DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 461 JC 770 281

AUTHOR Helfgot, Steven R.
TITLE A Philosophical Statement on Student Development and the Role of Counseling in Illinois Community Colleges. Final Draft.
INSTITUTION Illinois Council of Community Coll. Administrators.
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Counseling; Counseling Services; *Counselor Role; Educational Philosophy; Individual Development; *Junior Colleges; *Models; *Student Development; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

This document sets forth a philosophical basis for student personnel programs in Illinois community colleges, and describes the activities and functions of student development specialists working within a student personnel services model derived from the philosophical premises. The resultant "student development" model reflects a recognition of the fact that the community colleges are community-based, opportunity and goal oriented, and emphasize the integration of learning and living. Consequently, student personnel services must be an integral part of the educational process and active in facilitating the total human development of its clientele, rather than simply focusing on the "student part" of the individual. Professional counseling is the key element in student development. It must be integrated with other campus activities, must maximize a student's chances to reach his potential, focusing on educational, personal, social and vocational development, and, being student centered, must take into account the interests, aptitudes, needs, values and potential of the student. Comprehensive counseling should include goal setting, personal assessment, development of change strategies, strategy implementation, evaluation, and recycling of the whole process for each student. (JDS)

A PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENT ON STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND THE ROLE OF COUNSELING IN ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

written for:

The Task Force Committee, Student Services Commission,
Illinois Council of Community College Administrators

by: Steven R. Helfgot,
Assistant Professor of Student Development
Oakton Community College, Morton Grove, Ill.

edited by: The Task Force Committee
John P. Donohue, Chairman
Vice President for Student Development
Oakton Community College, Morton Grove, Ill.

Carol A. Davis, Asst. to the
Vice Pres. for Student Development
Oakton Community College
Morton Grove, Illinois

Dr. Joann Powell,
Dean of Counseling
Wm. R. Harper College
Palatine, Illinois

Wayne Knopf, Dean
Student Development & Services
Richland Community College
Decatur, Illinois

Philip Theodorou, Dean
Student Development
Moraine Valley Community College
Palos Hills, Illinois

Dr. Jack McCrary
Director of Counseling
Elgin Community College
Elgin, Illinois

Dr. Randolph Webster
Vice President for Student Services
College of Lake County
Grayslake, Illinois

A PHILOSOPHICAL STATEMENT ON STUDENT DEVELOPMENT AND THE ROLE OF COUNSELING IN ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Introduction

As we enter the second half of the seventies, we, as educators, face a world of realities far different from those of a few years ago. In the world at large the economic growth that characterized the recent past has given way to declining national economies, worldwide inflation, growing unemployment, and a general sense of "hard times." Political structures have been shaken to their foundations. Values, ethics, and morals have been questioned, tested, and, at times, battered in all areas of public life.

While in education the activism of the late 1960's has disappeared, the effects of this era linger in the numbers of students who demand that they receive a dollar's worth of education for a dollar's worth of tuition. Yet, while students of a decade ago called for social and political "relevance" in their education, today the call is for practical relevance in the classroom--for skill training, for the development of abilities that lead to jobs. Further, the "traditional" college student right out of high school finds many of his fellow students to be "nontraditional," either adults coming to college for the first time or returning to acquire new skills.

Enrollment patterns, too, are remarkably altered. Elementary schools in some areas are closing; high school enrollments are dropping. Four-year colleges and universities find growth in their enrollment continuing, but at a markedly slower pace. All of this has forced the educational community to become more accountable. In the face of a depressed economy, boards of trustees,

legislators, local communities, and students demand that we be accountable for the way money is spent. In the face of the "consumer movement," both "professional critics" and our real consumers--students and employers--demand that we be accountable for what we do on our campuses and in our classrooms and ultimately for the product we produce.

Within educational systems, and within individual institutions, demands for accountability are being made of departments, programs, and services. Student personnel programs in particular are being asked over and over again to show their value to institutions of higher educstion. Often considered peripheral to, or supportive of, but rarely as essential to the primary objective of the college--education--these programs are coming under an ever more critical eye. More and more are we required to explain what we do, why it matters, and what value it has.

In response to this demand, the American College Personnel Association is taking the lead in defining and articulating the role and purpose of student personnel programs. It is in this same spirit that the student personnel professionals of Illinois' community colleges are undertaking herein to define and articulate their own specific role and purpose in community college education.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this paper then is to articulate a philosophical basis for the student personnel programs in Illinois community colleges. Further, we wish to illustrate the implications of this philosophical position by looking at one key aspect of these programs: counseling. To achieve these ends we will examine

counseling in terms of 1) the evolving role of student personnel work, 2) the mission of Illinois community colleges, and 3) the student development model, the model on which many of the student personnel programs in Illinois community colleges are based, and toward which others are striving.

