DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 636 JC 790 217

AUTHOR Creamer, Don G.; Clowes, Darrel A.
TITLE Student Development: Mainstream or Penumbra?
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Ancillary Services; Community Colleges; Compensatory Education; *Curriculum Development; *Developmental Programs; *Educational Trends; General Education; *Junior Colleges; Nontraditional Students; Program Development; Remedial Instruction

ABSTRACT

Developmental studies programs are a reality in many colleges and universities, and where they do not now exist, the likelihood of their presence in the near future is high. Student developmental programs are a key ingredient within institutional resources to improve chances of success for students in developmental studies. Student development is not a student personnel program. It is a set of educational practices, grounded in developmental education theory, designed to marshal all available resources within an institution into a process which will produce a predictable result--self-sufficiency in students. Both developmental studies and student development programs should move from the penumbra of college curricula to the mainstream. Pivotal issues which bear upon the probability of success in developmental studies include creating a condition of critical mass, the significance of residential settings, and the centrality of self-sufficiency in developmental education. Student development/developmental studies programs which can be adapted to specific campus environments and characteristics of the developmental studies program and its students include: (1) the Self-Assessment Laboratory, (2) the Life Planning Center, (3) the Curriculum Planning Laboratory, (4) the Human Development Curriculum, (5) an Interdivisional Counseling Network, and (6) the Environment Assessment Laboratory. (Author/MB)

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT: MAINSTREAM OR PENUMBRA?

Don G. Creamer

Darrel A. Clowes

When developmental studies and student development programs are mainstreamed and coupled, the success potential of both is improved.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT: MAINSTREAM OR PENUMBRA?

Don G. Creamer
Darrel A. Clowes

The nature of higher education in this country is determined in part by a dream. The influence of the European and British systems of education is evident throughout the spectrum of higher education in the United States; however, the American adaptations to these historical lineages now dominate many aspects. These adaptations are, in fact, the realization of a dream--a uniquely American dream that all citizens can benefit from higher learning and that all should have equal access to institutions of higher education. One manifestation of this dream is that thousands of citizens who have been granted equal access to colleges and universities may be denied equal opportunity to benefit from higher learning because of a myriad of "deficiencies" in their preparation at other levels of education.

Thus, the partial realization of a dream, a cultural value still given high priority in this society, has created a dilemma for colleges and universities throughout the nation. How can traditional aims of higher education be achieved for all when huge segments of the population lack the traditional preparation of higher education? For decades, universities in particular avoided a head-on confrontation with this dilemma by claiming immunity from a responsibility. After World War II, community colleges were created by the hundreds across the country in

part to provide the equal access portion of the American dream. But neither response--avoiding the issue by some institutions and creating specialized colleges--has provided a satisfactory solution. Thus, many Americans, hungry for equal opportunity in this society, continue to swell the student ranks of all types of colleges and universities.

The community college traditionally has responded to this dilemma by creating developmental studies programs--a curriculum intended to remedy the "deficiencies" of these students. Modest, but noteworthy, success has been achieved by these efforts (Roueche and Kirk, 1973). Increasingly, universities are finding it necessary to follow a similar path (Roueche and Snow, 1977) as their enrollments become more and more inclusive of these "new" students.

The problem no longer is whether colleges and universities shall be required to respond to these students; to respond is imperative. The problem is how to make their responses effective. Assuming that for the immediate future the response is likely to take the form of creating developmental studies curricula within the colleges and universities, the problem becomes how shall the resources of the institutions be marshalled to insure effectiveness of these programs.

This chapter will explore the potential of student development programs to assist colleges and universities to make developmental studies effective. More specifically, this chapter will examine a particular view of student development--a model called student development education--for its potential impact on the outcomes of developmental studies.

The Concept of Student Development Education

Student development education has its origins in student personnel work in higher education and more fundamentally in developmental education (Miller and Prince, 1976). Traditionally, student personnel services have provided a broad range of activities complimentary, but still ancillary, to instruction. In this tradition, counseling is seen as the "heart" of the services, but the services extend into every aspect of out-of-class learning and provide a much-needed dimension of higher education in its effort to facilitate the development of the total individual.

