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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

American higher education is entering a critical period in its existence. During the 1960's, rapid expansion in higher education was common throughout the nation. The total degree-credit enrollment in 4-year institutions increased from 3,131,393 in 1960 to 6,124,000 in 1970, while the estimated full-time equivalent instructional staff also increased from 210,000 in 1960 to 420,000 in 1970 (Simon & Fullam, 1979). Today, this growth era is over for most institutions, and higher education is in a period of stabilization which appears to be moving toward retrenchment. The total degree-credit enrollment in 4-year institutions is expected to shift from the current level of 7,682,000 in 1977 to 8,033,000 in 1981, and then slowly decline to 7,623,000 by 1985, while the estimated full-time equivalent instructional staff is expected to shift from 540,000 in 1977 to 563,000 in 1981 and then decline to 532,000 in 1985 (Frankel & Harrison, 1977).

As enrollments level and decline, financial concerns will continue to be central institutional priorities. The need to reduce or at least closely control expenditures will require reductions in the size of the faculty and staff in many institutions. One major
outcome of these reductions will be faculty and staff who are less mobile. This decrease in mobility may generate morale problems. The implications of this possibility are most serious since higher education cannot afford to become an enterprise plagued by the low morale, apathy, hostility, and stagnation that may result from retrenchment. Institutions must be exciting, challenging, and innovative if they are to survive the coming years with limited funding and still successfully meet the needs of society.

During the 1960's, faculty and staff were able to change positions and institutions with relative ease. Upward professional mobility frequently came with these changes. An outgrowth of this mobility was the regular opportunity for institutions to introduce new faculty and staff into the campus community, which stimulated renewal of tenured faculty and staff through new professional interactions. However, when student enrollments decline the size of the faculty and staff will decrease causing higher education to identify new ways to stimulate faculty and staff under the condition of institutional retrenchment. There may be an increased need to redirect the assignments and responsibilities of some faculty and staff, as it becomes necessary for fewer personnel to implement programs and services.

The utilization of staff development programs in higher education may become important and necessary in order to maintain the quality of the educational experience which is provided for students. The importance of staff development is emphasized by Richardson (1975):

If institutions can no longer be changed primarily by the process of adding new personnel, then steps
must be taken to help existing staff members adjust to the new demands being made of them. The process of improving staff capabilities for dealing effectively with new and continuing responsibilities is most commonly referred to as staff development. (p. 303)

Hirschowitz (1975) spoke of the necessity of staff development:

The staff development program should be firmly founded upon the recognition of necessity. It is imperative that the formal leaders understand and endorse that time used for purposes of collaborative learning, planning, cross-fertilizing consultation, mutual support, and staff development is not an organizational luxury or privilege—it is an organizational necessity. Commitment to staff development is necessary for the organization to thrive, build morale, increase its holding power, produce, and perpetuate itself. (p. 213)

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges and to determine the implementation feasibility of the model. The study included a review of literature reports on staff development philosophies and programs for higher education administrators. The model was designed by integrating the characteristics of staff development reported in the professional literature with the perceptions of the investigator.

An essential component of the study was to determine whether the implementation of the staff development model was feasible in student affairs units at private colleges. A questionnaire which was entitled Student Affairs Staff Development Survey (see Appendix A) was developed and administered to chief student affairs administrators at selected
private colleges in the Midwest. The purposes of the survey were threefold: (1) to determine whether the completion of the task in each stage of the model was perceived as feasible by the chief student affairs administrator; (2) to determine whether the methods to accomplish the task in each stage of the model were perceived as desirable by the chief student affairs administrator; and (3) to determine whether the task in each stage of the model had been completed at each institution since the 1975-76 academic year.

Rationale for the Study

The rationale for the study rested on the need of student affairs administrators to design and implement staff development programs to enhance staff budgets and/or retrenchment. Miller (1975) emphasized that a dearth of literature pertaining to staff development activities in student affairs programs existed. He suggested that only three studies appeared to address student affairs staff development practices: Gross (1963), Stamatakos and Oliaro (1972), and Truitt and Gross (1970). There were two conclusions common in these three studies: (1) there was a scarcity of literature which examined the staff development concept as it related to student affairs staff members, and (2) there was a need for further study of this subject.

Sixteen years ago Gross (1963) stressed the fact that staff development programs, which he termed "in-service education," for student affairs professionals had not received sufficient attention in the professional literature. In a monograph written for the
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Truitt and Gross (1970) also concluded that insufficient attention had been given in the literature to the "potential role of in-service education programs for student affairs professionals" (Truitt & Gross, 1970, p. 210). They outlined a rationale for in-service education programs and proposed several guiding principles for in-service education programs.

It was interesting to note that Truitt and Gross (1970) wrote their monograph during an era of economic well-being and expansion in higher education. They did not relate "in-service education" to a rationale based on retrenchment, job security, and staff morale. Similarly, Stamatakos and Oliaro (1972) did not cast the "in-service development" needs of student affairs personnel in a mode of budget or enrollment crisis. Their rationale was much like that of Truitt and Gross:

In-service development is a vital method for maintaining the necessary level of information and competence to allow student personnel workers to meet the challenges of their job in an assertive, productive fashion. Failure to do so results in the kind of reactive, crisis administration that too often characterizes the functioning of the student personnel program. (Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972, p. 270)

In an era of steady state budgets and fiscal retrenchment, staff development programs for student affairs professionals provide a realistic way to maintain quality and flexibility in the delivery of programs and services to students. A review of the professional literature substantiated that staff development for student affairs personnel has received little attention through the years. No
comprehensive model of staff development specifically for student affairs units existed in the professional literature. Hence, the major purpose of this study was to develop a comprehensive staff development model for student affairs staff members in a private college.

**Definition of Terms**

A review of the professional literature revealed that several terms have been used to refer to the general concept of staff development. These terms included: in-service education, in-service development, and administrative development. For the purposes of this study, each of these terms was considered synonymous with the term "staff development." These other terms were used only in the text of a direct quotation by an original author.

The terms and definitions which were used in conducting this investigation were as follows:

**Staff development.** - A planned experience designed to change behavior and result in improved personal growth and/or improved professional performance of a student affairs staff member.

**Staff development model.** - A systematic approach to staff development.

**Staff development program.** - A planned experience or activity which is intended to improve either the personal growth or the professional competence of a student affairs staff member.

**Chief student affairs administrator.** - The administrative officer of a college who is directly responsible for the operation of...
the student affairs program. This administrator usually reports
directly to the president or chief executive officer of the institu-
tion.

Student affairs program. - All services and programs of a
college which are not involved directly with academic instruction, but
are intended to facilitate the personal growth and development of
students.

Student affairs administrator. - An administrator of a
college who is responsible for one or more components of the student
affairs program. This administrator reports either directly or in-
directly to the chief student affairs administrator.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited by the following factors:

1. The design of the model was based upon a review
of the professional literature since 1960 and
the perceptions of the investigator.

2. The feasibility component of the study included
only the chief student affairs administrators at
the 25 member institutions in the Great Lakes
Colleges Association (GLCA) and the Associated
Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) Consortia.