The scope of this paper, perhaps paradoxically, will be both comprehensive and limited. It will be comprehensive inasmuch as discussion of counseling services must be based on the concept of what a fully functioning student development program is. Yet, we ask the reader to understand that we are discussing only one aspect of a student development program, i.e., counseling that has the potential to profoundly affect students and other members of the campus community. In the future we will explore in similar fashion other elements of student personnel programs such as admissions, financial aids, student activities. etc.

An Historical Look at Student Personnel Work

Many theorists in the student personnel field have traced the evolution of student personnel work in higher education. Terry O'Banion, formerly of the University of Illinois, and a highly-respected expert in the field, did so in his 1971 monograph, "New Directions in Community College Student Personnel Programs." In that monograph, O'Banion describes the models on which student personnel programs have been built in the past. He writes:

> One of the historical models for the student personnel worker is that of regulator or repressor. The Student Personnel profession came into being largely because the president needed help in regulating student behavior.... In this model the student personnel regulator works on colonial campuses as a mercenary at war with students.... He tends to behave in ways that regulate, repress, reject, reproof, reprimand, rebuff, rebuke, reserve, reduce,

> and even remove human potential. In this system... staff members attempt to maintain a strict supervision over student affairs. (O'Banion, 1971, p. 8)

This model, in short, views students as individuals who need to be controlled, whose actions need to be monitored, and whose behavior is in need of strict regulation. It takes a negative view toward students, challenges their capacity for growth, and questions their individual and collective capacity for responsible social development.

In this model counseling is institution oriented. It is a form of control or discipline designed to cause the student to conform to institutional needs and live up to institutional expectations. The goals, needs, and outcomes of the counseling process are institutionally determined. The student is most often a passive or even hostile recipient of the services.

O'Banion continues by describing the "service" or "maintenance" model for student personnel programs:

> In this model the student personnel program is a series of services scattered around the campus which includes financial aid, registration, admissions, student activities, and academic advising. The student personnel worker provides services for students who seek them. (O'Banion, 1971, p. 8)

There are several essential elements in the service model. It is aimed at the student as student, not at the student as human being. It is based on the student's needs, to be sure, but only on those needs that relate to the student's life in school. The services provided are created by the institution to support its students; they are useful, but not of primary importance. Often they relate only remotely if at all to the rest of the student's life, his growth, and his education.

In this model, counseling is a product which students can obtain if they so desire. Students may initiate the process in a sincere desire to have particular needs met, but the process is restricting. Students can seek out the counseling center if they wish to do so, but the experience tends to be isolated from the rest of the student's life. Further, the students are rarely involved meaningfully in determining what kinds of services ought to be provided. The institution determines what students might need and thus what will be available to them.

Yet a third model to which O'Banion refers is the "therapeutic" model:

> In this model the student personnel worker behaves as if he were a psychotherapist or a counseling psychologist. His contribution to the educational program is to provide therapy for a few selected students who have intense personal problems. He is often disdainful of other student personnel functions such as academic advising and student activities.
>
> In this model counselors become isolated in their counseling cubicles which students eventually come to perceive as places to go only when they have serious problems. (O'Banion, 1971, p. 8)

This model, in terms of its philosophical orientation, has a relationship to the developmental model to be discussed later within this document, in that it reflects a commitment to human growth. However, in its focus and in its constituency it falls short. Psychotherapy is developmental; it has as its objective movement and growth. It fails, however, to provide for the development of people who are not disturbed. It is remedial and stops when the development of the individual reaches the "normal" level. Further, there is no place for nontherapeutic activities in this model and thus it must stand apart from the whole spectrum of activities found in student personnel programs.

Counseling in the theraputic model is everything. The setting is a medical or clinical one; the goals are treatment and cure--the elimination of problems. Therefore, such things as educational or vocational exploration--those things that are so much a part of counseling in an educational setting--are demeaned and ignored. Counseling is, on the one hand, helpful and growth producing, and on the other, restricted and limiting.

Though presented critically, each of the models described thus far has, in its time and place, been useful to, and used by, colleges and the students whom they serve. In fact, on individual community college campuses these models still operate and are still used either in toto or in combination with parts of other models. However, given the realities of the 70's, the deficiencies in these models and the unique and ever changing role of community college education, we believe none of these models to be adequate. A new model is needed, and a new model is emerging. We would like to present that model here. But first some discussion of the mission of Illinois community colleges is required, for it is against the backdrop of that mission that the new model, the student development model, makes sense.

The Mission of Illinois Community Colleges

Rather than turn to things already written about the community college movement in general, and the Illinois community colleges in particular, we would like to define the mission of our institutions in more "real" terms.