In recent years, many of these professionals have become increasingly disillusioned with effectiveness of traditional student personnel services. Despite their best efforts, their work has remained essentially outside of instruction, the main thrust of higher education. Their theories, and their strategies, emphasize services to students, and they are seen by their teaching colleagues as specialists in the delivery of services. In this tradition, the harder they try, the more proficient they become as service specialists, the further they drive themselves away from their colleagues and consequently from potential impact on essential learning for all students.

Student development education is seen as an alternative to this drifting away from the mainstream of higher education (Creamer and Rippey, 1975). In this view, student development professionals are seen as educators, not as service specialists. According to this point of view, development is the "heart" of all educational programs, including instruction. To be sure, student development education provides programs for learning in out-of-class settings, but it is no longer limited to these traditional turfs. Many programs follow curricular patterns; others,

structured more traditionally, employ basic concepts of teaching in their organization and strategy. Contrary to a strict counseling viewpoint which sees each student in need of special assistance with his or her world, student development sees each student progressing through normal, sequential stages of development in need mainly of opportunities to experience his or her world more fully in preparation for further development.

Student development education is holistic in its theoretical foundations and in its strategies. The concept finds its roots in developmental education (Dewey, 1916; Havighurst, 1953; Perry, 1970; Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972; and Piaget, 1972) where cognitive and affective dimensions of growth are seen as equal partners in human development. In this view, cognition is basic to development and development is the aim of education. Such a view inexorably ties student development in all of its programs to instruction and gives meaning to all educational endeavors whether they occur in or out of the classroom.

Consistent with the holistic view of education, student development sees its strategies as providing a gestalt for learning experiences for all students. One-on-one strategies, an essential type from a therapeutic view, are de-emphasized in student development education, although they remain in the arsenal of professional tools. Instead, strategies which are designed to impact the entire institution receive emphasis. Many learning problems of students can be diagnosed by assessing conditions of the total learning climate of a college or university and can be dealt with preventively rather than therapeutically. Thus, student development is proactive, rather than reactive, in its stance toward development; it operates in the mainstream rather than on the penumbra of education.

*Penumbra refers to the fringe; a surrounding or adjoining region in which something exists to a lesser degree.

The purpose of this chapter is not to elaborate fully on student development education, but rather to explore its strength in improving the effectiveness of developmental studies curricula; therefore, attention now must shift to specifics--those of developmental studies students and programs and those of student development strategies vis a vis these programs.

The Nature of Developmental Studies Programs

American society has endorsed the principle of equality of opportunity for all and has interpreted this to mean equality in access to higher education. At the same time society, institutions of higher education, and faculties all have felt pressure to maintain standards of academic excellence as status measures, as measures of the effectiveness of the educational system, and as matters of professional principle. Therefore, developmental education programs have been created in institutions of higher education throughout the United States as responses to this pressure to provide equality of access while maintaining excellence.

Many thoughtful professionals argue that equality of access to higher education is not in itself a sufficient guarantee of equality (Karabel, 1972; Astin, 1977), and that the pressure for equality of access often only perpetuates the existing stratifications in our society (Karabel, 1972). Still, pressure for equality of access continues from the society at large and from the federal government. Educational institutions themselves strive to maintain their economic stability through increased enrollments. These forces all work to insure continued and increased opportunities for access to higher education for students from all sectors of American life.

These external forces operating upon institutions of higher education to expand access are met by counterforces operating from within the institutions to protect and maintain the traditions of excellence and academic integrity that have given value and status to the faculties and to the institutions. This tension has set the stage for a variety of violent swings in the instructional patterns of many institutions. The most volatile institutions, and the institutions most subjected to pressures of equality of access, have been the community/junior colleges which have emerged over the past twenty years. These institutions begin with the premise of an open door policy guaranteeing equality of access while striving to maintain standards of excellence sufficient to insure the acceptance to their programs and students to employers and to other sectors of higher education.

