CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

State financial support for colleges and universities began to erode in the mid 1970s, a trend which has continued through the start of the 21st century. In the 1974-1975 academic year, state funding comprised 31% of institutions' total revenue; however, in the 1994-1995 academic year, state funding only accounted for 23% of overall revenue. Although colleges and universities continue to receive funding from states, this source of income can no longer be relied upon to meet the demands of increasing numbers of students in the higher education system (Cohen, 1998).

As a result of decreases in state funding, the interaction between colleges and universities and the state has dramatically changed. Because there is less money to be allocated, states are no longer willing to empower collegiate institutions with the self-regulatory authority that has dominated much of their history. There is a growing expectation among states that institutions of higher education provide evidence of performance to be deserving of limited state funds (Alexander, 2000).

This diminished authority is also driven by an increased demand from the public to justify government spending. The public has demanded greater accountability for government spending as a result of a rising political sentiment to limit governmental spending. There is an increased expectation that colleges and universities will be more efficient and productive in their use of public funds. The public expects responsible spending from the higher education sector (Alexander, 2000).

These increased expectations have created a demand for colleges and universities to be more accountable for their spending of public funds. The call for greater accountability is also fueled by a governmental expectation for higher education to play a vital role in producing an educated and skilled workforce that contributes to economic growth (Alexander, 2000).

As state funding for higher education continues to decrease, these calls for accountability will only increase. The money that states contribute to colleges and universities is considered to be an investment. This utilitarian perspective of state contributions to collegiate institutions is driving the demand for accountability. As states continue to have less money to invest in higher education, they will continue to want increasing measures of accountability so they may choose to invest in institutions that offer the highest returns (Alexander, 2000; Wellman, 2001).

The movement toward accountability in higher education is based on the belief that the traditional measures used to gauge effectiveness and performance in higher education were not adequate (Alexander, 2000). Accountability systems developed at the state-level are designed to produce indicators of institutional performance that can be compared across institutions. These systems usually incorporate the use of qualitative and quantitative methods and are designed to provide information to a public audience (Wellman, 2001). Even advocates of accountability who are less optimistic of its evaluative usefulness believe that such measures will at least compel colleges and universities to perform self-examinations that will illuminate their weaknesses (Lively, 1992).

Several accountability systems have been developed throughout the country to measure institutional performance. The three most commonly used approaches are performance reports, performance-based funding, and assessment of state goals. States using performance reports, for the most part, employ them as standards to compare their data with the data from other states. Additionally, these reports can be used to evaluate changes in performance over time (Wellman, 2001).

Another commonly used model is performance-based funding. In this method, states base their funding for colleges and universities on performance reports. Most often, these reports are evaluated based on benchmarking the data against data from other states where parallel data are available. Another evaluation approach used in performance-based funding is looking for positive changes in performance over time (Wellman, 2001).

The final accountability system that is widely used involves the assessment of progress toward a few statewide goals. States identify key goals for higher education and use them as a basis for evaluating institutions. Accountability reports are used to document an institution's progress in attaining these identified goals. This state goals accountability system has become widely used throughout higher education to measure performance. It differs from the other accountability systems discussed because it incorporates the use of assessment in ensuring accountability (Wellman, 2001).

Assessment is an ongoing process of regulation and evaluation that determines current status as well as future needs (Creamer et al., 1992). The practice of assessment is being encouraged as an accountability approach by numerous states and accrediting boards. The

Southern Association for Colleges and Schools (SACS), for instance, has implemented an outcomes assessment approach for accreditation (Mann, Gordon, & Strode, 1991).

Assessment efforts have been applied in numerous ways throughout higher education. Their uses range from the academic arena to co-curricular areas. In the academic arena, assessment efforts have been applied in the evaluation of student learning. These efforts have sought to understand both the level and quality of student learning (Brakke & Brown, 2002; Cross, 1987; Shavelson & Huang, 2003). Assessment is also used to evaluate student achievement (Shavelson & Huang, 2003). The results of such assessment efforts have contributed to the improvement of student learning and academic instruction (Brakke & Brown, 2002; Cross, 1987; Shavelson & Huang, 2003).

Additionally, assessment can be used in the academic realm in program creation and development. It can be applied to the creation of a course, academic program, or institutional curriculum (Cote & Jordan, 2002). Beyond merely creating a program, assessment is used to evaluate the delivery method of academic programs and services. This application of assessment has become more pervasive as new technologies impact the way that academic programs and services are delivered to students (McLoughlin & Luca, 2002).

In addition to the uses of assessment in the academic arena, there have been numerous types of assessment that have been developed specifically to meet the unique needs of student affairs (Banta, Rudolph, Van Dyke, & Fisher, 1996; Danals, 2001, Heubner, 1989; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Torok, 1997; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996; Watwood, 1995). These efforts have often focused on assessing the personal, social, and civic student gains in addition to cognitive gains (Shavelson & Huang, 2003). One of the types of assessment used in student affairs is satisfaction assessment. This type of assessment seeks to examine the satisfaction level of students and other clients with programs and services provided by student affairs administrators (Danals, 2001, Schuh & Upcraft, 2001, Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

A second type of assessment frequently used in student affairs is outcomes assessment. This type of assessment can be used to determine the student learning and development outcomes achieved through a program or service. Additionally, outcomes assessment can be used to measure other desired outcomes (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002 Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

There are many reasons why assessment is necessary in student affairs and will continue to be used in the future. Some of the primary reasons for using assessment include survival, quality, and politics. Assessment is important to the survival of student affairs because of constant pressure for this area in higher education to prove its worth. Limited budgets contribute to the pressure placed on student affairs administrators to demonstrate the importance of their programs and services. Assessment can be used to demonstrate effectiveness as well as provide evidence of the positive relationships between out-of-class experiences and student learning outcomes (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Quality is another reason that assessment is important for student affairs. Survival is often a primary motivator to conduct assessment in student affairs; however, addressing the quality of programs can be equally important. Assessment can help define what is meant by quality, to measure whether or not it exists, and to link goals to outcomes. One of the primary goals of student affairs is not merely to provide programs and services to students, but to provide programs and services of the highest quality. Assessment serves as a tool for measuring achievement of this goal (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Assessment is also necessary in student affairs for political reasons. Student affairs professionals are often called upon by high-level administrators at an institution to provide information about their programs, services, or facilities. Because academia is a data driven enterprise, conducting assessments to produce such data can be politically important. In addition, assessment results can be used to influence policy, which also make it politically significant (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

There are several different forms of assessment that are being used within student affairs. Upcraft and Schuh (1996) and Schuh and Upcraft (2001) explain several forms of assessment within the context of a comprehensive assessment model for student affairs. This model advocates moving away from a piecemeal strategy for doing assessment and focuses instead on providing consistency and a place to start planning an assessment strategy (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Types of assessment include needs assessment, satisfaction assessment, and outcomes assessment. The first of these types, needs assessment, seeks to understand the needs of students and other clientele that use student affairs-related services, programs, and facilities. The results of this type of assessment can be used to evaluate whether or not current services and programs

are meeting client needs. Additionally, this information be used to determine if what is currently being offered meets the needs of students and other clientele (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Another type of assessment that is used in student affairs is satisfaction assessment. This type of assessment seeks to understand the satisfaction level of students and other clients. Understanding satisfaction can help determine strengths as well as areas for improvement for programs, services, and facilities (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Outcomes assessment is a third type of assessment in student affairs. Outcome goals are often identified in the process of developing a program, service, or facility (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). These outcome goals can be immediate, intermediate, or long-term. Some programs may have all three types of goals (Schwitzer, 2002). Outcomes assessment measures a program's or service's success in reaching these goals. The information obtained is useful in determining if a program, service, or facility produced the desired outcomes. The results may also be useful in effectively designing future program interventions (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Many of the assessment methods used in student affairs rely heavily on self-assessment and self-regulation (Creamer et al, 1992). Based on this focus, several different types of guidelines and standards of practice have been created to aid in self-assessment and self-regulation. These guidelines and standards have been utilized in meeting the rising demands for assessment and accountability in the realm of student affairs.

Due to increased calls for accountability and assessment in higher education, the American Council on Education's Advisory Committee on Self-Regulation Initiatives and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) encouraged 12 professional student affairs organizations to create standards of practice for the profession. This cooperative effort led to the development of the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) in 1979 (CAS, 1986; CAS, 2003; Mann et al., 1991).

By 1986, CAS consisted of 22 member organizations and had published a book of standards and guidelines that could be used to assess programs and practice in select student affairs areas. This original edition contained standards for 16 functional areas, including academic advising, housing and residential life programs, and minority student programs and

services. Additionally, this first edition contained standards for 12 administrative concerns, including mission, leadership and management, and funding. Over time additional standards have been developed for other administrative concerns and functional areas as the need for standards was identified (Mann et al., 1991).

CAS standards were originally developed "for the purpose of improving and advancing student development services and educational opportunities in postsecondary education institutions and to promote cooperative interassociational efforts" (CAS, 1986, p. 1). The standards have several possible uses including staff development, reaccredidation studies, and budget justification. CAS standards can also be used in program planning, development, and evaluation. These standards have provided a method of program evaluation that meets the call for an assessment approach to accountability advocated by several states and accrediting boards (Mann et al., 1991).

Current standards of practice exist for Master's level student affairs graduate preparation programs and 29 functional areas and including: academic advising, career planning and placement, college unions, commuter student programs and services, counseling services, disabled student services, fraternity and sorority advising, housing and residential life programs, judicial programs and services, learning assistance programs, minority student programs and services, recreational sports, religious programs, research and evaluation, student activities, and student orientation programs, among others (CAS, 2003; Mann et al, 1991).

There are other functional areas for which standards have yet to be developed, however. For example, there are no standards of practice for programming boards. Programming boards are usually student run organizations charged with the task of providing entertainment, educational, recreational, and social opportunities for the students at their college or university. Some programming boards have specific target audiences for their events while others are broader in scope and provide events aimed at the entire student body.

CAS has developed standards for college unions and student activities offices. However, these standards do not provide adequate guidance for the planning, development, and evaluation of programming boards. There is a need for standards of practice to be developed for this specific functional area.

In summary, decreases in state funding have led to increased calls for accountability in higher education (Alexander, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Wellman, 2001). States have responded by

developing ways of assessing accountability (Creamer et al, 1992; Wellman, 2001). To meet these demands for accountability, higher education has developed various assessment methods (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Standards of practice emerged as a method of conducting assessments and meeting calls for accountability. CAS was developed to create standards of practice specifically for higher education (Mann et al, 1991). Currently, CAS standards exist for Master's level student affairs graduate preparation programs and 29 functional areas, a majority of which are considered to be a part of student affairs. Despite the numerous standards that exist for areas in student affairs, there are not standards of practice for programming boards (CAS, 2003).

Data about programming boards is needed to generate standards of practice for them. This study examined characteristics of successful programming boards. Through this research, the researcher hopes to produce data that can be used to inform the development of standards of practice for college and university programming boards.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of successful college and university programming boards (CUPBs). The researcher worked in conjunction with professionals who work with CUPBs to identify the characteristics that are central to a successful programming board.

Specifically, the researcher focused on Organization and Management characteristics; Human, Financial, and Facility Resource characteristics; Campus and Community Relationship characteristics; Program characteristics; Mission characteristics; Assessment and Self-evaluation characteristics; and Leadership characteristics that led to positive outcomes in programming. Successful CUPBs were identified by members of the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA). NACA is a national association whose mission is to "[link] the higher education and entertainment communities in a business and learning partnership, creating educational and business opportunities for student and professional members" (NACA Overview, n.d.). NACA provides programming boards with educational opportunities for its members, opportunities to view showcased talent, and obtain a means to reduced pricing for contracting performers through co-op buying. Based on the nominations received, document analysis was conducted on requested materials related to the programming board and its

functions, and interviews were conducted with the advisors of the most successful programming boards to explore in depth the characteristics of the programming boards they advise.

Research Questions

This study examined the following research questions:

1. What are the organization and management characteristics of successful programming boards?

2. What are human, financial, and facility resource characteristics of successful programming boards?

3. What are the campus and community relationship characteristics of successful programming boards?

4. What are the program characteristics of successful programming boards?

5. What are the mission characteristics of successful programming boards?

6. What are the assessment and self-evaluation characteristics of successful programming boards?

7. What are the leadership characteristics of successful programming boards?

Significance of the Study

This study was significant in terms of future practice, research, and policy. In terms of practice, the results of this study were significant for several campus constituencies. One of the groups that might benefit includes student affairs professionals who work with programming boards. The results of the study provided these professionals with characteristics of successful programming boards. Professionals could use the results to evaluate their programming boards or explore possible changes that would make them more successful.