The single, most important of these realities is that our institutions are community based. This implies an essential diversity. Community college districts in Illinois range from the urban inner city to the affluent suburbs, to

the rural areas of the state. District populations are likewise diverse in terms of education, income, age, and other demographic factors. Thus, the students we serve are very different. Any meaningful student personnel program must be prepared to meet students on the individual campus both "where they are" and "where they are coming from."

A second reality of community college education in Illinois is that it is opportunity oriented. Admission is essentially "open door." The goal is to get students in, help them find something they want and/or need to do, allow them to complete it, and send them on their way. If the door is indeed open, then we must be prepared to meet the human needs of whomever walks in that "open door." Student personnel programs have a large role to play here. We must be prepared to deal with the educational, emotional, and intellectual disparity among students that the open door implies.

Third, community college education in Illinois is goal-oriented. Students come to the community college seeking "something." This "something" may be as specific as training for a particular career, or preparation to complete a baccalaureate degree; it may be, on the other hand, something as evasive as "what to do with my life," or "what am I going to be." Many community college students are involved in this searching and goal exploration and the institutions themselves accept, foster, and even encourage this exploration and definition process. Given this, a student personnel program must be prepared to meet the students wherever they are in the process and help them along to the next step.

Fourth, community college education in Illinois is what may best be described as an emphasis on the integration of learning and living. While as educators

we value learning and the accumulation of knowledge for its own sake, we recognize that many community college students have a more practical or utilitarian view of education. While they value knowledge and learning, they value even more what they can do with that knowledge and learning. Thus, to have value to these students, student personnel workers must offer programs that also apply to the student's life. Frills, luxuries, and "good experiences" are simply not sufficient.

Finally, we must consider the way students on community college campuses spend their time. Often they come to campus for classes and then leave immediately for a job or home and family. While this is the most true of part-time and evening students, it applies to substantial numbers of full-time day students as well. For student personnel workers, this means two things: first, being passive, simply waiting for students to find us will diminish our effectiveness; second, to reach many of our students, we must be part of the educational mainstream and not on the fringes.

Given these realities in conjunction with the criticisms noted earlier of other models, we are ready now to suggest a new model.

Student Development: The Emerging Model

Perhaps the one theme which ties together all these realities of community college education, is the theme of "students in process." Our campuses seem to be populated by individuals who are moving, growing, searching, changing, developing, and doing. Thus, a model for student development workers to use in meeting the needs of these students must be a model aware of, if not in fact directed at, the process. It must be a model that can allow us to encounter the students whoever

they are and wherever they are and move with them so they become who and what they want to be, and toward getting where they want to go. It must be a model focused on all facets of the human being, not just on the student.

The student development model is exactly that kind of model. Don Creamer, former chairman of the Commission on Student Personnel Programs in Junior Colleges of the American College Personnel Association, writes:

> Student development is a philosophical position which affirms a belief that the best way to educate people is to integrate fully all objectives of learning--whether cognitive, affective, or psychomotor--toward an end of self-determination in all human beings. (Creamer, 1975, p. 2)

And adds O'Banion:

> Fundamental to the new definition is a belief that man is a growing organism capable of moving toward self-fulfillment and responsible social development.... (O'Banion, 1971, p. 9)

Indeed, the Illinois Community College Board seems to support just such a model in its paper, "Philosophy and Purposes for the System of Public Community Colleges in Illinois." That document states that:

> The community college system strives to fulfill the mandate of the Illinois State Constitution of 1970 which indicates that a fundamental goal of the People of the State is the educational development of all persons to the limits of their capacities. (ICCB Manual of Policies and Procedures and Guidelines, 1975)

In these definitions are important clues as to what separates the student development model from its predecessors. Never before was there an articulated commitment on the part of higher education to invest itself so completely in the lives of its students. Never before did higher education consider that its responsibility went beyond the dissemination of knowledge and the intellectual development

of the student. While it was always the hope of higher education that through exposure to the college community students would become "better human beings," there was never any concerted effort to help students define what "better human being" meant, much less to help them achieve that definition.

With the student development model in operation, that institutional hope becomes an institutional responsibility shared with the student. The college becomes an active participant in the individual's life and growth. There is recognition that the institution cannot dissect the human being and thus be concerned only with cognitive or intellectual development.

Indeed, a philosophical position remains just that and nothing more until one or more strategies for implementation is attached to it. Creamer, referring to the developing "Tomorrow's Higher Education" model for student development, does this when he states that:

> Student development is a professional strategy intended to facilitate growth in other human beings through the skillful use of competencies in goal setting; assessment; behavior change, including instruction, consultation and milieu management; and evaluation. This view looks at the tools available to all educators and sees a relationship of these individual tools to each other to form a complete strategy. (Creamer, 1975, p. 2)

In this statement much of what makes student development so unique is suggested, especially the idea that student development is aimed at the complete human being.

