistical significance ($p<.05$) was found between groups for this source of awareness (.003). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed HE/CSP (.002) gained more of their awareness from graduate studies than did HPER prepared directors. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for HE/CSP prepared directors and the source of graduate studies.

Perceived Importance of CAS Standards

A total of 367 recreational sports directors responded to the perceived importance of CAS standards questions. Frequency data revealed 216 recreational sports directors (58.9%) found the CAS standards to be very or somewhat important and 57 (15.5%) found the standards unimportant or somewhat unimportant. Specific hypotheses for perceived importance follow.
Perceived Importance and Professional Affiliation

HO7: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards based on their professional affiliation other than NIRSA.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted for the professional association of NASPA/ACPA. Members (n=64) perceived the CAS standards more important (M=3.938) than non-members (M=3.594), however, non-members were a more similar (LM=3.462; HM=3.726; SD=1.163) group. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected (.022) and statistical significance (p<.05) was found between members and non-members of NASPA/ACPA (.030) with equal variances not assumed. Statistical significance was not found with membership in any of the other professional association. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for the NASPA/ACPA membership group only.

Perceived Importance and Organizational Report Lines

HO8: There are no significant differences in recreation director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by organizational report lines.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted with the original organizational report groups of the independent variable of organizational location and the dependent variable of perceived importance. Student affairs based programs (n=269) perceived the CAS standards to be more important (M=3.784) than programs based in other organizational units. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance (.421) was not rejected and statistical significance (p<.05) was found between groups (.001). Post hoc tests using Bonferroni corrections revealed programs housed within student affairs perceived
the standards to be more important than their counter parts in athletics (.033) and other areas (.025). Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for recreational sports directors of programs housed in student affairs.

**Perceived Importance and Academic Preparation**

**HOₙ:** There are no significant differences in recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by academic preparation.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of highest degree and the dependent variable of perceived importance of the CAS standards. Master’s prepared directors were the largest group \(n=235\), had the highest average perception of importance \(M=3.660\) and were the most similar group \(LM=3.515; HM=3.804; SD=1.122\). Levene’s test for homogeneity was not rejected \(.451\), however, no statistical significance \(.578\) was found between groups.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of academic discipline and the dependent variable of perceived importance of the CAS standards. HPER prepared directors were the largest \(n=259\) and most similar group \(LM=3.559; HM=3.831; SD1.111\), and HE/CSP prepared directors had the highest degree of perceived importance \(M=3.709\). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected \(.598\), however, no statistical significance \(.098\) was found between groups.

Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was not rejected for academic preparation by highest degree and academic discipline.
Other Findings for Perceived Importance

*Perceived importance and NIRSA region.*

Ho_{pi1}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by NIRSA region.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the dependent variable of perceived importance and the independent variables of NIRSA region. No statistical significance was found between the variables and the hypotheses were not rejected.

*Perceived importance of CAS standards and personal variables.*

Ho_{pi2}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by professional experience.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted for the dependent variable of perceived importance and the independent variables associated with professional experience. No statistical significance was found between the variables and the hypotheses were not rejected.

Ho_{pi3}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by biological gender.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the dependent variable of perceived importance and the independent variable of biological gender. No statistical significance was found between the variables and the hypotheses were not rejected.

*Perceived importance of CAS standards and institutional variables.*

Ho_{pi4}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by institutional size.
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the dependent variable of perceived importance and the independent variable of institutional size. No statistical significance was found between the variables and the hypotheses were not rejected.

\( H_{0_{pis}}: \) There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s perceived importance of CAS standards by institutional type.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the dependent variable of perceived importance and the independent variable of institutional type. No statistical significance was found between the variables and the hypotheses were not rejected.

In order to determine if ownership of any of the standards had an effect on the perceived importance of the standards, recreational sports directors were asked to identify which standards they owned. This question was responded to by all recreational sports directors \((n=400)\) and a non response was scored as non-ownership. Results indicated Learning Reconsidered 2 \((n=136; 34\%)\), NIRSA General and Specialty Standards \((n=129; 32\%)\) and the CAS standards \((n=105; 26.3\%)\) were the most common documents owned by recreational sports directors. Cross tabulation of ownership of materials reveal many owners of the CAS standards also own Principles of Good Practice \((n=25)\), NIRSA General and Specialty Standards \((n=78)\), Learning Reconsidered \((n=63)\) and Learning Reconsidered II \((n=80)\). Hypotheses were developed to determine if ownership of these documents have an effect on the recreational sports directors perceived importance of the CAS standards.
Perceived Importance and Ownership of the Standards

Perceived importance and ownership of the CAS standards.

HO$_{p16}$: There are no significant differences in the perceived importance of CAS standards by recreational sports directors who own the CAS standards.

Independent samples t-test was conducted using owners and non-owners of the CAS standards. Owners perceived importance of the standards ($M=4.380$) was substantially greater than that of the non-owners ($M=3.382$). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected (.000) and statistical significance ($p<.05$) was found between owners and non-owners (.000) for perceived importance of the standards, with equal variances not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected and ownership of the CAS standards had a positive effect on the recreational sports director’s perceived importance of the standards.

Perceived importance and ownership of the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards.

HO$_{p17}$: There are no significant differences in the perceived importance of CAS standards by recreational sports directors who own the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards.

An independent sample t-test between owners and non-owners was conducted and owners of the NIRSA General and Specialty Standards ($n=118$) perceived the CAS standards ($M=4.059$) more important than non-owners ($M=3.462$). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected (.030) and statistical significance ($p<.05$) was found between owners and non-owners (.000) for perceived importance of the standards, with
equal variances not assumed. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for owners of the *NIRSA General and Specialty Standards*.

**Perceived importance and ownership of Learning Reconsidered.**

HO_{p8}: There are no significant differences in the perceived importance of CAS standards by recreational sports directors who own *Learning Reconsidered*.

An independent samples t-test was conducted between owners and non-owners of *Learning Reconsidered*. Owners of *Learning Reconsidered* (n=90) had a higher perception of the importance of the standards (M=4.200) than non-owners (M=3.477). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected (.016) and statistical significance (p<.05) was found between owners and non-owners (.000) for perceived importance of the CAS standards, with equal variances not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for owners of the *Learning Reconsidered*.

**Perceived importance and ownership of Learning Reconsidered II.**

HO_{p9}: There are no significant differences in the perceived importance of CAS standards by recreational sports directors who own *Learning Reconsidered II*.

An independent samples t-test was conducted between owners and non-owners of *Learning Reconsidered II*. Owners of *Learning Reconsidered II* (n=126) had a higher perceived importance of the standards (M=4.111) than non-owners (M=3.415). Levene’s test for equality of variances was not rejected (.169) and statistical significance (p≤.05) was found between owners and non-owners (.000) for perceived importance of the CAS standards, with equal variances assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for owners of *Learning Reconsidered II*. 
Perceived importance and ownership of Principles of Good Practice.

HO\textsubscript{p10}: There are no significant differences in the perceived importance of CAS standards by recreational sports directors who own Principles of Good Practice.

An independent samples t-test was conducted between owners and non-owners of Principles of Good Practice. Owners of Principles of Good Practice (n=32) had slightly higher perception of the importance of the standards (M=3.816) than non-owners (M=3.639). Levene’s test for equality of variances was not rejected (.573) and statistical significance was not found between owners and non-owners. Based on the analysis of these data, hypothesis is not rejected for owners of Principles of Good Practice.

Perceived Importance and Other Variables

Data were also analyzed to determine if other professional, personal, or institutional variables had a relationship with the recreational sports director’s perceived importance of the standards.

Perceived Importance of Learning Outcome Domains

Recreational sports directors were asked to rate the importance of specific learning outcome domains identified in the program section of the CAS standards. Collection of learning outcome data was limited to those recreational sport directors responding to the first two applications of the survey (n=305). These data were analyzed using frequencies and descriptive statistics. Respondents rated all learning outcomes above the neutral level (3.000) and specifically rated Leadership Development (M=4.421), Effective Communication (M= 4.393) and Healthy Behavior (M=4.359) as the most important outcome domains. See Figure 4.5.
Figure 4.5 Learning Outcome Domains

Note: Responses limited to the first two mailings of the survey n= 305

Application of CAS Standards

Respondents completing the third version of the survey were eliminated from the analysis of application of the CAS standards. Data from the first two mailings were transformed based on completion of questions following the statement “Please continue ONLY if you are aware of the CAS Standards by indicating a rating of 3 or more. If you are unaware of the CAS standards please STOP and return the survey.” This statement was followed by “If you are aware of the CAS Standards please proceed to the remainder of the survey.” The assumption underlying these statements was that one could only apply a standard if one was aware of the standard. Data from respondents ending at this statement were transformed from missing data to reflect “never use.”
A total of 304 records were used in the analysis of application questions relative to using the learning outcomes section of the CAS standards with student employees. The application variable is a composite score and represents an average of the responses to the application of the learning outcomes identified in Figure 5. Frequency data revealed 106 directors (34.9%) applied the learning outcomes from the CAS standards frequently or occasionally and 152 (50%) never used or seldom used the standards. Specific hypotheses for the application of learning outcomes are as follows.

**Application and Professional Affiliation Other Than NIRSA**

HO$_{11}$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by professional affiliation other than NIRSA.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted for the dependent variable of application and the independent variable of membership in the professional organizations of NASPA/ACPA. Levine’s test for equality of variances assumed was not rejected (.092) and statistical significance was found ($p < .05$) for members (.005) of NASPA/ACPA with equal variances assumed. Statistical significance was not found for membership in AAPHERD, NRPA, NACUBO/NACAS, Other and NIRSA only groups. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for members of NACAS/ACPA.

**Application and Organizational Location**

HO$_{12}$: There are no significant differences in a recreation director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines.
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the dependent variable of application and the independent variable of organizational location. Student Affairs based programs \((n=222)\) applying the learning outcomes standards had higher rate of application \((M=2.64)\) and were more similar \((LM=2.45; HM=2.84; SD=.098)\) than other based programs. Levene’s test for equal variances was rejected (.000). Organizational location data were transformed to form student affairs and other categories. Independent samples t-test was conducted and statistical significance \((p<.05)\) for student affairs (.000) application of the CAS standards was found, with equal variances not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for programs housed in student affairs.

Application and Academic Preparation

\(H_{03}\): There are no significant differences in a recreational sport director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of highest degree and the dependent variable application of CAS standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.359) and statistical significance \((p<.05)\) was found between groups (.050). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance between doctoral and bachelors (.045) prepared directors.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the independent variable of academic preparation and the dependent variable of application of the CAS standard. Directors with academic preparation in HE/CSP \((n=47)\) had higher rates of application \((M=2.72)\) than either the HPER \((M=2.44)\) or other \((M=2.05)\) groups and the HPER prepared directors were the most similar group \((LM=2.25; HM=2.63; SD=1.44)\).
Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.120) and no statistical significance was found between groups.

Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for members of doctoral prepared directors.

Other Findings for the Dependent Variable of Application

Data were also analyzed to determine if other professional, personal, and institutional variables had a relationship with the recreational sports director’s application of the standards, relative to student development and learning for student employees.

Application and NIRSA region.

HO\textsubscript{ap1}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by NIRSA region.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variables of NIRSA region. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variable of NIRSA region and the dependent variable of application of the CAS standards. Based on the analysis of these data no statistical significance was found with the variable of NIRSA region and the hypothesis was not rejected.

Application and personal variables.

HO\textsubscript{ap2}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by years in the position.
Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variables of years of experience. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variable of years in the position and the dependent variable of application of the CAS standards. Based on the analysis of these data no statistical significance was found with the variable of years in the position and the hypothesis was not rejected.

**HO_{ap3}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by years as a NIRSA professional.

**Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the dependent variable of application of the CAS standards and the independent variable of years as a NIRSA professional.** Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected (.007). Analysis of the means revealed a wide disparity between professionals with less than six years more than six years of experience. The data was transformed into two groups and an independent samples t-test was conducted using the two new groups of less than six \((M=1.98)\) and greater than six \((M=2.58)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was again rejected (.049) and statistical significance \((p<.05)\) was found (.002) with equal variances not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for years as a NIRSA professional and application of the standards for student development and learning.

