

NOMINATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE GREENLEAF DISTINGUISHED ALUMNUS/A AWARD

The Greenleaf Distinguished Alumnus/a Award has been established as a continuing memorial to Dr. Elizabeth A. Greenleaf. The recipient of the award will be chosen each year by a committee composed of current students, alumni and faculty and will be announced each year at the Indiana University reception at the ACPA convention.

Dr. "G" was known throughout the profession for her deep interest in and friendship with the alumni of the department. For the most part, contributions from alumni supplemented by personal and professional friends created the fund supporting the award. The recipient will receive a suitably inscribed and framed citation and will have his or her name engraved upon a plaque which will be permanently displayed in the office of College Student Personnel within the School of Education.

Nominations are hereby solicited for possible recipients of the award and are due by February 1, 1981. They should be sent to the Chairperson of the Department and should be supported by statements, letters, and other material detailing the contributions and professional work of the individual being nominated. Consideration of nominees will place heavy emphasis upon the degree to which the nominee reflects those qualities which Dr. "G" exemplified such as contributions to the profession, serving as a role model and mentor for colleagues, and demonstrating interest in their personal and professional progress.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS PROFESSIONALS: A REPORT ON THE STATE OF THE ART

Trish Volp

A review of the historical development and significance of staff development for student affairs staff is presented. The author suggests an examination of "best practices" (i.e., factors critical to program success) as revealed in the literature of other professions and through case studies of student affairs staff development programs acknowledged as successful. Models developed from this examination would be used as guidelines for program development.

Interest in the professional development of educators has increased over the past two decades due to psychological, philosophical, and environmental factors. The literature of public schools, community colleges, and college instructional staff has provided frequent forums for discussion (Cohen, 1973; *Educational Leadership*, 1976, 1980; Freedman, 1973; Gaff, Festa, & Gaff, 1978; Hammons, 1977; O'Banion, 1977; Webber, 1976). On the other hand, the student affairs literature has provided an uneven perspective on both theory and practice in staff development. Much of that published has focused on needs for staff development and recommendations for specific training activities. However, little has been published regarding implementation of comprehensive student affairs programming. In addition, the term "staff development" has been used to describe several different, though overlapping, concepts.

This paper will review the historical context and significance of student affairs staff development, identify the various uses of the term, and report the state of the art. Conclusions and recommendations will follow.

Trish Volp is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Higher Education. She was the Director of Student Voluntary Services at Ball State University, where she received an M.A. in College Teaching Journalism and an M.A. in Social Psychology. She also served as director of Public Relations and Recruitment Officer at St. Margaret's Academy in Minneapolis after receiving a B.A. from the University of Minnesota.

Historical Context and Significance of Staff Development

Interest in professional development in education has primarily been a phenomenon of the last two decades. Increased interest in adult development combined with calls for accountability and efficiency in higher education have encouraged an emphasis on faculty and staff development. It has been suggested that: (1) there are recognizable stages of development in adults (and therefore faculty and professional staff); (2) adults are capable of learning new skills and strategies; and (3) change can be stimulated through planned, comprehensive development programs (Gaff, Festa & Gaff, 1978; Ralph, 1973).

Fewer financial resources—resulting from declining enrollments and spiraling inflation—created conditions for increased demands for accountability as well as less mobility for student personnel workers in the 1970's (Beeler, 1977b). Thus, an end has been signaled to "an era in which it was easy to change jobs and institutions and in which agencies could look forward to a regular supply of new professionals armed with the latest ideas and skills from their graduate education" (Delworth & Yarris, 1978, p. 1). The training and retraining of student affairs staff members thus became a necessary response to this situation.

Increasingly tighter budgets had other effects on student affairs staff. For example, funds normally used to bring consultants to campus and to send staff members to national conventions and conferences were becoming limited. This meant staff training would have to come from resources on the campus itself (Beeler & Penn, 1978).

In addition to the changing environmental factors, the student personnel commitment to development of each individual's potential must be applied to the staff member as well as the student. The development of professionals as individuals in all likelihood will lead to benefits back to the institution in programs and services as well (O'Banion, 1973; Truitt & Gross, 1970).

Another trend in higher education which propelled the use of staff development was the changing composition of the student body. Staff development has been cited as one way to help student personnel workers adapt to the changing needs and demands of students (Beeler, 1977b; Shaffer, 1972).