In part two, where we will deal more specifically with the roles of practitioners of student development, we will examine the practical meaning of these new concepts. Here we will look at the philosophical implications which underlie these concepts.

The key philosophical orientation of student development is its positive and affirming attitude toward students. Student development theory is grounded in a belief that students are responsible individuals both interested in and capable of personal growth. It presumes that students wish to identify and achieve that which is best for themselves and for their lives. Indeed the strategies of student development require deliberate and planned activity generated by the individual student. It is the individual who must assess the situation and then decide what and how to change. Student development professionals are simply resource people equipped with information and skills that students can use in achieving the desired change.

From all of this we wish to draw three conclusions:

1. The student must be an active and responsible participant in his own educational and growth process. The passive learner, the student as receptacle, is incompatible with the model.
2. The student, with help and support, must make his own decisions and live and deal with the consequences of those decisions. "Self-fulfillment" and "responsible social development" require this position.
3. All professionals on the campus must work collaboratively towards greater integration of their professions. Growth is ongoing, happening always, in the classroom and out. Classroom instructors and student development workers must thus recognize a mutual interest and concern. Affect and cognition cannot be separated; educators cannot deal with one and not the other.

The Role of Counseling in Student Development

As we move now to a definition of counseling, we want to note that nowhere in this paper have we mentioned the term "guidance." Those activities, other than counseling, usually associated with guidance--testing, consultation, the providing of information, and others--have a place as part of a student development program. We, however, choose not to use the word "guidance" to describe them. Rather, along with counseling, they are student development functions.

In the Washington State Manual for Student Services for Community Colleges, it is stated:

> Consistent with the goals of community college education, the goal of community college counseling programs is to offer a cluster of professional services and related experiences which will maximize a student's chances for making responsible decisions relating to his educational, personal, social, and vocational development. Further, these decisions should be appropriate to, and in consonance with, the student's interests, aptitudes, needs, values, and potential. (Washington State, 1971, 1. 11)

This definition virtually without change can be applied to the counseling aspect of the student development programs in Illinois community colleges. This will become more evident after several parts of this definition are explained more fully:

1. Professional services. The implication here is that counselors are trained, able professionals; they have the training, credentials, and special competence to do their specific job. Like other members of the academic community, they have special skills and a discipline, or body of knowledge from which those skills derive. Counseling is not a function for instructional faculty or others to undertake in their spare time. Professional counseling services are to be provided by

professional counselors.

2. Related experiences. This implies that community college counseling goes beyond these particular "professional services provided by counselors." It involves other professionals, paraprofessionals, and students themselves. It implies a certain integration of counseling with other activities on the college campus. We will discuss further on collaborative efforts between counselors and others.

3. Maximize a student's chances. To maximize chances for a student is to move counseling beyond the traditional therapeutic mold. Indeed, as O'Banion states, counseling in the student development model aims "to help those who are unhealthy to become more healthy and those who are already healthy to achieve yet even greater health." (1971, p. 10) And he adds that "counseling emerges from therapy for a selected clientele to an educational process for all members of the educational...community." (1971, p. 32) Maximizing chances in a student development model means helping every individual to move toward his potential.

4. Educational, personal, social, and vocational development. These are the elements of a developmentally-oriented counseling program for the community college, a program that focuses on the development of human potential. Further, they imply life integration and an integrated counseling program. To distinguish these areas from one another is to create false distinctions. Human beings moving toward self-fulfillment are moving toward integrating their educational,

personal, social, and vocational needs. In reality those needs overlap. The student having an academic problem will be affected personally; the student having trouble identifying a vocational path may find his educational progress suffering from lack of direction and purpose. And the student with a personal problem may well be suffering socially as well. So the student development approach to counseling speaks to the whole person and all the realities of his life.

5. Interests, aptitudes, needs, values, potential. Two things emerge here. The first is that a counseling program in the student development model must be student centered. It must be a program in which the institution responds to the individual. "Subject matter" for counseling comes from the student, not from the counselor. It is the student's "interests, aptitudes, needs, values, and potential." It puts the counselor squarely in the role of a "facilitator." Counseling thus is not giving answers to questions or providing the solutions to problems. Rather it is a process which aids the student in his own development. It helps him learn the process of controlling his own life: how and where to seek out information; how to solve problems and to make decisions; how to confront and cope with situations. Self-fulfillment, autonomy, and independence are the goals. A second implication is the simple realization of individual differences. A counseling program based on interests, aptitudes, needs, values, and potential must of necessity be individually based. It must be as diverse

as the population it claims to serve. And, as stated earlier, our populations are diverse.