Students who are a part of programming boards might benefit from this study. This study identified characteristics of successful programming boards that could be used as an evaluative tool. The results could be used by students to initiate changes to their programming boards that might improve them.

CAS might also benefit from this study. The results of this study provided information about the characteristics of successful programming boards. This information could be used by CAS to develop standards of practice for CUPBs.

This study also had significance for future research. The present study explored the characteristics of successful programming boards through quantitative measures. Future studies

might involve case studies of successful programming boards. Such studies would provide greater depth to the knowledge about successful programming boards.

Results of this study could also lead to research that focuses on benchmarking studies of CUPBs. The characteristics of successful programming boards identified through the present study could be used as a basis for benchmarking programming boards. This type of study would help expand the knowledge about practices of various programming boards.

Future studies might quantitatively explore the programs sponsored by programming boards. This study broadly examined characteristics of successful programming boards; however, a need remains for research focused on CUPBs' programs. Studies of this nature could provide a wide range of knowledge about the programs that come from programming boards.

Finally, this study was significant for future policy. The results of the study provided student affairs policymakers with information about the characteristics of successful programming boards. Policymakers might use this information to develop formal standards of practice for CUPBs. The findings of this study could initiate the formation of standards by an organization such as CAS.

The results of this study might also impact future policy on the evaluation of programming boards. This study examined the characteristics of successful program boards. The results of the present study could be used to develop evaluation or assessment policies for CUPBs.

This study might also impact future policies of individual programming boards. The current study provided information to professionals and students working with CUPBs that identified the characteristics of successful programming. The identification of these characteristics may initiate change in policies of existing programming boards.

Delimitations of the Study

The present study had some initial delimitations. The first was related to the sample. Only student affairs professionals who advise successful programming boards were included in the sample. It is possible that other professionals who work with programming boards have valuable insight into the characteristics of successful programming boards, but these individuals were not involved in the study. Had they been included, different results might have emerged.

A second delimitation also related to the sample in this study. Responses were obtained only from professionals advising programming boards. It is possible that students or others involved with

programming boards could provide unique insights into characteristics of successful programming boards. Since other individuals were not included in the sample, the findings may be limited.

A final delimitation was related to the scope of the study. The researcher limited the number of programming board characteristics that were explored in this study. It is possible that other characteristics that are integral to the success of programming boards were not included. The results could have been influenced in an unanticipated way if this happened.

Despite these delimitations, this was an important study. It provided initial data on the characteristics of successful programming boards. As demands for accountability increase, data on what is considered successful become more important in creating accountability measures.

<div align="center">Organization of the Study</div>

This study is organized in five chapters. Chapter One examined the background, purpose, and reasons for conducting this study. In Chapter Two, I explore the current literature relevant to the study. The methods for selecting the sample and gathering data for this study are reviewed in Chapter Three. Chapter Four brings together the study's results. Finally, Chapter Five discusses the results of the study and their implications for future practice, research, and policy.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To understand the need for obtaining data about CUPBs, first it was necessary to examine the role that assessment plays in student affairs in general. Two groups of studies emerged in this review: literature on the usefulness of assessment in student affairs and the types of assessment conducted in student affairs.

To fully explore the need for standards of practice for CUPBs, however, it was also necessary to examine the literature on standards of practice in student affairs administration. Two groups of studies emerged: those that focused on the use of standards of practice in student affairs in general and those that focused on CAS standards.

Finally, research on campus programming was examined to understand the relevance of this study. There were three groups of literature about college and university programming boards: literature about planning and implementing programs, literature about programming board supervision, and literature about funding campus programming. This chapter is organized around these three major categories and their respective subtopics.

Research on Assessment in Student Affairs

Assessment has emerged out of increased calls for accountability in higher education. This growing focus on accountability has stemmed from decreases in state funding (Alexander, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Creamer et al, 1992; Wellman, 2001). Higher education has responded to diminished resources by developing various forms of assessment (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996; Wellman, 2001).

Student affairs is not exempt from the demands for accountability. Numerous types of assessment have been developed to meet the unique needs of student affairs (Banta, Rudolph, Van Dyke, & Fisher, 1996, Danals, 2001; Heubner, 1989; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Torok, 1997; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996; Watwood, 1995). To understand the types of assessment that are being used, it is first important to examine the ways that assessment is useful for student affairs.

Usefulness of Assessment in Student Affairs

The use of assessment in student affairs emerged in response to questions of effectiveness. These questions come from state legislatures, the public, the federal government, students, and students' families. Although accountability was in large part responsible for the

emergence of assessment, there are multiple reasons why the use of assessment in student affairs is necessary (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001).

To start, assessment in student affairs is a matter of survival. In addition to responding to growing calls for accountability, assessment in student affairs is necessary to meet internal pressures to justify resource expenditures. In times of limited funding, institutions of higher education seek to evidence that money is spent efficiently and effectively (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

As budgets in higher education continue to drop, this need for assessment increases. With reduced funding, colleges and universities often focus on academics (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). At times, this focus fails to recognize the educational value of out-of-class experiences. This occurs despite evidence that the experiences students have outside the classroom are significant in helping them achieve learning outcomes (Whitt & Miller, 1999).

In response to any shift away from out-of-class experiences, student affairs departments can use assessment as a tool to validate the educational outcomes and usefulness of their perceived "non-academic" department. Through highlighting the educational value of the programs, assessment is a tool that can illustrate the worth of the work done in student affairs (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Part of the responsibility of student affairs professionals is to provide high quality services and programs. Quality assurance is another driving force behind the need for assessment in student affairs. Assessment can serve multiple roles in the investigation of quality. It can be used as a tool for linking goals with outcomes (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Torok, 1997; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Assessment can also be employed to define quality (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Using assessment as a means for defining what is meant by the term quality is essential in meeting demands for accountability. This is an area where a great deal of work needs to be done to avoid the imposition of definitions and standards by the state (Katz, 1994). Assessment for the purposes of determining quality has often been imposed by outside sources; however, higher education needs to be proactive in initiating assessment efforts and defining quality through assessment (Watwood, 1995).

Additionally, assessment can be useful in determining whether or not quality exists within the program, department, or student affairs division (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft &

Schuh, 1996). Providing quality programs and services to students is a cornerstone of the work of student affairs (Torok, 1997). Assessment is a necessary component of defining and evaluating the level of quality; therefore, assessment is essential in determining whether or not student affairs is living up to its mission to provide quality programs and services (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Torok, 1997; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Assessment is also useful in student affairs to determine affordability. Within student affairs divisions, there is an ongoing effort to provide greater numbers of programs with less money. This is often driven by budget reductions. Ensuring cost-effectiveness is important when trying to do more with less. Assessment can be used to help gauge the affordability and cost effectiveness of programs and services (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Strategic planning is another process that drives the need for assessment within the student affairs profession. Strategic planning is focused on larger issues such as mission, long-term goals, and relationships with other organizations. Assessment can be particularly useful in the early stages of strategic planning. It contributes to the process of strategic planning by helping to define the goals and objectives of a program or service as well as identifying problems that need to be addressed to achieve those goals. Assessment provides a systematic method of answering questions associated with strategic planning and can assist student affairs professionals in determining what needs to be done and how to do it (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Assessment also can be useful in policy development and decision-making. Developing policy and making institutional judgments are difficult processes that require a great deal of information and evidence to lead to informed decisions. Assessment can provide information to student affairs professionals that will allow them to go about developing policies and making decisions in a systematic way (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Finally, assessment is useful in student affairs because of institutional politics. Assessments are often conducted at the request of others within the institution. This makes it a politically important process. There are also forces outside of the institution that may request that assessments be conducted, such as members of the state legislature. Student affairs professionals must respond to these requests and provide evidence that supports the value of what they do (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Types of Assessment in Student Affairs

The literature described above outlines the need for assessment in student affairs divisions. Once the need for assessment has been identified, it is necessary to determine the appropriate type of assessment to use. This step can be the most difficult part of the assessment process. Often, student affairs professionals do not conduct assessments simply because they do not know where to begin.

The comprehensive assessment model presented by Upcraft and Schuh (1996) and Schuh and Upcraft (2001) describes various types of assessment that are useful in conducting assessment in student affairs. The first type is tracking. Tracking involves measuring how student services, programs, and facilities are used. This includes not only assessing the volume of people they serve, but also relevant demographic characteristics of users. Using this type of assessment allows student affairs professionals to examine whether or not the target audience for a service, program, or facility is using it. It may also provide information about populations that need to be better served (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

A second type of assessment in student affairs is needs assessment. It involves developing an understanding of student and other client needs. Needs assessment can be difficult to implement; however, it is extremely valuable in understanding the types of services, programs, or facilities that ought to be developed to meet user needs (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Needs assessment can also aid in distinguishing between needs and wants of clienteles (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

The third type of assessment discussed by Upcraft and Schuh (1996) and Schuh and Upcraft (2001) is satisfaction assessment. The aim of this type of assessment is to gain an understanding of clientele satisfaction. Assessing the satisfaction of students and other clients that use student affairs services can also identify the strengths of those services as well as areas for improvement. It is important to understand clientele satisfaction because clients who are not satisfied with a service will not use it, which makes the service ineffective and may even suggest that it is unnecessary (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Student cultures and campus environments assessment is a fourth type. It is essential to understand how students perceive their campus environment and culture to understand the ways that they interact with their environment (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Student behavior is the result of the interaction between student personal characteristics and

environmental variables (Danals, 2001; Heubner, 1989). Given this interaction, understanding how students perceive their environment may be significant in understanding their behaviors and outcomes. These assessments are also useful in understanding the campus climate for specific populations (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

A fifth type of assessment is outcomes assessment. Outcomes assessment is useful in determining student learning and development outcomes of the programs and services provided on campus. It can also be used to measure other desired outcomes. Although these types of assessments are difficult to design and implement, they are vital in measuring whether services are achieving their intended outcomes (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Programs often have varying levels of goals. A single program may have immediate-level, intermediate, and long-term outcome goals. Outcomes assessment can be used to measure success in meeting goals on any of these levels (Schwitzer, 2002).

The sixth type of assessment discussed by Upcraft and Schuh (1996) and Schuh and Upcraft (2001) is comparable institution assessment. This form of assessment involves comparing an institutional program or service with other institutions that appear to be doing a better job with the same program or service. Comparable institution assessment is often referred to as benchmarking. The results of this assessment can help staff understand how other institutions achieve results through their programs. This information can be translated into program changes that may lead to the same results as those achieved at other institutions. To successfully conduct this type of assessment, it is vital that the comparable institutions are carefully selected and that their programs are evaluated to ensure that they are, in fact, good programs (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

National standards assessment is a seventh type. National standards assessment is conducted to measure a program or service against a set of nationally accepted standards. Possible standards that may be used include those developed by CAS, national or regional accreditation agencies, or professional organizations (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Another type of assessment in the comprehensive assessment model is cost effectiveness assessment. This type of assessment involves judging whether or not the student gains from a program or service justify the costs associated with providing that program or service. Cost effectiveness assessment can be very difficult to conduct, particularly because of methodological

issues. However, it can provide valuable insight into the productivity of programs or services offered within student affairs (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996).

Peer review is a final assessment method. This type of assessment involves allowing an external specialist to assess the quality of a program, service, or facility. The main focus of this type of assessment is determining quality. Peer review may become less common as funding continues to drop since it is typically an expensive form of assessment (Banta et al, 1996).

<div align="center">Research on Standards of Practice</div>

The discussion of national standards assessment above illustrates how standards of practice in student affairs can be useful in assessing programs, services, or facilities. Many of the assessment efforts that have been made in student affairs have focused on self-assessment and self-regulation (Creamer et al, 1992). This focus has led to the development of different types of guidelines or standards of practice. Within student affairs, several types of standards have been developed and these standards of practice have been used in numerous ways.

Use of Standards of Practice in Student Affairs

National student affairs associations have been at the forefront of developing standards of practice for student affairs. In 1992, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) released a Statement of Ethical Principles and Standards. The statement provides student affairs professionals with five ethical principles and four standards that can be used to make professional decisions. The five ethical principles are: act to benefit others, promote justice, respect autonomy, be faithful, and do no harm. The four standards cover the areas of professional responsibility and competence, student learning and development, responsibility to institution, and responsibility to society. Used together, these principles and standards can be a resource for student affairs professionals in ethical decision-making (American College Personnel Association, 1992).