3. The survey data were applicable only to the GLCA/
ACM Consortium Colleges, although the survey find-
ings and recommendations may be generalized to
small private colleges outside the GLCA/ACM
Consortia if institutional variations are taken
into consideration.

4. The survey findings and recommendations were
based upon the logical analysis of the investi-
gator.
Organization of the Study

The remainder of this study is organized and presented in four additional chapters. Chapter II is a review of the professional literature pertaining to staff development in higher education with a special emphasis on literature related to staff development for student affairs administrators. Chapter III is a presentation of the staff development model and a description of the research design and procedures which were used to conduct the feasibility component of the study. Chapter IV is a presentation and analysis of the data collected through the administration of the questionnaire to the chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges. Chapter V is a summary of the conclusions and recommendations for future research which were relevant to the findings of the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature reviewed for this study included the higher education literature since 1960 which related to administrative staff development. The purpose of the literature review was to identify the philosophical rationales and specific applications of the staff development concept to administrators in higher education. Since the goal of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges, it was important to derive from the higher education literature specific implications for planning staff development activities. The questions which guided the literature review were:

1. What is the nature and extent of the higher education literature which is related to staff development for administrators?

2. What specific staff development activities or programs for administrators are reported in the higher education literature?

3. What characteristics of staff development are reported in the higher education literature?

The literature review was organized in three sections which related directly to each of these guiding questions: higher education
Higher Education Literature

An investigation of staff development for student affairs administrators in higher education was completed by Gross (1963) in a doctoral dissertation which examined in-service education for student affairs administrators. Gross made recommendations which have had an impact on subsequent professional literature related to staff development. He proposed these guidelines for staff development for student affairs administrators:

1. In-service education programs for student personnel workers should be characterized by the following principles:
   a. Each school's program must be planned, initiated and perpetuated in view of individual staff and institutional goals and needs. No one pattern of in-service education is universally applicable to all institutions.
   b. Every in-service education program should begin with a set of agreed upon objectives which give direction to the overall program.
   c. In-service education programs must be continuously planned and maintained.
   d. Participation in in-service education programs should not be forced. The motivation for voluntary participation should result from the prevailing professional climate and attitude of the chief personnel officer, department, and institution as well as the participants' need awareness and desire to such a program.
   e. In-service education programs should involve maximum participation of the total staff in the planning and on-going activities.
   f. In-service education programs should utilize the knowledge and skill of the program participants.
as well as those of consultants and other resource personnel.

g. In-service education activities must be geared to the varying levels of professional readiness of individual program participants.

h. Study topics for in-service education programs should reflect immediate problems and needs of the staff and institution and at the same time provide opportunity for the development of more generalized knowledge and understanding.

i. In-service education programs should use a variety of resource materials, techniques, procedures, and personnel.

j. Content of in-service education programs for personnel workers should reflect the theoretical foundations and research findings of various related disciplines.

k. Opportunity must be made to apply new knowledge and techniques, gained through in-service education, into the program and services of the institution.

l. In-service education programs should be conducted during a regularly designated time in the normal work schedule of student personnel workers.

m. Adequate budget and facilities should be assigned and made available to the in-service education program.

n. Participants in the in-service education program should be actively involved in program evaluation.

2. The obligation to initiate, implement, and direct an in-service program should rest with one person, preferably the chief personnel officer who must bear responsibility for its success or failure. In institutions in which student personnel services are specialized and not centrally organized, direction of specific aspects of the program may be delegated to other members of the staff.

3. All chief student personnel administrators in institutions of higher education should plan and initiate, if they have not already done so, comprehensive programs of in-service
education embracing all student personnel services and workers.

4. Chief student personnel administrators should not view in-service education as an addendum to the total student personnel program but as an integral, on-going responsibility of the total staff. Participation in professional growth activities should be included in the job descriptions of all student personnel workers.

5. Chief student personnel administrators should rely less on professional organizations to stimulate and promote professional growth of their staffs and give increased attention to the development of in-service education programs on their own campus.

6. Institutional and departmental policies and practices should be so designed as to foster in-service activity and reward those student personnel workers who upgrade themselves professionally.

7. In-service education programs should be continuously evaluated and measuring instruments, by which this can be accomplished should be designed, developed and validated. (Gross, 1970, pp. 114-116)

Truitt and Gross (1970) collaborated to write a monograph for the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. They maintained that there was a need for continuing in-service education for student affairs administrators for the following reasons:

1. The inadequate or unrelated preservice education of many in student personnel work underscores the importance of in-service education.

2. Continued growth of its members is one of the distinguishing features of a profession and can be achieved through in-service education.

3. In-service education programs can effect change in the student personnel program.

4. A structured in-service education program is necessary to provide continuity for a specialized and constantly changing staff.

5. The fact that new staff members rarely assume their initial positions at their peak effectiveness requires the establishment of in-service education programs.
6. In-service education programs provide excellent opportunities for each staff member to contribute to the student personnel program.

7. Properly planned in-service education programs enable the personnel staff to transcend the routine of daily personnel functions.


The importance of staff development was illustrated in a study by Perry (1966). In an effort to identify legitimate evaluation criteria for judging the administrative behavior of chief student affairs administrators, he discovered that vice presidents for student affairs judged the importance of nine behavior categories in the following order of importance: long range planning; ability to plan current operations; ability to make decisions; interpersonal effectiveness; development of staff; ability to delegate and assign; ability to coordinate and direct; academic scholarship experience orientation; and ability to check up and follow up. The development of staff was judged the fifth most important behavior criteria for evaluating the administrative behavior of the chief student affairs administrator.

The results of Perry's (1966) research suggested that staff development should be a high priority for the chief student affairs administrator. Shaffer (1967) supported this contention when he suggested that the influences upon students in the 1960's had necessitated a different approach to student personnel work. He identified the following forces as having a major influence upon students: the social milieu of prosperity; the dominance of an existentialist
philosophy in their world and upbringing; the declining role of the church; the relativism of family standards; the change in philosophies of education held by colleges; off campus political involvement; and the trend toward legalism in all of society. In response to these forces which were molding a different student, Shaffer emphasized the importance of staff development:

The student personnel staff faces current challenges by recognizing that continuous professional growth and development by every staff member as an essential aspect of effective student personnel work. A person cannot help other people grow if he himself has stopped growing. Individual staff members have this personal obligation. More importantly, for staff leaders a major responsibility is leading, stimulating, and facilitating the personal and professional growth of colleagues. A staff climate encouraging such an attitude does not just happen, it must be planned and developed. (Shaffer, 1967, p. 182)

Greene (1971) suggested that in-service education was a mechanism which encouraged individuals to reach their potential:

One of life's greatest tragedies is the story of unfulfilled potential. Pity the musician, poet, tailor, baseball player, lawyer, or teacher who has never realized the personal, occupational, or professional heights that lay within his grasp. In-service training is the gateway leading toward the realization of this potential. (Greene, 1971, p. 201)