**HO_{ap4}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by biological gender.
Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variable of biological gender. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variable of biological gender and the dependent variable of application of the CAS standards. Based on the analysis of these data no statistical significance was found with the variable of biological gender and the hypothesis was not rejected.

**HO_{ap5}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by ownership of the CAS standards.

Independent samples t-test was conducted for the independent variable of ownership of the CAS standards and the dependent variable of application. Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected (.008) and statistical significance was found between non-owners and owners (.000) with equal variances not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for ownership and application of the standards for student development and learning.

*Application and institutional variables.*

**HO_{ap6}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by institutional enrollment.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted using the dependent variable of application of the CAS standards and the independent variable of enrollment. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.140) and statistical significance \( (p \leq .05) \) was found between groups (.008). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni
corrections revealed statistical significance between large and small schools (.037) and extra-large and small schools (.028). Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for institutional enrollment an application of the standards for student development and learning as applied to student employees.

**HO_{ap7}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by size of the student staff.

Analysis of variance was conducted using the transformed independent variable of student staff size, combing large and extra large staffs, and the dependent variable of application of the standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.262) and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between groups (.002). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni corrections revealed statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) between small and medium (.005) and small and large (.019) sized student staffs.

Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for student staff size an application of the standards for student development and learning for student employees.

**HO_{ap8}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by professional staff size.

The independent variable of professional staff size was transformed into the categories of less than 6 and more than 6 and independent t-test was conducted. Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected (.049) and statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between small and large staffs (.002) with equal variances not assumed. Based on
analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for professional staff size and application of the standards for student development and learning for student employees.

$H_{0_{app}}$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s application of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees by institutional type.

Independent samples t-test was conducted for the independent variable of institutional type and the dependent variable of application. Levene’s test for equality of variances was not rejected (.407). Statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between private and public institutions (.005) with equal variance assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for institutional type and application of the standards for student development and learning.

*Barriers to Applying the CAS Standards*

Directors completing the barriers section of the survey ($n=142$) found most of the barriers to applying CAS standards on the lower end of the significance scale. The most significant barriers included lack of time ($M=3.340$), lack of staff resources ($M=3.286$) and lack of training ($M=3.268$). Least significant barriers included fear of finding non-compliance ($M=1.637$) and not helpful based on past use ($M=1.842$). *Figure 6* provides a complete list of the potential barriers for the use of the standards.
Figure 4.6 Barriers to Applying the CAS Standards

Note: Responses limited to the first two mailings of the survey n= 305

Barriers to Applying The Standards By Professional Affiliation

HO13: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on a recreational sports director’s membership in other professional organizations.

A series of independent samples t-tests were used to determine if there were possible differences in the perceived barriers to application of the standards by the recreational sports director’s affiliation with the aforementioned professional
associations. The most significant barrier for NASPA/ACPA members \((n=32)\) was the lack of time \((M=3.333)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barriers of lack of training \((.001)\) and fear of finding non-compliance \((.027)\), however, no statistical significance was found with any of the barriers. The most significant barrier for AAPHERD members \((n=18)\) was also a lack of time \((M=3.611)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barrier lack of funds \((.026)\), however, no statistical significance was found with any of the barriers. The most significant barrier for NRPA members \((n=13)\) was lack of time \((M=3.00)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barrier of unspecified other \((.001)\). Statistical significance \((p \leq .05)\) was found for the barrier of unspecified other \((.005)\) with equal variances not assumed and for the barriers of lack of funds \((.047)\) and lack of staff resources \((.044)\) with equal variances assumed. The most significant barrier for NACAS/NACUBO members \((n=4)\) was lack of time \((4.00)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected and no statistical significance was found with any of the barriers. The most significant barrier for members of other professional associations \((n=49)\) was lack of time \((M=3.306)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barriers of not useful \((.023)\) and other \((.030)\). Statistical significance \((p \leq .05)\) was found with the barrier not helpful based on past use \((.000)\) with equal variances not assumed. The most significant barrier for NIRSA only directors \((n=42)\) was lack of staff resources \((M=3.512)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barriers of lack of funds \((.023)\), lack of training \((.027)\), not helpful based on past use \((.030)\) and other \((.001)\). Statistical significance \((p \leq .05)\) was found with the barrier not helpful based on past use \((.001)\) with equal variance not assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected.
for NRPA, other professional associations, and for directors with membership in only NIRSA.

**Barriers to Applying The Standards By Organizational Location**

**HO14:** There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the organizational location of the recreational sports department.

Independent samples t-test was conducted using student affairs based respondents and the combined group of academic, athletic, business and other units. The most significant barriers for student affairs based directors \((n=115)\) were lack of time \((M=3.313)\) and lack of staff resources \((M=3.307)\). Levene’s test for equality of variances was rejected for the barrier lack of perceived value \((.009)\). Statistical significance \((p<.05)\) was found with equal variances not assumed for the variable of lack of perceived value \((.018)\). Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected and a comparison of organizational location suggests student affairs based programs see the barriers of lack of time and lack of resources significantly more of a barrier than the lack of perceived value and differ in this perception than other located departments.

**Barriers to Applying the Standards by Academic Preparation**

**HO15:** There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the academic preparation of a recreational sports director.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for highest degree attained. The most significant barriers for doctoral prepared directors \((n=12)\) was lack of time \((M=3.250)\), for master’s prepared directors \((n=112)\) was lack of staff resources \((M=3.357)\) and for bachelor’s prepared directors \((n=15)\) was lack of training on how to use the standards. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances was rejected for the
barriers of lack of institutional support (.001) and fear of finding non-compliance (.001). Statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between groups for the barrier of lack of training (.014). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction reveal bachelors prepared directors found lack of training significantly more of a barrier (.010) than did doctoral prepared directors.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for academic discipline. The most significant barriers for HPER prepared directors ($n=107$) was lack of time ($M=3.346$). HE/CSP prepared directors ($n=22$) found lack of staff resources ($M=3.409$) and lack of time ($M=3.409$) the most significant barriers. Recreational sports directors from other academic disciplines ($n=11$) found lack of staff resources ($M=3.455$) and lack of training on how to use the standards ($M=3.455$) the most significant barriers. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected for all barriers and there was no statistical significance found between any of the groups in any of the barriers. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for bachelors prepared directors and the lack of training.

*Other Findings Associated with Barriers to Application*

Data was also analyzed to determine if other professional, personal, and institutional variables had a relationship with the barriers to application of the standards by recreational sports directors. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the dependent variables of lack of time, lack of staff resources and lack of training and the independent variables of NIRSA region, biological gender, years in the position, years as a NIRSA professional, institutional enrollment, size of professional and student staff, and institutional type.
Barriers to applying the standards by NIRSA region.

HO_{bar1}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the NIRSA regional location of the recreational sports program.

Among all NIRSA regions, region 1 (n=22) found the barriers of lack of time (M=4.091), lack of training (M=3.909), and lack of staff resources (M=3.773) most problematic. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the variables NIRSA region and individual barriers to application. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was rejected for the barrier of lack of staff resources (.019) but was not rejected for lack of time (.832) and lack of training (.082). Statistical significance (p<.05) was found between groups with both lack of time (.016) and lack of training (.034). Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed Region 1 was statistically more likely to consider the barrier of lack of time than either Region 2 (.017) or Region 4 (.047). Based on analysis of these data the hypothesis was rejected for the barriers of a lack of time and a lack of training for these NIRSA regions.

Barriers to applying the standards by personal variables.

HO_{bar2}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on a recreational sports director’s by professional experience.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variables of years in the position and years in the profession and no statistical significance found for either of these variables. Based on analysis of these data, the hypotheses were not rejected for the independent variables of years as a professional and years in the position.
HO_{bar3}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to application of the CAS standards based on a recreational sports director’s by biological gender.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted and there was no statistical significance found in the personal variable of biological gender. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was not rejected for the independent variable of the biological gender.

**Barriers to applying the standards by institutional variables.**

HO_{bar4}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the undergraduate enrollment of the institution.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the independent variable of enrollment and the individual dependent variables of barriers to application. Small institutions \((n=72)\) considered lack of time \((M=3.559)\), lack of staff \((M=3.500)\) and lack of training \((M=3.471)\) considerably greater barriers than did large institutions. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected for lack of staff \((.867)\), lack of time \((.116)\) and lack of training \((.220)\). Statistical significance was not found between groups for any of the variables. Data was transformed and medium and small institutions were combined. Independent samples t-test was conducted using the new group of small/medium sized \((n=88)\) and large \((n=53)\) institutions. Levene’s test for equality of variances was retained for all variables and statistical significance \(\(p \leq .05\)\) was found for lack of staff resources \(\(p = .035\)\) and lack of training \(\(p = .021\)\) by recreational sports directors at small/medium institutions. Based on analysis of these data the hypothesis was rejected for the barriers of a lack of time and a lack of training for undergraduate enrollment.
HO_{bar5}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the size of the professional staff of the recreational sports department. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the variables of staff size and the individual barriers to application. Recreational sports programs with less than 5 pro staff ($n=73$) consider lack of staff ($M=3.779$), lack of training ($M=3.589$) and lack of time ($M=3.589$) the most significant barriers to implementing the standards. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances was not rejected for lack of staff (.322), lack of time (.573) and lack of training (.393). Statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found between groups for lack of staff resources (.001) and lack of training (.018). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed the barrier of lack of staff was significantly higher for programs with less than 5, and 6-10 pro-staff members (.001). Data was transformed and institutions with more than 6 professional staff members were combined ($n=67$) and an independent samples t-test was used to compare the new group of more than 6 staff with less than 5 staff members. Levene’s test for equality of variances was not retained for lack of staff (.044) but was retained for lack of time (.675) and lack of training (.921). Statistical significance ($p \leq .05$) was found for lack of staff resources (.000) and lack of training (.021) for less than 5 staff members. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for the barriers of lack of staff with less than 5, and with 6-10 pro-staff members, and for lack of staff resources and lack of training for less than 5 staff members.

HO_{bar6}: There are no significant differences in the barriers to applying the CAS standards based on the type of institution.
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-tests were conducted and there was no statistical significance found in the independent variable of institutional type. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was not rejected for the independent variable institutional type.

**Satisfaction with CAS Standards**

A total of 167 recreational sports directors responded to the satisfaction questions regarding using the learning outcomes section of the CAS standards with student employees. The dependent variable of satisfaction is a composite score and represents an average of the responses to the individual learning outcome satisfaction variables identified in Figure 5 on page 97. Frequency data revealed 93 directors (23.3%) applying the learning outcomes standards were very satisfied and satisfied and only 6 (3.6%) were never or seldom satisfied when applying the standards. A hypothesis was developed to determine if a relationship existed between application and satisfaction.

**H_{Sat1}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by those directors applying the standards.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted between application and satisfaction. Directors using the standards frequently \((n=16; M=4.31)\) and occasionally \((n=88; M=3.82)\) appear to be the most satisfied with the standards. Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was rejected \((.000)\). Application categories were transformed into to groups, seldom/no use, called non-users \((n=63)\) and occasional/frequent use, called users \((n=104)\). An independent samples t-test was conducted for the newly modified groups and the satisfaction variable. Levene’s test for equality of variance was
not rejected (.589) and statistical significance ($p\leq .05$) was found between users and non-users (.000) with equal variances assumed. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for directors applying the standards more frequently.

_Satisfaction with the CAS Standards by Professional Association_

**HO$_{16}$**: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by membership in professional organizations other than NIRSA.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted for membership in all professional associations. Only NACAS/NACUBO members had significantly lower satisfaction with the standards. Levene’s test for equality of variance between NACUBO/NACAS members was not rejected (.239) and statistical significance ($p=.05$) was found between members (.022) and non-members with equal variances assumed. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for membership in NACAS/NACUBO.