In 1997, the ACPA and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) jointly published principles of good practice for student affairs. The principles were developed by a group of seasoned professionals involved in the two associations. The final list includes 7 principles. A good professional: engages in active learning; helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards; sets and communicates high expectations for student learning; uses systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance; uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals; forges educational partnerships

that advance student learning; and builds supportive and inclusive communities. The principles are grounded in student development research as well as the experiences of seasoned student affairs professionals. They can be used as a foundation for evaluating programs and services and can provide guidance to individual professionals in their daily practice as administrators (American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1997; Blimling & Whitt, 1998).

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education has produced the most comprehensive set of standards of practice for functional areas in student affairs. These standards are all based on a common format and are available for 28 functional areas and Master's level student affairs graduate preparation programs. These standards can be used as a guideline for developing programs and services as well as a basis for evaluating the functional area (CAS, 2001; Mann et al., 1991).

CAS Standards

CAS was established in 1979 in response to increased calls for accountability and assessment in higher education. The American Council on Education's Advisory Committee on Self-Regulation Initiatives and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) encouraged 12 professional student affairs organizations to come together to create standards for the profession. Through this collaborative process, CAS was created and standards of practice were promulgated to guide practice in student affairs. The original name for the organization was the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS, 1986; CAS, 2003; Mann et al., 1991).

The name of the organization changed to The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education in 1992. The change was driven by a desire to include all programs that serve students. Membership in the organization has also grown to include representatives from almost 30 professional associations. These representatives come together to collectively contribute to the efforts of CAS. CAS continues to review the existing standards as well as develop standards of practice for new areas of student affairs professional practice (CAS, 2003).

The mission of CAS has also evolved over time. Currently, the stated purpose of CAS is to "[promulgate] standards that enhance the quality of a student's total learning experience in higher education" (CAS, 2001, p. 21). Several principles underlie this philosophy, including

cooperative collaboration, emphasis on student development, holding the student responsible for learning, and an ethical base to practice (CAS, 2003).

Development of CAS standards. The first set of CAS guidelines was published in 1986 and included standards for 16 functional areas as well as academic preparation standards (CAS, 1986; CAS, 2003; Mann et al., 1991). The formation of standards was based on the idea that there was a need among student affairs professionals for criteria that could be used to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of their programs and services. There was an additional desire for the standards to be representative of best practices in student affairs. The Council believed that there were common characteristics among almost all functional areas within student affairs and the standards attempted to highlight these commonalities as well as respect their differences (CAS, 2003).

In 1988 the organization developed and published a Self-Assessment Guide (SAG) for each of the sets of standards published in the 1986 guidelines. The assessment guides helped link program evaluation and assessment to standards of practice in student affairs. Additionally, they provided a systematic, functional-specific method for conducting assessment (CAS, 2003).

Standards for each area include 13 basic sections. The first section is related to the mission of the functional area. It discusses the general characteristics that the mission of the area at any institution should encompass. This section is useful in the development of a mission statement for the functional area and includes general guidelines for what should be included in that statement. The second section discusses the program of the functional area. It focuses on the outcomes of the program for the student. These include growth, learning, clarification of values, development of goals, and a heightened sense of social responsibility. This section can be particularly valuable in developing a program in the functional area as well as assessing an existing program and creating programmatic efforts (CAS, 2003).

The third section is focused on the leadership of the functional area. It emphasizes the necessity of successful leadership in providing quality programs and services. There is also a section that describes characteristics of successful leaders. The information in this section can be used as a guideline for the role that leadership should take in that functional area. The fourth section is related to organization and management. It describes structural elements of the functional area including the effective management of the area. The organization and management section is useful in structuring the functional area (CAS, 2003).

The fifth section discusses human resources. Separate from leadership, there is also a need for quality personnel to staff the office. This section is concerned with outlining ways for implementing quality staffing practices. It is inclusive of professional staff as well as student workers. This section is valuable as a guideline for staffing practices. The sixth section addresses financial resources. It is helpful in determining how to develop funding priorities for the functional area. The financial resources section also can be used in establishing and reviewing financial practices (CAS, 2003).

The seventh section of each CAS standard is related to facilities, technology, and equipment. It discusses the need for adequate resources in each of these areas to meet the goals and mission of the functional area. Information in this section can be used as a guideline for developing facilities as well as obtaining new technology and equipment. The eighth section discusses legal responsibilities. It explains the need for staff members to be informed about laws that are related to their area's responsibilities. The section explores where responsibilities lie for providing this information. It is helpful in understanding the legal responsibilities that need to be addressed for a given functional area (CAS, 2003).

The ninth section focuses on equity and access. It highlights the need for the equitable distribution of programs and services to all students. All aspects of the services that student affairs professionals provide should be reflective of this commitment to equitable access. This section is useful in ensuring that the area's programs and services are provided equitably. The tenth section discusses the relationships between the campus and external entities. It is focused on maintaining positive relationships between colleges and universities and their surrounding communities. The information in the section can be used in the development and maintenance of relationships both on and off campus (CAS, 2003).

The eleventh section is related to diversity. It discusses the importance of encouraging diversity in every aspect of the institution and the need for functional areas to provide an environment that is accepting of that diversity. Professionals can use the section as guidance for developing an environment that fosters diversity. The twelfth section is focused on ethics. It emphasizes the need for all persons involved in the functional area to operate under a clear set of ethical guidelines. Programs and services should reflect these ethics. This section is useful in evaluating the ethics employed by the area (CAS, 2003).

Finally, the thirteenth section of CAS standards discusses assessment and evaluation. This section outlines the need for regular assessment and evaluation of the functional area. Additionally, it highlights the importance of quality methodologies in making the information useful in evaluation of the area. This section can be used in the development and implementation of assessment and evaluation endeavors (CAS, 2003).

Existing CAS standards. The most recent publication of CAS standards includes standards of practice for 29 functional areas and Master's level student affairs graduate preparation programs. CAS standards have been created for the following functional areas of student affairs: academic advising; admission programs; alcohol, tobacco and other drug programs; campus activities; campus information and visitor services; career services; college health programs; college union; commuter student programs; conference and events programs; counseling services; disability support services; educational services for distance learners; financial aid programs; fraternity and sorority advising; housing and residential life programs; international student programs and services; judicial programs; learning assistance programs; lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender programs; minority student programs; outcomes assessment and program evaluation; recreational sports programs; registrar programs and services; religious programs; student leadership programs; student orientation programs; TRIO and other educational opportunity programs; and women student programs and services (CAS, 2003). Two of the functional areas for which standards currently exist are related to college and university programming boards, college union and campus activities.

There are currently standards of practice for college unions. This set of standards is tangentially related to the area of college and university programming boards. College unions often house programming boards, provide facilities for events, and provide advisors for programming boards. Despite the connections between college unions and programming boards, the existing standards are not adequate to meet the needs of programming boards (CAS, 2003).

In the mission section of the college union standards, one of the primary goals listed is to "promote programs that are responsive to student development needs" (CAS, 2001, p. 88). While college unions are charged with promoting and facilitating the implementation of campus programming, programming boards are responsible for actually planning and implementing the programs. Because this set of standards does not provide guidance for program planning and implementation, there is still a need to create standards of practice for programming boards.

The existing CAS standards for campus activities are also nominally related to college and university programming boards. The mission section of these standards suggests that "the purposes [of campus activities] must enhance the overall educational experiences of students through social, cultural, multicultural, intellectual, recreational, community service, and campus governance programs" (CAS, 2001, p. 50). College and university programming boards produce many of these types of programs. However, there are other types of programs included, such as campus governance programs that are usually not produced by programming boards.

These two sets of standards are more broadly focused on all of the areas related to campus activities. College and university programming boards comprise one part of the programmatic efforts of campus activities. While the college union and campus activities standards focus on programmatic efforts, they are broad in scope and do not fully address the specific needs of programming boards. There is still a need for standards of practice that are narrowly tailored to the needs and purposes of college and university programming boards.

Research on College and University Programming Boards

An examination of the literature related to college and university programming boards revealed that very little scientifically based research has been conducted and written about on this topic. The vast majority of the literature is based on experience, general observations, and opinion. Additionally, a majority of this literature is written and published in a publications produced by the National Association for Campus Activities, hence may reflect a bias in some way.

A review of recent literature on college and university programming boards uncovered three themes in the literature. First, a large portion of the literature focused on the general steps and processes for conducting programs. Second, there was literature focused on the supervision of college and university programming boards. A final theme was funding campus programming produced by programming boards.

Planning and Implementing Programs

College and university programming boards are charged with the task of planning and implementing programs on campus. It is a complicated process and event success is dependent upon students' knowledge of the program planning process. One commonly overlooked step in the process is researching competing events. If there are other events going on either on or off campus, it may adversely affect the success of a planned event. Also, it is important to ensure

21

that there are no rules, regulations, or ordinances that impact the performance. For example, the institution may have a noise curfew that would require the performance to end at a specific time or there may be paperwork that is required if fog or haze is used during the performance (Cohen & Damon, 2002).

Another area that is often overlooked when planning events is securing volunteers to assist with set-up, with the show, and with clean up. Volunteers are an essential part of making any program a success, and effectively communicating volunteer needs for a program is vital (Cohen & Damon, 2002; Stansberry & Stevens, 2002). There must be clear communication methods and quick response to any questions or concerns. It is also important to establish expectations for volunteers before they arrive at the program. This will help avoid confusion as well as avoid losing volunteers due to unexpected responsibilities. Finally, when working with volunteers it is essential that student leaders lead by example. Volunteers will be much more motivated to help when they feel they are partners with the student leader (Stansberry & Stevens, 2002).

In addition to having an in depth understanding of the program planning process, student leaders and programming board advisors must understand contracts. Having a working knowledge of contracts is important in protecting the institution. Every contract should clearly identify who the performers are, when they will perform, how long they will perform, how much they will be paid, and when payment will occur. In addition to the contract, many artists also have a contract rider, which outlines the technical and hospitality requirements of the artist. If an artist does not have a contract rider, these elements should be covered in the contract (Diekroeger, 2001; Radley & Kirk, 2001).

It is important to review both the contract and contract rider in depth. This will help avoid any unexpected surprises the day of the performance. Also, the product of any negotiations should be written into either the contract or contract rider. When negotiating a contract, it is vital to understand any state laws and institutional rules or regulations that impact the negotiation process. For example, an institution may not allow students to make offers to artists. One way to avoid legal concerns with contracts is to allow the university's legal counsel to review contracts (Diekroeger, 2001; Radley & Kirk, 2001).

Many programming boards produce programming series in addition to single events. Common programming series include films, comedians, and late night programs. When

developing a program series, it is essential to assess the needs of the campus. Every institutional culture is different, which will impact the type of events that are successful. A film series may be extremely popular at one institution while it is unsuccessful at another. Student behavior may also be helpful in determining a time and place for the program series. Regardless of the type of series, carefully planned and implemented program series can serve as the foundation for a programming board (Nelson, 2002; Parkinson, 2003; Waltrip, 2002).

Regardless of the type of event, promoting programs is a key determinant of success. Programming boards are constantly seeking creative ways to advertise upcoming events. Continually advertising in the same manner may gradually become less productive over time (Harney, 2003; Nelson, 2002; Parkinson, 2003). It is not only important to ensure that programming boards are not excluding audiences because of the way they are advertising. For example, if advertising is done primarily in the residence halls, non-resident and non-traditional students may not know about the event (Tucker, 2003). Promotion is the most important part of planning an event because without advertisement no one will attend the event (Harney, 2003; Nelson, 2002; Parkinson, 2003).

As with any type of event, students and advisors who work with programming boards need to evaluate possible risks associated with planned programs. Some of the risks that are particularly significant in a campus programming setting include crowd behavior, the target audience, the weather when planning an outside event, alcohol consumption, and security. In addition to examining applicable risks, it is important to evaluate the probably of an occurrence. Programming board advisors should take the lead in initiating these conversations and ensure that risk management is taking place for campus programming (Diekroeger, 2002).

Programming Board Supervision

An examination of the literature on college and university programming boards revealed extensive work focused on supervising programming boards. Supervision is difficult and being a good supervisor requires being intentional (Russell, Stansberry, & Lawhead, 2003). Effective supervision entails providing educational opportunities as well as motivation (Zummerman, 2002). Supervisors with differing levels of experience face different challenges. For example, beginning advisors may need to make extra efforts to develop professional boundaries if they are close in age to their students (Greenwell, 2002). However, seasoned advisors may need to seek out ways to stay current on new entertainment trends, particularly technology advancements, and

remain passionate about working in student activities (Knofla, 2003; Vest, 2002). Regardless of level of experience, supervisors should recognize that supervision is a learning process for the supervisor, students, and professional staff (Russell, Stansberry, & Lawhead, 2003).