And, finally, it has been stated the single greatest resource on any campus is the staff. Consequently, the professional growth and development of the staff is necessary for the welfare of the institution as well (Beeler & Penn, 1978; O'Banion, 1973, 1977). A National Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges affirmed:

It is only good sense that the investment [in staff] should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or to slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect.

...As the college's purposes change and adapt to the social needs of its community, its staff deserves—*must have*—opportunities to adapt and change too (O'Banion, 1977, pp. vii-viii).

"Staff Development"—What Is It?

"Staff development" is a term that has been loosely used throughout the student affairs literature to imply an attitude, a comprehensive program, a specific activity, or any combination of the three.

As an attitude, "staff development" connotes a commitment to the value of promoting the professional growth and personal effectiveness of staff members, with increased program effectiveness and institutional renewal as side effects (Appleton, Briggs & Rhatigan, 1978). Shaffer (1978) has summarized this viewpoint:

Staff development is not just a simplistic device or even a collection of devices for improving the skills of various staff members. Rather, staff development is central to the total organizational effort and response to change. It is less a technique and procedure than it is a philosophy and attitude (p. 1).

Often this attitude has supported a framework of ongoing comprehensive programming designed to enhance staff members' competencies in meeting student needs, their own needs, and those of the institution (Beeler, 1977b; Beeler & Penn, 1978; Canon, 1976; Truitt & Gross, 1970; Wanzek & Canon, 1975). Although "staff development" in this context most often implies comprehensive student affairs programming, it also is used to describe comprehensive programming in subunits of student affairs, e.g., housing or academic advising (ACPA Commission III; Bostaph & Moore, 1980). The term "staff development" also is used to describe short term training activities designed to enhance a specific competency or set of competencies, e.g., counseling skills (ACPA Commission III; Beeler, 1977a; Greenwood & Lembcke; Miller, 1975; Passons, 1969).

State of the Art of Staff Development

The majority of writers referring to staff development in student affairs literature have: (1) supported the concept of ongoing staff development; and (2) generally requested information to fill a knowledge void (Herron, 1970; Shaffer, 1966, 1972; Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972; Williamson, 1961). Also reported in the literature were specific training programs within the staff development context—describing a format, content matter, or both (Gordon, 1980; Jones, Elshof & Jennings, 1979; Passons, 1969). However, little has been reported about process and structure of comprehensive student affairs staff development (Beeler & Penn, 1978). Comprehensive programming in the areas of housing and academic advising as well as

paraprofessional training has received some attention (ACPA Commission III; Bostaph & Moore, 1980; Delworth, 1978). The most thorough descriptions of comprehensive program development in student affairs have been contributed by those in the community college field (Anchetta, 1979; Frederico; O'Banion, 1973).

Three surveys have been conducted regarding the state of student personnel staff development on the campus. All three emphasized the concern that student affairs professional development needs were not being met (Gross, 1963; Miller, 1975; Beeler & Penn, 1978).

Gross in 1963 conducted a study of 100 institutions for the National Association for Student Personnel Administrators. Thirty-six percent of the institutions surveyed did not have staff development programs, although a number of the administrators reported an interest in such programming. The remainder of the schools generally indicated limited staff development programs. Gross concluded that little attention was being given to the implementation of comprehensive area-wide staff development programs.

Ten years after Gross's study, Miller conducted a survey for the American College Personnel Association responding to "the apparent lack of applicable research or authoritative literature available." (p. 258) More than three quarters of the 219 respondents reported that staff members participated in on campus staff development activities as part of their regular activities. Approximately one-fifth reported no type of staff development took place on their campus. Nevertheless, Miller found that 80 percent of the reporting units were functioning without a specific policy concerning staff development responsibilities and expectations, and respondents felt their staff development needs were not being met. Miller's questions were basically concerned with activities and not comprehensive programs, although he recommended the latter.

Penn and Brennan in 1976 (reported in Beeler & Penn, 1978) surveyed 19 institutions on the west coast and found 85 percent of the student affairs divisions did not have formal staff development programs. Only 10 percent of those surveyed reported their divisions had a high level of commitment to staff development; 25 percent indicated there was little support and almost two thirds believed there was moderate commitment. Similar to Miller's findings, Penn and Brennan found that 85 percent of those surveyed indicated their divisions did not have definitive staff development policies or expectations. Penn and Brennan also reported that almost 75 percent of those surveyed indicated positively that staff development should receive more attention in the future.