The Impact of Increased Access on Higher Education. Since community colleges operate without an established tradition of their own, they have been more vulnerable to radical attempts at reforms. Cycles of instructional reform based on behavioral objectives, systematic instruction, and recently on career education or on cognitive style, give evidence to the community colleges' felt need to adapt different systems to cope with a new kind of problem for higher education. It is in these institutions as well that the respectability of developmental studies has emerged as an institutional response to the problem of coping with "new students" brought to the institution by broadened access to higher education. The tension generated by the presence of this body of students has led to a pattern of administratively imposed solutions to instructional problems as pressures

are exerted from the top of the hierarchy to try and bring about equality while still maintaining excellence. This effort by administrators to find and impose "pat" solutions to instructional problems frequently has led to severe reactions from faculties; it also has created enormous tensions and rifts within institutions.

Developmental education is in itself a pressure point within community colleges representing the arrival of a substantial new body of students with a corresponding differentiation of the faculty and the curriculum to create a new area specifically designed to serve these new students. Developmental education in this way can be seen as an institutional response to an emerging new clientele. This development also can be seen as an attempt by the institutions to wall off these new students from the main body of the curriculum of the college and therefore to protect the standards and patterns of excellence existent in the institution.

Until 1970's this problem was presumed to be the problem of the public community college. In the 1970's profound changes have occurred in the characteristics of entering college freshmen throughout the higher educational system. Declining scores on SAT's in math and verbal ability have testified to the shift in clientele, and the emergence of major developmental studies programs in four-year colleges and universities (Roueche and Snow, 1977) is prima-facie evidence of the arrival of the community colleges' new students on the campuses of four-year institutions.

There is a multiplicity of causes for the emergence of these new students in four-year colleges. Among these reasons must be the impact of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants and allied federal funding support for students which enabled lower middle class students to attend not only the local community college but also to attend a more distant four-year

college. Numerous studies have documented the flow of new students into higher education, although whether the new students are fairly representative of all of our socio-economic classes and ability levels is not clear (Astin, 1975). Peng (1977) has reported on the National Longitudinal Study (NLS) on the class of 1972 as conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics. He has shown a significant shift in patterns of college attendance between the Project Talent study on the class of 1961 and the NLS study of the class of 1972. There is an apparent marked increase in the proportion of low socio-economic class and low ability students moving into four-year colleges as opposed to their earlier clustering in the two-year colleges. There also appears to be a concentration of minority group students in the four-year schools as opposed to the two-year schools. Both of these findings run counter to normal expectations. Peng's analysis of the data underscores the significance of the emergence of new students and new developmental programs on campuses throughout higher education.

Impacts of Increased Access on Organizational Characteristics. American higher education is an amalgamation of highly diversified institutions. Cross (1971) and Jencks and Riesman (1968) have argued that with the increased frequency of open door admission policies throughout all of higher education, there are corresponding increased in homogeneity among institutions. Baldridge, et al. (1977) have argued that differentiation continues to exist as a dominant characteristic among the various types of institutions in higher education. Perhaps both positions are right. Cross's perception of an influx of new students into a wider range of institutions in higher education may well be accurate, but it also may be

that these new students are not entering the full spectrum of higher education but are entering two-year schools and increasingly the less prestigious four-year institutions. In this sense, a greater homogeneity would be likely with a greater similarity in student populations, curricula problems, and instructional problems forcing both community colleges and certain four-year institutions into similar patterns to resolve similar problems. At the same time it is possible that more prestigious institutions have been able to maintain their admission patterns and special purposes so that their differentiation from other institutions and from each other continued. This is an area about which little is known and about which further research needs to be done. However, it appears a reasonable hypothesis that there has been a shift in the characteristics of entering college freshmen in the less prestigious four-year colleges and the least prestigious universities and possibly a minor shifting in the configuration of students entering the two-year colleges. Thus, the organizational and curricular differences between two and four-year institutions at the bottom of the prestige scale may be narrowing while the differences from institutions at the upper half of the scale continue or increase.