In an editorial for student affairs administrators, Shaffer (1972) asserted that productive staff development programs would be necessary for professional survival. He suggested that current literature should be discussed in staff meetings or special staff seminars, position papers and research reports should be used as input techniques to elevate discussions from the personal biases of the staff, and special conferences specifically oriented to institutional problems
should be initiated. Shaffer concluded the editorial with a strong statement which supported the concept of staff development:

> In short, it is apparent that the future promises a continuing stream of shotgun blasts of novel, diverse, and security-shattering experiences. To meet demands placed upon them, institutions will require staff who possess special skills, poise, and confidence to meet new situations in addition to the usually expected technical competences. These traits will be developed only by consciously planned and zealously implemented staff development programs. Truly such programs are the master key to professional survival. (Shaffer, 1972, p. 262)

Stamatakos and Oliaro (1972) pointed to the paucity of professional literature on in-service development and contended that this was illustrative of the fact that in-service development did not assume a lofty position in day-to-day administrative priorities. Contrary to that apparent reality, they suggested that "in-service development is more a function of an effective student personnel program than a service to staff members" (Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972, pp. 270-271). They proposed that in-service development should be built into job functions which, in turn, should be developed from student personnel philosophy and the student affairs program goals. The responsibility for providing the philosophical direction for the division and a job description which outlined the job function of each staff member should belong to the chief student personnel administrator.

R. C. Richardson (1975) indicated that staff development permitted institutions to change without expanding staff size. He observed that "many institutions are limited at present in their efforts to establish effective programs of staff development by the
absence of a conceptual framework which relates activities designed to upgrade staff to the ongoing processes of the institution" (Richardson, 1975, p. 304). Richardson contended that staff development activities should expose staff members to new ideas and practices which can be translated into action which will contribute to the successful achievement of institutional goals. He contended that "the extent desirable changes which occur as a result of explicitly designed staff development experiences can be maintained depends upon ongoing processes, including committee activity, senates, staff evaluation procedures, and the behavior of those in positions of leadership" (Richardson, 1975, p. 310).

According to a national study of selected American College Personnel Association members, Miller (1975) reported the following conclusions concerning staff development activities for student affairs administrators:

1. Only one out of every five institutions has formalized a policy statement about in-service staff development programming.

2. A vast majority of institutions release student affairs staff members to attend off campus professional development activities.

3. Nine out of ten institutions pay half or more of the cost of staff development activity if there is a probable benefit to the institution for such attendance.

4. Cost, probable benefit, and location of the activity are the three most important variables involved in decision related to attendance at off campus activities.

5. Seventy-nine cents out of every dollar expended for off campus professional development activity is spent on professional association convention attendance. The remainder is spent for attendance at professional development workshops or similar conferences.
6. Six days per year are spent by the average professional staff member in off-campus professional development activities.

7. Staff members in three-fourths of the colleges and universities participate in approximately four hours of on-campus in-service staff development activity per month as a part of their normal staff work load.

8. Two-thirds of the institutions allow staff released time of up to four hours per week to attend academic courses.

9. Three-fourths of the programs that allow released time for academic course work indicate that their leadership encourages staff members to take the time.

10. On-campus in-service education programming receives just over one-tenth of the total in-service expenditure. One fourth of that amount is spent for staff attending academic graduate courses.

11. Professional development workshops presented by ACPA and other associations, consulting firms, and other institutions is ranked as the single most beneficial development activity by those representing higher-education leadership.

12. Lower-echelon staff members as a group rate on-campus staff development programs involving outside consultants as the single most beneficial professional development activity.

13. Attendance at professional association conventions is rated as being of less benefit than most other activities, even though the greatest amount of the in-service education budget is expended for attendance at such meetings.

14. Development of specific skills and exposure to new approaches and resource uses have been identified as the two most valuable benefits from participation in continuing education programs.

15. Vice-presidents of student affairs rank opportunities for personal growth and self-renewal as a more important benefit than do their subordinates. (Miller, 1975, pp. 262-263)

Hirschowtiz (1975) suggested that individual differences among staff members should be respected and accommodated in a staff
development program. He contended that a staff development program should recognize "the needs of any one person will be the same as all other staff persons; some needs of any one staff person will be the same as those of some other staff persons; some needs of any one staff person will be the same as those of only a few other staff persons; and some of the needs of any one staff person will be the same as those of no other staff person" (Hirschowitz, 1975, p. 213). In addition, he proposed that the "case method" should be utilized in staff development activities to encourage the active participation of staff. He advocated that the guiding principle for staff development activities should be that "learners hear, and forget; see, and remember; do and understand" (Hirschowitz, 1975, p. 213).

Canon (1976) proposed a developmental model for divisions of student affairs which consisted of three functional hierarchies with a supporting corollary for each level. The levels and supporting corollaries were:

Level I: Primary identification is with the professional subspecialty and the particular student affairs subunit (financial aid, counseling center, activities, etc.).

Corollary I: The effectiveness of a division of student affairs whose staff is functioning at Level I is equal to something less than the sum of its parts.

Level II: The primary identification of staff is with the student affairs enterprise. Competencies in subspecialty areas remain high.

Corollary II: The effectiveness of a division of student affairs whose staff is functioning at Level II will be approximately equal to the sum of its parts.
Level III: Primary focus of the staff is on the institutional mission as viewed through the prism of a strong and sophisticated conceptualization of the purposes of higher education.

Corollary III: The effectiveness of a division of student affairs whose staff functions at Level III is equal to something more than the sum of its parts. (Canon, 1976, pp. 29-30)

According to Canon (1976), the goal of student affairs administrators should be to function at Level III. He contended that a division of student affairs administrators which is able to function at Level III can have a significant impact on the environment of an institution.

Canon (1977) suggested that the major roles of the chief administrator in staff development are to support the concept philosophically and financially, to insure program consistency, and to serve as a model by participating in the staff development activities. He warned that by participating in the staff development process, a chief administrator would open him/herself to an exciting, yet difficult, experience of personal and professional growth. However, "if staff are to buy into that notion, the chief administrator had better start by showing the way" (Canon, 1977, p. 11).

Nejedlo (1977) maintained that staff development does not just happen by itself. Rather, people make it happen through the following: assessing staff needs; assisting individuals become aware of the need for change; identifying change strategies; implementing the change strategies; evaluating the process; and insuring continuity.

Rhatigan and Crawford (1978) conducted a study to determine
the preferences of student affairs professionals concerning various staff development activities. They reported that student affairs administrators rank ordered the following three major categories of staff development activities: (1) discussions with others (other student affairs professionals, students, faculty, and staff); (2) attending workshops, regional meetings, or national conferences; and (3) reading professional literature (journals, books, "thought" papers). This rank order was consistent for all of the respondents regardless of the respondent's institution size or type, position, years of experience, professional organization affiliations, or level of education.

Beeler and Penn (1978) proposed that a new staff position, Director of Education, should be added to the staff of the student affairs division. The primary function of this position would be to design, implement, and coordinate staff development activities which would meet the division-wide needs of the student affairs staff. To achieve this goal, they suggested that four important sequential stages should be followed to create a successful staff development program: assess needs, design content, implement activities, and evaluate outcomes.