_Satisfaction with the CAS Standards by Organizational Location_

**HO$_{17}$**: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by organizational report lines.

Independent samples t-test was conducted using the independent variable of organization location and the cumulative dependent variable of satisfaction. Student Affairs based programs ($n=141$) had higher satisfaction ($M=3.57$) with the standards than other based programs ($M=3.52$). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.502) and no statistical significance was found. Based on analysis of these data
the hypothesis was not rejected for the dependent variable of satisfaction of the standards with the independent variable of organizational location.

*Satisfaction with the Standards by Academic Preparation*

**HO18:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction of CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by academic preparation.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the independent variable of highest degree and the cumulative dependent variable of satisfaction. Doctoral prepared directors (\(M=3.93\)) were more satisfied than either master’s (\(M=3.55\)) or bachelor’s (\(M=3.41\)) prepared directors. Master’s prepared directors were more similar (\(LM=3.43; HM=3.67; SD=.720\)) than doctoral and bachelor’s prepared directors. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.072), however, no statistical significance was found between groups.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted using the independent variable of academic discipline and cumulative dependent variable for satisfaction. Directors with academic preparation in HE/CSP (\(n=28\)) had higher average rates of satisfaction (\(M=3.79\)) than either the HPER (\(M=3.52\)) or other (\(M=3.50\)) groups. HPER prepared directors were more similar (\(LM=3.39; HM=3.66; SD=.750\)). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not rejected (.245) and statistical significance was not found between groups. Based on analysis of these data, the hypothesis was not rejected.

*Other Findings for Variables Associated with Satisfaction*

Data was also analyzed, through the development of hypotheses, to determine if other professional, personal, and institutional variables had a relationship with the
recreational sports director’s satisfaction with of the standards, relative to student
development and learning for student employees.

*Satisfaction with the standards by NIRSA region.*

$H_{0_{sat2}}$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s
satisfaction with CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to
student employees, by NIRSA region.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were
conducted for the independent variable of NIRSA Region and the dependent variable of
satisfaction with the CAS standards. Results of these tests revealed no statistical
significance between the independent and dependent variables. Based on the analysis of
these data the hypothesis was not rejected for NIRSA region.

*Satisfaction with the standards by personal variables.*

$H_{0_{sat3}}$: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s
satisfaction with CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to
student employees, by professional experience.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted for the variables related to
professional experience as determined by years in the position. Directors with less than 1
year in the position ($n=9$) had a slightly higher rate of satisfaction ($M=4.11$) than
directors with 6-9 years ($M=4.00$) of experience. Levene’s test for homogeneity of
variance was not rejected (.140) and statistical significance ($p_{\leq .05}$) was found between
groups (.017). Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed directors with 6-9
years in the position were statistically more satisfied with the standards for student
development and learning (.046) than directors with 1-5 years. Based on the analysis of these data, the hypothesis was rejected for directors with 6-9 years in the position.

**HO_{sat4}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction with CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by biological gender.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variable of biological gender and the dependent variable of satisfaction with the CAS standards. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variable of biological gender and the dependent variable. Based on the analysis of these data the hypothesis was not rejected for biological gender.

*Satisfaction with the standards by institutional variables.*

**HO_{sat5}:** There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction with CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by institutional size.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variables related to institutional size, which included enrollment, size of professional staff and size of student staff and the dependent variable of satisfaction with the CAS standards. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variables related to institutional size and the dependent variable. Based on the analysis of these the hypothesis was not rejected for any of the variables associated with institutional size.
HO_{sat6}: There are no significant differences in a recreational sports director’s satisfaction with CAS standards for student development and learning, as applied to student employees, by institutional type.

Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and/or independent samples t-tests were conducted for the independent variables related to institutional type and the dependent variable of satisfaction with the CAS standards. Results of these tests revealed no statistical significance between the independent variables related to institutional type and the dependent variable. Based on the analysis of these the hypothesis was not rejected for institutional type.

Summary

Examination of the population data, through frequencies and descriptive analysis, reveals a growing movement of recreational sports programs toward being organizationally housing in student affairs. Analyses of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-tests were conducted and brought to light the impact this movement has had on the recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance and application of the CAS standards (Table 5).
Table 4.5

Statistical Significance Between Dependent and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPA/ACPA</td>
<td>$p = .001$</td>
<td>$p = .030$</td>
<td>$p = .005$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPHERD</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPA</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACUBO/NACAS</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$p = .022$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRSA Only</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Org Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$p = .000$</td>
<td>$p = .001$</td>
<td>$p = .000$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>$p = .008$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$p = .045$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>$p = .004$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPER</td>
<td>$p = .004$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE/CSP</td>
<td>$p = .042$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
<td>$ns$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 (Continued)

Statistical Significance Between Dependent and Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRSA Region</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in position</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in profession</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p=.008</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>p=.005</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p= significance ≤ .05 and ns=non-significance. All tests conducted using α=.05. Bonferroni corrections used to reduce Type I error where applicable.

Directors whose programs are housed in student affairs, and who were members of professional organizations associated with student affairs, such as NASPA or ACPA, and who had an academic background in HE/CSP were more aware of the standards than other directors. This relationship with student affairs was also evident in the director’s perceived importance and application of the CAS standards as well as other standards relative to recreational sports programs. This is not to say that other variables
did not have an impact on awareness, perceived importance and application of the standards. Institutional size and type as well as professional experience were also found to have had a significant affect. However, the importance of organizational location and the associated variable of membership in NASPA/ACPA can not be understated as these are the only variables, within institutional or the director’s control, that can be immediately transformed in order to positively impact the director’s awareness, perceived importance and application of the CAS standards for recreational sports.
CHAPTER FIVE

“We are all, at heart, gradualists, our expectations set by the steady passage of time. But the world of the Tipping Point is a place where the unexpected becomes expected, where radical change is more than possibility. It is contrary to all our expectations, a certainty” Malcolm Gladwell, (p. 13)

Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

In the *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference* (Gladwell, 2000, 2002), author Malcolm Gladwell suggests that epidemics, both positive and negative, are created from small, interconnected factors that are not readily observable. Gladwell sites the impact of “broken windows theory” (p. 141), the concept that broken windows, graffiti and dirty streets lead to crime, as an example of the small yet interconnected factors that led to lower crime rates in New York city. For the recreational sports profession, the growing focus on learning outcomes and the influence of CAS standards on that growth is an epidemic worth starting.

There is a burgeoning emphasis on learning outcomes in recreational sports programs, as evidenced by the NIRSA’s participation in the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) and in *Learning Reconsidered II*. Practical evidence of this focus can be found in the program for the 2007 NIRSA annual conference in which there are seven presentations regarding the CAS standards, *Learning Reconsidered* or learning outcomes. The focus of this study was to investigate how various institutional, personal and professional variables might influence a recreational sports director’s
awareness of and attitudes toward the CAS standards, specifically in the area of learning outcomes for student employees.

The basic tenets underlying this research were that standards, in general, are important to professionals, and awareness and perceived importance are positively related to the application of those standards. Specifically for recreational sports directors, and thus the profession, CAS standards for recreational sports, are important for the profession, and if directors are aware of the standards they will apply them more frequently. The purpose of this study was to determine if differences exist between various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports directors and their awareness, application, and satisfaction with CAS standards for recreational sports, and to identify potential perceived barriers to the use of the standards.

*What Matters Most*

“… every organization…has some kind of inner mission or purpose, whether clearly identified and stated or unperceived…(and) find success or fulfillment in direct proportion to the degree in which they function in harmony with their deeply imbedded framework, of roles and governing values, and how well their decisions and actions arise out of their sense of organizational mission.” (Smith, 2000, p.183)

A brief search of the internet for the phrase “what matters most” provides a dizzying array of articles and books on the subject. Most relevant to this study is Hyrum Smith’s *What Matters Most: the Power of Living Your Values* (2000). Smith articulates the importance of focusing personal and organizational efforts on established goals that are value centered. This study supports the use standards, specifically the CAS standards for higher education, to guide practice for recreational sports directors, as articulated
through the professional organization the NIRSA. A primary element of those standards is in the area of student development and learning. Knowing what variables affect the awareness and application of those standards, particularly in the area of student development and learning for student employees is what matters most.

Organizational Location and Professional Affiliation

“Location, location, location” is often the mantra of a realtor. This study argues that location of a recreational sports program, within the college or university, should be as important to the recreational sports director and students within the program as the proper neighborhood is to a home buyer.

Population demographics, when compared to the previous studies (Schnieder, et al., 2005; Milton, 2002; Bryant, 1994; and Cohen, 1995) confirm a growing movement of recreational sports programs toward student affairs and away from academics. The issue of organizational location has been discussed within the profession over the last 20 years. The Rationale for independent administration of collegiate recreational sports programs (Bryant, et al., 1994) suggests recreational sports should move away from the historical roots of physical education and intercollegiate athletics toward some type of independent administrative structure and revealed student affairs as the most common home for recreational sports. During that same time period William Canning, then recreational sports director at Tulane University and currently a partner in Centers, a privately owned collegiate management service company, stated in Athletic Business magazine that “the bottom line… is that all of these structures can work” (Canning, as quoted in Cohen, 1995, p. 38).
There is ample evidence that much has changed in the 13 years since Rationale… and Canning’s statement. This study expands on the findings of previous studies (Bryant, et al., 1994; Cohen, 1995; Schneider et al, 2005) indicating the predominant location for the independent administrative structure of a recreational sports program is student affairs. Over the 13 year span between the 1994 NIRSA study (61%) used in Bryant’s white paper and this study the percentage of recreational sports programs housed in student affairs has raised by 12% and now sits at 72%. At large institutions, enrollments of greater than 25,000, this number balloons to 86% as compared to 65% in 1995 (Cohen, 1995). The rise in student affairs based programs may be connected with a corresponding reduction from 16% (Cohen, 1995) to 4% in academic housed programs. Athletic based programs, the second most common organizational location, has reached a plateau, starting at 18% in the 1994 NIRSA study and is currently at 19%. Business based recreational sports programs represent a small percentage of all programs ($n=9$; 3%). The fact that the majority of recreational sports programs are housed in student affairs is important, but not as important as the impact the location has on the recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance and application CAS standards and the awareness of all standards related to the profession.

Standards and documents reviewed for this study included Principles of Good Practice, NIRSA General and Specialty Standards, CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered II. These resources serve as tools to guide the recreational sports director, particularly in the area of student learning and development. The impact organizational location had on a recreational sports director’s awareness of these documents and standards was profound.
Directors housed in student affairs were, in general more aware of all of the documents and standards and statistically more aware of the *Principles of Good Practice*, *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education*, *Learning Reconsidered* and *Learning Reconsidered II* than other groups combined. With the exception of the *NIRSA General and Specialty Standards*, student affairs based directors were statistically more likely to own a copy of the standards than directors housed in other areas. The *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education*, the big blue book of standards was owned by 105 recreational sports directors and 89.5% of those directors (n=94) were housed within student affairs. Similar results were found with ownership of the *NIRSA General and Specialty Standards* (n=97; 75.2%), *Learning Reconsidered* (n=81; 84.4%), *Learning Reconsidered II* (n=118; 86.8%) and *Principles of Good Practice* (n=29; 85.3%).

Student affairs based directors were more aware of the standards than all individual groups and statistically more aware than programs housed in intercollegiate athletics and all other groups combined. The source of this awareness was also significantly different for directors housed in student affairs. The director or senior student affairs officer played a much more significant role in aiding in the directors awareness of the standards. This was substantially different from those programs housed in other areas, particularly in intercollegiate athletics.

In general, this study found that recreational sports directors perceived all standards as relatively important, particularly the *NIRSA General and Specialty Standards* (M=4.040) and the *CAS Standards* (M=3.654). Except for the document *Principles of Good Practice*, student affairs based recreational sports directors perceived all other standards and resources relative to student learning, including the *NIRSA
General and Specialty Standards, CAS Standards, Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered II, to be statistically more important than directors housed in other organizations.