One of the central functions of programming board advisors is providing learning opportunities to students. One research study examined what student leaders learn from their involvement in campus activities. Student leaders were surveyed about their college experience and the outcomes associated with campus activities involvement. The results of the study found that there was a positive relationship between involvement and outcomes. Some of the positive outcomes included developing quantitative skills, personal self-discovery, and learning about economic productivity (McCluskey-Titus, 2003).

Students involved in a programming board in a leadership position are provided with the opportunity to apply concepts and skills that they are learning in the classroom. Preparation is one area that links students' out of class experience with what they are learning in the classroom. Students are given opportunities to plan, organize, and implement programs on a regular basis. They use these preparation skills for assignments on a regular basis and also continue to utilize those skills as they enter the workforce. Participation in a programming board also fosters the development of relationships and communication with a variety of interest groups, both of which skills are essential to working in groups for class or work. Being a student leader for a programming board helps students learn to develop priorities, which helps them manage their time while they are in college and after they graduate. Finally, working on a programming board helps students develop passion. Just as many student leaders are passionate about what they do with the programming board, they need to find what they are passionate about in the classroom (Layton, 2003). The parallels between student involvement in a programming board and class work as well as the positive outcomes that involvement has on student development highlight the important role that programming board advisors play in student development (Layton, 2003; McCluskey-Titus, 2003).

There are numerous things that programming board advisors can do to enhance the development of the students they advise. First, it is important to recognize the different needs of students. For example, a student's racial background may affect his/her individual development. Theories such as Helms' model for racial identity development can help advisors understand how they can promote student development. Beyond the individual level, racial identity may

impact the type of programs that student leaders choose. Encouraging a student's development may also affect the diversity of programs that a board sponsors (Hyman & Arminio, 2001).

Emotional intelligence is another factor that may impact the developmental needs of a student. Measures of emotional intelligence include five components: interpersonal, intrapersonal, adaptability, stress management, and general mood. Programming board advisors can develop training sessions that meet the Emotional Intelligence development needs of student leaders. Development of these skills contributes to the students' overall development and success both in and out of the classroom (Scheusner, 2003).

Other strategies that programming board advisors can use to contribute to student development include creating leadership opportunities and providing training sessions. In addition to leadership positions on the programming board, advisors can work with student leaders to develop programs that provide students who are not in leadership positions with leadership opportunities. These efforts may start small with one or two opportunities, but can grow to a larger program that help students gain the knowledge and skills that can move them into leadership positions on the board (Brown, 2002). Programming board training provides another opportunity to contribute to student development. Training retreats can be particularly meaningful during time of transition (Rotz, 2003).

Funding Campus Programming

Funding campus programming was a final theme identified through reviewing the literature on college and university programming boards. Work focused on declining funding for programming boards has become increasingly common in the literature as colleges and universities face budget cuts (Hyatt, 2002; Mussi, 2002). Many of these articles describe strategies for coping with smaller budgets.

One strategy for sponsoring more programs with less money is Cooperative (CO-OP) buying through the National Association of Campus Activities. CO-OP buying provides colleges and universities with the opportunity to contract performers at a reduced rate when a "block" of dates within a centralized geographical area is booked. Participating in the process allows schools to stretch their programming dollars. Cooperative buying requires programmers to spend additional time coordinating with local institutions, but the time invested can save money that can be used to bring more performers to campus (Bestler-Wilcox, 2002; Mussi, 2002).

Applying for grants and seeking corporate sponsorship are also strategies that can be implemented to make programming dollars go further (Hyatt, 2002; Watkins, 2001). Writing the grant proposal takes additional time; however, should the grant be successful, it provides a source of supplemental funding for programs (Watkins, 2001). Similarly, corporate sponsorship can provide an outside source of funding. While not all businesses are willing to provide this type of funding, many corporate entities donate money annually, seek new avenues for advertising, or are willing to develop an exclusive agreement for use of their service at a discounted rate (Hyatt, 2002).

Finally, collaboration is a method for stretching programming funds. Working with other organizations and offices on campus can provide additional funding for events. Co-sponsorship can be particularly beneficial in the implementation of educational programs. Academic departments may be willing to collaborate, which provides students with the opportunity to work with faculty and staff in a different setting. Additionally, collaborating with academic departments has the potential to enhance the program's efforts to connect in-class and out-of-class experiences (Clayborne & Perkins, 2002; Hyatt, 2002).

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

State funding for higher education has been decreasing and this has prompted increased calls for accountability. Assessment has emerged as one way to meet the growing demand for accountability (Alexander, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Creamer et al., 1992; Wellman). Numerous forms of assessment have been developed for higher education (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996; Wellman, 2001).

Developing standards of practice is one form of assessment that has been used in student affairs (Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Both the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators have been involved in efforts to develop standards for student affairs (American College Personnel Association, 1992; American College Personnel Association and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1997; Blimling & Whitt, 1998). The Council for the Advancement of Standards of Higher Education has developed standards of practice for 29 functional areas as well as Master's level student affairs preparation programs (CAS, 2003).

Despite the extensive standards of practice that exist for areas in student affairs, there are not standards for programming boards. Nor are the standards of practice addressed in the

literature on programming boards. Instead, that literature focuses on implementing programs (Cohen & Damon, 2002; Diekroeger, 2001; Harney, 2003; Nelson, 2002; Parkinson, 2003; Radley & Kirk, 2001; Stansberry & Stevens, 2002; Tucker, 2003; Waltrip, 2002), supervising programming boards (Brown, 2002; Greenwell, 2002; Knofla, 2003; Hyman & Arminio, 2001; Layton, 2003; McCluskey-Titus, 2003; Rotz, 2003; Russell, Stansberry, & Lawhead, 2003; Scheusner, 2003; Vest, 2002; Zummerman, 2002), and acquiring funding (Bestler-Wilcox, 2002; Clayborne & Perkins, 2002; Hyatt, 2002; Mussi, 2002; Watkins, 2001). The present study was designed to address both the lack of research about CUPBs and the potential need for standards of practice for this group of organizations. This study sought to discover the characteristics of successful programming boards.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of successful college and university programming boards (CUPBs). Specifically, I focused on organization and management; human, financial, and facility resource characteristics; campus and community relationship characteristics, program characteristics; mission characteristics; assessment and self-evaluation characteristics; and leadership characteristics of CUPBs deemed to be successful by professionals who work in this area of student affairs administration.

These characteristics were chosen for investigation based on the sections included in each of the CAS standards of practice. Overall, there are 13 characteristics discussed in each set of CAS standards. However, only seven of those characteristics are investigated in this study. I chose to only investigate the CAS characteristics that are most closely related to programming boards. I consulted with student affairs professionals who have experience working with CUPBs in order to determine which characteristics of successful college and university programming boards to explore in this study. These professionals provided me with insight into the CAS characteristics that are most closely related to the work done by CUPBs.

Because there is little known about characteristics of successful programming boards, I used two methods of inquiry in an attempt to explore the richness of the topic. First, document analysis was conducted to obtain certain pieces of information. Second, interviews were conducted to obtain answers to remaining questions related to the research questions. To gain information that would illustrate the full range of information, I sought data related to the following research questions:

1. What are the organization and management characteristics of successful programming boards?
2. What are the human, financial, and facility resource characteristics of successful programming boards?
3. What are the campus and community relationship characteristics of successful programming boards?
4. What are the program characteristics of successful programming boards?
5. What are the mission characteristics of successful programming boards?

6. What are the assessment and self-evaluation characteristics of successful programming boards?

7. What are the leadership characteristics of successful programming boards?

Sample Selection

The population for this study consisted of successful CUPBs and the student affairs professionals who advise programming boards in each of the seven regions of the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA). There were two criteria for being an advisor participant in this study. First, participants had to be an advisor to a college or university programming board. To provide the documents requested and answer the questions posed in this study, participants had to have an in-depth knowledge about the programming board, including information about the board's history. Because students involved in programming boards may not have an understanding of all aspects of a programming board, I chose to use advisors of programming boards as respondents in this study.

The second criterion for being a participant in the present study was having a working email address. Information about the study and participation in the study was communicated via email; therefore, making it necessary for participants to have a working email address. To identify this sample, several steps were taken.

First, the member directory of the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) was used to generate contact information for student affairs professionals who are involved in student activities. These individuals were asked to identify successful programming boards. The following procedure was used to obtain this information.

On November 3, 2003, an electronic mail message (Appendix A) was sent to the primary professional for each institutional member identified in the NACA member guide informing them about the study. The message outlined the purpose of the study and asked their assistance in identifying the sample for the study. There are seven regions in NACA. Since I wanted a geographic representation of CUPBs in the sample, I chose the sample by region. Participants were informed of their identified NACA region based on the information provided in the NACA member directory and were asked to identify the top four successful college and university programming boards from their region as well as the criteria used to determine success.

One week later, November 11, 2003, a second electronic mail message (Appendix B) was sent asking those who had not yet responded to my request to do so. Two days later, November

13, 2003, all data that had been collected were analyzed. These data were used to select the study's sample.

I determined frequency data for the programming boards and criteria that were listed by NACA members. Frequency data were calculated for each region. Based on this analysis, the top eight successful programming boards were identified from each region for a total of 56 successful CUPBs. These programming boards were used as potential participants for this study. The top four programming boards from each region were initially contacted and asked to participate, creating a total of 28 potential programming boards in the sample. The remaining 28 CUPBs (four from each region) were alternates, to be included in the study should one of the top four programming boards from a region decline the invitation to participate.

The next step in selecting the sample for the present study was determining the advisors for the 56 successful programming boards identified by the frequency data. Names and contact information were obtained for these individuals through either the NACA member directory or their college or university website.

Once the contact information was collected, an electronic mail message (Appendix C) was sent to the advisors of the 28 successful programming boards identified by NACA members. The message outlined the purpose as well as the timeline for the study. Participants were asked to indicate whether they were willing to participate in the study and, if so, were asked to provide the researcher with several documents as well as participate in a follow-up interview. Those who agreed to participate were included in the sample.

If a participant declined to participate in the study, the advisor of the next highest ranked successful programming board for that region (5-8) was contacted and asked to participate. These steps were repeated until four programming board advisors from each region agreed to participate in the study.

<center>Instrumentation</center>

For purposes of this study, an Institutional Profile (IP) form (Appendix D) was developed in consultation with student affairs professionals at a major research university in a mid-Atlantic state. To elicit participant responses, the Institutional Profile form contained questions that sought to answer the research questions posed in this study. The IP form was divided into the following eight sections related to successful practice in CUPBs: (a) Institution and Contact Information, (b) Organization and Management Characteristics, (c) Human, Financial, and

<center>30</center>

Facility Resource Characteristics, (d) Campus and Community Relationship Characteristics, (e) Program Characteristics, (f) Mission Characteristics, (g) Assessment and Self-Evaluation Characteristics, and (h) Leadership Characteristics. The latter seven IP sections corresponded directly with the study's research questions. When possible, anticipated categories of responses to items were created. In the event that the data revealed additional categories, they were added.

The first Section of the Institutional Profile relates to general Institution Information and Contact Information for the programming board's advisor. The institutional information included the institution's name, type (public v. private), and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollment. The contact information included the contact's name, email, phone number, and the date and time of the phone interview conducted with the contact. This section consisted of nine items.

Section Two of the IP sought to discover the various Organization and Management characteristics of successful programming boards. Items in this section related to the structural make-up of the programming board itself as well as the way in which the programming board fits into the organization of the institution. Additionally, this section uncovered the process for students to obtain leadership positions on the programming board and the types of leadership development opportunities made available to them. This section contained 13 primary items.

The third section of the protocol addressed Human, Financial, and Facility Resource characteristics of programming boards. This section consists of 10 items. Items in this section were divided into three sets. One set of items related to Human resources, one set pertained to Financial resources, and the final set of items related to Facility resources. The items about Human resources sought to ascertain the number of professional staff working with the programming board and their educational background. This set of items also asked how many support staff members work with the programming board as well as what types of training are available to all staff who work with the programming board.

In the second set of items (Financial resources), participants were asked to identify the average annual amount of funding the programming board received over the three years preceding the study and the sources of those funds. This section also asked about the ways that funding is distributed throughout the programming board organization.

The final set of items in this section related to Facility resources. The items focused on the capacity and setup of venues available to the programming board. Additionally, this set of

items sought to examine how access to those venues is obtained as well as the costs of using the venues.

In section four of the IP form, Campus and Community Relationship characteristics of successful programming boards were identified. Participants were asked to describe the various marketing techniques used to promote events and the organization as a whole. This section also explored how marketing materials are produced and funded. The third section consisted of three items.