Some of the professional literature related to staff development was oriented to the community college sector of higher education. According to Hammonds and Wallace (1974), "the time has passed for debating whether or not a need for staff development exists. The issue is 'how'" (Hammonds & Wallace, 1974, p. 38). They proposed several questions which should serve as a guide in planning a staff development program. These questions were:
1. What answer can be given to staff who ask, "Why do we need a staff development program?"

2. Who will be responsible for the planning?

3. How will specific staff development needs be identified?

4. What is the balance between institutional priorities and individual needs?

5. Which staff should be invited to participate?

6. How flexible will the program be?

7. How can staff be motivated to participate?

8. How should the program be scheduled?

9. Who will conduct the program?

10. What instructional technique(s) work(s) the best?

11. How should the program be publicized and disseminated?

12. Should the program be evaluated, and if so, how?

13. How should the program be funded and what other kinds of support are needed? (Hammonds & Wallace, 1974, pp. 38-39)

Petty (1974) indicated that community colleges need to develop "grooming" programs to prepare individuals for leadership roles. He asserted:

At a time when personnel development may have become one of the highest priorities in education, community colleges can no longer rely solely on outside agencies and graduate schools to prepare competent practicing managers. Presidents, especially, must take it upon themselves to organize effective inservice training programs that link managers' career objectives with institutional goals. (Petty, 1974, p. 18)

Claxton (1976) indicated that the term staff development should be redefined so that it means individual growth rather than a remedying of deficiencies. He proposed the following guidelines to
describe what staff development is and is not:

1. Staff development is not "for someone else." Rather it is for everyone on the staff—faculty, administrators, student services staff, support staff, custodial personnel, secretarial staff, and security officers.

2. Staff development is not something isolated from other activities of the organization. It is a continuous, interactive process that encompasses the entire institution and all its people.

3. Staff development is not a pre-packaged program brought in from the outside and imposed on the institution. Rather, the staff looks at what is needed for this particular community college and the design of the program flows from the analysis.

4. A staff development program is not a haphazard use of resources. It is a planned resource allocation which is consistent with the goals of the institution.

5. Staff development is not a "bag of tricks." Instead, it is a context for selecting ways to achieve individual and institutional goals and a means by which they can be achieved. (Claxton, 1976, p. 28)

He suggested that the process of staff development should be a cycle which includes reviewing goals, assessing needs, sponsoring activities, assessing program effectiveness and feeding the results back into planning so modifications can be made.

O'Banion (1974) described the results of his work as a consultant with a two year institution to assist them formulate a staff development program. He assessed the needs of the faculty and staff through an initial interview which was followed up by a questionnaire. Based on the results of the interview and survey data, he recommended the following: assigning either a faculty member with partial release time or the Dean of Instruction the responsibility of coordinating
a staff development advisory group; offering a series of staff development workshops oriented to the needs of the campus; offering the workshops during college time; utilizing outside consultants to lead the workshops; and evaluating the effectiveness of each workshop. O'Banion emphasized the importance of evaluation in planning and implementing staff development programs. He suggested that "program evaluation should consist of collection of program data categorized as intended (what is planned to take place) and observed (what actually occurs) inputs, transactions, and outcomes" (O'Banion, 1974, p. 60).

Wiedman (1976) described the assessment procedures which were utilized to complete a management development needs assessment of college administrators at a two year institution. The method of this study included an individual interview and the administration of the Management Development Assessment Inventory. The results of the needs assessment indicated: (1) administrators desired an on-going program of professional development; (2) administrators expressed uncertainty about what their specific management development needs were due to a lack of clarity about their role responsibilities; (3) administrators indicated a strong interest in developing management skills through small group sessions and workshops; and (4) administrators expressed the greatest interest in activities oriented to leadership and management/administration.

Hammonds and Wallace (1976) assessed the staff development needs at community colleges which were located in the Northeastern region of the United States. They concluded that the most important staff development needs of administrators included improvement in
these areas: the ability to plan and direct innovation and change, goal setting, participative management, human relations, control of conflict, and the delegation of authority and responsibilities.

Staff Development Programs

The professional literature contained numerous descriptions of staff development programs which have been implemented in higher education, primarily at large universities or at community colleges.

Passons (1969) described an in-service training program for student personnel staff which was held at the University of Pennsylvania. The purpose of the program was to familiarize staff with the concept of empathic understanding. Four sessions of approximately 90 minutes were held at weekly intervals. The methods used by the program leader included lecture, discussion, and role playing. Although the program goal of improving skills in empathic understanding was deemed successful through the evaluation, Passons discovered another secondary benefit of the program. He stated:

The project provided an opportunity for meeting staff from offices other than one's own, and thus afforded interaction on the similarities and differences of specific roles and functions of the participants in the light of the overall aims of student personnel work. Perhaps working together in such programs could serve to bridge some of the communication gaps that often are found in the administration structure of student personnel divisions. Although this initially was a tangential objective, it is possible that it could assume import equal to that of the in-service training for individuals. (Passons, 1969, p. 38)

Jones (1970) described a program offered to the staffs at the Clearwater campus and the St. Petersburg campus of St. Petersburg
Junior College. The purpose of the program was to update the staff members on current issues and practices in counseling. The seminar was offered by a consultant from the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida who met with the participants three hours a week for ten weeks. During the seminar the instructional techniques of lecture, discussion, and role playing were utilized to achieve the purpose of the program.

According to Harvey, Helzer, and Young (1972), the staff retreat is a practical and effective staff development activity. They reported that the staff retreat offered experiential based learning which permitted a staff to respond to three general demands for change. These demands for change were: (1) problems of destiny--growth, identity, and revitalization; (2) problems of human satisfaction and development of students, staff, faculty, and community; and (3) problems of organizational effectiveness. Through a retreat, a staff has an opportunity to work in small teams (ten or less) to: generate data which identifies the needs for change; provide feedback data to relevant group participants; and complete action planning based upon the first two opportunities. While the retreat could vary with regard to time and location, it was important that the purpose of the retreat be clearly stated so that the staff could work toward common goals. When the staff returns to the campus, the authors suggested that the following must occur for the desired change to happen on campus:

1. Immediately upon reentry into the system each retreat participant must make the necessary contacts to initiate
that portion of the plan-of-action for which he was responsible.

2. Soon after reentry, massive efforts should be made to communicate the rationale for change to the larger system and to seek involvement and commitment from others.

3. Efforts will also be needed to gain the cooperation of the adjacent systems so as to facilitate movement toward change. (Harvey et al., 1977, p. 277)

In addition, they proposed several hints for success for any potential "in house" retreat leaders:

1. Consult with top personnel of the client organization.

2. Build goals for the retreat with the power individuals.

3. Study the dynamics of the client system.
   a. Resistances to the laboratory method.
   b. Conflicting goals.
   c. Varying purposes of subsystems.
   d. Be aware of issues that could immobilize the retreat, i.e., radical conflict, competitive powerplays, status, authority, etc.