Table 5.1

Differences in Learning Outcomes by Organizational Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome Domains</th>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Diversity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Growth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Educational Goals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Self-Appraisal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarified Values</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Choices</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Awareness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ranking based on mean for student affairs and other based recreational sports programs.
Recreational sports directors found student learning outcome domains, identified within the program section of the *CAS Standards*, to be important, no matter where they were organizationally housed. Ten of the sixteen learning outcome domains had a mean of above 4.0 and the average of all 16 domains was 3.989. Differences in the importance of these outcomes were not statistically significant between the groups but the top 9 outcomes for each group were ordered differently (Table 6).

Other variables associated with student affairs based recreational sports programs were found to have a statistically significant impact on awareness and importance of the standards. Student affairs based recreational sports directors were significantly more likely to belong to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and/or the American College Personnel Administrators (ACPA), and directors with memberships in these associations were significantly more aware of and perceived the standards to be more important than directors with membership in other organizations. As was the case with student affairs based directors, the source of awareness of the standards for members of NASPA/ACPA was from the director or senior student affairs officer. This differed from other organizational locations which found professional development as the greatest source of awareness.

As important as it is to properly locate recreational sports programs in student affairs, it is equally important to note the negative affects of locating the program in intercollegiate athletics or other departments. Recreational sports programs located within other departments, most prevalently the intercollegiate athletics, were significantly less aware of the standards, perceived them to be less important and applied them less
revently. These recreational sports directors were less likely to own any of the standards, which greatly impacted their application.

Size and Scope

There are a limited number of studies in which to compare the results of this research and most deal with institutional variables related to awareness or importance. This examination supports Marron’s (1989) conclusions that public institutions are more likely than private institutions to implement standards. However, institutional size, previously not a factor, was found to be significant in implementing the standards for recreational sports directors. This study also supports Rizzo’s (2005) discovery that, in general, the standards are perceived to be important. The barriers of lack of time, staff resources, and training were different than Ratcliffe’s (2004) barriers of lack of awareness, helpfulness, and a fear of being found to be non-compliant, which was the least significant (M=1.637) for recreational sports directors.

Other personal variables, within this analysis, had a significant impact on awareness, perceived importance and application of the standards. The debate over academic preparation has been minimal but discussion over what goes into the curriculum to prepare recreational sports directors has been a topic since the 1976 national conference, when a plan for professional preparation was presented to the NIRSA executive committee (Clark, 1978). This study provides empirical evidence to support previous work indicating the primary academic degree for recreational sports director is the master’s degree and the most common academic disciplines are within the health, physical education, recreation (HPER) and sport management related fields (Milton, 2002). Evidence exists that suggest recreational sports directors with doctorate
degrees in higher education and college student personnel (HE/CSP) are somewhat more aware and apply the standards more and perceive them to be more important than less prepared directors, particularly when compared with bachelors prepared directors from non-related disciplines. While in most cases it is not practical for recreational sports directors to obtain a doctorate, this finding provides some rationale for those interested in furthering their education and scholarship.

*Communities of Practice: Recommendations for the Practitioner*

“Learning that is personally transformative turns out to be the learning that involves membership in a community of practice” (Wenger, 1999, p. 32)

*Professional Affiliation*

The tenet that awareness and perceived importance of standards leads to their application is realized through the variables associated with organizational location, membership in the professional organizations associated with student affairs, and professional experience of the recreational sports director. Findings from this research provide support for making recommendations for near-term practical changes that will enhance the ability of the recreational sports director to re-focus his or her efforts on student learning outcomes as articulated in the CAS standards.

Empirical evidence from this study supports the relocation of those academic, athletic, and business based recreational sports programs, focused on student development and learning outcomes, as articulated in the CAS standards, to student affairs. This recommendation is based on the mission of holistic student development and learning for both recreational sports programs (NIRSA, 2006) and student affairs (Evans, et al., 1998; Hamrick, et al., 2002, Schuh, 1999) and the importance of the use of
standards to support that development and learning (Dean, 2006). The evidence supports
the recreational sports directors active participation in NASPA and/or ACPA and the
formation of a commission (ACPA) or knowledge community (NASPA) focused on the
impact recreational sports has on the holistic development and learning of college
students. These knowledge communities should complement the NIRSA’s newly formed
Student Learning Knowledge Community (NIRSA, 2007).

The history of recreational sports movement suggests a desire to find a
community of practice with which to align. In the early years this alignment tended to be
with physical education and athletic programs and was built primarily around the concept
that sport and activity, in any form, was what bound the profession. This study suggests
the profession should align with other organizations utilizing student learning as the
common connector in forming the community of practice (Smith, 2002).

The NIRSA Registry Committee

Another near-term recommendation is to enhance the professional development
opportunities for recreational sports professionals to become aware of and apply the
standards. The number one source of a recreational sports director’s awareness of the
standards is from professional meetings and conferences. There is growing evidence, as
demonstrated by the seven CAS and Learning Reconsidered related programs at the 2007
NIRSA Annual Conference that this trend will continue. Regional data reveal an
inconsistent distribution of standards related information which is compounded by the
barrier of a lack of training, which may also have been exacerbated by lack of attendance
at national meetings. Recreational sports professionals with knowledge and experience
with the CAS standards and Learning Reconsidered should be encouraged to make
presentations at local and regional meetings and to submit articles to the *Recreational Sports Journal* and trade magazines. In order to provide the same emphasis as facilities, marketing and management, an annual symposium for recreational sports professionals should be established to focus on standards related student development and learning.

Small private colleges and universities were statistically less aware of and applied the standards less often than the larger public institutions. While institutional size and type do not provide for near-term or long-term practical change, recreational sports professionals within these institutions should be a specifically targeted for education and professional development.

*The NIRSA Curriculum Task Force*

The NIRSA curriculum task force is charged with developing an academic curriculum that prepares future generations of recreational sports professionals. Findings from academic preparation variables associated with this research study provide practical information for the preparation of these future professionals. Evidence from this study informs the NIRSA Curriculum Task Force of the importance of being aware of all standards, and particularly the CAS standards for professional sports. The synergistic and interdisciplinary nature of the field of recreational sports (Franklin & Hardin, in press) requires preparation in multiple academic fields. The primary academic program preparing recreational sports professionals is the HPER disciplines (Milton, 2002). This study provides empirical evidence to support the expansion of the traditional recreational sports curriculum to include knowledge related to student development and learning theory, and exposing students to the *CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, Learning Reconsidered, Learning Reconsidered II* and the *Principles of Good Practice*. 
The NIRSA Standards Committee

From 2005-2007, the NIRSA Standards Committee has worked on consolidating the NIRSA General Standards with the CAS Standards for Recreational Sports. The proposed consolidated set of standards was provided for review by the NIRSA membership during February of 2007 (K. Bayless, personnel communication, January 26, 2007). The results of this research support that consolidation effort, particularly in the area of student learning outcomes. A primary element of Part 2-Program is a listing of sixteen student learning outcome domains and examples of those outcomes used in the study. CAS requires all domains be addressed by the professional association writing the standards, the NIRSA in the case of recreational sports, but does not require any specific order. This research provides a rationale to order the domains based on responses from recreational sports directors regarding the importance of the domains and suggests the order identified in Figure 5 on page 98 or Table 5 on page 119.

The research indicates that professional development is the primary source of awareness of the standards. Consequently, the standards committee should play a vital role in presenting standards related information at national, regional and local meetings and should play a major part in preparing a symposium on student development and learning outcomes for recreational sports professionals.

Ways of knowing: Recommendations for Research

“If we knew what it was we were doing, it would not be called research, would it?” Albert Einstein (Quotations Page, 2007)

Huitt (1998) suggests there are four ways of ascertaining truth; the source is trustworthy, our intuition or personal inspiration tells us something is true, something is
experienced, and the knowledge is gained through reasoning or thinking logically and critically about the first three. This study serves as a starting point for gaining knowledge about how recreational sports professionals become aware of and apply standards, particularly in the area of student learning outcomes in recreational sports programs. Future research should focus on expanding what is now known through employing a balance of quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

Quantitative measures should be used to address the general delimitations of the study which limited the population to four-year colleges and universities represented by membership in the NIRSA and the learning outcomes section to student employees. An expansion of the population, to include recreational sports directors from two-year colleges, would provide a broader view of the field. Variables for residential or commuter campuses should be added to the study to address issues related to community colleges as well as other four-year institutions. To assist in identifying awareness and source data that would enhance niche programming for the registry committee as well as provide measures to see how effective the curriculum task force is in changing academic preparation curriculum, research should also be broadened to canvas a sample of all recreational sports professionals to contrast that of the directors. As the recreational sports profession places more emphasis on learning outcomes future research should include questions dealing with application of the standards relative to student learning outcomes applied to participants as well as employees should be explored.

The HPER academic disciplines, the most common for recreational sports directors, have become specialized over the last 20 years and the data associated with this variable provided a somewhat clouded view of academic preparation. In order to provide
more clarity future studies, involving this population, should disaggregate the HPER field into physical education, recreation, sport management/administration and exercise physiology/bio-mechanics to determine their influence.

Future replication of this study must take into account the NIRSA’s plan to consolidate the NIRSA general standards and the CAS standards for recreational sports.

The area of this study that produced minimal significance was in satisfaction with the standards. Qualitative research methodology should be employed to clarify the recreational sports director’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the standards and with other elements examined in this study. Qualitative measures should also be used to determine if and how recreational sports directors are measuring student learning outcomes. Clarifying sources and barriers to the use of the standards may be obtained more effectively through employing qualitative techniques.

**Conclusion**

This research study sought to determine if various personal, institutional and organizational attributes of recreational sports directors affected their awareness, perceived importance, application, and satisfaction with CAS standards for recreational sports, and to identify potential sources of awareness and perceived barriers to the use of those standards. The results indicated organizational location of the recreational sports program in the area of student affairs and affiliation with student affairs based professional organizations were found to be significant factors in determining a recreational sports director’s awareness, perceived importance and application of the CAS standards. Other institutional characteristics including size and type were factors with awareness and application and academic preparation and degree attainment were
significant factors with awareness only. This study provides a basis for future research in the areas of standards, academic preparation, and student development as applied in recreational sports programs.
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THE ROLE OF RECREATIONAL SPORTS
CAS Standards Contextual Statement

Recreational Sports programs are viewed as essential components of higher education, supplementing the educational process through enhancement of students' physical and mental development. Students who participate in recreational sports tend to develop positive self-images, awareness of strengths, increased tolerance and self-control, stronger social interaction skills, and maturity—all gleaned from recreational sports experiences. The field of recreational sports has grown into a dynamic, organized presence providing quality co-curricular opportunities for the majority of the student body.

The term "intramural" is derived from the Latin words "intra," meaning "within," and "muralis." meaning "walls." Intramurals began in US colleges and universities during the 19th century as students developed leisure time sporting events. Throughout that century, intramural sports were almost exclusively the only form of athletic competition for college males. Originating from intramurals, interest in varsity athletics increased in popularity and the institutions assumed responsibility for organizing athletic events.

Until late in the 1800's, intramural sports were perceived by most to be of little instructional or educational value. Near the end of the century, however, colleges and universities began to administer intramural sports for men. In 1913, the first professional staff members were employed to direct intramural programs. Intramurals continued to grow in strength and gain support, until by the 1950's there was a general realization by institutional leaders of the intrinsic educational value of sports. Programs expanded and additional facilities were constructed in response to student-led initiatives, and campus facilities were established exclusively for recreational sports activities.

Over-time, intramural programs diversified and participation increased. The rise in popularity of aerobic exercise and a societal push toward greater gender equity in the workplace and on college campuses produced an influx of women into recreational sports, resulting in even higher levels of interest and participation. Consequently, the late 1980's witnessed a second period of rapid growth in programs and the advent of new and better campus facilities for physical activities.

As they evolved, recreational sports programs experienced changing perceptions about their institutional roles and the standards appropriate for their administration. The wide range of programming currently organized and managed by recreational sports personnel has resulted in a multiplicity of administrative structures. At a majority of institutions, recreational sports programs are placed under the administrative auspices of a division of student affairs.

The National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) suggested that while organizational designs vary among institutions, the full realization for the contributions of recreational sports to any campus depends on institutional commitment to that endeavor.