Section five sought to discover the Program characteristics of successful programming boards. This section was designed to elicit data about the types of programs put on by the programming board, including program series. This section also examined the number of programs produced by each programming board over the last three years. This section of the IP form included four items.

The sixth section of the protocol examined the Mission characteristics of successful programming boards. The items in this section sought to identify the mission statement of the programming board. Section six of the protocol had one item.

Section seven of the protocol identified the Assessment and Self-evaluation Techniques used by the programming board. The items in this section focused on the techniques used to assess and evaluate the programming board. Additionally, the section sought to examine who is responsible for implementing those efforts. The seventh section had two items.

Finally, the eighth section of the protocol sought to discover the Leadership Characteristics of successful CUPBs. Participants were asked to identify who was responsible for carrying out various programming tasks. This section also explored the advising style used with the programming board. Section eight of the protocol had two items.

Once the IP form was drafted, experienced student affairs professionals were asked to review the protocol. The professionals who participated in the expert review were experienced in the field of student affairs as well as educational research. These professionals included an Associate Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs, an Assistant Director of Student Programming, a Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs, and an Associate Vice President for Student Affairs.

Data Collection Procedures

Before collecting any data, the researcher sought approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Research Involving Human Subjects at the campus where the researcher was based. Once IRB approval was obtained, the data collection phase of the study began.

This study utilized two methods of data collection and the collection was done in two stages. Stage one of the data collection process involved the collection of materials to be used in document analysis. Stage two of data collection utilized interviews to obtain additional information about each of the programming boards.

Participants were sent an electronic mail message (Appendix E) asking them to send the researcher the documents they had agreed to submit when they accepted the invitation to participate in the study. These included: (a) the Annual Report for the office or department where the programming board is housed for 2000/01, 2001/02, and 2002/03, (b) an organizational chart of the Division of Student Affairs, (c) an organizational chart of the office or department where the programming board is housed, (d) the resumes of each of the professional staff whose job responsibilities include working with the programming board, and (e) the mission statement of the programming board. Additionally, the electronic mail message informed participants that they would be contacted to participate in an interview for the second stage of the data collection process. Upon receipt of the requested documents, each of the documents was labeled with the institution's name and date of receipt to avoid any potential future confusion with other materials.

One week after sending the initial request for materials, a second electronic mail message (Appendix F) was sent asking those who had not yet responded to my request to do so. If participants did not respond to this second email within one week, it was assumed that they were no longer interested or willing to participate in the study. In such cases, the advisor of the next highest ranked successful programming board for that region (5-8) was contacted and asked to participate.

An electronic mail message (Appendix G) was sent the day after materials from each participant were received thanking the participant for his/her contribution to the study. The message also outlined steps to be taken if the participant wished to receive a copy of the results of the study.

After each set of documents was received, I examined the documents to obtain the information that answered the items on the IP form. The documents were used to answer as many items as possible on the Institutional Profile. Once this process was completed for an institution, the contact person was asked to participate in the second stage of data collection for the study.

In stage two of the data collection process, participants were sent an electronic mail message (Appendix H) asking them to participate in an interview. The message requested the participants respond by identifying dates and times when they were available to be interviewed. Using the interview time preferences provided by participants, a schedule of interviews was created. Each participant was sent an electronic mail message (Appendix I) confirming their interview day and time.

At the beginning of each interview, I introduced myself and provided brief information about my qualifications. Next, the purpose and goals of the interview were reviewed as well as the general format of the interview. Participants were then given the opportunity to ask questions that they had about the study. Participants were informed that extensive notes would be taken during the interview to capture the information provided. Participants were asked to provide information on all those IP items that remained unanswered after the document analysis had been completed. When necessary, follow-up questions were asked. These questions were only asked to clarify participant responses that were ambiguous or unclear to me.

At the end of the interview, I gave the participants an opportunity to add to their responses to any of the questions posed in the interview. Participants were informed of the procedure that would be used following the interview. Finally, the participants were invited to contact me if they had any questions about the results of the study or the final report.

Authenticity and Trustworthiness

Authenticity is defined as a consistent method of data collection and the relevance of data collection to the research questions posed in a particular study. It relates to how accurately the researcher has interpreted the phenomenon being examined through the data collection process as well as the credibility of the study's results (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this study, authenticity was enhanced through the use of three methods.

The first method used to enhance authenticity was triangulation. Triangulation involves the use of multiple data points to determine themes from the data (Creswell, 2003). To obtain

multiple data points in this study, I examined the documents and survey responses and identified trends when the same issue was identified three or more times in response to a research question. The use of triangulation increases the accuracy of the data (Creswell, 2003).

Second, expert review was used as a means of increasing authenticity. The Institutional Profile form was developed in collaboration with student affairs professionals and faculty members who were familiar with CUPBs and research design. Expert review enhances the validity of the findings (Creswell, 2003).

Member checking is one way of enhancing the trustworthiness of the data (Creswell, 2003). Trustworthiness is defined as assuring the truthfulness of the data collected in a study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The process of member checking involves providing participants with a summary of the data they provided to the study for their review and feedback. Participants are given the opportunity to check the accuracy of the researcher's interpretation of their responses (Creswell, 2003). In this study, participants were informed that extensive notes would be taken during the interview to capture the information provided. At the end of the interview, these notes were read to the participant. The participant was given the opportunity to make any additions or changes to the information that they deemed necessary. By having participants review the information provided to the researcher, the trustworthiness of the data was increased. Finally, member-checking was also used to increase the accuracy of the present study's findings. Member-checking is another method of increasing the authenticity of the study (Creswell, 2003).

Data Analysis Procedures

Once the Institutional Profile forms had been completed, they were analyzed to address the research questions posed in this study. Data collected through the documents and interview responses provided two types of data. The first type was data that could be quantified. Although using an interview method for data collection is inherently qualitative in nature, some of the data collected were quantifiable.

Questions that elicited quantifiable data were identified and the data from those questions were entered into a spreadsheet. Responses were sorted by their associated protocol question. I calculated descriptive statistics for each of the items. For example, participants were asked to report the amount of funding their programming board received each of the last three years. These three figures were averaged and then divided by the FTE undergraduate enrollment to obtain a per student expenditure

level. The researcher calculated the range and mean of this per student expenditure figure to paint a general fiscal picture of boards.

The study also yielded some qualitative data. These data were analyzed by identifying categories of responses. To identify these categories, I took extensive field notes during the interviews and reviewed them several times. To aid in this process, I identified items that were likely to be included during the interview stage of data collection. It was likely that each interview would touch on different topics based on what the documents revealed. However, it could be assumed that certain items would be asked during the interview process. For example, it could reasonably be assumed that the item in the Human, Financial, and Facility Resource characteristics section that sought to understand how programming boards obtain access to venues would not be able to be answered through document analysis.

Based on the identification of these items, anticipated response categories were created for these questions. For example, two response categories were created for the above-mentioned question about how programming boards obtain access to venues: self-regulated and outside-regulated. A self-regulated process was one where access to venues was controlled by the students and/or advisors working with the programming board. An outside-regulated process was one that required members of the programming board to work with an office or staff member outside of the programming board to obtain venue access. In addition to these predetermined categories, space was left on the IP form for a different category to be added if the interview revealed a new category. The field notes were used to identify additional categories.

The field notes were reviewed several times to ensure that I understood the data provided by participants. Through this review, responses that pertained to the items on the Institutional Profile form were coded. Each response was analyzed and assigned to the appropriate response category for that IP item. Since the Interview Protocol was divided into sections that mirrored the research questions, this process was used to interpret the responses to each research question.

The first step that was taken in analyzing the data was to look for possible content categories in the data. For example, in the Human, Financial, and Facility Resource characteristics section, if participants provided answers to the item about how they obtain venue space such as "we control access to our venue space", then the comment would be coded into the Self Regulated category. If a participant answered the same question with the words, "we go through the event services office, which is within the division of student affairs", then the

comment would be coded in the Outside Regulated category. If the explanation offered by a respondent suggested neither a self-regulated nor an outside-regulated process, the response was assigned to a category called "other." Extensive notes were taken on exactly what the process was at that institution. I then reviewed all the "other" responses to see if new categories of responses could be identified. If three or more participants described a similar process, I identified that as an additional category and created a name for that category.

A tally sheet was compiled once all of the data were coded. The sheet included columns that identified theme codes for each IP item. The total number of times the category was identified was tallied. Finally, response category totals were summed for each Institutional Profile item. The totals were used to generate frequency distributions for each category for each item. The resulting data guided the researcher's responses to the research questions posed in the current study.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

In conclusion, gathering data through the use of document analysis and interviews in this study helped in obtaining a wide range of participant responses and allowed for the topic to be explored in depth. The methods of data collection and data analysis that were used enabled the research to answer the research questions posed in the present study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The following chapter describes the results of this study's examination of the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. The chapter begins by describing the changes made in data collection procedures. Next, a description of the sample is provided. The sections that follow describe the results of the project. The results are presented in order of the seven research questions posed in the study.

Changes in Data Collection Procedures

There were two changes made to the data collection procedures as the study progressed. First, I originally planned to select the top four programming boards nominated from each of seven NACA regions for participation in the study, creating a total sample of 28 programming boards. However, once the nomination data were analyzed, there was a clear break in the data indicating the top successful programming boards in each region. Based on this discovery, I altered the participant selection process to include those boards in each region that were clear choices of nominators. Response rates for the nomination process are summarized in Appendix J and the results of the process are summarized in Appendix K. Due to this change in the process, three institutions from the Central, Mid America, Mid Atlantic, South, and West regions and four institutions from the Northeast and Northern Plains regions were invited to participate in the study. One institution in the Northeast region declined to participate, rendering a total sample of 22 institutions. In addition to providing a list of nominated programming boards, nominators were asked to provide the criteria used for determining success. The data related to the listed criteria are summarized in Appendix L.

The second revision to data collection procedure related to the method of asking programming board advisors to participate in the study. I originally planned to send an email to each of the programming board advisors asking them to participate. Because the data clearly revealed the top boards in each region, I felt that it was important to ensure participation by those programming boards. In order to help increase the likelihood of participation, I decided to make an initial phone call to each institution summarizing the study and seeking participation. The protocol for these phone calls is described in Appendix M. A follow-up electronic mail message (Appendix N) was sent to each advisor after the phone conversation describing the details of participation.

Characteristics of Sample

The final sample consisted of 22 college and university programming boards. Of the 22 participant institutions, 13 were Public Four-year institutions, seven were Private Four-year campuses, and two were Community Colleges. In order to examine the size of the institutions, I collected the Full-Time Equivalent undergraduate enrollment from each campus. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. The FTE undergraduate enrollment of the institutions ranged from 1,800 to 26,254 with the mean enrollment at 9,675. Participating institutions were assigned to Enrollment Size Categories, which were based on those used by NACA. Institutions were assigned to a category of SO (0-500), S1 (501-1,000), S2 (1,001-5,000), S3 (5,001-10,000), S4 (10,001-15,000), and S5 (15,001 and up). I calculated the number of institutions that fell into each category and percentage of the total sample. These sample characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Organization and Management Characteristics

The first research question examined the organization and management characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. I collected 13 pieces of data on this topic from each participating campus. First, I looked at the number of leadership positions on the programming board. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Second, I examined the number of executive positions available on the programming board through calculating the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Then, I explored the response from each institution and assigned each to a category of Extensive (four or more executive positions), Narrow (one to three executive positions), or None (no executive positions). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category.

Fourth, I looked at the number of programming board committees. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Next, I assigned each response to a category of Extensive (six or more committees), Narrow (one to five committees), and None (no committees). I calculated the number of participant responses in each category and percentage of the total sample.

Sixth, I explored how the president was selected. I assigned each response to a category of Elected by CUPB Representatives, General Student Body Election, Selected by University Committee (selected by university representatives), Selected by Department (selected by the programming board's home department), Appointed by SGA (appointed by student government

Table 1

Characteristics of Sample (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Institution Type				
Public 4-year	13	59	-	-
Private 4-year	7	32	-	-
Community College	2	9	-	-
Institution Size				
FTE Undergraduate Enrollment	-	-	1,800 – 26,254	9,675
Enrollment Size Categories				
S0	-	-	-	-
S1	-	-	-	-
S2	7	32	-	-
S3	7	32	-	-
S4	3	14	-	-
S5	5	23	-	-

association representatives), or No President (no president position). I calculated the number of participant responses in each category and percentage of the total sample represented by each option.