Impact of Developmental Studies Programs. Roueche has documented convincingly the emergence of major developmental studies programs in four-year colleges and universities (Roueche and Snow, 1977). The existence of these programs throughout higher education, therefore, indicates a pressure point created by the arrival of students who are under-equipped for a variety of reasons to cope with the standard curricula offered by the colleges. Although it would be of interest to discover how these

changes occurred and to understand the forces at work to produce this change in our higher educational system, it is of paramount importance to cope more successfully with the situation. In fact, it is possible that the curriculum alarms and excursions of the 1960's and early 1970's may have been symptomatic of this gradually increasing pressure brought about by new kinds of students enrolling in various types of institutions.

It may be that an acknowledgement of a new clientele by many institutions will enable them to more effectively address the curricula problems and instructional dilemmas that have been on the penumbra of our concerns about curriculum direction and instructional strategies. It may be that the developmental studies programs represent the emergence of a critical mass which must now be dealt with more directly.

Higher education's traditional response has been to "cool out" or to partition off these less academically able students through a process of differentiation--by offering specialized courses or programs. <u>It may be that the primary responsibility now is to find processes for integration to bring these students into the mainstream of the curriculum and to bring their specialized curricula into the mainstream of the college.</u>

Community colleges and southern black four-year colleges have the longest history of dealing with the problems of the under-prepared student. In the public community college, this effort generally has resulted in a fragmentation of the curriculum. Colleges typically have established a series of developmental studies courses or a separate developmental program which is walled off from the rest of the curriculum. The general education functions of the college curriculum generally have had little to do with the developmental studies courses. Indeed, general education currently does not exist as a separate curriculum in community colleges;

it is lost within the university parallel and transfer curriculum. Transfer oriented courses generally are designated as service courses and as general education courses but with goals and standards appropriate only to the transfer function. The reality in most community college curricula has been a series of courses dominated by the university parallel and transfer function to the detriment of the general education function. Since only approximately 10% of all community college students do transfer to a four-year institution, there has been a subversion of the purposes of a comprehensive curriculum to benefit a few at the expense of many.

As community colleges must strive to correct this wrong over the next several years, so the four-year colleges would be well advised to avoid this danger as they now grapple with the reality of the developmental student and his needs.

Development and the Curriculum Mainstream. Therefore, as higher education faces increasing numbers of more heterogeneous students, it is important that institutions respond to the increasing numbers of developmental studies programs by establishing processes for integration into the mainstream curriculum and not processes for differentiation which either wall away developmental students or track them out of the college curricula. There are several patterns which can serve as a model to help accomplish this. Roueche, in his on-going and long-term work on the developmental student, has developed a series of criteria that address not only the academic skill needs but the personhood needs of the developmental student as a basis for bringing him into readiness for the mainstream curriculum. Roueche also had identified characteristics of successful programs which should be a useful guide (Roueche and Snow, 1977). More importantly,

perhaps, he has given clear warning that success at maintaining developmental students in the developmental studies program itself is no guarantee of success at maintaining that student when he moves out of the developmental studies program into the mainstream curriculum. It is very clear that we need to address the problems of making these students self-sufficient so that they can move independently through the college. Recent work has indicated that a focus upon characteristics such as internality and externality for lotus of control appear to be fruitful considerations with these students (Rotter, 1966; Gurin, et al., 1969; Trachtman, 1975; Messick, 1976). The development of a cognitive-developmental psychology has pointed the way to a reconsideration of development as a goal for education (Kohlberg and Mayer, 1972). Through the unification of elements of the theoretical constructs of Kohlberg and the more pragmatic and applied insights of Trachtman, Messick, and Roueche, it is possible that developmental studies may themselves soon be carrying the burden for general education in the community colleges and in the lower division of many four-year institutions. Education to develop a capacity for independent judgement and a personal sense of values historically has been the focus of general education. Currently, this focus is abandoned for a focus upon career education and vocationalism in the community colleges and many four-year colleges. It is very possible that developmental education itself can take on these functions as the underlying base to develop the academic and personhood skills usually associated with general education. In this way, there is hope that developmental studies need no longer serve as a differentiation function but rather will become an integrating function within the curricula and among the student body--a vehicle for bringing remedial education, developmental education and general education into

the mainstream of curriculum in much of higher education.