NIRSA (1996) delineated seven primary goals of recreational sports programs:
1. To provide participation in a variety of activities that satisfy the diverse needs of students, faculty, and staff members and where appropriate guests, alumni, and public participants can become involved.
2. To provide value to participants by helping individuals develop and maintain a positive self-image, stronger social interactive skills, enhanced physical fitness, and good mental health.
3. To enhance college and university student and faculty recruitment and retention initiatives.
4. To coordinate the use of campus recreation facilities in cooperation with other administrative units such as athletics, physical education, and student activities.
5. To provide extracurricular education possibilities through participation in recreational sports and the provision of relevant leadership positions.
6. To contribute positively to institutional relations through significant and high-quality recreational sports programming.
7. To cooperate with academic units, focusing on the development of a recreational sports curricula and accompanying laboratory experiences.

Recreational sports programming significantly impacts student life, development and learning, as well as recruitment and retention. (Hossler and Bean (1990, p.), in The Strategic Management of College Enrollment, wrote that "recreational sports (i.e., informal leisure time relaxation, games, intramurals) have been endorsed by institutions for their value in helping students maintain good physical health, enhancing their mental health by providing a respite from rigorous academic work, and teaching recreational skills with a carryover for leisure time exercise throughout life."

Through participation in recreational sports, students are encouraged to develop critical thinking skills, create new problem-solving strategies, hone decision-making skills, enhance creativity, and more effectively synthesize and integrate this information into all
aspects of their lives. In this way, students both perform more effectively in an academic environment and flourish throughout all phases of the co-curricular experience.
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RECREATIONAL SPORTS
CAS STANDARDS and GUIDELINES

Part 1: MISSION
The recreational sports program (RSP) must incorporate student learning and student development in its mission. The program must enhance overall educational experiences. The RSP must develop, record, disseminate, implement and regularly review its mission and goals. Mission statements must be consistent with the mission and goals of the institution and with the standards in this document. The RSP must operate as an integral part of the institution's overall mission.

The mission of the RSP is to enhance students' fitness and wellness, knowledge, personal skills, and enjoyment by providing:

- opportunities for a variety of activities that may contribute to individual physical fitness and wellness
- opportunities for cooperative and competitive play activity in the game form
- a medium through which students can learn and practice leadership, management, program planning and interpersonal skills
- access to quality facilities, equipment and programs

To accomplish this mission recreational sports programs should:

- provide a variety of opportunities including informal programs (self-directed), intramural sports (structured), sports clubs (interest groups), instructional programs, special events, outdoor programs, fitness and wellness programs, extramural programs, family and youth programs and programs for people with disabilities
- coordinate effectively the scheduling of events and maintenance of campus sport facilities with other campus units
- provide extracurricular opportunities through participation and leadership roles designed to enhance social, psychological, and physiological development
- contribute positively to public relations efforts of the institution, including the recruitment and retention of students
- when appropriate, work in collaboration with academic units to help teach courses and facilitate laboratory experiences
- assist with the socialization of students into the campus environment

Part 2: PROGRAM
The formal education of students consists of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, and must promote student learning and development that is purposeful and holistic. The recreational sports program (RSP) must identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes and provide programs and services that encourage the achievement of those outcomes.

Relevant and desirable outcomes include:
- intellectual growth, effective communication, realistic self-appraisal, enhanced self-esteem, clarified values, career choices, leadership development, healthy behaviors, meaningful interpersonal relationships, independence, collaboration, social responsibility, satisfying and productive lifestyles, appreciation of diversity, spiritual awareness, and achievement of personal and educational goals.

The RSP must provide evidence of its impact on the achievement of student learning and development outcomes.

The program may use the examples that follow or identify other more germane indicators.

Student Learning & Development
Outcome Domains

Intellectual Growth
Examples of Achievement Indicators
- Produces personal and educational goal statements;
- Performs critical thinking in problem solving;
- Uses complex information from a variety of sources including personal experience and observation to form a decision or opinion;
- Obtains a degree;
- Applies previous understanding to a new situation or setting;
- Expresses appreciation for literature, the fine arts, mathematics, sciences, and social sciences

Effective Communication
Examples of Achievement Indicators
- Writes and speaks coherently and effectively;
- Writes and speaks after reflection, able to influence others through writing, speaking or artistic expression;
- Effectively articulates abstract ideas;
- Uses appropriate syntax;
- Makes presentations or gives performances

Enhanced Self-Esteem
Examples of Achievement Indicators
- Shows self-respect and respect for others; initiates actions toward achievement of goals; takes reasonable risks; demonstrates assertive behavior; functions without need for constant reassurance from others

Realistic Self-Appraisal
Examples of Achievement Indicators
- Articulates personal skills and abilities;
- Makes decisions and acts in congruence with personal values;
- Acknowledges personal strengths and weaknesses;
- Articulates rationale for personal behavior; seeks feedback from others; learns from past experiences
Clarified Values
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Articulates personal values; Acts in congruence with personal values; Makes decisions that reflect personal values; Completes personal belief system; Values personal and cultural beliefs and values; Identifies personal, work and lifestyle values and explains how they influence decision-making.

Career Choices
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Articulate career choices based on assessment of interests, values, skills and abilities; Documents knowledge, skills and accomplishments resulting from formal education, work experience, community service and volunteer experiences; Makes the connections between class deadlines and out-of-classroom learning; Can construct a resume with clear job objectives and evidence of related knowledge, skills and accomplishments; Articulates the characteristics of a preferred work environment; Comprehends the world of work; Takes steps to initiate a job search or seek advanced education.

Leadership Development
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Articulates leadership philosophy or style; Serves in a leadership position in a student organization; Comprehends the dynamics of a group; Exhibits democratic principles as a leader; Exhibits ability to visualize a group purpose and desired outcomes.

Healthy Behavior
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Chooses behaviors and environments that promote health and reduce risk; Articulates the relationship between health and wellness and accomplishing long-term goals; Exhibits behaviors that advance a healthy community.

Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Develops and maintains satisfying interpersonal relationships; Establishes mutually rewarding relationships with friends and colleagues; Listens to and considers others' points of view; Treats others with respect.

Independence
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Exhibits self-reliant behaviors; Functions autonomously; Exhibits ability to function interdependently; Accepts supervision as needed; Manages time effectively.

Collaboration
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Works cooperatively with others; Seeks the involvement of others; Seeks feedback from others; Contributes to the achievement of a group goal; Exhibits effective listening skills.

Social Responsibility
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Understands and participates in relevant governance systems; Understands and participates in the development, maintenance, and/or orderly change of community, social, and legal standards or norms; Appropriately challenges the unfair, unjust, or uncivil behavior of other individuals or groups; Participates in service/volunteer activities.

Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Achilles balance between education, work and leisure time; Articulates and meets goals for work, leisure, and education; Overcomes obstacles that hamper goal achievement; Functions on the basis of personal identity, ethical, spiritual and moral values; Articulates long-term goals and objectives.

Appreciating Diversity
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Understands one’s own identity and culture. Seeks involvement with people different from oneself; Seeks involvement in diverse interests; Articulates the advantages and challenges of a diverse society; Challenges the appropriateness of stereotypes by others; Understands the impact of diversity in one’s own society.

Spiritual Awareness
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Develops and articulates personal belief system; Understands roles of spirituality in personal and group values and behaviors.

Personal and Educational Goals
Examples of Achievement Indicators
Sets, articulates, and pursues personal goals; Articulates personal and educational goals and objectives; Uses personal and educational goals to guide decisions; Understands the effect of one’s personal and educational goals on others.

The RSP must be (a) intentional, (b) coherent, (c) based on theories and knowledge of learning and human development, (d) reflective of developmental and demographic profiles of the student population, and (e) responsive to special needs of individuals, special populations, and communities.

Recreational sports programs must reflect the needs and interests of students, faculty, staff, and other members of the campus community. The RSP must satisfy the particular needs of the campus by balancing team, dual, individual meet, and special event sport experiences.

The overall recreational sports program should include...
Recreational Sports

- Informal programs to provide self-directed, individualized participation that accommodates the desire to participate in sport for fitness and enjoyment.
- Intramural sports to provide structured contests, meets, tournaments, and leagues limiting participation to the individuals within the institution. A variety of forms of tournaments should be available, including elimination, challenge, league, and meets. Equitable participation opportunities should be provided for men and women, and when appropriate, co-recreational activity should be offered. Opportunities to participate at various levels of ability should be made available to students (e.g., beginner, intermediate, and advanced).
- Sport clubs to provide opportunities for individuals to organize around a common interest. Opportunities should be available for a variety of interest focused on a sport within or outside the institution. Self-administered and self-regulated groups are normally coordinated and assisted by staff in such areas as governance, facilities, scheduling, safety, budgeting, and fund-raising through sport club coordination. Formation of clubs should be accomplished through appropriate and established channels.
- Instructional programs to provide learning opportunities, knowledge, and skills through lessons, clinics, and workshops. Depending on type, size, resources, and setting of the institution, the program may include extramural sports, outdoor recreation, fitness and wellness, and special events.
- Special events to introduce new sport or related activities that are unique in approach or nature from traditional programs. These events may be held within or outside the institution.
- Outdoor programs and activities to provide participants with opportunities to enjoy natural environments and experience new challenges.
- Fitness programs to provide opportunities and assistance in personal exercise programs. This voluntary program should motivate individuals to assess their levels of fitness and maintain a positive fitness lifestyle. Individual assessment should be available for participant feedback.
- Recreation and aquatic programs.
- Wellness programs to encourage achievement of one's full health potential. These programs should provide an opportunity to work cooperatively with professionals in health services including counselors and physicians and may be accomplished in concert with others who are similarly oriented.
- Extramural sports to provide structured tournaments, contests and meets among participants from other institutions. Champions from intramural sports are frequently chosen to represent the institution.
- Family and youth programs for members of the campus community. These activities may include special events, sports, games, instructional programs, fitness and wellness, and outdoor programs.
- Programs for people with disabilities to engage in activities designed to have a positive impact on mobility, socialization, independence, fitness, and community integration.

Program planning and implementation should include consideration of:
- proper facility coordination and scheduling
- rules and regulations that address participant safety
- an environment that minimizes the chance of injuries
- advice to groups and organizations
- accurate interpretation of institutional policies and procedures to program participants
- conflict management issues
- proper supervision of recreational sports activities
- inventory, maintenance, and procedures for participant use of equipment
- participant involvement in program content and procedures through committee structures
- recognition system for participants, employees, and volunteers
- cultural diversity issues
- accurate and adequate publicity and promotion
- volunteerism

Part 3. LEADERSHIP

Effective and ethical leadership is essential to the success of all organizations. Institutions must appoint, position, and empower leaders within the administrative structure to accomplish stated missions. Recreational sports program (RSP) leaders must be selected on the basis of formal education and training, relevant work experience, personal skills and competencies, relevant professional credentials, as well as potential for promoting learning and development in students, applying effective practices to educational processes, and enhancing institutional effectiveness. Institutions must determine expectations of accountability for leaders and fairly assess their performance.

RSP leaders of programs and services must exercise authority over resources for which they are responsible to achieve their respective missions.

RSP leaders must:
- articulate a vision for their organization
- set goals and objectives based on the needs and capabilities of the population served
- promote student learning and development
- prescribe and practice ethical behavior
- recruit, select, supervise, and develop others in the organization
- manage financial resources
- coordinate human resources
- plan, budget for, and evaluate personnel and programs
- apply effective practices to educational and administrative processes
- communicate effectively
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· initiate collaborative interaction between individuals and agencies that possess legitimate concerns and interests in the functional area.

RSP leaders must identify and find means to address individual, organizational, or environmental conditions that inhibit goal achievement.

RSP leaders must promote campus environments that result in multiple opportunities for student learning and development.

RSP leaders must continuously improve programs and services in response to changing needs of students and other constituents, and evolving institutional priorities.

Part 4. ORGANIZATION and MANAGEMENT

Guided by an overarching intent to ensure student learning and development, the recreational sports program (RSP) must be structured purposefully and managed effectively to achieve stated goals. Evidence of appropriate structure must include current and accessible policies and procedures, written performance expectations for all employees, functional workflow graphics or organizational charts, and clearly stated service delivery expectations.