4. Construct a tentative design and confer with organizational head for approval. The client needs to "own" as much of the design as possible.

5. Carefully build final design, considering all dynamics.

6. Finalize "contract" with client. This contractual arrangement is important as it builds and finalizes commitment for the retreat. (Harvey et al., 1972, pp. 277-278)

Meyerson (1974) reported a staff development program for student affairs staff members at the University of Nebraska. After careful examination, a staff development committee determined that student affairs staff training needs fell into four areas: (1) college interaction; (2) informational emphasis; (3) skill training; and (4)
thinking time. In response to these needs, the committee developed a student affairs mini-university. A few examples of courses offered include: a social seminar on drugs, a return to the academy, university and the law, life planning workshop, "dungeon of delight--campus residence halls," administrative technique and minority sensitivity, and successful leadership. The mini-university faculty were drawn from the student affairs staff, the regular faculty at the university, and individuals from the community. Members of the student affairs staff were encouraged to participate in up to three classes offered by the mini-university. Based on the evaluation of this program, Meyerson concluded that the program was successful.

Wanzek and Canon (1975) described several staff development activities which were sponsored for student affairs staff members by the Professional Growth Committee at Northern Illinois University. The staff development activities which were described included: a student affairs division newsletter, a mini-grant program which encouraged new program development, and a mini-course program which offered topical courses and workshops.

T. E. Richardson (1975) suggested that administrators have regular informal opportunities to train and coach staff members. He indicated that these informal opportunities present themselves in bull sessions, speaking engagements, simulations, devil's advocacy, and policy work sessions. Since the chief student affairs administrator often must "provide considerable influence on others through others" (Richardson, 1975, p. 38), he considered these informal
opportunities to coach staff an important staff development technique.

Fredrico (1975) described a staff development model for student personnel services which was developed at Lehigh County Community College in Pennsylvania. The important components of the model included: a clear statement of the program goals; the assignment of one staff member to coordinate the planning, conducting, and evaluating of the programs; released time was set aside each week during regular working hours for staff development activities; and a staff resources room was set up to house professional literature. The process of the model was guided by four questions: Where are we presently? Where do we want to go? How can we attain the goal? and How will we know when we have attained the goal? The format of the staff development model was a three hour weekly staff meeting which served as a springboard for continued informal staff discussion during daily staff interactions.

Beeler (1977a) formulated a staff development workshop for student affairs staff which focused upon the referral process. He developed a referral game which served as a stimulation to sharpen the referral skills of staff members in the student affairs division of a state university.

Beeler (1977b) described a mini-university model for professional staff development which was implemented by the division of student affairs at Eastern Michigan University. During the fall and winter semesters, non-tuition mini-u courses were offered to the student affairs staff in one to two hour blocks over a four-week period. The program was coordinated by a Professional Staff
Development (PSD) Committee and a one-quarter time Director of PSD. This was a division wide program in which all staff members were expected to participate either as a learner or an instructor. The results of the mini-us evaluation supported the continuation of the program.

Characteristics of Staff Development

The goal of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges. To achieve this goal, it was important to identify some specific characteristics of staff development which were evident in the higher education literature in order to insure that the model would have relevance to contemporary literature on the subject. Characteristics of staff development which were proposed and discussed in the higher education literature included:

1. Staff development does not just happen rather, it must be planned and encouraged (Nejedlo, 1977; Shaffer, 1967).

2. Staff development activities should occur during the regular working hours of the participants (Canon, 1977; Fredrico, 1975; Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974).

3. Staff development activities should be supported by institutional budget resources (Canon, 1977; Claxton, 1976; Fredrico, 1975; Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974).

4. Staff development activities should respond to the specific needs of the staff at a particular institution (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974; O'Banion, 1974; Wiedeman, 1976).
5. The goal of a staff development activity should be clearly stated (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Fredrico, 1975; Gross, 1963; Harvey et al., 1972).

6. Staff development activities should be related to institutional goals and priorities (Claxton, 1976; Gross, 1963; Petty, 1974; R. C. Richardson, 1975).

7. The staff development program should be the assigned responsibility of one individual (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Canon, 1977; Fredrico, 1975; Gross, 1963; O'Banion, 1974; Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972).

8. Staff members should participate in planning staff development activities (Canon, 1977; Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974; O'Banion, 1974).


10. Participation in staff development should be voluntary (Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974).

11. Staff development activities should respond to individual and institutional needs (Hammonds & Wallace, 1974; Hirschowitz, 1975; Nejedlo, 1977).

12. The staff development program should utilize a variety of educational strategies and techniques (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Hammonds & Wallace, 1974; Nejedlo, 1977; Shaffer, 1972).

13. Staff development activities should reflect the theoretical foundations of appropriate disciplines (Gross, 1963).

14. The staff development program should be supported by the top leadership at the institution (R. C. Richardson, 1975).

15. The effectiveness of staff development activities should be evaluated (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Nejedlo, 1977; O'Banion, 1974).
CHAPTER III

A STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Introduction

The goal of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges and to determine the implementation feasibility of the model. A review of the higher education literature revealed that a staff development model for student affairs administrators did not exist. In addition, various authors indicated that staff development had received little emphasis in the professional literature despite its apparent importance and relevance (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Miller, 1975; Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972; Truitt & Gross, 1970).

The remainder of this chapter is organized in eight sections: rationale for staff development, guidelines for model design, model components and characteristics, the model, development of the questionnaire, population for the study, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures.

Rationale for Staff Development

Numerous statements of rationale for staff development were found in the review of the professional literature which suggested that staff development was important for student affairs administrators.
These statements of rationale included:

1. Student affairs administrators must be able to respond to changing student needs through their own personal and professional development (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Shaffer, 1967, 1972).

2. Most student affairs administrators in the field lack adequate preparation and training for their positions (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Truitt & Gross, 1970).

3. Continued education and training is an expectation of a professional (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Truitt & Gross, 1970).

4. Continued personal and professional development can raise the morale and aspirations of student affairs administrators (Truitt & Gross, 1970).

5. Student affairs administrators must be ready to respond to changing student populations (Beeler & Penn, 1978).

6. Higher education administrators must be able to maintain the quality of services in a steady state or retrenchment fiscal environment (R. C. Richardson, 1975).

7. Student affairs administrators must become better managers (Beeler & Penn, 1978).

8. There is too little emphasis on staff development in the professional literature (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Miller, 1975; Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972; Truitt & Gross, 1970).

Guidelines for Model Design

The staff development model for student affairs administrators which was designed for this study was based upon several guidelines. These guidelines were:

1. The model was intended to be feasible for implementation at a small, private college.

2. The model was intended to be comprehensive in the scope of application.

3. The model was intended to be a systematic process.
4. The model was intended to be task oriented.
5. The model was intended to be a sequential process.
6. The model was intended to be a continuous process.