Where We Are/Where We Are Going

Counseling is the key element in the student development programs in Illinois community colleges. On that we agree. The desired orientation of those counseling programs is a student development orientation. On that, too, we agree. In other areas there is diversity, and that diversity is healthy. It reflects the diversity of our communities, of our student bodies, of our systems of organization and institutional philosophies, of our personnel, and of the designs of our "delivery systems." The counseling programs in our institutions run the gamut from the traditional counseling center model to the nontraditional programs where counselors are fully integrated faculty members.

Whatever the approach, the concern is with the full human development of the individual student. Thus there is constant evaluation, exploration, and change. Old activities are modified and even done away with. New things are experimented with and, if useful and successful, assimilated into programs. This in itself exemplifies the commitment we have to the student development model: nothing is sacred; nothing is absolute; nothing is carved in stone. If something meets student needs, if it contributes to human development, it is a part of the program. If it does not do this, it is not a part of the program.

So we find ourselves and our counseling programs, while operating at widely varying points, all striving to operate within the framework of the student development model. And more and more we will find it necessary to operate

within that model. Indeed, it might be said that the "student development" model will soon become the "human development" model--especially in community colleges. For more and more the students we serve are not the traditional students. Rather, they are people at widely varying developmental stages. Thus, we see counselors working in community counseling centers, in programs for women returning to school, in adult resource centers, and in programs for senior citizens. Neither the traditional models, nor the traditional college counselor can fully function in these areas. However, trained counseling professionals, aware of the human development model and institutionally supported, can and will become Human Development Specialists; and that it seems is where our future lies.

In part two we will speculate on that future as we look at the activities and functions of counselors working in the student development model as student development specialists.

Introduction to Part II

Having given a philosophical base for our work, we now want to begin to examine the requisites and mechanics necessary for the full implementation of student development programs in community colleges. We want to show that student development is more than a philosophical position, that it is in fact a series of behaviors and activities that are recognizable and definable and have the possibility of implementation in our institutions.

What follows may frighten some, threaten, excite, stimulate, and/or challenge others. However, we want it understood that what follows is neither demand for radical change nor impractical "pie in the sky" idealism. Rather, it suggests the ways in which community colleges can begin, in small steps if so desired, to become student development oriented institutions.

The Need for Institutional Commitment

Student development, as we have discussed it thus far, is both an orientation for the work of those people in what is traditionally known as "student services," and a series of strategies for them to use in their work. In its most ideal application, however, and perhaps that ideal is one for which we are seriously striving, student development defines both the orientation and the activity of all professionals in the college: administrators, instructors, and counselors.

Thus, whether the institution simply has or is striving for a student development program or is trying to implement the broader idea of what Creamer and Rippey have called "student development education," there is a strong need for institutional commitment and administrative support. For purposes of this

paper we will focus on the narrower meaning of student development as in the student development program concept. We will look first at what kinds of institutional and administrative support are necessary for a student development program to work.

First, it is necessary to have a demonstrated ideological commitment to the idea of educating the whole person. The success of a student development program is based on this commitment because without it there can be no acceptance of and appreciation for student development faculty as educators with a vital and co-equal educational responsibility to carry out.

A second necessity stems from this. The ideological commitment is shallow unless it is reflected in the organizational structure of the institution. Thus, it is necessary that student development faculty be integrated--in terms of status, function, and physical presence--into the rest of the faculty.

Some possible methodologies which would support such commitments include the following:

1. The student development program ought to be called by that name rather than by some other designation, and the chief student development officer ought to have a title reflective of the commitment to student development, i.e., Dean for Student Development rather than Dean of Students.
2. The status of the chief student development officer ought to be co-equal to that of the other key line officers (instruction, business, etc.), thus giving equal voice and equal weight to the student development program.

3. Counselors' titles ought to reflect in some way their status as student development specialists.

4. A commitment to student development specialists as educators ought to be reflected in faculty rank and role, faculty status, and faculty contracts for them.

5. Student development specialists ought to be integrated physically into the faculty rather than isolated in a counseling center.

Some of these suggestions are simple; they require little change of existing structures or titles. Others are more complex, requiring in some cases fundamental changes in institutional arrangements. The key element in all of them, however, is that they require a particular stance or orientation on the part of the administrative officers at all levels. Given this understanding, we can move on to a role definition of student development faculty.

The Role of Student Development Faculty

The essential question is what makes a student development faculty member different from a counselor? And, further, what additional or different functions do student development faculty perform? Is there a difference in the way they perform those functions?

Before we address these questions, one general statement. The focus of the activities and functions performed is of central importance, and that focus is always the students. The student development specialist "works" within parameters to aid students in identifying, clarifying, and achieving their individual ends. Though the strategies are different, the end is the same. So whether the professional

is working in direct consultation with the student, or indirectly through consultation work with faculty, the priority is always to help students meet their chosen goals.