Designing the Student Development Program

The previous section details the major concerns and characteristics of developmental studies programs in higher education. Assessing these concerns from the standpoint of student development yields four critical considerations which should be addressed in student development programming:

1. A primary developmental objective for developmental studies is to assist students in becoming more self-sufficient.
2. A major objective of educational strategists should be to create a critical mass condition for developmental studies students.
3. The developmental studies program should be fully integrated with other educational programs of the institution.
4. A principle purpose of developmental studies is to fulfill the general education requirement for students.

This assessment provides the basic cornerstones for planning the student development programs to assist in the developmental studies effort.

It may be helpful to draw one final parallel between traditional student personnel services and student development education--to examine the penumbra vs. mainstream activities.

On the penumbra--Typcial student personnel service strategies. The following generalized strategies represent the major thrusts of student personnel services appropriate for developmental studies programs:

--Providing admissions counseling, including orientation, and initial educational advisement;

--Providing housing, including appropriate educational experiences;

--Arranging for financial aid for deserving students;

--Gathering data on students from tests and interviews used in counseling and advising sessions;

--Providing counseling as needed (typically far-ranging in types from personal therapy to veteran advising);

--Providing educational and career planning services, including occasional in-class activities;

--Maintaining student records, primarily through the registrar's office;

--Conducting various student activities;

--Conducting research on student performance.

Obviously, student personnel services programs vary from institution to institution, and just as obviously, they provide important services to students in many different ways--ways often essential to student survival in complex colleges and universities. However, even a cursory analysis shows that most traditional services are inappropriate to meet the requirements of developmental studies programs.

In the mainstream--Typical student development education strategies. Appropriate strategies for student development education are listed below: (These strategies are described in the specific context of developmental studies programs.)

--Creates a process for self-assessment and self-placement in developmental studies;

--Creates a process for career self-assessment and decision-making concerning future educational and career plans;

--Designs record-keeping functions to maximize feedback capabilities to students for continuous self-appraisal of progress;

--Assumes a direct teaching role for part of the developmental studies curriculum;

--Collaborates with faculty in developmental studies in curriculum development and in teaching/counseling strategies;

--Teams with faculty in instruction where indicated in curriculum plan;

--Collaborates with faculty in use of appropriate counseling/facilitative competencies;

--Collaborates with faculty in research on curriculum reform, instructional effectiveness, and student performance;

--Serves daily as educational and career advisor conducting in-class and individual counseling sessions;

--Collaborates with administration and faculty in identification of special student needs which must be met in developmental studies curriculum;

--Collaborates with administration in identification of environmental barriers to optimum learning conditions for developmental studies students and works to remove them or to modify them toward more acceptable constraints;

--Provides essential services, such as financial aid and housing, directly to students.

These strategies reflect the basic educational role of student development professionals and suggest specific relationships and interven-

tions necessary to deal with the developmental studies requirements listed above. In fact, these strategies may be seen as the basic elements of a complete plan for responding to developmental studies; however, critical concepts are hidden in these statements. They need to be extricated and discussed in greater detail since their understanding is essential to the success of any plan of these proportions.

Teaching self-sufficiency through process. Student development utilizes basic teaching concepts in all its programs. Any process employed to accomplish student development goals must be analyzed by answering the questions, "What are we teaching by the process employed?" Frequently, institutionalized processes actucally teach the opposite of stated goals. For example, most counseling programs assert a goal of self-directedness for students; yet, many activities of counselors and academic advisors actually teach dependence. This condition is a problem particularly when dealing with developmental studies students. It was shown earlier that self-sufficiency is a major goal of developmental studies programs. It follows that all processes and activities should teach self-sufficiency.

Since student development professionals will be called upon to handle the initial advising and placement of students in developmental studies programs, the choice of appropriate process is critical to the ultimate success or failure of the program.