Evidence of effective management must include use of comprehensive and accurate information for making decisions, clear sources and channels of authority, effective communication practices, decision-making and conflict resolution procedures, responsiveness to changing conditions, accountability and evaluation systems, and recognition and reward processes. The RSP must provide channels within the organization for regular review of administrative policies and procedures.

Institutional leaders should recognize the significant differences in mission among intercollegiate athletics, physical education and recreation academic units, and the recreational sports programs, and act accordingly. The organizational placement of recreational sports within the institution should ensure the accomplishment of the program’s mission.

Members of the campus community should be involved in the selection, design, governance, and administration of programs and facilities. Students, faculty and staff and members, and the public, when appropriate, may be involved through committees, councils, and boards.

Part 5. HUMAN RESOURCES

The recreational sports program (RSP) must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals. Within established guidelines of the institution, the RSP must establish procedures for staff selection, training, and evaluation; set expectations for supervision, and provide appropriate professional development opportunities. The program must strive to improve the professional competence and skills of all personnel it employs.

Professional staff members must hold an earned graduate degree in a field relevant to the position they hold or must possess an appropriate combination of educational credentials and related work experience.

Degree or credential-seeking interns must be qualified by enrollment in an appropriate field of study and by relevant experience. These individuals must be trained and supervised adequately by professional staff members holding educational credentials and related work experience appropriate for supervision.

Student employees and volunteers must be carefully selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated. They must be trained on how and when to refer those in need of assistance to qualified staff members and have access to a supervisor for assistance in making those judgments. Student employees and volunteers must be provided clear and precise job descriptions, pre-service training based on assessed needs, and continuing staff development.

The RSP must have technical and support staff members adequate to accomplish its mission. RSP staff members must be technologically proficient and qualified to perform their job functions, be knowledgeable of ethical and legal uses of technology, and have access to training. The level of staffing and workloads must be adequate and appropriate for program and service demands.

Salary levels and fringe benefits for all RSP staff members must be commensurate with those for comparable positions within the institution, in similar institutions, and in the relevant geographic area.

The RSP must institute hiring and promotion practices that are fair, inclusive, and non-discriminatory. The program must employ a diverse staff to provide readily identifiable role models for students and to enrich the campus community.

The RSP must create and maintain position descriptions for all staff members and provide regular performance planning and appraisals. Further, the program must have a system for...
regular staff evaluation and must provide access to continuing education and professional development opportunities, including in-service training programs and participation in professional conferences and workshops.

Part 6: FINANCIAL RESOURCES
The recreational sports program (RSP) must have adequate funding to accomplish its mission and goals. Funding priorities must be determined within the context of the stated mission, goals, objectives and comprehensive analysis of the needs and capabilities of students and the viability of internal or external resources.

The RSP must demonstrate fiscal responsibility and cost effectiveness consistent with institutional protocols.

Institutional funds for the recreational sports program should be allocated on a permanent basis. In addition to institutional funding, other sources may be considered, including state appropriations, student fees, user fees, donations, contributions, fines, concession and store sales, rentals, and dues.

Part 7. FACILITIES, TECHNOLOGY, EQUIPMENT
The recreational sports program (RSP) must have adequate, suitably located facilities, adequate technology, and equipment to support its mission and goals efficiently and effectively. Facilities, technology, and equipment must be evaluated regularly and be in compliance with relevant federal, state, provincial, and local requirements to provide for access, health, safety, and security. The institution must provide adequate indoor and outdoor facilities, technology and equipment with prioritized blocks of time, for recreational sports programs to accommodate the diverse needs and interest of the campus community. As a general rule, the larger the population and the more geographically isolated the institution, the greater the need for quality and diversity of facilities. Consideration should be given to a balance of facilities that would provide participation opportunities in team, dual, individual, and meet sports, as well as in fitness and conditioning. Examples of such facilities include swimming pools, gymnasiums, weight rooms and fitness facilities, and general use playing fields.

Part 8. LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES
Recreational sports program (RSP) staff members must be knowledgeable about and responsive to laws and regulations that relate to their respective responsibilities. Staff members must inform users of programs and services and officials, as appropriate, of legal obligations and limitations including constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and case law; mandatory laws and orders emanating from federal, state/provincial and local governments; and the institution's policies.

Staff members must use reasonable and informed practices to limit the liability exposure of the institution, its officers, employees, and agents. Staff members must be informed about institutional policies regarding personal liability and related insurance coverage options.

The institution must provide access to legal advice for RSP staff members as needed to carry out assigned responsibilities and must inform staff and students in a timely and systematic fashion about extraordinary or changing legal obligations and potential liabilities. Recreational sports professionals should be fully aware of and understand legal areas such as due process, employment procedures, equal opportunity, and civil rights and liberties.

Although participation in recreational sports is a voluntary action, liability of wrongful or negligent acts should be a continuing concern.

Reasonable efforts must be made to insure a safe environment, properly maintained equipment, proper instruction, and adequate supervision.

Part 9. EQUITY and ACCESS
Recreational sports program (RSP) staff members must ensure that services and programs are provided on a fair and equitable basis. Facilities, programs and services must be accessible. Hours of operation and delivery of access to programs and services must be responsive to the needs of all students and other constituents. The RSP must adhere to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity laws.

The RSP must be open and readily accessible to all students and must not discriminate except where sanctioned by law and institutional policy. Discrimination must especially be avoided on the bases of age; color, creed; cultural heritage; disability; ethnicity; gender identity; nationality; political affiliation, religious affiliation, sex, sexual orientation; or economic, marital, social, or veteran status.

Consistent with its mission and goals, the RSP must take affirmative action to remedy significant imbalances in student participation and staffing patterns.

As the demographic profiles of campuses change and new instructional delivery methods are introduced, institutions must recognize the needs
of students who participate in distance learning for access to programs and services offered on campus. Institutions must provide appropriate services in ways that are accessible to distance learners and assist them in identifying and gaining access to other appropriate services in their geographic region.

Part 10. CAMPUS and EXTERNAL RELATIONS
The recreational sports program (RSP) must establish, maintain, and promote effective relations with relevant individuals, campus offices, and external agencies.

The recreational sports program should be an institution-wide process that systematically involves student affairs, academic affairs, and other administrative units, such as campus police, physical plant, and the business office.

The recreational sports program should collaborate campus-wide to disseminate information about their own and other programs and services on campus.

The program staff should serve as a resource to the community, providing expert advice on recreational issues and activities.

Part 11. DIVERSITY
Within the context of each institution's unique mission, diversity enriches the community and enhances the collegiate experience for all; therefore, the recreational sports program (RSP) must nurture environments where commonalities and differences among people are recognized and honored.

The RSP must promote educational experiences that are characterized by open and continuous communication that deepens understanding of one's own identity, culture, and heritage, and that of others. The program must educate and promote respect about commonalities and differences in their historical and cultural contexts.

The RSP must address the characteristics and needs of a diverse population when establishing and implementing policies and procedures.

Part 12. ETHICS
All persons involved in the delivery of the recreational sports program (RSP) must adhere to the highest principles of ethical behavior. The RSP must develop or adopt and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice. The RSP must publish these statements and ensure their periodic review by relevant constituencies.

Ethical standards of relevant professional associations should be considered.

RSP staff members must ensure that privacy and confidentiality are maintained with respect to all communications and records to the extent that such records are protected under the law and appropriate statements of ethical practice. Information contained in students' education records must not be disclosed without written consent except as allowed by relevant laws and institutional policies. Staff members must disclose to appropriate authorities information judged to be of an emergency nature, especially when the safety of the individual or others is involved, or when otherwise required by institutional policy or relevant law.

All RSP staff members must be aware of and comply with the provisions contained in the institution's human subjects research policy and in other relevant institutional policies addressing ethical practices and confidentiality of research data concerning individuals.

RSP staff members must recognize and avoid personal conflict of interest or appearance thereof in their transactions with students and others.

RSP staff members must strive to insure the fair, objective, and impartial treatment of all persons with whom they deal. Staff members must not participate in nor condone any form of harassment that demeans persons or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive campus environment.

When handling institutional funds, all RSP staff members must ensure that such funds are managed in accordance with established and responsible accounting procedures and the fiscal policies or processes of the institution.

RSP staff members must perform their duties within the limits of their training, expertise, and competence. When these limits are exceeded, individuals in need of further assistance must be referred to persons possessing appropriate qualifications.

RSP staff members must use suitable means to confront and otherwise hold accountable other staff members who exhibit unethical behavior.

RSP staff members must be knowledgeable about and practice ethical behavior in the use of technology.
Part 13. ASSESSMENT and EVALUATION

The recreational sports program (RSP) must conduct regular assessment and evaluations. The program must employ effective qualitative and quantitative methodologies as appropriate, to determine whether and to what degree the stated mission, goals, and student learning and development outcomes are being met. The process must employ sufficient and sound assessment measures to ensure comprehensiveness. Data collected must include responses from students and other affected constituencies.

Evaluation of student and institutional needs, goals, objectives, and the effectiveness of the recreational sports program should occur on a periodic basis. A representative cross-section of appropriate people from the campus community should be involved in reviews of the recreational sports program.

The RSP must evaluate periodically how well they complement and enhance the institution's stated mission and educational effectiveness.

Results of these evaluations must be used in revising and improving programs and services and in recognizing staff performance.
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Coordinator of Intramurals & Special Events, University Recreation - HigherEdJobs.com

* Ability to effectively develop and monitor budget.
* Ability to assist in planning and executing sound fiscal management.
* Ability to effectively supervise personnel and complete all associated actions in a timely and accurate manner.
* Ability to communicate effectively and work with diverse populations.
* Ability to work collaboratively and effectively with local and University community constituents.
* Ability to manage multiple priorities.
* Strong interpersonal, organizational and decision-making skills.
* A commitment to using technology to support the goals of the department.

Qualifications

Masters degree in Recreation, Health & Human Performance or related field and experience working in a recreation, sport or fitness setting required. Experience working in a college setting and supervisory experience beneficial. The successful candidate must be able to work evening and weekend hours and/or a modified work week schedule. A background check will be required for the successful applicant.

Application Procedure

Applications or nominations should be forwarded to Austin Peay State University, Human Resources Office, P.O. Box 4507, Clarksville, TN 37044. Application packets should include a letter of interest; resume, names, addresses and telephone numbers of three references; and college transcript showing highest degree. (An unofficial transcript may be submitted for screening purposes, but the selected candidate must submit an official transcript prior to the beginning of employment). Review of applications will begin March 20, 2006 and continue until the position is filled. See the APSU Home Page at http://www.apsu.edu/ for a detailed job description, other employment opportunities and information on employee benefits or contact Human Resources at (931) 221-7177.