With this in mind, let us focus on the functions of student development faculty.

Counseling

Counseling remains a primary activity of the student development specialist. Its uniqueness in the student development model is found in several elements.

1. Counseling is student-oriented. This is to say that counseling is a tool to help the student identify and achieve the student's goals. The student development specialist represents the primary contact point between the student and the institution. As such, the student development specialist assists the student in using any and all institutional resources to accomplish the student's stated goals. Thus, while counseling is student-oriented, there is no adversary relationship with the institution; the institution in fact promotes student orientation through the agency of the student development specialist.
2. Counseling is student-initiated and student-determined. In a student development approach, counseling is not imposed on students. The approach presumes the students to be the prime movers in the relationship, the determiner of their own needs; thus, counseling that is required or imposed is both counterproductive and philosophically inconsistent. This is not to say that student development specialists

refrain from engaging in active outreach; in fact, they can and must outreach. And that outreach can be most effective because the student development specialist is perceived as a supportive representative of a supportive institution.

3. Counseling is comprehensive. The focus on student development as we have suggested in several places in this document, is the whole person, and thus counseling is counseling of the whole person. Academic advisement, educational counseling, career counseling, and personal/social counseling are all part of the role of the student development specialist. This comprehensive approach to counseling relates also to the real complexity of human life in which individual problems rarely know the boundaries of being categorized as "personal," "educational," or "career."

4. Counseling is a part of the educational program. By this we mean that the counseling process is not only comprehensive, but it is integrated with the rest of the institution's educational program as well. Counseling in all its aspects works in partnership with classroom instruction, co-curricular activities, etc., to facilitate as fully as possible the educational growth and development of the individual human being. This element of integration of counseling suggests some of the new directions in which student development specialists, working in the student development model, are taking in their work.

New Directions and Activities: The Tomorrow's Higher Education Project of the American College Personnel Association)

In part one of this document we referred to the Tomorrow's Higher Education project of the American College Personnel Association. We would like to repeat here the functional definition of student development as articulated by the Tomorrow's Higher Education project.

> Student Development is a professional strategy intended to facilitate growth in other human beings through the skillful use of competencies in goal setting, assessment, behavior change including instruction, consultation and milieu management, and evaluation. This view looks at the tools available to all educators and sees a relationship of these individual tools to each other to form a complete strategy. (Creamer, 1975, p. 2)

We want to focus here on what these strategies of goal setting, assessment, instruction, consultation, milieu management, and evaluation mean and how their use defines a student development program.

One striking feature of these strategies is that their usage implies an organized plan of growth, development, and change for the student. The strategies strongly suggest to the individual: you are in charge of your own life; you can make things happen. The process is fairly clear.

1. Goals are set.
2. The individual's current position in relation to those goals is assessed.
3. The best change strategy or combination of strategies is implemented.
4. The effectiveness of the strategy is evaluated in terms of the meeting of the individual's goals.
5. New goals are set and the process begins all over again.

Goal setting is the first of the student development strategies which we

will explore in depth. Remembering that student development focuses on the whole person and that the student development program is part of the college's total educational program, we can understand the goal setting process for what it is: a collaborative process "between students and student affairs professionals and faculty for determining the specific behaviors toward which the student wishes to strive." (A. C. P. A., 1974) It involves setting general goals and specific objectives.

The goals are for the student's life so the student is, of course, the primary goal setter. To the extent that the goals concern the student's educational progress, appropriate faculty members will be involved. The role of the student development specialist is to help establish and clarify the student's goals, to work with the student in making certain that the goals are real, sensible, attainable, and really those of the student.

Once goals are set and before the student becomes involved in the process of attaining those goals, the student in collaboration with the student development specialist undertakes an assessment process to determine the student's level of readiness to pursue and achieve the student's goal(s). Tests, counseling, self-reports from the student and other techniques may be used in this assessment process.

What is assessed depends in large measure on the student's goal(s). But some general options include: skill level, adequacy of information, learning style, personal style, and the developmental stage of the student. It is a serious introspective procedure undertaken with the help of the student development specialist, using both subjective and objective information.

Having developed personal goals and engaged in a personal assessment,

the student is ready to use one or more of the change strategies suggested in the Tomorrow's Higher Education model. Student development specialists both directly and indirectly help make these strategies available to the student.

The first of these change strategies is instruction. In this regard there are two kinds of instructional activities we would like to consider. First are courses taught by student development specialists. Second are courses in which student development specialists are involved somehow in a partnership or team approach with faculty from other disciplines.