Model Components and Characteristics

The format design of the staff development model was a series of nine sequential stages. The model represented a systematic approach to staff development since each stage consisted of the following common components:

1. **Task**: This component was a short description of the task of the stage.
2. **Method**: This component was a description of the specific procedures which achieve the task.
3. **Problems & Recommendations**: This component was a description of potential problems which may occur in the stage and possible ways of solving the problems.
4. **Staff Modality**: This component was a description of the type of staff involvement in the stage.
5. **Time**: This component was a description of the time elements necessary in the stage.
6. **Budget Support**: This component was a description of the budget elements necessary in the stage.
7. **Stage Completion**: This component was a description of the final product of the completed stage.
8. **Evaluation**: This component was a description of the evaluation method for the stage.

The model was comprehensively designed to incorporate several characteristics of staff development which were extracted from the higher education literature. These characteristics included:
1. The model supported the proposition that staff development must be planned and encouraged.

2. The model supported the proposition that staff development should occur during the regular working hours of participants.

3. The model supported the proposition that staff development should be supported by institutional budget resources.

4. The model supported the proposition that staff development should respond to the specific needs of a staff at a particular institution.

5. The model supported the proposition that the goals of staff development should be clearly stated.

6. The model supported the proposition that staff development should be related to institutional goals and priorities.

7. The model supported the proposition that the implementation of staff development activities should be the assigned responsibility of one individual.

8. The model supported the proposition that staff development activities should be planned by the participants.

9. The model supported the proposition that staff development should be an ongoing process.

10. The model supported the proposition that staff development should respond to practitioner and institutional needs.

11. The model supported the proposition that the theoretical foundations of appropriate disciplines should be evident in staff development.

12. The model supported the proposition that staff development should be supported by the top leadership at the institution.

13. The model supported the proposition that the effectiveness of staff development should be evaluated.
The model did not support the proposition that participation in staff development activities should be strictly voluntary. Rather, the model supported the belief that participation in staff development activities is necessary and should be required for all staff. In addition, the model supported the proposition that staff development should be used as a prescriptive element in a performance appraisal process.

The Model

This section of this chapter is devoted to a presentation of the sequential, nine-stage staff development model. While the design of the staff development model was based upon several general guidelines and reflected numerous characteristics which were evident in the higher education literature, there were several situational variables which could not be addressed by the model beyond simple acknowledgement. These situational variables included: the specific attitudes and personalities of the student affairs staff members; the attitudes of students, faculty, and other administrators toward the student affairs program; the attitude of the president toward staff development; the relationship between the chief student affairs administrator and the other senior administrators of the institution; the internal political climate at the institution; and finally, the fiscal realities at the institution. While each of these situational variables could have ramifications on any implementation of the model, the responsibility for adapting the model to the specific climate of a particular institution must be done locally by the chief student...
affairs administrator of the institution.

**Summary of the Model**

Shown below is a summary of the nine stage staff development model which was designed for student affairs administrators at a private college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Staff Modality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1.</strong> Review literature to determine developmental needs of students.</td>
<td>Learning about developmental needs of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2.</strong> Institutional needs assessment study.</td>
<td>Learning about developmental needs of students at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3.</strong> Articulate goals of student affairs.</td>
<td>Planning intended professional goals for a specific staff position at the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4.</strong> Formulate plans to achieve goals.</td>
<td>Planning student development strategy delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5.</strong> Identify needed knowledge and skill to achieve goals.</td>
<td>Identify necessary staff knowledge &amp; skills to achieve individual staff members plans of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 6.</strong> Assess staff knowledge and skill needs and prioritize.</td>
<td>Learning individual staff knowledge and skill needs required to implement plans of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 7.</strong> Plan staff development activity addressing needs.</td>
<td>Plan staff development activity to enhance staff knowledge &amp; skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 8.</strong> Implement and evaluate staff development activity.</td>
<td>Learning knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 9.</strong> Review effectiveness of staff development activity.</td>
<td>Learning about effectiveness of staff development program and relate to student affairs goal achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The complete model is presented below in its entirety.

STAGE 1

Task: Review the professional literature to identify the developmental needs of college students.

Method: 1. Chief student affairs administrator (CSAA) identifies the primary human development theorists after consulting the staff.
         2. CSAA assigns one or more theorists to each staff member for review.
         3. Each staff member reviews and prepares a critique of his/her theorist(s).
         4. Each staff member presents his/her critique to the entire student affairs staff.

Problems (P) & Recommendations (R):

1. P: Lack of motivation by some staff members who may view time spent reading and discussing the literature as wasteful.  
   R: At the outset, the CSAA should clearly articulate the professional importance of staff familiarity with the student development literature.  CSAA should identify this general familiarity with the literature as a professional expectation.

2. P: It may be difficult to narrow the literature review to a manageable scope.  
   R: CSAA will need to make some decisions about what literature to review based largely upon his/her own philosophy of student development.

Staff Modality: Learning about developmental needs of college students.

Time: CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage.  CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

Budget Support: CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary.  CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the professional literature review critiques are presented and the developmental needs of college students are identified.
Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.

STAGE 2

Task: Assess the student development needs of the institution.

Method:
1. CSAA assigns selected staff the task of assessing the student development needs of the institution.
2. Assigned staff design a needs assessment study.
3. Assigned staff implement the needs assessment study.
4. Assigned staff report the results of the needs assessment study to the entire staff and make appropriate recommendations.

Problems & Recommendations:
1. P: A needs assessment study is a major project which would demand a significant amount of staff time and energy.
   R: CSAA should encourage the necessary time expenditure by the assigned staff to complete this project in a four week period of time.
2. P: Staff members may lack the necessary research skills to design and implement the needs assessment study.
   R: CSAA may need to provide assistance or solicit the aid of a consultant to complete the project.

Staff Modality: Learning about developmental needs of college students at the institution.

Time: CCAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CCAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

Budget Support: CCAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CCAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the results of the needs assessment study are presented to the entire staff.
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Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.

Stage Evaluation:

STAGE 3

Task: Articulate the goals of the student affairs program.

Method:
1. Each staff member formulates the goals for his/her specific area(s) of responsibilities.
2. Each staff member presents his/her goals to the CSAA.
3. CSAA and each staff member design a method which will evaluate the achievement of each student affairs program goal.
4. CSAA assumes responsibility for developing a comprehensive goal statement for the student affairs division based upon the refined goals of individual staff members.

Problems & Recommendations:
1. P: Some staff may resist the concept of goal formation by arguing that it is a waste of time. 
   R: CSAA should carefully outline the purpose and importance of staff goals and inform the staff of the due date for the goal statements.
2. P: Goal formation may become a bureaucratic end in itself. 
   R: CSAA should provide the necessary guidance to assist staff formulate realistic goals which are a foundation for action and not an end in themselves.
3. P: Presenting his/her goals to the CSAA may be threatening to some staff members. 
   R: CSAA should encourage staff members and be available as a consultant for any staff who desire individual assistance.

Staff Modality: Planning intended professional goals of a specific student affairs position.

Time: CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.
Budget Support: CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the CSAA distributes a comprehensive goal statement articulating the goals of the student affairs program.

State Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.

STAGE 4

Task: Formulate specific plans of action to achieve the goals of the student affairs program.