Application Information

Postal Address: Robyn White
Human Resources
Austin Peay State University
601 College Street
P.O. Box 4507
Clarksville, TN 37044

Phone: 931-221-7177
Fax: 931-221-0345
Email Address: hrapplications@apsu.edu

More Information on Austin Peay State University

Institutional Profile
Current openings for Austin Peay State University on HigherEdJobs.com.
Employee Benefits
Fast Facts
About Clarksville, TN
Austin Peay State University

[Minorities, women, and members of other protected groups are encouraged to apply. APSU is an AA/EOE]

Douglas Franklin

From: william7@ohio.edu
Sent: Saturday, October 06, 2005 8:38 PM
To: franklin@ohio.edu
Subject: Job Description w/ Stu Dev Theory

This job description actually asked for "Knowledge of student development theories and current practices is desired," under minimum qualifications. Thought you might like to see that!! Michelle

Coordinator of Intramurals & Club Sports in Lynchburg, Virginia

Salary: Open
Type: Full Time - Entry Level

The Office of Student Activities at Lynchburg College is seeking applicants for the Coordinator of Intramurals & Club Sports beginning January 9, 2006. The Coordinator is responsible for intramural programs, club sports, outdoor adventure programs, and leadership development. This is a 12 month, full-time position reporting to the Director of Student Activities. Specific responsibilities include: 1. Provide leadership, budget management and strategic planning in development and implementation of programs designed to provide for the recreational needs of the campus community. 2. Administration of the club sports program including coach and officer training, contest scheduling; facility scheduling for all practices and competitions; education on risk management guidelines, compliance with college policies and procedures, and fund-raising assistance. 3. Serve as the Office of Student Activities liaison with the Athletic Department to arrange facility reservations. 4. Serve as the advisor to the Sport Club Council. 5. Supervise "open gym" student employees, intramural officials, and student supervisors including hiring, training, and evaluating their performance. 6. Responsible for the administration and oversight of the Intramural & Club Sport budgets. 7. Responsible for equipment purchase, storage, and check-out. 8. Responsible for marketing and promotion of all Intramural and Club Sport activities, special events, and other recreational opportunities; including the maintenance of the intramural website. 9. Assist with the planning and coordination of major school events sponsored by the Office of Student Activities and recognized student groups. 10. Assist the Coordinator of Outdoor Adventure and Leadership Development Programs in the planning and implementation of summer leadership workshops and trips for non-profit and corporate clients. 11. Collaborate with academic departments, athletics, students, and administration to promote student learning and social development, performing related work as required. Interested and qualified applicants should arrange for all of the following materials to arrive no later than Friday, October 28, 2005: a) Letter of application; b) Resume; c) Three (3) references with contact information. Please send all materials to: Heidi Scheumier, Director Office of Student Activities, Lynchburg College 1501 Lakeside Drive Lynchburg, VA 24501. Information regarding the Office of Student Activities can be found at http://www.lynchburg.edu/osa.xml Lynchburg College is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Requirements:
Minimum requirements include a master's degree in recreation/sport and administration/management related field. The preferred candidate will have two (2) years previous experience training sports officials, supervising student employees, and planning and implementing sports leagues/tournaments. Knowledge of student development theories and current practices is desired.

Preferred Education: Masters

10/19/2005
NOTES: Employer will assist with relocation costs

Apply online at http://nirsajobcontrolcenter.com/jobdetail.cfm?job=222045032

10/19/2005
**Director of Campus Recreation**

**Job Code:** FY 05-0120  
**POSTED:** May 01

**Salary:** Open  
**Location:** Brownsville, Texas

**Employer:** The University of Texas Brownsville and Texas Southmost College  
**Type:** Full Time - Experienced

**Category:** Director  
**Required Education:** Masters

---

**Description**

To coordinate and participate in the operations and activities involved in student sports programs, wellness programs, campus activities, monitor and supervise workout areas, and to promote student support services, and to perform a variety of technical tasks relative to assigned areas of responsibility. The function of this position is to coordinate all aspects of the UTB/TSC Campus Recreation program(s). This position is responsible for planning, developing and supervising all recreation programs and facilities for UTB/TSC students, faculty and staff. This individual will be responsible for selection, training, supervision and evaluation of professional staff members in the multiple departments in this area. This position will also be responsible for preparing the budget as it pertains to operations for programs and facilities. This position is security-sensitive and subject to Texas Education Code 51.215, which authorizes the employer to obtain criminal history record information. If you need additional information please contact Mr. Vincent Sola, Assistant VP for Student Development at (956)882-5178 and go to http://www.utbtscd.edu/utbtsddb/scripts/search.asp to submit an application packet to our Human Resources department.

---

**Requirements**

Mid-Manager level must have a Master’s degree from an accredited college or university in sports administration, business administration, student personnel administration or related field with a minimum of seven years full-time professional supervisory experience in campus wellness and recreational programs or related fields. This individual must possess a strong working knowledge of student development theory, leadership development practice, and working experience dealing with diverse student populations. Excellent written and oral skills and the
ability to work with diverse groups. Experience in facility management, planning, budgeting and supervision. Current CPR and First Aid certifications preferred. National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) member.

Employer Information

About The University of Texas Brownsville and Texas Southmost College

The University of Texas at Brownsville in partnership with Texas Southmost College employs approximately 1,000 and serves more than 12,500 students at its campus located in Brownsville, Texas. UT Brownsville provides eligible employees with a Basic Coverage Package on the 1st of the month following a 90-day waiting period. You may select Optional Coverage for you and your... more info

View all our jobs

< Back | Apply For This Job | Email Job | Save Job

Asst Director of Club Sports & Intramural Sports

Job Code: 03030455

Salary: $30,000 - $35,000
Location: Bloomington IN

Employer: Indiana University
Division of Recreational Sports
Type: Full Time - Experienced

Categories: Intramurals, Sport Clubs
Required Education: Masters

Description

Join one of the largest and most comprehensive, inclusive, and progressive recreational sports programs in the country, recognized by Sports Illustrated on Campus as "perhaps the nation's top recreational sports program". Our mission is to provide sport and fitness services for students, faculty and staff and the public to encourage an active, healthy lifestyle and enhance a sense of community. We accomplish this by offering diverse sport and fitness opportunities; distinctive facilities and equipment; educational avenues for student development; and leadership to the profession. The division serves over 45,000 students, faculty, staff and public participants annually. Our programs utilize two multi-purpose facilities (housing over 400,000 square feet of activity space) and numerous outdoor fields. Our team consists of 40 appointed staff members, 11 graduate assistants and 900 hourly wage staff members. For more information, please visit our web site at www.recports.indiana.edu.

Position Summary: Coordinate club sports program including risk management, event programming, and counseling student leaders. Coordinate select intramural sports with the assistance of a Graduate Assistant.

Qualified applicants must apply online at www.indiana.edu/~hrm/careers/, please attach an electronic cover letter, resume and contact information for three references. If selected for an interview, you will be asked to provide three letters of recommendations and college transcripts. Indiana University provides an excellent benefit package included. Anticipated start date July 6. The position will remain open until filled.

Requirements

Master's degree in recreation or related field required, 2-3 years full time experience in club sports programming in a college recreational setting preferred. Certified Recreational Sports Specialist preferred. We seek team members who have experience in programming and are committed to quality service and take initiative to use their skills and creativity in a results oriented environment. Supervision of hourly employees and/or volunteers; demonstrated verbal and written skills; demonstrated ability to work in a student development model; strong interpersonal and technology skills preferred.

Employer Information

About Indiana University Division of Recreational Sports

The Division of Recreational Sports at Indiana University, Bloomington, offers recreational opportunities to its more than 37,000 students as well as its faculty, staff and the Bloomington community. Our division has a staff of approx. 50 full-time personnel, 15 graduate and program assistants and close to 900 student hourly employees. We provide ongoing training and support.

View all our jobs

< Back  Apply For This Job  Email Job  Save Job

Coordinator of Intramural and Recreational Sports

Institution: Georgia College & State University
Location: Milledgeville, GA
Category: Admin - Student Affairs and Services
Posted: 06/21/2006
Application Due: Open Until Filled
Type: Full Time

Georgia College & State University is seeking qualified applicants for the Coordinator of Intramural and Recreational Sports position within the Department of Campus Life and Student Activities, which is a unit of the Division of Student Affairs. This is a full-time 12-month position that reports to the Director of Campus Life and Student Activities. The Coordinator of Intramural and Recreational Sports is responsible for the development, implementation, coordination, and evaluation of Intramural Sports, Sport Clubs, and Venture Out programs.

Duties include, but are not limited to, the following: coordination of the total administration of the intramural sports, sport clubs, and venture out programs; hiring and training two graduate assistants; management of daily operations of all intramural sports and venture out activities; recruiting, hiring, training, and evaluating undergraduate supervisors and sport officials; budget development/management; coordination of scheduling, usage, and maintenance of Intramural Complex; development and maintenance of relationships with various student groups and organizations; maintenance and inventory of equipment; planning and implementation of special events; participation in staff meetings/committees as part of the Division of Student Affairs; and others as assigned.

Collaborative programs with other departments and agencies are expected, such as Greek Life, Leadership, and The GIVE Center (community service). In addition, excellent communication skills, both written and verbal, are necessary. Must occasionally work in cooperation with the county recreation department. An understanding and appreciation for student development and programming is necessary. Position requires late nights and some weekends. Summer duties are assigned based on departmental needs.

Requirements
Qualifications: Master's degree in Recreation, Sport Management, Physical Education, Outdoor Education or related field required. Supervisory skills, CPR/First Aid certifications, Wilderness Medical Associates/First Responder certification preferred, and computer competency is also desired. Knowledge of IMTRACK by Recreational Solutions is a plus. Candidates should have at least 2-3 years of practical experience working with a diverse group of students in intramural sports, sport clubs, or outdoor adventure. Candidate must have experience conducting training clinics for officials in flag football, soccer, softball, and basketball. Candidate is expected to lead by example, which includes, but is not limited to, officiating games and demonstrating high ethical standards on and off the field. For more departmental information, please visit our website: http://info.gcsu.edu/lntranet/campuslife.

Application Deadline: To apply, located the job listing at http://www.gcsu.edu/jobs. Submit a GCSU application, a resume, and the names, mailing addresses, email addresses and phone numbers of three references by June 30, 2006 to:

Department of Human Resources and Payroll Services
Georgia College & State University
Campus Box 028
Milledgeville, GA 31061
Phone: 478-445-5596

Application Information
Postal Address: Georgia College & State University

6/25/2006
More Information on Georgia College & State University

Institutional Profile
Current openings for Georgia College & State University on HigherEdJobs.com:
- Georgia College & State University
- Milledgeville Convention & Visitor's Bureau
- Milledgeville-Baldwin County Chamber of Commerce
- Benefits

GCSU is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution committed to the diversity of its community. Candidates with demonstrated experience working with students of diverse backgrounds are encouraged to apply. For more information, please visit our web page at www.gcsu.edu.


6/25/2006
Intramural Sports Coordinator

Institution: East Tennessee State University
Location: Johnson City, TN
Category: Admin - Student Affairs and Services
         Admin - Athletics/Coaching
Posted: 06/05/2006
Application Due: Open Until Filled
Type: Full Time

Student Affairs - Department of Campus Recreation - Intramural Sports Coordinator - Level 6 - 231340

Essential functions: The Intramural Sports Coordinator will be responsible for staging a comprehensive individual and team sports competitive structured program for the institution's students and employees; and performing other related duties as assigned. The program's weekend offerings are to be expanded and a special emphasis will be placed on the educational benefits of the student worker experience.

Qualifications: master's degree in recreation, sports management, student personnel services or related field; service as a campus recreation graduate assistant and undergraduate student worker required; and referee certifications preferred. The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to the concept of the educational benefits of the student worker experience. Evening and weekend work schedules will be required. Submit completed ETSU application, cover letter and resume to Office of Human Resources, ETSU, Box 70564, Johnson City, TN 37614-1707.

Application Information
Postal Address: Human Resources
              East Tennessee State University
              Box 70564
              Johnson City, TN 37614-1707
Phone: 423-439-4457
Fax: 423-439-8354

More Information on East Tennessee State University
Institutional Profile
Current openings for East Tennessee State University on HigherEdJobs.com
ETSU's main home page.
ETSU employee benefits
ETSU's Office of Human Resources home page.
ETSU employment opportunities.

ETSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

Coordinator of Recreation and Intramurals

Institution: The University of Virginia's College at Wise
Location: Wise, VA
Category: Admin - Athletics/Coaching
Admin - Student Affairs and Services
Posted: 05/09/2006
Application Due: Open Until Filled
Type: Part-Time/Adjunct

Coordinator of Recreation and Intramurals

The University of Virginia's College at Wise invites applications for a Coordinator of Recreation and Intramurals (CRI) (state title Administrative & Office Specialist III-Student Activities). This is a 1500 hour, ten month, classified staff position reporting to the Assistant Director of the C. Bascom Slemck Student Center/Director of Campus Recreation (DCR).

The CRI assists in providing leadership and supervision to the campus recreation program that boasts over 4,500 annual participants. The CRI will assist the DCR in the supervision of five undergraduate intramural supervisors, one single day/weekly event assistant, one outdoor recreation assistant, and an average of eighteen student officials (referees). The primary responsibility of this position is to work with the DCR in the day-to-day operations of the Intramural and Outdoor Recreation programs with an emphasis on evening and weekend duties. Summer employment may be an option.