In this case, some variation of self-assessment and placement is clearly indicated. Many--perhaps most--students who require developmental studies have a long history of failure in school work. They have learned, sometimes not so subtly, that they are mostly incompetent, highly dependent students. Traditional academic advising programs employ a clinical you-come-to-me-and-I-will-help-you attitude which actually reinforces their

nagative self-image. On the other hand, a process which emphasizes self-assessment communicates to the student that he or she is competent to make decisions regarding his or her life when given adequate information. From this process the student begins to feel autonomous, in charge of his or her life, and self-sufficient.

A key factor in student success in developmental studies is the process through which the student came to participate. Without this positive foundation, students' attitudes in developmental studies may be hostile and fatalistic. Only a minor miracle may overcome such attitudes; therefore, they should be avoided from the outset.

The critial mass principle. When certain chemical elements are combined in exact proportions, a reaction occurs. These elements form a critical mass when, and only when, the balance between ingredients is exact. The analogy is relevant to success in developmental studies. A single factor is not likely to produce desired results. One teacher, or even a combination of teachers engaged in similar activities, is insufficient to the task. Other elements, combined with good teaching, are more likely to cause the reaction being sought.

The principle may be summarized as follows: All resources of an institution--person, fiscal and physical--possess capabilities to facilitate development in students when properly managed toward a common goal. The energies inherent in these properties, when combined, help to create a critical mass sufficient to stimulate learning oriented behaviors in students.

Obviously, this principle suggests another key involvement for student development professionals in the success of developmental studies programs. The requirement is to maximize the use of all resources of the

institution and to bring them into the precise relationship with each other to create learning oriented behavior in students. A simple illustration: students need to see in obvious ways that all professionals on the payroll care what is happening to them and are involved in the teaching-learning enterprise. Therefore, counselors and administrators need to be in the classroom to demonstrate their involvement.

The collaboration imperative. Collaboration has two major advantages over independent action. First, collaboration communicates to students that teachers are putting forth their best effort to help them succeed. It is, after all, a process and this process shows students that teachers care enough about them to make great efforts in their behalf. Second, collaborative effort is almost always more potent than individual effort if only because two heads are better than one.

There are other reasons to collaborate. Developmental studies programs must be integrated with other programs of the institution, and collaboration provides the foundation for that effort. Also, it must be remembered that developmental studies programs are attempting to meet certain general education requirements of the students; thus, learning activities need to be broad based, dealing with those things all people need to know in order to live full and rich lives in this society (Reynolds, 1969). A combination of professional talents is indicated to achieve such far ranging goals.

Student development practitioners can and must help to bring collaboration about among many disciplines, including their own, to focus on planning and executing learning activities for developmental studies students. Student development professionals can be the catalysts, the organizers, the facilitators of collaborative planning the teaching. More than this, however, student development professionals must teach in addition

to planning.

The teaching role. The involvement of student development in developmental studies must be complete if it is to be significant. Student development professionals must be concerned with the processes employed in dealing with students, with insuring full collaboration among many disciplines, and with arranging for the achievement of a critical mass condition in the students' immediate learning climate. But, most important, they must be involved directly in the process of teaching.

A major portion of most developmental studies curricula includes work directly with the self-sufficiency issue. Many programs include complete courses like "Human Development" or "Human Relations." Student development professionals could teach these courses. Other programs incorporate units in self-concept building in courses labeled Reading, Writing or Mathematics. Student development professionals could team with other instructors to help with this phase of the courses. In any case, no matter what the circumstance, student development professionals must teach in the developmental studies program.

At this point, it may be helpful to digress briefly to deal squarely with a partfcular issue which plagues educators when they are required to work together with other professionals. Between teachers and counselors, conflict occurs on most campuses when counselors assert their intentions to "consult" with other faculty. Even if counselors' motives are altruistic and their competencies unassailable, such gestures often lead to open warfare. The situation is analogous to the white middle-class staff of a social service agency announcing a new program to be administered in an all black ghetto. A "Who needs your help?" reaction would be expected.

The kinds of working relationships described above are not derived from the "consultation motive." They are derived from a condition of mutual interdependence. This latter condition clearly requires that assistance be a two-headed coin. It is collaborative--each professional needing assistance from the other and each offering their best assets freely and openly. The task is to join forces with others, not to coerce them; to demonstrate to colleagues that one will "lead" where the other wishes to go, not necessarily to reveal some new direction; to prove one's value to one's colleague by inductive methods, not to announce one's indispensibility.