Method: 1. Each staff member formulates plans of action to achieve his/her goals by clarifying the following:
   a. Identify the purpose of a planned action.
   b. Identify the target population for the planned action.
   c. Identify the how, when, and where of the planned action.
   d. Identify who will implement the planned action.
   e. Identify how the planned action will be evaluated.

2. Each staff member presents his/her plans of action to the CSAA.

3. CSAA and each staff member design a method to evaluate the effectiveness of each specific plan of action.

4. CSAA assumes responsibility for developing a master schedule for the implementation of the plans of action for the student affairs division based upon the refined plans of action of individual staff members.

Problems & Recommendations: 1. P: Staff members may be unable to formulate plans of action which deviate from traditional approaches.

   R: CSAA may need to assist the staff by presenting materials and concepts of creative problem solving or utilize an outside consultant.
2. **P:** Conflict may arise concerning the priority of the various staff plans of action.

   **R:** CSAA may need to make a decision concerning the priority of the staff plans of action based upon the student affairs division goals and his/her perception of the institutional need.

3. **P:** Staff members may not understand either the importance or the concepts of program evaluation.

   **R:** CSAA may need to present materials and concepts of evaluation to the staff or use an outside consultant.

**Staff Modality:** Planning student development strategy delivery.

**Time:** CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

**Budget Support:** CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

**Stage Completion:** The stage will be completed when the CSAA distributes a master schedule for the implementation of the specific plans of action to achieve the student affairs program goals.

**Stage Evaluation:** Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reaction to the process of the completed stage.

---

**STAGE 5**

**Task:** Identify the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary for the staff to achieve their specific plans of action.

1. Each staff member identifies the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary to achieve his/her plans of action and presents them to the CSAA.

2. CSAA shares his/her perceptions of the knowledge and skills necessary in these
areas to achieve each staff member's plans of action.

3. CSAA and each staff member negotiate a prioritized list of the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary to achieve the staff member's plans of action.

Problems & Recommendations:

1. P: Identifying the nature and extent of the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve the plans of action may be difficult.

R: CSAA and staff may need to either consult a recognized expert in the field or make a calculated guess the first time.

Staff Modality: Identifying necessary staff knowledge and skills.

Time: CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

Budget Support: CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the CSAA completes a prioritized list of knowledge and skills necessary to achieve each staff member's plans of action.

Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.

STAGE 6

Task: Assess the needs of the individual student affairs staff member in the areas of knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills.

Method: 1. CSAA designs a short rating instrument to assess the needs of the staff in the areas
of clientele knowledge, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills. The instrument would be used by CSAA and the staff members to assess the staff members' needs.

2. Each staff member completes the instrument rating him/herself.
3. CSAA rates each staff member by completing the rating instrument for each staff member.
4. CSAA and each staff member discuss the results of the knowledge and skill needs assessment.
5. CSAA, in consultation with each staff member, consolidates and prioritizes a list of staff development needs for each staff member based upon the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve his/her plans of action and the results of his/her knowledge and skills need assessment.

Problems & Recommendations:
1. \( P \): CSAA may not have the skills necessary to develop a rating instrument.
   \( R \): CSAA may need to consult another staff member or a consultant.
2. \( P \): Some staff members may be very threatened by the rating process.
   \( R \): CSAA should address this issue at the outset by assuring confidentiality of the results.

Staff Modality: Learning staff knowledge and skill needs.

Time: CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

Budget Support: CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the CSAA completes a prioritized list of staff development needs for each staff member.

Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.
STAGE 7

Task: Plan a staff development activity which will address each of the top priority knowledge and skill needs of the student affairs staff.

Method:
1. CSAA: identifies the knowledge and skill needs which are common for the entire staff.
2. Entire staff: brainstorms a list of staff development activities which will address the knowledge and skill needs.
3. CSAA: outlines the resources which may be available to support the staff development activities.
4. Entire staff: plans a feasible staff development activity for each knowledge and skill need including a program effectiveness evaluation method. The evaluation method should begin in this stage with a formal description of the intended (what is planned to take place in a certain activity) program inputs—materials, leader participants, budget transactions, and other resources; intended transactions—the interaction between the leader, participants, and materials; and intended outcomes—the desired behavior change which the program should achieve (O'Banion, 1974). Desired behavior change can be classified in one and/or a combination of three categories: (1) behavior which is started; (2) behavior which is modified; and (3) behavior which is stopped. There are two types of goals which a staff development activity should achieve: (a) the immediate readiness to change behavior in the desired way and (b) the long range implementation of the desired behavior change.
5. Individual staff member: meets with the CSAA to discuss individual knowledge and skill needs which are not shared by the entire staff.
   a. CSAA and the staff member brainstorm a list of staff development activities which address his/her special knowledge and skill need(s).
   b. CSAA outlines the resources which may be available to support the individual staff members special developmental activities.
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Problems & Recommendations:

1. P: Some staff members may not be motivated to either plan or participate in the staff development activities.

R: CSAA should lead these staff members in an appropriate way which may include: (1) special encouragement; (2) engineering more responsibility for the unmotivated staff; or (3) a private confrontation where CSAA makes it clear that their participation is necessary and required.

2. P: The resources available for staff development may be too limited.

R: CSAA may need to assist staff be creative to stretch the limited resources.

R: CSAA may need to seek additional support for a specific program through the president of the institution.

3. P: Certain staff members may not perceive some of their own individual staff development needs.

R: CSAA may need to assist a staff member focus upon an individual need. He/she may need to encourage the staff member to participate in a staff development activity through an appropriate means.

Staff Modality: Planning staff development activities to enhance staff knowledge and skill.

Time: CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

Budget Support: CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the CSAA possesses a plan of feasible staff development activities which address the common and individual needs of the staff.
Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.

STAGE 8

Task: Implement and evaluate the staff development activities.

Method:
1. CSAA: plans a timing schedule for the implementation of the staff development activities which are intended for the entire staff.
2. CSAA: appoints a staff member to manage and coordinate the implementation of each staff development activity.
3. Activity coordinator: for the entire staff, implements the staff development activity according to the time schedule and utilizing the necessary available resources.
4. Activity coordinator: for the entire staff, prepares a formal description of the observed (what actually occurs) inputs, observed transactions, and observed immediate readiness outcomes. Data for this description could be collected in numerous ways including:
   a. activity coordinator rating or report
   b. participant rating or report
   c. CSAA rating or report
   d. clientele rating or report
   e. faculty/staff rating or report
   f. activity leader rating or report
5. Activity coordinator: submits the formal description of observed inputs, transactions, and outcomes to the CSAA.
6. CSAA: completes a formal description of the long range implementation outcomes by observing the implementation of the desired behavior by each staff member at a later time.
7. CSAA: directs the implementation of all special staff development activities planned for specific staff members.
8. CSAA: prepares a formal description of the observed inputs, observed transactions, and observed immediate readiness outcomes and long range implementation outcomes at a
Problems & Recommendations:

1. **P:** Some staff may not respond to the efforts of the activity coordinator to implement the staff development activity.
   