The successful candidate should have experience working in student life. The CRI should possess excellent communication, written, and organizational skills and the ability to provide an immediate and positive impact on students. The position requires the ability to work well as a team member and leader, while demonstrating skills in the areas of human relations, conflict mediation, inventive planning, and sports officiating. A bachelor's degree and student life experience is required.

Application materials including a cover letter, resume and a state application should be sent to:
Coordinator of Recreation & Intramurals Search Committee
Office of Human Resources
The University of Virginia's College at Wise
1 College Avenue, Wise VA 24293
Review of applications will begin on May 19, 2006 and continue until filled.

UCW-Wise is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer committed to excellence through diversity

Application Information
Postal Address: Francine Meade
Human Resources
The University of Virginia's College at Wise
1 College Avenue
Wise, VA 24293
Phone: 276 328-0142
Fax: 276 328-0239
Online App. Form: http://www.uvawise.edu
Email Address: gh2k@uvawise.edu

UVa-Wise is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer committed to excellence through diversity.
Assistant Director of Student Activities/Coordinator of Recreation

Institution: New York Institute of Technology
Location: Old Westbury, NY
Category: Admin - Student Affairs and Services
Posted: 05/01/2006
Application Due: Open Until Filled
Type: Full Time

Reporting to the Directors of Student Activities and Housing and Residential Life, the Assistant Director is responsible for assisting with the overall development, coordination and evaluation of comprehensive Student Activities, Housing and Residential Life, and Recreation program. Assist in the daily management of the Offices of Student Activities and Housing and Residential Life including campus programming, facilities management, advising clubs and organizations, student leadership development activities, volunteer and community outreach efforts, and supervision of the Resident Assistant Program in the Clark Residence. Coordinate the club sports program, administer the YMCA contract, and manage the game room and student activity space. Assist the Directors of the Directors of Student Activities and Housing and Residential Life in the accomplishment of annual objectives in support of the college's educational mission and strategic goals. On-campus housing required.

Qualifications:

Master's degree in higher education administration, student development, counseling or related field, and 1-3 years of professional experience required. Experience in co-curricular program development, student leadership development, and student activities required. Residential Life experience required. Excellent interpersonal, communication, decision-making, counseling/advising, advocacy, and organizational skills are essential. Appreciation of a culturally diverse student population; background in event and/or program planning; ability to manage projects and programs independently; proficiency in the use of Microsoft programs; and the ability to deal with ambiguity in a complex changing environment are essential. Ability to work nights and weekends on occasion is required.

Application Information
Postal Address: Human Resources
New York Institute of Technology
Northern Boulevard
Old Westbury, NY 11568
Fax: (516) 686-7529
Email Address: humanresources@nyit.edu

More information on New York Institute of Technology
Institutional Profile

NYIT is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

6/25/2006
Coordinator of Intramurals & Special Events, University Recreation

Institution: Austin Peay State University
Location: Clarksville, TN
Category: Admin - Athletics/Coaching
         Admin - Student Affairs and Services
Posted: 02/27/2006
Application Due: Open Until Filled
Type: Full Time
Salary: $2,130.85 to $2,840.75 USD Per Month
Notes: included on Affirmative Action email

General Description

The Coordinator for Intramural Sports and Special Events is under the general supervision of the Director of University Recreation with responsibility for all aspects of Intramural and Special Event programming.

Duties and Responsibilities

* Supervise the recruitment, training, supervision, and evaluation of intramural and special event staff.
* Supervise the development, implementation and evaluation of intramural and special events programming.
* Risk management associated with intramural sports and special event programming.
* Budgetary responsibility for intramural sports and special events, in concert with the director.
* As a member of the leadership team, assist in planning, development, implementation and analysis of short- and long-term goals for the Department of University Recreation.
* Supervise the development of student leaders for intramural programs and special events, including team supervision and training.
* Supervise the marketing and promoting of intramural and special events programs.
* Manage all aspect of operation during evening hours and special events.
* Maintain a functioning knowledge of facility operations and procedures for all areas of University Recreation.
* Assure student staff compliance with University Recreation student employee and graduate assistant handbooks.
* Remain competent and current through professional development to include self-directed reading and networking with colleagues.
* Participate in division-wide activities and support programs.
* Work collaboratively and effectively with university and community constituents.
* Perform other job-related duties as assigned.

Essential Functions

* Willingness to learn and acquire knowledge with the intent of applying said knowledge to university recreation, intramural sports and special events.
* Willingness to learn and acquire knowledge of risk management and liability issues affecting intramural sports and special event programming with the intent of applying said knowledge.
* Ability to use and understand student development theories and practices, and current trends in the areas of student recreation.
* Ability to develop, implement and evaluate intramural and special events programming.
* Ability to establish and maintain accurate records and reports.

APPENDIX C: Cover Letter

November 5, 2006

Dear Collegiate Recreational Sports Director:

The following survey is part of a research study to determine if a relationship exists between various personal, institutional, and organizational attributes of campus recreation directors and their awareness, application, satisfaction and barriers to the use of Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) professional standards for recreational sports. You have been selected to participate in this research study because of your membership in the National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) and because of your position as Director or Senior Officer of a collegiate recreation program. Specific findings from the study will delineate how collegiate recreation departments become aware of and use the standards relative to student learning and development as applied to student employees. The final results of the study will be used by our NIRSA colleagues on the Curriculum, Standards and Registry Committees.

The participation packet includes this cover letter, a four page survey document, a SCANTRON answer sheet, and a self addressed postage paid envelope used to return the survey. Please complete only the GENERAL PURPOSE section of the answer sheet starting with question 1 and using a No. 2 pencil. The survey is divided into two sections and should take approximately 15 minutes.

Your participation in the study is important, even if you are not aware of the CAS standards for recreational sports. If this is the case, please complete section 1, questions 1-38, only and return the form. The survey and answer sheet should be mailed by December 7, 2006. This will allow me to analyze the data for submission to the committees for their use the NIRSA Annual Conference.

The information you provide will be anonymous. Please DO NOT complete the name or demographic sections of the answer sheet. Participation in this study is voluntary and completion and submission of the survey indicates your consent to participate. Results of the study will be available upon request. Should you have any questions or concerns please contact me at 740-593-0805 or send an e-mail to me at franklin@ohio.edu. Concerns regarding me or my research techniques should be directed toward my dissertation chair, Dr. Marc Cutright at cutrightm@ohio.edu.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

Douglas Franklin  
Assistant Dean for Recreation and Wellness and Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education  
Ohio University
APPENDIX D: FULL SURVEY

---

**CAS Standards for Student Learning Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1: The National Intramural and Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) adopted standards for student learning and development through the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education. The following demographic data will be used to help identify and stratify information to gain an understanding of the profession's awareness, application, satisfaction and barriers related to these standards. Please darken the appropriate circles with the no. 2 pencil provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The organizational location of my campus recreation program is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My highest academic degree is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic discipline of my highest degree is in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical Ed./Recreation/Sport Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other than NIRSA, I am affiliated with the following professional organizations: (Check all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. NASPA or ACPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My gender is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have been in my current position:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have been a NIRSA professional member for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My institution is located in NIRSA Region:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How many undergraduate students attend your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Small 5,000 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How many full-time professional recreation staff do you supervise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How many student employees are employed in your campus recreation department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Less than 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My institution is:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your agreement with the statement as it applies to your campus recreation program using the following rating scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement range: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intellectual Growth is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Effective Communication is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Enhanced self-esteem is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Realistic self-appraisal is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Clarified Values is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Career Choices is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Leadership Development is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Healthy Behavior is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Independence is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Collaboration is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Social Responsibility is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Appreciating Diversity is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Spiritual Awareness is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Personal and Educational Goals is an important learning outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your general awareness of the following documents? Please identify if you own a copy of the publication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness Range: 1 = Unaware to 5 = Very aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. NIRS General Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Learning Reconsidered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Learning Reconsidered II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your general perceived importance of the following documents? Please identify if you own a copy of the publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Range: 1 = Unimportant to 5 = Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. NIRS General Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Learning Reconsidered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Learning Reconsidered II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue ONLY if you are aware of the CAS Standards by indicating a rating of 3 or more. If you are unaware of the CAS Standards please STOP and return the survey.

If you are aware of the CAS Standards please proceed with the remainder of the survey.
Section 2: You have indicated that you are aware of the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for recreational sports. Please identify your level of application and satisfaction with the learning outcomes as applied to student employees in your campus recreation program.

Please darken the circle most closely associated with your **application** of the following learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Range: 1= Never</th>
<th>2= Rarely</th>
<th>3= Occasionally</th>
<th>4= Frequently</th>
<th>5= Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Intellectual Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Effective Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Enhanced self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Realistic self-appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Clarified Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Career Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Healthy Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Appreciating Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Spiritual Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Personal and Educational Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please darken the circle most closely associated with your **satisfaction** of learning outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Range: 1= Not satisfied</th>
<th>2= Dissatisfied</th>
<th>3= Neutral</th>
<th>4= Satisfied</th>
<th>5= Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Intellectual Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Effective Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Enhanced self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Realistic self-appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Clarified Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Career Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Healthy Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Meaningful Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Satisfying and Productive Lifestyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Appreciating Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Spiritual Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Personal and Educational Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please proceed to the final page of the survey. Over →
Please identify the source or sources of your awareness of the CAS standards and the magnitude of the contribution of the source.

Range: 1 = Not a contributor to 5 Major contributor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Not a Contributor</th>
<th>Major Contributor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71. Graduate Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Professional Journals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Professional Meetings and Conferences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Dept. Director or Senior Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Colleagues within the recreation department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Institutional colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Professional colleagues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Other, please specify</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you are aware of but do not apply the CAS standards related to learning please indicate the barriers to application of the standard.

Range: 1 = Not significant to 5 Very Significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Not Significant</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79. Lack of funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Lack of staff resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Lack of time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Lack of training on how to use the CAS standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Lack of perceived value</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Lack of institutional support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Lack of perceived necessity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Not helpful based on past use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Fear of finding non-compliance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Other, please specify</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have completed the survey. Thank you for participating and please return the survey in the self-addressed envelope provided.
APPENDIX E: ABBREVIATED SURVEY

December 21, 2006

Dear Collegiate Recreational Sports Director:

I recently sent a survey to NIRSA members serving as directors of 4-year public and private colleges and universities. Please disregard this survey if you have completed either the first or second iterations of the full survey. The survey is part of a research study to determine if a relationship exists between various attributes of campus recreation directors and their awareness, application, satisfaction and barriers to the use of Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) professional standards for recreational sports. I have abbreviated the third and final survey in hopes of obtaining your valuable input. Please answer the following questions:

1. My campus recreation program is organizationally housed in:
   - [ ] Student Affairs
   - [x] Academics
   - [ ] Athletics
   - [ ] Business
   - [ ] Other, please specify __________________________

2. My highest academic degree is:
   - [x] Doctorate
   - [ ] Masters
   - [ ] Bachelors
   - [ ] Associate
   - [ ] No degree

3. The academic discipline of my highest degree is in:
   - [ ] Physical Education, Recreation or Sport Management
   - [x] Higher Education or College Student Personnel
   - [ ] Other, please specify __________________________

4. Other than NIRSA, I am affiliated with the following professional organizations:
   - [ ] NASPA/ACPA
   - [ ] AAPHERD
   - [ ] IRPA
   - [ ] NACAS
   - [ ] NACUBO
   - [ ] Other, please specify __________________________

5. My general awareness and perceived importance of the following documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1st Unaware to 5=Very Aware</th>
<th>1st Unimportant to 5=Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs</td>
<td>[ ] Own</td>
<td>[ ] 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRSA General Standards</td>
<td>[ ] Own</td>
<td>[ ] 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for the Advancement of Standards</td>
<td>[ ] Own</td>
<td>[ ] 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Reconsidered</td>
<td>[ ] Own</td>
<td>[ ] 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Reconsidered II</td>
<td>[ ] Own</td>
<td>[ ] 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Douglas Franklin
59 Westfield Place
Athens, OH 45701

Douglas Franklin
59 Westfield Place
Athens, OH 45701

RECREATION AND
SPORTS SERVICES

45701+3656