Furthermore, the condition of mutual interdependence strongly suggests that student development professionals need to learn from other faculty the great myriad of competencies they have not had sufficient opportunity to learn from their traditional roles. One would suspect that a healthy attitude to adopt when approaching any collaborative venture would be, "Help me to learn what you do best so I may incorporate new skills in my behavior." In this way, interdependence within the total faculty can facilitate the integration of the student development program within the college.

The Generalization of Learning. Finally, the design of student development programs must recognize the pervasiveness of general education requirements. In the sense that general education refers to those learnings which all people need to live fuller lives, student development can provide enrichment experiences through programs which ordinarily transcend formal curriculum. In a well integrated effort, enrichment of the formal curriculum

should be a planned process with student development professionals bearing a major responsibility for implementation.

The Institutional Setting. Recalling the critical mass principle, some types of institutions simply have more to work with than others and, therefore, some stand a better chance of finding the correct balance of resources to insure success. It is ironic that community colleges, those institutions with a preponderance of developmental studies programs now in full operation, may be least well equipped to create a critical mass for their students. Some community colleges have limited, or over-diffused, resources. They may be trying already to do more than their resources will support. But from the viewpoint of developmental education, perhaps their greatest weakness is the lack of a residential population in their student body.

On this point, research findings are clear. The achievement of most developmental learning objectives is far more common in a residential college than in a commuter college (Chickering, 1975; Astin, 1977a). There are several reasons for this condition and they bear directly on planning student development programs for developmental studies students. Residential students feel more identified with the college and with the faculty. They make a larger investment in their education by spending more time and energy directly on their educational work, and they live in a "home" where curricular enrichment experiences are commonplace through residence hall programming. These added ingredients at a residence college or university make the achievement of a critical mass more probable than at a commuter institution even given equal planning and management.

There is no good reason for community colleges to be glum over this disparity, nor for four-year residential colleges and universities to be smug. The essential point is that both types need to recognize their assets and liabilities and make enlightened plans to take maximum advantage of their strengths.

Some Suggestions for Student Development/Developmental Studies Programs

To achieve maximum success, any student development program must be adapted to the specific circumstances of the campus environment and the specific characteristics of the developmental studies program and its students. The following suggestions are generalized sufficiently to allow considerable modification for local conditions. They are offered for two reasons: (1) as a summary of what has been said above; and (2) to offer practical and specific ideas for readers in their own considerations of this topic.

Program #1: The Self-Assessment Laboratory. From the point of admission to the college or university, students should take charge of their academic and career plans. In order to accomplish this, they need considerable information about themselves, about the institution, and about the curriculum. A program should be designed so students can take a realistic look at these factors based on data acquired during the self-assessment process and then decide for themselves which route to pursue. Above all, the process chosen should teach self-sufficiency.

Program #2: The Life Planning Center. The process begun in the Self-Assessment Laboratory should be continued throughout the collegiate experience. Circumstances change, students acquire new data about themselves, and students need to re-examine earlier decisions. This center

should be based on a self-assessment model allowing for maximum personalized exploration of life options. It should be staffed by professionals from all disciplines and from all roles in the college or university. It should provide an excellent opportunity for integration of educational programs and for faculty collaboration on a critical issue in development for all students--career of life planning.

Program #3: The Curriculum Planning Laboratory. Curriculum development and reform is a continuous process. It should be formalized and made visible to allow maximum participation in curriculum development by all affected. This certainly includes all instructors and student development professionals involved in developmental studies. It probably should include many students, administrators, and persons from outside whose lives and work bear on the curriculum planning issues for the program.

Program #4: The Human Development Curriculum. Many conditions of the human experience effectively form barriers to optimum learning; students bring these conditions with them to the college or university. These conditions should be dealt with proactively and preventively. The curriculum should help students understand themselves and their world better. The payoff likely will be immediate in the form of better grades and more self-directed learning. Portions of this curriculum, or all of it, may become a part of the developmental studies program; portions may serve the general education component of the curriculum. Certainly, student development professionals and perhaps many other teaching professionals ought to be involved in the planning and in the teaching of this curriculum.