The surveys of Gross, Miller and Penn and Brennan indicate that: (1) many institutions have some form of staff development activity on campus; (2) there are few comprehensive student affairs staff development programs in operation; and (3) most student personnel workers express an interest in

more developmental opportunities. All three concluded that comprehensive programming should be given high priority to meet the needs expressed by staff members.

Summary and Recommendations

Despite a lack of information in the literature, some student affairs staff development activities are reported on three out of four campuses. However, a very small proportion of student affairs divisions had ongoing comprehensive programming at the time of the surveys. Nevertheless, polled student personnel administrators showed interest in receiving more information and/or guidance in the area of staff development.

The following recommendations are offered:

(1) A consistent definition of staff development should be articulated and used. It is suggested here that "staff development" should be used to describe comprehensive programs that reflect commitment to the encouragement of personal and professional growth in staff members. Opportunities within the context of staff development could be labeled as training activities, experiences, and the like.

(2) An effort should be made to determine WHY campuses have not responded to the staff needs reported in the literature and research for almost 20 years. One assumption is that little is known about "best practices" for comprehensive staff development in student affairs. Another assumption is that the profession's philosophical commitment to staff development reported in the research is not matched by behaviors to establish or to improve staff development programs. Many persons support U.S. Savings Bonds payroll deductions, but it does not necessarily follow that those persons plan to, or will, join the program. The research has only scratched the surface in portraying the intentions and implementations of staff development on campuses. This has to be rectified if supportive conclusions are to be drawn concerning staff development.

(3) When a commitment to action has been made, what can be done to insure the success of a staff development program? Very little is known regarding the key factors critical to the success of staff development programs. An examination of "best practices" is necessary. Two methods seem to be appropriate for determining "best practices": (a) the literature of other professional fields—e.g., business, school administration, social work—should be searched for staff development findings that can be applied to student affairs, and (b) case studies should be conducted on campuses with acknowledged successful student affairs staff development programs.

(4) Based upon the "best practices" identified through the process described above in (3), models should be designed and shared with student affairs colleagues. These models should be used as *guidelines* for the development of campus-specific programs.

The reasons for comprehensive staff development appear compelling, but ultimately the decision for staff development must be made on each campus. Perhaps in the future, if a campus commits its resources and time to a staff development program, it will find guidance from the student affairs literature.

REFERENCES

- ACPA Commission III Staff Development Task Force. *Staff development training: A resource report*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Anchetta, B. *Staff development for student personnel services in the Los Angeles Community College District*. San Mateo, CA, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161 488).
- Appleton, J.R., Briggs, C.M., & Rhatigan, J.J. *Pieces of eight: The rites, roles and styles of the Dean by Eight Who Have Been There*. Portland, OR: NASPA Institute of Research and Development, 1978.
- Beeler, K.D. Mini-U: A promising model for professional staff development in student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 1977, 14, 38-43. (a).
- Beeler, K.D. Staff development in student affairs: The referral process. *NASPA Journal*, Fall 1977, 16, (sic), 14-23. (b).
- Beeler, K.D., and Penn, J.R. *A handbook on staff development in student affairs*. Corvallis, OR: OSU Book Store, 1978.
- Bostaph, C., & Moore, Marti. Training academic advisors: A developmental strategy. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1980, 20, 45-50.
- Canon, H.J. A developmental model for divisions of student affairs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1976, 17, 178-181.
- Cohen, A.M. (Ed.). *New directions for community colleges: Toward a professional faculty*, no. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Delworth, U. (Ed.). *New directions for student services: Training competent staff*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Delworth, U., & Yarris, E. Concepts and processes for the new training role. In U. Delworth (Ed.), *New directions for student services: Training competent staff*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Educational Leadership*, 1976, 34 (3). Special issue on staff development.
- Educational Leadership*, 1980, 37 (5). Special issue on staff development.
- Frederico, J.J. *A staff development model for student personnel services*. Schnecksville, PA: Lehigh County Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 097 944).
- Freedman, M. (Ed.). *New directions for higher education: Facilitating faculty development*, no. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