Seventh, I looked at requirements for becoming president of the CUPB. I calculated the number of participant responses and percentage of the total sample for each of the following categories of responses: GPA, Experience on CUPB, Good Academic Standing (as defined by the institution); Good Judicial Standing (as defined by the institution); Hours Enrolled; and No President (no organization president). Next, I examined how students were selected for leadership positions on the board. I assigned each response to a category of Elected by CUPB Representatives, General Student Body Election, Selected by University Committee (selected by university representatives), Selected by CUPB President, or Selected by Department (selected by the programming board's home department). I calculated the number of participant responses in each category and the percentage of the total sample assigned to each category.

Eighth, I explored the programming boards' home departments. I calculated the number of participant responses and percentage of the total sample for each of the following categories: Student Life, Student Involvement, Student Development, Student Activities, Student Union, Programs, Dean of Students, Student Affairs, Student Services, and Student Success and Enrollment. Ninth, I looked at whether or not the institution had other programming boards. I calculated the number and the percentage of the total sample that had other boards. Then, I examined the number of other programming boards at each participating institution through calculating the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses.

Next, I examined the methods used by each programming board to train student leaders. I calculated the number of participant responses for each method and the percentage of the total sample assigned to each category. Finally, I explored the breadth of assessment and self-evaluation methods used by each programming board and assigned each institution to a category of Extensive (seven or more training methods), Moderate (five or six training methods), or Minimal (four or fewer training methods). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each method. The results from these analyses are summarized in Table 2.

Human, Financial, and Facility Resource Characteristics

The second research question examined the human, financial, and facility resource characteristics of successful CUPBs. I analyzed the data for each group through a distinct process. The results for each group are described below.

Human Resource Characteristics

To examine human resource characteristics, I collected eight pieces of data. First, I looked at whether or not the programming board had professional staff advisors. If the board had professional advisors, it was assigned to the Yes category and if it did not it was assigned to the No category. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. Second, I examined the number of professional staff advisors for each programming board. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Then, I explored the education level of professional advisors. I assigned responses to a category of Masters in Student Affairs or Related Field, Masters in Field other than Student Affairs, or Bachelors Degree. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category.

Next, I looked at whether or not the programming board had graduate advisors. If the board had graduate advisors, it was assigned to the Yes category and if it did not it was assigned to the No category. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. Fifth, I examined the number of graduate advisors for each programming board and calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses.

Then, I explored whether or not there were support staff members whose responsibilities included working with the programming board. If the programming board did have support staff, it was assigned to the Yes category and if it if did not it was assigned to the No category. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. Next, I looked at the number of support staff members that worked with each CUPB. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Finally, I examined the types of support staff members. Participant responses were assigned to a category of Secretary, Account Manager, or Facility/Ticket Manager based on the responsibilities assigned to each support staff member. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses.

Financial Resource Characteristics

To examine financial resource characteristics, I collected three pieces of data from each participating institution. First, I explored the annual funding of each programming board. I

Table 2

Organization and Management Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Leadership Positions				
Number of Leadership Positions	-	-	6 – 17	10.8
Executive Committee				
Number of Executive Positions	-	-	0 – 6	3.55
Breadth of Executive Committee				
Extensive	8	36	-	-
Narrow	13	59	-	-
None	1	4.5	-	-
Committees				
Number of Committees	-	-	0 – 10	6.23
Breadth of Committees				
Extensive	15	68	-	-
Narrow	5	23	-	-
None	2	9	-	-
President Selection				
Elected by CUPB Representatives	13	59	-	-
General Student Body Election	2	9	-	-
Selected by University Committee	3	14	-	-
Selected by Department	2	9	-	-
Appointed by SGA	1	4.5	-	-
No President	1	4.5	-	-
President Requirements				
GPA	15	68	-	-
Experience on CUPB	14	64	-	-
Good Academic Standing	3	14	-	-
Good Judicial Standing	2	9	-	-
Hours Enrolled	5	23	-	-
No President	1	4.5	-	-
Leader Selection				
Elected by CUPB Representatives	13	59	-	-
General Student Body Election	3	14	-	-
Selected by University Committee	2	9	-	-

Table 2 (continued)

Organization and Management Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Selected by CUPB President	3	14	-	-
Selected by Department	1	4.5	-	-
Home Department				
Student Life	3	14	-	-
Student Involvement	2	9	-	-
Student Development	2	9	-	-
Student Activities	3	14	-	-
Student Union	2	9	-	-
Programs	2	9	-	-
Dean of Students	3	14	-	-
Student Affairs	2	9	-	-
Student Services	2	9	-	-
Student Success & Enrollment	1	4.5	-	-
Other Programming Boards				
Other Programming Boards	9	41	-	-
Number of Other Programming Boards	-	-	0 – 3	0.64
Training Opportunities				
Fall Retreat	22	100	-	-
Spring Retreat	17	77	-	-
Regional Conferences	21	95	-	-
National Conferences	18	82	-	-
University Conferences	9	41	-	-
Transition Period	6	27	-	-
Leadership Workshops	10	45	-	-
In-house Training	8	36	-	-
University Course	3	14	-	-
Breadth of Training				
Extensive	2	9	-	-
Moderate	15	68	-	-
Minimal	5	23	-	-

calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses for the amount of funding in each of the last three academic years, the average amount of funding for the last three years, and the average per student funding for the last three years.

Second, I looked at the funding process. Based on how the programming board obtained its funding, each response was assigned to a category of Annual Cut of Activity Fees, Annual Cut of SGA Budget, SGA Allocation, Student Fee Allocation, or Administrative Allocation (funding determined by university administrators). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. Finally, I examined how the programming board's funding is distributed throughout the organizational structure. I assigned each response to a category of Programming Board, Funding Board, SGA, or Institution. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category.

Facility Resource Characteristics

To examine facility resource characteristics, I collected six pieces of data from each participating campus. First, I looked at the venue types available to each programming board. Venue spaces were assigned to the following categories: Ballroom (multipurpose space with fixed stage); Performing Arts (fixed seating and fixed stage); Theater (theater style seating and film screening capability); Outdoor (any venue located outdoors); Arena (large, multipurpose space with some fixed seating); Nightclub/Bar (dance floor space and/or bar, stage capability); Gym (multipurpose space with no fixed seating); Dining (cafeteria style venue); Coffeehouse (tables and chairs and stage capability); Classroom; and General Space (open indoor spaces). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each type of venue.

Second, I explored the total number of venue spaces available to each programming board by calculating the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Next, I examined the number of each type of venue used by participating programming boards. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Fourth, I looked at whether participating programming boards had to pay rental fees to use any venues. If a programming board had to pay to use one or more of its venues, it was assigned to the Venues with Rental Fees category. If a programming board did not have to pay to use any of its venues, it was assigned to the Venues without Rental Fees category. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each type of venue rental category. Finally, I examined the process that boards use to reserve venue space. Campuses were assigned to a category of

Outside-regulated (all venue access is controlled by a source outside of the programming board), Self-regulated (all venue access is controlled by the programming board), or Both (some venue spaces are outside-regulated and some are self-regulated). I calculated the number and percentage of responses for each category. These results are summarized in Table 3.

Campus and Community Relationship Characteristics

The third research question examined the campus and community relationship characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. I collected four pieces of data on this topic from each participating institution. First, I looked at the advertisement methods used by each programming board. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each method. Then, I examined the breadth of advertisement methods used by each programming board and assigned each institution to a category of Extensive (seven or more advertisement methods), Moderate (five or six advertisement methods), or Minimal (four or fewer advertisement methods). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses assigned to each category.

Third, I explored who is responsible for advertisement creation. I assigned each response to a category of Student Leaders (students who hold leadership positions on the programming board are responsible for creation), Intern (a student intern who is not a member of programming board is responsible for creation), Unpaid Outside Source (an unpaid, professional outside source is responsible for creation), Paid Outside Source (a paid, professional outside source is responsible for creation), Graduate Assistant (a Graduate Assistant is responsible for creation), or Student Leaders and Paid Outside Source (student leaders and a paid professional outside source are responsible for creation. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each category.

Finally, I looked at the manner in which advertising projects are funded. I assigned participant responses to categories of Allocated Funds (funds allocated through the programming board's annual funding process) or Generated Funds (funds generated through charging for events or fundraising). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses assigned to each category. The results from this analysis are summarized in Table 4.

Program Characteristics

The fourth research question examined the program characteristics of successful CUPBs. I collected three pieces of data on this topic from each participating campus. First, I looked at the

Table 3

Human, Financial, and Facility Resource Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Professional Staff Advisors				
Professional Advisors				
Yes	22	100	-	-
No	0	0	-	-
Number of Professional Advisors	-	-	1 – 4	1.82
Education Level of Professional Advisors				
Masters in Student Affairs or				
Related Field	13	59	-	-
Masters in Field other than Student				
Affairs	8	36	-	-
Bachelors Degree	8	36	-	-
Graduate Advisors				
Graduate Assistants				
Yes	11	50	-	-
No	11	50	-	-
Number of Graduate Assistants	-	-	0 – 3	0.77
Support Staff				
Support Staff				
Yes	16	73	-	-
No	6	27		
Number of Support Staff	-	-	0 – 3	0.95
Types of Support Staff				
Secretary	11	50	-	-
Account Manager	5	23	-	-
Facility/Ticket Manager	2	9	-	-
Annual Funding				
2000/01	-	-	34,784 – 345,000	156,729
2001/02	-	-	34,584 – 345,000	158,250
2002/03	-	-	41,634 – 350,000	162,352
Average	-	-	37,001 – 346,667	159,110
Per Student Expenditure	-	-	3.09 – 102	29.93

Table 3 (continued)

Human, Financial, and Facility Resource Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Funding Process				
Annual Cut of Activity Fees	8	36	-	-
Annual Cut of SGA Budget	1	4.5	-	-
SGA Allocation	4	18	-	-
Student Fee Allocation	7	32	-	-
Administrative Allocation	2	9	-	-
Funding Distribution				
Programming Board	16	73	-	-
Funding Board	4	18	-	-
SGA	1	4.5	-	-
Institution	1	4.5	-	-
Venue Spaces				
Summary of Types Available on All Campuses				
Ballroom Venues	14	64	-	-
Performing Arts Venues	13	59	-	-
Theater Venues	15	68	-	-
Outdoor Venues	19	86	-	-
Arena Venues	12	55	-	-
Nightclub/Bar Venues	3	14	-	-
Gym Venues	11	50	-	-
Dining Venues	10	45	-	-
Coffeehouse Venues	13	59	-	-
Classroom Venue	6	27	-	-
General Space Venues	9	41	-	-
Total Number of Venues	-	-	3 – 13	7.32
Per Campus Availability				
Number of Ballroom Venues	-	-	0 – 2	0.77
Number of Performing Arts Venues	-	-	0 – 3	0.91
Number of Theater Venues	-	-	0 – 2	0.73
Number of Outdoor Venues	-	-	0 – 3	1.32
Number of Arena Venues	-	-	0 – 1	0.55
Number of Nightclub/Bar Venues	-	-	0 – 1	0.14
Number of Gym Venus	-	-	0 – 2	0.59
Number of Dining Venues	-	-	0 – 3	0.59

Table 3 (continued)

Human, Financial, and Facility Resource Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Number of Coffeehouse Venues	-	-	0 – 1	0.59
Number of Classroom Venues	-	-	0 – 5	0.55
Number of General Space Venues	-	-	0 – 3	0.64
Venue Cost				
Venues with Rental Fees	7	32	-	-
Venues without Rental Fees	22	100	-	-
Number of Venues with Rental Fees	-	-	0 – 2	0.36
Number of Venues without Rental Fees	-	-	3 – 11	6.95
Venue Access				
Outside-regulated	18	82	-	-
Self-regulated	-	-	-	-
Both	4	18	-	-

Table 4

Campus and Community Relationship Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Advertising Methods				
Flyers	13	59	-	-
Posters	20	91	-	-
On-campus Newspaper	13	59	-	-
Off-campus Newspaper	1	4.5	-	-
On-campus Mailing	4	18	-	-
Semester/Yearly Calendar	5	23	-	-
Display Case(s)	3	14	-	-
Banners	8	36	-	-
Website	11	50	-	-
Closed Circuit TV	6	27	-	-
Listserv(s)	10	45	-	-
Table Tents	11	50	-	-
Sandwich Boards	6	27	-	-
Radio	5	23	-	-
Sidewalk Chalk	6	27	-	-
Info Table	3	14	-	-
Event Specific Ads	10	45	-	-
Bulletin Boards	2	9	-	-
Giveaways	3	14	-	-
Breadth of Advertising				
Extensive	2	9	-	-
Moderate	12	55	-	-
Minimal	8	36	-	-
Advertisement Creation				
Student Leaders	14	64	-	-
Intern	2	9	-	-
Unpaid Outside Source	2	9	-	-
Paid Outside Source	2	9	-	-
Graduate Assistant	1	4.5	-	-
Student Leaders and Paid Outside				
Source	1	4.5	-	-
Advertisement Funding				
Allocated Funds	21	95	-	-
Generated Funds	1	4.5	-	-

types of programs sponsored by each programming board. Responses were placed into the following categories of events: Blockbuster Concerts/Comedians (major national touring acts), Concerts (up and coming national, regional, and local acts), Films, Performing Arts, Speakers, Novelty, Comedy, Trips (trips to off-campus programs and locals), Art Displays/Gallery, Health and Fitness (health awareness programs and/or fitness classes), Nightclub, Outdoor Recreation, and Car Shows. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each type of program.