Much has been written suggesting the need for student development specialists to be teaching credit courses in Human Potential, Personal Growth, Human Sexuality, etc. We strongly support this idea. These kinds of courses do contain subject matter and yet are strongly based in affect and process. And it is student development specialists with their particular skills who can bring together the necessary blend of subject matter and process, of cognition and affect needed to teach these courses.

Student development specialists can become involved in many cooperative activities with other faculty from other disciplines. These activities can range from the facilitation of classroom process, to the teaching of a segment of a course, to team teaching a course, to teaching one course in an integrated interdisciplinary multiple course package.

Having the student development specialist in the classroom in any of these suggested ways, provides some important reinforcement for the student development model:

1. When the student sees the student development specialist both in the counseling office and in the classroom, the idea that there is concern with the "whole person" rather than a divided concern for different aspects of the person is reinforced.
2. When the student sees the student development specialist in the classroom, his role as educator is reinforced.
3. When the student sees the student development specialist and another faculty member working together in the classroom, there is reinforcement for the idea of integrating education rather than dividing it into subjects, disciplines, etc.
4. When student development specialists and instructional faculty work together, they, as professionals, tend to integrate their own disciplines and learn elements of one another's skills, thus expanding their own educational skills and moving closer to the idea of student development education.

Instructional strategies are perhaps most useful in helping the student in achieving educational goals or career goals that require the student to complete certain educational requirements. Further, instructional strategies will become more useful as more "personal growth" or "human development" courses become regular parts of the curriculum.

The formal collaboration of student development specialist with instructional faculty in the classroom suggests other forms of collaboration as well. In the Tomorrow's Higher Education model one of these forms is called consultation. In a 1974 document outling the Tomorrow's Higher Education model, the following

is said of consultation:

> Consultation represents the utilization and knowledge, technology, and expertise toward achieving a desired objective through counseling, modeling, and similar processes.... The role of the student development consultant should include influencing program direction and facilitating action. But it must be remembered that the client, whether student or colleague, must control the decisions and be responsible for the consequences resulting from those decisions. The consultant should be an expert in the process and content of human development.... Advising, counseling, and collaborative skills are used by the consultant to provide direction for individuals, groups, and organizations in order to facilitate student self-responsibility and self-direction. Two types of consultation...are, 1) consultation with resource persons, such as faculty, student affairs staff, or administrators and, 2) direct consultation with individuals, groups, organizations seeking help. (A. C. P. A. 1974)

Consultation is not simply instructors referring "troubled" or "problem" students to counselors; nor is it counselors simply checking with instructors on the educational "progress" of their clients. Rather, consultation is the mutual reliance of all educators on one another to provide the maximum growth/learning experiences for the maximum number of students.

The consultation strategy presumes that student development specialists are in touch with, and able to influence, the many and varied offices, departments, and divisions common in many institutions, as well as services and agencies available in the local community. This in turn suggests the third function, or change strategy defined by the T. H. E. model: Milieu Management.

As we conceptualize it, the need for the milieu management strategy comes from the focus on the whole person. If the objective is for change and growth in that person, then the individual needs as much support as is available. If the individual can be helped to learn to manage and structure the many aspects of the personal

environment in order to support the self in that change and growth, then the process is helped. The role of the student development specialist would be to help the student determine how this milieu can be made supportive and then to aid the student by 1) bringing together any variety of institutional resources necessary to aid the student and 2) consulting with the student in order to help equip the student with the knowledge, information, and skills necessary to organize and manage the environment in supportive ways.

Obviously, for such a strategy to be useful and successful, the student development specialist must be knowledgeable of those resources and in a position to bring them together when necessary. And this suggests yet another point which we have made previously, but which we wish to reiterate now: only when administrators, instructors, and counselors work together can the total environment in which the student finds himself be structured in desired ways.

Finally, having gone through the processes of goal setting and assessment, and having utilized appropriate change strategies, the student development faculty member works with all those concerned in an evaluation process. This includes both formal and informal evaluation procedures. The entire process is ongoing--because the results of the evaluation lead to the setting of new goals, another assessment process, and so on.

Our look at the role of student development faculty has redefined to some extent the counseling process. It has introducted new functions for counseling professionals who would operate in a student development model. All of these things have implications for our institutions. These redefined and new functions demand new ways of looking at the conventional measures by which the quality and quantity

of both counselors and counseling are evaluated.

Implications for the Institution

A primary concern for any administrator responsible for a counseling program is counselor availability. In a traditional counseling model where counselors spend the vast majority of their time in their offices in a counseling center, there is little problem with availability. In a student development model where the student development specialist may be in the classroom, in the office of a faculty colleague, or doing a special program, the direct availability for one-to-one counseling is limited. This presents several problems. First, we must deal with the presumed decrease in availability. This can be done in part--and quite honestly given the parameters of the student development model--by redefining availability. In this way the student development specialist who is teaching a class of fifteen students six hours a week can be considered "available" for those six hours. Indeed, we might well say that he is more available to students than if he used those same six hours to see students one-on-one. If the student development specialist is spending an hour in consultation with an instructor about a plan for a particular student, we can consider that also as an hour's time that is (admittedly indirect) available to the students.