Program #5: Interdivisional Counseling Network. Much of the counseling and advising needed by developmental studies students is needed on-the-spot. (This is probably true for all other students as well.) Further-

more, what is needed may or may not require therapeutic competencies. Most counseling and advising competencies can be learned by any professional. One role of counselors, working within the academic department or division, should be to teach certain counseling and advising skills to colleagues and to learn teaching skills possessed by their colleagues. The purpose is to form an ever-increasing network of professionals, all of whom possess counseling, advising, and teaching competencies. Such a pool of talent forms an enormous institutional resource to facilitate the teaching-learning process throughout the enterprise.

Program #6: The Environmental Assessment Laboratory. Many learning barriers exist within the system. Often, they exist from benign neglect. Sometimes, their presence is not even known until some particularly conscientious student or faculty member stumbles onto them. What is needed is a deliberate and systematic effort to identify environmental barriers and then to work to remove or to modify them. The concept is akin to a combination of the ombudsman concept and an institutional research office.

Summary

Developmental studies programs are a reality in many colleges and universities, and where they do not now exist, the likelihood of their presence in the near future is high. Student development programs are a key ingredient within the institutional arsenal to improve chances of success for students in developmental studies. Student development is not a revamped student personnel program. It is a set of educational practices, grounded in developmental education theory, designed to marshall all available resources within an institution into a process which will produce a predictable result--self-sufficiency in students.

Arguments are presented that both developmental studies and student development programs should move from the penumbra (of college curricula) to the mainstream. Pivotal issues are discussed which bear on the probability of success in developmental studies, including creating a condition of critical mass, the significance of residential settings, and the centrality of self-sufficiency in developmental education.

References:

Astin, A. W. Four Critical Years. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1977a.

Astin, A. W. The Myth of Equal Access in Public Higher Education. Atlanta, GA: Southern Education Foundation, 1975.

Astin, A. W. "On the Failures of Educational Policy," Change, September 1977b, 9, pp. 40-43.

Baldridge, V. J.; Curtis, C. V.; Ecker, G.; and Riley, G. L. "Diversity in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, 1977, 48, pp. 367-388.

Chickering, A. W. Commuting Versus Resident Students. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Creamer, D. G. and Rippey, D. T. "Student Development Education: Implications for Teaching, Counseling, and Administration," UCLA: ERIC, ED 139 482, 1975.

Cross, K. P. Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Dewey, J. Democracy and Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916.

Gurin, P.; Gurin, G.; Lao, R.; and Beattie, M. "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, pp. 29-53.

Havighurst, R. J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longeman's, 1953.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.

Karabel, J. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42, pp. 521-562.

Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. "Development as the Aim of Education," Harvard Educational Review, 1972, 42, pp. 449-496.

Miller, T. K. and Prince, J. The Future of Student Affairs. San Francisco, GA: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Messick, S. and Associates. Individuality in Learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Peng, S. S. "Trends in the Entry to Higher Education: 1961-1972," Educational Researcher, January 1977, pp. 15-19.

Perry, W. G., Jr. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Piaget, J. Psychology and Epistomology: Towards a Theory of Knowledge. (Translated from the French by P. A. Wells.) Harmondsworth, England: Penguin University Books, 1972.

Reynolds, J. W. The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1969.

Rotter, J. B. "Generalized Expectencies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (whole No. 609).

Roueche, J. E. and Kirk, R. W. Catching Up: Remedial Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Roueche, J. E. and Snow, J. J. Overcoming Learning Problems: A Guide to Developmental Education in College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Trachtman, J. P. "Cognitive and Motivational Variables as Predictors of Academic Performance Among Disadvantaged College Students," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, pp. 324-328.

Don G. Creamer is associate professor of education and Darrel A. Clowes is assistant professor of education at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Both have extensive administrative experience in urban community colleges with large developmental studies programs.