Then, I examined the number of annual programs or program series implemented by each programming board. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses. Finally, I explored the number of programs sponsored by each programming board. I calculated the range of responses and the mean response for all campuses for the number of programs in each of the last three academic years, the average number of programs for the last three years, and the average per student number of programs for the last three years. These results are summarized in Table 5.

Mission Characteristics

The fifth research question examined the mission characteristics of successful CUPBs. I collected two pieces of data on this topic from each participating institution. First, I looked at whether or not the programming board had a mission statement. If the board had a mission statement, it was assigned to the Mission Statement category and if it did not it was assigned to the No Mission Statement category. I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. Second, I examined the mission statements from each institution and assigned the mission statement to one or more categories. The categories were Nature of Organization (described how the organization is run), Types of Programming (described the different types of programs provided), Target Audience (described the intended audience of programming), and Programming Outcomes (described the desired outcomes of programming). The results from this research question are reported in Table 6.

Assessment and Self-evaluation Characteristics

The sixth research question examined the assessment and self-evaluation characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. I collected three pieces of data on this topic from each participating institution. First, I looked at the assessment and evaluation techniques used by each programming board. I calculated the number and percentage of

Table 5

Program Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Types of Programs				
Blockbuster Concerts/Comedians	16	73	-	-
Concerts	22	100	-	-
Films	20	91	-	-
Performing Arts	9	41	-	-
Speakers	19	86	-	-
Novelty	22	100	-	-
Comedy	20	91	-	-
Trips	8	36	-	-
Art Displays/Gallery	2	9	-	-
Health and Fitness	2	9	-	-
Nightclub	2	9	-	-
Outdoor Recreation	1	4.5	-	-
Car Shows	1	4.5	-	-
Annual Programs				
Number of Annual Programs	-	-	2 – 10	5.68
Number of Programs				
2000/01	-	-	30 – 421	125
2001/02	-	-	30 – 235	122
2002/03	-	-	30 – 365	130
Average	-	-	30 – 340	126
Per Student Programs	-	-	.001 - .093	.026

Table 6

Mission Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Mission Statement				
Mission Statement	15	68	-	-
No Mission Statement	7	32	-	-
Categories of Mission Statement Content				
Nature of Organization	3	14	-	-
Types of Programming	14	64	-	-
Target Audience	9	41	-	-
Programming Outcomes	10	45	-	-

participant responses for each method. Then, I examined the breadth of assessment and self-evaluation methods used by each programming board and assigned each institution to a category of Extensive (utilized five or more methods), Moderate (utilized three or four methods), or Minimal (utilized one or two methods). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each category.

Finally, I looked who was responsible for implementing assessment and self-evaluation. I examined the response from each institution and assigned each to a category of Student Leaders (students who hold leadership positions on the board are responsible for implementation), Programming Board Advisor (an advisor is responsible for implementation), Student Leaders and Programming Board Advisor (student leaders and an advisor are responsible for implementation), Department (someone in the department where the programming board is housed other than an advisor to the board is responsible for implementation) or Student Leaders and Department (student leaders and someone from the department are responsible for implementation). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses for each category. The results from these analyses are summarized in Table 7.

Leadership Characteristics

The final research question examined the leadership characteristics of successful CUPBs. I collected two pieces of data on this topic from each participating campus. First, I examined who was responsible for carrying out each of a series of programming tasks. Responses were assigned to categories of Advisor (an advisor is responsible for the task), Student (a student on the programming board is responsible for the task), Both (an advisor and a student share responsibility for the task), or Outside Source (someone other than an advisor or a student is responsible for the task). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category.

Second, I looked at the advising style used with the programming board. Based on the description of advising, each response was assigned to a category of Program Director (high concern for product, low concern for process), Program Teacher/Director (high concern for product, high concern for process), Program Advisor/Teacher (low concern for product, high concern for process), or Program Consultant (low concern for product, low concern for process). I used the advising styles described in the Situational Advising Model as response categories. These advising styles are based on the Situational Leadership styles developed by Hersey and

Table 7

Assessment and Self-evaluation Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	Range	m
Assessment and Evaluation Methods				
Event Survey	12	55	-	-
Campus-wide Survey	6	27	-	-
Leader Evaluation	12	55	-	-
Advisor Evaluation	8	36	-	-
Staff Evaluation	1	4.5	-	-
Volunteer Evaluation	4	18	-	-
Executive Evaluation	2	9	-	-
Event Debriefing	4	18	-	-
Tracking Data	5	23	-	-
Needs Assessment	1	4.5	-	-
Long-term Assessment Plan	2	9	-	-
Breadth of Assessment and Self-evaluation				
Extensive	3	14	-	-
Moderate	7	32	-	-
Minimal	12	55	-	-
Assessment and Evaluation Implementation				
Student Leaders	7	32	-	-
Programming Board Advisor	7	32	-	-
Student Leaders and Programming				
Board Advisor	6	27	-	-
Department	0	0	-	-
Student Leaders and Department	2	9	-	-

Blanchard (Allen, 1983). I calculated the number and percentage of participant responses in each category. These results are summarized in Table 8.

<div style="text-align:center">Conclusion</div>

In conclusion, this study examined the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. The results summarized in this chapter reflect some interesting patterns and trends with regard to the practices of successful programming boards. A discussion of the results and their implications for future practice, research, and policy are offered in the following chapter.

Table 8

Leadership Characteristics of Successful College and University Programming Boards (N=22)

Characteristic	n	% N	range	m
Programming Tasks				
Initial Agent Contact				
Advisor	1	4.5	-	-
Student	17	77	-	-
Both	4	18	-	-
Outside Source	0	0	-	-
Negotiation with Agent				
Advisor	5	23	-	-
Student	11	50	-	-
Both	6	27	-	-
Outside Source	0	0	-	-
Making Offer				
Advisor	7	32	-	-
Student	12	55	-	-
Both	2	9	-	-
Outside Source	1	4.5	-	-
Execute Contracts				
Advisor	19	86	-	-
Student	0	0	-	-
Both	2	9	-	-
Outside Source	1	4.5	-	-
Event Promotion				
Advisor	0	0	-	-
Student	22	100	-	-
Both	0	0	-	-
Outside Source	0	0	-	-
Advancing Show				
Advisor	3	14	-	-
Student	10	45	-	-
Both	9	41	-	-
Outside Source	0	0	-	-
Advisement Style				
Program Director	1	4.5	-	-
Program Teacher/Director	8	36	-	-
Program Advisor/Teacher	10	45	-	-
Program Consultant	3	14	-	-

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. Professional members of NACA were asked to nominate the most successful boards in their NACA region. Based on the results of this nomination process, institutions were asked to participate in the study. I conducted document analysis and phone interviews in order to examine the characteristics of these successful CUPBs.

This chapter is designed to examine the results of this study and their implications. The chapter is organized around four sections. First, I discuss the general findings in relation to the research questions. Next, the implications for future practice, research, and policy are discussed. The limitations of the study are examined in the third section. Finally, some general conclusions about this project are drawn.

The Findings as They Relate to the Research Questions

Given the general findings of the study presented in Chapter 4, it is important to discuss the results in the context of the research questions posed in the study. Specifically, this section discusses the results that are significant to the creation of standards of practice for CUPBs.

Organization and Management Characteristics

The first research question posed in this study explored the organization and management characteristics of successful CUPBs. The data collected surrounding this research question revealed seven findings that are significant for the creation of standards of practice for programming boards. A majority of the participating boards had a narrow executive structure, which consisted of three or fewer executive positions. Most of these boards also had an extensive committee structure consisting of six or more committees. These findings suggest that successful college and university programming boards have a limited number of executive position opportunities and a larger number of leadership opportunities within the organization's committees.

Another significant finding revealed that a majority of the programming boards' presidents were elected by CUPB representatives. This process was also the most commonly used to elect students to other leadership positions on the board. These two findings suggest that student leaders of successful programming boards are elected by CUPB representatives. In addition to providing insight into how programming board presidents are elected, the data

revealed that successful CUPBs have requirements for running for the president position. The two requirements used by a majority of participating boards were GPA and prior experience on the programming board.

The final two findings relate to the training opportunities provided to students who hold leadership positions on the board. A majority of participating programming boards provide a moderate number of training opportunities. Moderate training was defined as five or six opportunities. Further, 77% of participating institutions use five or more training methods. Of the various training opportunities, fall retreats, spring retreats, regional conferences, and national conferences were the opportunities provided by a majority of the programming boards. These findings suggest that successful college and university programming boards provide five or more training opportunities for students who hold leadership positions and fall retreats, spring retreats, regional conferences, and national conferences are among the opportunities provided.

Human, Financial, and Facility Resource Characteristics

The second research question looked at the human, financial, and facility resource characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. The data collected for this research question revealed eight findings of interest. These finding are discussed below in relationship to each aspect of the research question.

Human Resource Characteristics. The human characteristics aspect of this research question had three findings of interest. First, a majority of participating programming boards had at least one advisor with a Masters degree in Student Affairs or a related field. A second significant finding revealed that there is no conclusive evidence that successful CUPBs have graduate student advisors; some do have them and others do not. A third finding related to this research question showed that most of the boards had at least one support staff member whose responsibilities include working with the programming board.

These findings provide two insights into the human resource characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful college and university programming boards have at least one professional advisor with a Masters degree in Student Affairs or a related field. Second, successful CUPBs have at least one support staff member who works with the programming board.

Financial Resource Characteristics. The findings reveal two trends with respect to financial resource characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, a majority of the participating programming

boards received funding from student fees; however, the process through which those fees are allocated varied. Second, once the boards received the funding allocation, most maintained control over distributing that funding throughout the board.

These findings provide two insights into the financial resource characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. First, successful programming boards' funding comes from student fees. Second, successful CUPBs have the ability to control how the funding allocation is distributed.

Facility Resource Characteristics. There were three findings of interest related to facilities available to successful CUPBs. First, a majority of participating boards have access to the following types of venue spaces: Ballroom, Performing Arts, Theater, Outdoor, Arena, and Coffeehouse. A second finding in the data revealed that none of the participating institutions have to pay rental fees to use a majority of venue spaces. Third, a majority of the boards go through an outside source to obtain access to venue spaces.

These findings provide three insights into the facility resource characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful CUPBs have access to numerous types of venue spaces. Second, successful college and university programming boards are able to use a majority of venue spaces without paying rental fees. Finally, successful CUPBs do not have the responsibility of regulating access to venue space, but instead go through an outside source to obtain access.

Campus and Community Relationship Characteristics

In the third research question, I sought to examine the campus and community relationship characteristics of successful programming boards. The data for this research question revealed four significant findings. A majority of participating programming boards used a moderate number of regular advertising methods. Moderate advertising was defined as five or six methods. Further, 65% of participating institutions use five or more advertising methods on a regular basis. Of the various advertising methods reported, flyers, posters, and on-campus newspapers are the methods used by a majority of the programming boards. These findings suggest that successful CUPBs use five or more methods for advertising on a regular basis and flyers, posters, and on-campus newspapers are among the methods used.

A third finding revealed that a majority of the participating boards give students on the programming board responsibility for creating advertisements. Finally, almost all of the boards

are able to use allocated funding to pay for marketing efforts. These findings provide two additional insights into the campus and community relationship characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful college and university programming boards charge students with the responsibility for creating promotional materials. Second, successful CUPBs fund marketing efforts through allocated monies.

Program Characteristics

The fourth research question explored the program characteristics of successful CUPBs. The data collected surrounding this research question revealed three findings significant to the development of standards of practice for programming boards. First, a majority of participating boards sponsor the following types of programs: Blockbuster Concerts/Comedians, Concerts, Films, Speakers, Novelty, and Comedy. A second finding showed that all of the programming boards have annual programs or program series. Finally, while the number of programs sponsored by the boards each year varied greatly, the median number of programs was consistently about 125 programs. This finding did not reveal any significant differences based on institutional size.