- Gaff, S.S., Festa, C., & Gaff, J.G. *Professional development: A guide to resources*. Change Magazine Press, 1978.
- Gordon, V. Training academic advisors: Content and method. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1980, 21, 334-339.
- Greenwood, J.D., & Lembcke, B.A. (Eds.). *Student staff in college residence halls: Educational preparation and role clarification*. American College Personnel Association Monograph, 1975.
- Gross, R.F. *A study of in-service education programs for student personnel workers in select colleges and universities in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Hammons, J.O. (Ed.). *New directions for community colleges: Changing instructional strategies*, no. 17. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Herron, O.R., Jr. *New dimensions in student personnel administration*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook Co., 1970.
- Jones, J.T., Elshof, A.T., & Jennings, S.J. A student affairs training program for campus security personnel. *NASPA Journal*, 1979, 16, 22-26.
- Miller, T.K. Staff development activities in student affairs programs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1975, 16, 358-364.
- O'Banion, T. Patterns of staff development. In A.M. Cohen (Ed.), *New directions for community colleges: Toward a professional faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- O'Banion, T. (Ed.). *New directions for community colleges: Developing staff potential*, no. 19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Passons, W.R. In-Service training for student personnel staff: A pilot project. *Journal of NAWDC*, 1969, 33, 34-38.
- Ralph, N. Stages of faculty development. In M. Freedman. (Ed.), *New directions for higher education: Facilitating faculty development*, no. 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Shaffer, R.H. Introduction. In K.D. Beeler, & J.R. Penn, *A handbook on staff development in student affairs*. Corvallis, OR: OSU Book Store, 1978.
- Shaffer, R.H. Issues and problems in the organization, administration, and development of college student personnel programs in the years ahead. In G. Klopff (Ed.), *College student personnel work in the years ahead*, no. 7. Washington, D.C.: American College Student Personnel Association, 1966.
- Shaffer, R.H. Staff development—Key to survival. *NASPA Journal*, 1972, 9, 261-262.
- Stamatakis, L.C., & Oliaro, P.M. In-service development: A function of student personnel. *NASPA Journal*, 1972, 9, 269-273.
- Truitt, J.W., & Gross, R.F. In-service education. In O.R. Herron (Ed.), *New dimensions in student personnel administration*. Scranton, PA: International Textbook Co., 1970.

- Wanzek, R.P., & Canon, H. Professional growth in student affairs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1975, 16, 418-421.
- Webber, R., & others. *Improving college teaching: An annotated bibliography*. Change Magazine Press, 1976.
- Williamson, E.G. *Student personnel services in colleges and universities: Some foundations, techniques, and processes of program administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

ORIENTATION FOR FIRST YEAR STUDENTS: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Linda E. Wegryn

Trends in the development of orientation programs for first year students are reviewed and the role of student development in orientation is presented. The author suggests that associate instructors for introductory-level courses who are trained in cognitive styles could provide a means for integrating orientation with the classroom experience.

Easing the transition to college for first year students has long been a concern of faculty and administration in higher education. Successful acclimation to a host of new intellectual, physical, and social demands is likely to be a major determinant of the student's academic and personal achievement, as well as the overall satisfaction with the college experience. According to Shaffer and Martinson, the primary goal of the orientation process is communicating to the student that college is a "self-directed, intellectually-oriented experience" (1966, p. 23). Beyond this academic emphasis, the college should provide both the student and parent with (1) general information about the college; (2) counseling; and (3) aid with enrollment, registration, and other "mechanical" aspects of the matriculation process (Shaffer & Martinson, 1966).

That orientation is, or should be a multi-faceted process becomes clear through consideration of both the developmental concerns of college freshmen and the complexity of the college environment. This paper briefly reviews trends in orientation for traditional age (18 years old) freshmen; highlights several unique or experimental programs, and suggests to student affairs staff some possible future programming directions for orientation activities.

Linda Wegryn will receive her M.S. in Education in May 1981. After receiving a B.S. at Indiana University, she worked as a research associate in employment and training/human resources development for the National Institute of Public Management in Washington, D.C. She is currently a career adviser at the Career Center and a consultant with the American Council on Education, where she worked as a special assistant last summer.