Realistically we may need to look at expanding the number of student development faculty in an institution as the institution becomes more and more involved in the student development model. We must delineate a system for defining adequate staffing of the model and then evaluate our own situations on the basis of that definition.

A corollary that we may need to consider is the possible demise of the counselor to student ratio as a means of determining an adequate level of availability to students, and as a formula for determining staffing needs. 300:1 may have been a reasonable formula for staffing a pure counseling program; it becomes devoid of almost all meaning if used to try and staff a comprehensive student development program.

Staffing and Hiring also takes on a new perspective when being done for a student development program. We are not simply hiring counselors; we are hiring student development specialists, educators. We are hiring individuals to fill professional positions both faculty and administrative; we are hiring paraprofessionals and we are even hiring students to work as peer advisors.

Focusing here on the hiring of professional student development specialists we see the following as being areas of concern:

1. Student development specialists need to be trained and competent counselors first and foremost.
2. There needs to be a balance between "generalists" and specialists. Indeed, the ideal is perhaps a whole staff of competent generalists each with a particular speciality. What those specialties are will depend upon institutional needs. They may be classical counseling-oriented specialties like testing or career counseling; they may be new specialties like affective education. In any event, the purpose of the individual specialist would not be to assume total responsibility for that area, but rather to provide leadership in the speciality for colleagues in and out of the student development

program, for students, indeed for all members of the institution.

3. Student development specialists need to think of themselves as educators and have skills as educators especially in the humanistic or affective area.

4. Student development specialists must be equipped to work directly with administration, faculty, and staff as well as with students.

5. Self-motivation and an ability to work with a minimum of structure and a minimum of role definition are necessary.

6. Creativity, innovativeness, and an ability to assume responsible leadership are essential.

7. A knowledge of various developmental theories is important.

8. Student development is a new field. A commitment to continued professional growth and study in this emerging field is necessary.

This is, admittedly, only a beginning of a defined set of criteria for hiring and staffing. It reflects two things: first, that as we participate in both the development and practice of student development, we are in fact defining what is required of the student development specialist; second, to our knowledge there is no institution currently engaged in training student development specialists. Thus, there does exist a clearly defined statement of what one needs to learn in order to be a student development specialist. However, we think these concerns can serve as broad guidelines to be referred to in hiring student development specialists.

We will not address ourselves here to the question of administrative staff, paraprofessionals, and peer advisors, but it is probably safe to assume that similar kinds of skills, outlooks, and attitudes will be essential--in a greater or lesser

degree--for these people as well.

The future: Minimum or Maximum?

Is student development real? Can it make a real difference? Is it just new packaging of the same old product? We have been asking ourselves these questions and we are answering them: Yes, we believe student development is "for real"; it is the future of our professions. Yes, we believe it can make a real difference in the lives of our students as students and as people. No, we do not believe that student development is just new words to describe old tasks. But our belief in student development, our philosophical commitment to it, is not enough. We need to experiment and to innovate, to expand our activities so that we are in fact doing student development.

This requires change on our part, but it requires, also, change on the part of our colleagues in the educational community. Student services very often has been neglected in our institutions. Student development cannot function from that position of benign neglect. Budgets must be able to sustain, support, and develop a student development program that is a highly active and integral part of the educational program of a community college.

In summary, the ultimate query is: Do we opt for the minimum or for the maximum for the students of Illinois community colleges? Do we continue to support our student development programs as student services programs and make changes in name and facade only? Or do we support our student development programs as student development programs and let them be all that they can be? Our answer is clear. We invite all our colleagues, trustees, administrators, and

faculty--and all of our constituents--students and residents of our communities--to affirm our answer and to join us in a commitment to student development.

SRH:grm
7/29/76

REFERENCES

American College Personnel Association; "A Student Development Model for Student Affairs in Tomorrow's Higher Education," Journal of College Student Personnel; July 1975.

Brown, Robert D., "Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education--A Return to the Academy," American College Personnel Association, Washington, 1972.

Creamer, Don G., "Implementing Student Development," address to the 1975 Annual Convention of the American College Personnel Association.

Illinois Community College Board, "Philosophy and Purposes for the System of Community Colleges in Illinois," Illinois Community College Board Manual of Policies, Procedures, and Guidelines, 1975.

O'Banion, Terry, "New Directions in Community College Student Personnel Programs," American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, 1971.

Washington State Student Services Commission; "A Manual for Student Services for Community Colleges in the State of Washington," 1971.