These findings provide two insights into the program characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful programming boards use annual programs and program series as a base for the programming efforts. Second, successful programming boards, on average, sponsor 125 programs each year and blockbuster concerts and/or comedians, concerts, films, speakers, novelty acts, and comedians are included among the types of programs sponsored.

Mission Characteristics

The fifth research question posed in this study looked at the mission characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. The data for this research question revealed two significant findings. First, a majority of participating programming boards have a mission statement. Second, most of the mission statements include a description of the types of events that are sponsored by the programming board. These two findings suggest that successful college and university programming boards have a mission statement that includes a description of the types of programming sponsored by the board.

Assessment and Self-evaluation Characteristics

In the sixth research question, I sought to examine the assessment and self-evaluation characteristics of successful programming boards. The data collected for this research question

revealed three findings of interest. First, all of the participating programming boards employed at least one assessment and/or self-evaluation method. A majority of the boards used one or two methods; however, most of the advisors indicated that they would like to increase assessment and self-evaluation methods. Of the methods used, event surveys and leader evaluations were used most often. A final finding revealed that student leaders on the programming board and/or programming board advisors most commonly implement assessment and self-evaluation efforts.

These findings provide two insights into the assessment and self-evaluation characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful boards implement at least one assessment and/or self-evaluation method and event evaluations and leader evaluations are among the methods used. Second, successful CUPBs assign responsibility for implementing assessment and/or self-evaluation efforts to student leaders and/or advisors.

Leadership Characteristics

The final research question explored the leadership characteristics of successful CUPBs. The data collected surrounding this research question revealed four findings significant to the development of standards of practice for programming boards. First, a majority of participating boards give a student the initial responsibility for contacting an agent when the board is interested in a program. Second, most of the CUPBs assign responsibility for executing contracts to an advisor. A third finding revealed that all participating programming boards place the responsibility for advertising events on students who work with the board.

These findings provide insights into the leadership characteristics of successful CUPBs. First, successful college and university programming boards give responsibility for initially contacting agents to students, while assigning responsibility for executing contracts to professional advisors. Successful programming boards also designate students to promote events.

The final finding of interest for CUPB standards of practice relates to the advising style used with the programming board. The data revealed that 81% of participating programming board advisors use a Program Teacher/Director or Program Advisor/Teacher advising style with the board. These two categories share a characteristic that the other two styles of advising do not; both of these categories involve a high concern for the programming process. While these two advising styles vary in the level of responsibility advisors assume for programs, they share a focus on the process aspect of advising. This finding suggests that successful college and

university programming boards have an advising structure that is focused on the learning process and the educational potential for students who work with the programming board.

<center>Implications for Future Practice, Research, and Policy</center>

Given this discussion of findings that are significant in the creation of standards of practice for CUPBs, it is interesting to examine the implications of these results. This study had implications for future practice, research, and policy.

Implications for Practice

It is important to examine some of the immediate implications of my research for practice in order to fully understand the relevance of the results. In general, the results can be used to guide practice in many areas, including how many leadership positions are offered to students, how those leadership positions are delegated, staffing levels for CUPBs, and related details.

Beyond the obvious implications, however, there are other implications for college and university programming boards, particularly for advisors and students who hold executive positions on the board. First, the results of this study revealed that the organizational structure of successful programming boards includes three or fewer executive positions and six or more committees (see Table 2). Given these findings, programming board leadership might want to examine the current structure of the board. If the board has more than three executive positions and less than six committees, the programming board leadership might consider altering the structure of the board.

A second implication for CUPB practice relates to the requirements to run for the president position. The results of the study revealed that successful CUPBs have requirements for GPA and experience on the programming board for candidates seeking the president position (see Table 2). This finding impacts the programming board leadership. Programming board leadership might be well served to examine the current requirements for the president position. Boards that currently do not have requirements to run for president might want to consider instituting GPA and experience requirements. CUPBs that do have requirements in place may want to ensure that a GPA requirement and experience on the board are included among the existing prerequisites.

Third, the results of this study revealed that successful programming boards provide five or more training opportunities to student leaders and fall retreats, spring retreats, regional conferences, and national conferences are included among those opportunities (see Table 2).

<center>63</center>

Based on these findings, the programming board leadership might be well served to examine the current training opportunities that are being offered. If the board has fewer than five different types of training available, the programming board leadership might consider adding new training opportunities. Additionally, the board leadership might wish to ensure that fall retreats, spring retreats, regional conferences, and national conferences are among the opportunities being offered.

Another implication of the study's results relates to marketing events. The results of the study revealed that successful college and university programming boards regularly use five or more methods to advertise events and flyers, posters, and on-campus newspaper advertising are included among those methods (see Table 4). These findings suggest that programming boards might want to examine the current marketing methods being used. If the board is using fewer than five methods of advertising, the programming board leadership might want to consider adding new marketing methods. Also, the board leadership might be well served to ensure that flyers, posters, and on-campus newspaper advertisements are included among the methods being used.

The results of this study revealed that successful CUPBs use annual programs and program series as a base for their programmatic efforts (see Table 5). This finding uncovers a fourth implication for programming board practice. Programming boards might wish to examine whether or not there are annual programs or program series in place. If not, the programming board leadership might want to initiate the addition of this type of programming.

The results of this study also revealed that successful CUPBs have a mission statement that includes a description of the types of programs sponsored by the programming board (see Table 6). The advisors of the board and students who hold executive positions could use these findings in two ways. First, if the programming board does not currently have a mission statement, the programming board leadership might initiate a process with board members to develop a mission statement. For example, the programming board could meet to brainstorm about the purpose of the organization and use these ideas as a basis for the mission statement. Another way to go about creating a mission statement would be to use the mission statement for the office or department as a base. The programming board could add statements specific to the organization to the existing mission statement.

A second way these findings could be useful for practice relates to programming boards that have already created a mission statement. CUPBs with an existing mission statement might wish to examine the content of that mission to ensure that it includes a description of the types of programs sponsored by the board. If the types of programs are not discussed in the mission statement, the programming board leadership might initiate a conversation with board members about adding this component to the statement.

Another implication for CUPB practice relates to assessment and self-evaluation efforts. The results of the study revealed that successful college and university programming boards are implementing at least one assessment and/or evaluation method. In addition, event surveys and leader evaluations are assessment and evaluation methods most often used by successful boards (see Table 7). This finding impacts programming board advisors and students who hold executive positions on the board. Programming board leadership might be well served to examine the current assessment and self-evaluation methods being used. Boards that are not currently conducting assessments or evaluations might work to begin implementing them. CUPBs that are already conducting assessments and/or evaluations might ensure that they are including event surveys and leader evaluations as methods. Additionally, when developing assessment and self-evaluation tools, programming boards should identify exactly what they are attempting to measure. Clearly identifying the dependent variable is essential in obtaining data that answers the questions being posed.

Finally, one of the study's findings has implications specifically for advisor practice. The results of this study revealed that advisors of successful CUPBs use either a Program Teacher/Director or Program Advisor/Teacher advising style (see Table 8). Based on this finding, programming board advisors might wish to further educate themselves on these advising styles. Advisors could assess their current advising style to see if it falls within these two categories. If it does not, the knowledge gained about these styles might be used to make adjustments to the style currently being used.

Implications for Research

In addition to implications for practice, this research project has several implications for future research. The present study examined the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. Members of NACA were asked to nominate the most successful programming boards in their NACA region. The sample was selected based on these responses.

A future study might focus on student opinions of successful CUPBs. For example, another scholar might seek to understand the programming boards that students nominate as successful. Such a study might yield a different sample of successful CUPBs.

Results of this study could also lead to an examination of the impact of staffing on programming board success. The results of this study suggest that successful college and university programming boards have professional advisors and support staff who work with the board; however there were no significant results in relationship to graduate advisors. A future study might focus on examining the direct impact that the number of staff members has on programmatic outcomes. This type of study would help expand the knowledge about the effects of staffing practices on CUPBs.

While this study examined the types of venues used by programming boards, future studies might explore how frequently programming boards utilize each type of venue. For example, another researcher could use the categories of venues developed in this study as a basis for investing how often programming boards make use of each type of venue. Such a study would provide useful information about which types of venue spaces would be the most beneficial for programming boards to have access to.

Finally, research into the effects of advising style on student leader learning outcomes might be valuable. The present study examined the characteristics of successful CUPBs, including advising style characteristics. The results examined the advising styles used with successful programming boards; however, a future study might further examine the impact of the advising style on the learning outcomes of students who hold leadership positions on the board. This type of study could help programming board advisors understand the best way to maximize student learning. Additionally, such a study would expand on the knowledge gained through this study.

Implications for Policy

The results of this study also have implications for policy. The findings revealed that while the programming boards' funding allocation is made outside of the board, successful programming boards control the distribution of those funds once the overall allocation is received. This finding is significant for policy at the institutional level. Professional staff members who work with the programming board might want to examine the current policy on how the programming board's funding allocation is distributed. The findings suggest that

programming boards should be able to determine how the funding allocation is distributed. If the current policy does reflect this process, policymakers at the institution may want to amend their policy to allow the programming board to have control over allocation distribution.

Another finding that has implications for policy at the institutional level relates to venue access. The results of this study revealed that successful CUPBs are able to access a majority of venue spaces available to them without paying rental fees. Professional staff members who work with the programming board may want to examine how many venue spaces the board must pay to have access to and advocate for fewer venues that require rental fees. The findings suggest that programming boards should have to pay to access none or a limited number of the venue spaces they use. Institutional policymakers may want to eliminate rental fees for the venue spaces used by the programming board.

Finally, the results of this study have policy implications for National Association of Campus Activities. The results of this study revealed characteristics of successful college and university programming boards in the following areas: organization and management; human, financial, and facility resources; campus and community relationships; program; mission; assessment and self-evaluation; and leadership. These findings might be used by NACA to assist in programming board change and growth. The findings suggest that there are specific characteristics found in successful programming boards. Policymakers for NACA might want to use the results of this study as a basis for creating a programming board evaluation. The evaluation could be used by CUPBs to determine areas where the board is meeting minimal standards and where development is warranted.

<p align="center">Limitations of the Study</p>

As with all research, the present study was not without some limitations. One limitation of the study related to the nomination process. Professional members of NACA were asked to nominate the four top successful programming boards in their region. Nominators were not given criteria for determining success, but instead were each asked to identify the criteria they used for selecting boards. Not providing criteria for selection to the nominators could have resulted in programming boards being selected based on their reputation. If this occurred, there may have been two impacts. First, programming boards may have been selected based on reputation instead of performance. Second, programming boards that are successful but do not have a strong

reputation may not have been included in the sample. Either of these impacts would have influenced the results of the study

A second limitation also related to the nomination process. For all but one of the regions, there was a clear distinction between the most successful boards and the others nominated based on the nomination data. However, the data for the Mid Atlantic region were relatively flat (see Appendix K), which resulted in no clear distinction between the most successful boards and the other boards that were nominated. Despite the lack of clarity in the data, the three programming boards with the highest scores were invited to participate. The flat data results in this region may have resulted in successful programming boards being excluded from the sample.

The use of self-reported data was an additional limitation of this study. A majority of the data in this study was collected through document analysis; however, some of the data was self-reported during a phone interview. Self-reported data may not be as accurate as data collected through alternate means. Therefore, some of the results may have been different if another method was used for that part of data collection.

Finally, there was a limitation of the study related to data collection and analysis. When analyzed, some of the data produced inconclusive results. For example, half of participating boards had graduate advisors and half did not. This finding did not provide an understanding of whether or not successful programming boards have graduate advisors. Findings with inconclusive evidence suggest that asking different or additional questions may have resulted in more conclusive results. If an alternate investigation would have returned different results, there may have been characteristics of successful programming boards that were not revealed in this study.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, the results of this study provided insight into the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards. This is important in that standards of practice for CUPBs do not exist. In an era where state funding is decreasing, demands for accountability in higher education are increasing (Alexander, 2000; Cohen, 1998; Wellman, 2001). It is important for all offices to examine what they do, how they do it, and what impact their efforts have on the education of students through assessment (Danals, 2001; Schuh & Upcraft, 2001; Schwitzer, 2002; Upcraft & Schuh, 1996). Complying with standards of practice is one way of meeting calls for accountability.

CAS has created standards of practice for higher education, specifically for functional areas in divisions of student affairs. Existing CAS standards include standards of practice for Master's level student affairs graduate preparation programs and 29 functional areas. Despite the numerous existing standards, there are no standards of practice for programming boards (CAS, 2003). Given the increased calls for accountability, it is clear that standards of practice are needed for programming boards. The results of this study provide data about the characteristics of successful college and university programming boards that can be used as a basis for developing standards of practice for those boards.