   **R:** The activity coordinator may need to consult with the CSAA to discuss any problems or to request support. The CSAA should make the authority of the activity coordinator clear to the staff in the beginning.

2. **P:** The formal description of the observed inputs, transactions, and immediate readiness outcomes may begin to slide or be overlooked.
   
   **R:** CSAA may need to prod the activity coordinator to be certain the description is completed.

3. **P:** The activity coordinator and/or the CSAA may not have the skills necessary to develop a data collection technique.
   
   **R:** The activity coordinator and/or the CSAA may need to consult another staff member or a consultant.

---

**Staff Modality:** Learning knowledge and skills.

**Time:** CSAA and staff should identify a completion date for the stage. CSAA should authorize release time from standard staff duties to complete the stage.

**Budget Support:** CSAA and staff should identify the budget support necessary. CSAA authorizes budget support levels available.

**Stage Completion:** The stage will be completed when the CSAA possesses a formal description of the observed readiness outcomes and observed long range implementation outcomes for all of the planned staff development activities.

**Stage Evaluation:** Informal: CSAA should seek informal evaluative feedback from the staff regarding their reactions to the process of the completed stage.
STAGE 9

Task: Review the effectiveness of each staff development activity.

Method: 1. CSAA reviews the effectiveness of all staff development activities by comparing the intended inputs, transactions and outcomes (Stage 7) and the observed inputs, transactions, and outcomes (Stage 8). "Comparisons of congruence between program intents and actual program outcomes identifies areas in which a program or activity may be functioning effectively or where there is a gap between what was planned and actually occurred" (O'Banion, 1974, p. 60). This review should include the activities for the entire staff as well as special activities offered to specific staff members.

2. CSAA uses the results of the staff development effectiveness review to determine if the original goals (Stage 3) of the student affairs program were achieved and for future planning.

Problems & Recommendations: 1. P: The results of the review may not be used in any significant way.

R: CSAA may need to insure that the results are used either to revise current plans or are used in future planning.

Staff Modality: Learning whether knowledge and skill delivery was successful.

Time: CSAA should identify a completion date for the stage and arrange his/her schedule accordingly.

Budget Support: Not applicable in this stage.

Stage Completion: The stage will be completed when the CSAA has reviewed the evaluation results for all of the planned staff development activities.

Stage Evaluation: Informal: CSAA should note his/her administrative judgments of the review process for future reference.
Development of the Questionnaire

To determine the implementation feasibility of the staff development model in student affairs units at private colleges, it was necessary to develop a questionnaire which could be administered to chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges. A questionnaire which was entitled Student Affairs Staff Development Survey was developed. The construction of the questionnaire was based upon the tasks and methods of the nine-stage staff development model. The specific purposes of the survey were:

1. To determine whether the completion of the task in each stage of the model was perceived as feasible by chief student affairs administrators.

2. To determine whether the methods to accomplish the task in each stage of the model were perceived as desirable by the chief student affairs administrator.

3. To determine whether the task in each stage of the model had been completed at each institution since the 1975-76 academic year.

The questionnaire contained yes/no questions. Each question was related directly to the purposes of the survey. The questionnaire was constructed to elicit the desired information from the respondents in a direct and straightforward manner.

Population for the Study

The population which was used in this investigation consisted of the chief student affairs administrators at the 12 member institutions of the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) and the 13 member institutions of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM). The GLCA
Institutions included: Albion, Antioch, Denison, DePauw, Earlham, Hope, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Wabash, and Wooster. The ACM institutions included: Beloit, Carlton, Coe, Colorado, Cornell, Grinnell, Knox, Lake Forest, Lawrence, Macalester, Monmouth, Ripon, and St. Olaf. To achieve the purposes of this investigation, the Student Affairs Staff Development Survey was mailed to the chief student affairs administrator at each GLCA/ACM institution.

Data Collection Procedure

A cover letter (see Appendix B) which explained the purpose of the study and the questionnaire were mailed to each GLCA/ACM chief student affairs administrator on March 18, 1979. A self-addressed, stamped return envelope was included with each letter and questionnaire to encourage a prompt response. A follow-up telephone call was made on March 28, 1979, to each chief student affairs administrator who failed to respond to the initial letter. A follow-up letter (see Appendix B), along with another questionnaire and return envelope, was mailed on April 18, 1979, to all chief student affairs administrators who failed to respond to the telephone call.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data collected in this study were analyzed by frequency counts, percentages, and by logical analysis.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The problem of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges and to determine the implementation feasibility of the model. A questionnaire, entitled Student Affairs Staff Development Survey, was developed and administered to chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges in the Midwest. The goals of the survey were three-fold: (1) to determine whether the completion of the task in each stage of the model was perceived as feasible by the chief student affairs administrator; (2) to determine whether the methods to accomplish the task in each stage of the model were perceived as desirable by the chief student affairs administrator; and (3) to determine whether the task in each stage of the model had been completed at each institution since the 1975-76 academic year.

Analysis of the Data

The questionnaire was mailed to 25 chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges in the Midwest. Usable questionnaires were returned by 22 chief student affairs administrators.
which represented an 88% return rate.

The responses to each item on the questionnaire were tallied and are presented, by stage, in the following display so that the frequencies (f) and percentages (%) of the responses are indicated. All response items left blank by the respondents are reported as a "NO" response as well as a "NO Response." The data obtained from the questionnaire were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Review the professional literature to identify the developmental needs of college students...feasible?</td>
<td>18  81.8</td>
<td>4  18.2</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Would you employ the following methods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify the theorists to be reviewed after consulting the staff</td>
<td>14  63.6</td>
<td>8  36.4</td>
<td>6  27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assign theorists to be reviewed to each member of your staff.</td>
<td>9   40.9</td>
<td>13  59.1</td>
<td>6  27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have each staff member prepare a critique of the theorist reviewed.</td>
<td>8   36.4</td>
<td>14  63.6</td>
<td>6  27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have each staff member present a critique to your entire staff.</td>
<td>14  63.6</td>
<td>8   36.4</td>
<td>5   22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?</td>
<td>11  50</td>
<td>11  50</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stage 2                                                                       |     |    |             |
| A. Assess the student development needs of the institution...feasible?        | 21  95.5 | 1   4.5 | 0  0        |
| B. Would you employ the following methods:                                   |     |    |             |
| 1. Assign selected staff the task of designing and implementing a student needs assessment study. | 17  77.3 | 5   22.7 | 1   4.5     |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Have the selected staff report the results of the needs assessment study to your entire staff.</td>
<td>15 68.2</td>
<td>7  31.8</td>
<td>3  13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?</td>
<td>14 63.6</td>
<td>8  36.4</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 3**

A. Articulate the goals of the student affairs program... feasible? | 22 100 | 0  0 | 0  0 |

B. Would you employ the following methods:

1. Have each staff member formulate goals for his/her area of responsibility. | 20 90.9 | 2  9.1 | 0  0 |
2. Have each staff member present his/her goals to you. | 19 86.4 | 3 13.6 | 0  0 |
3. Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each goal. | 12 54.5 | 10 45.5 | 0  4.5 |
4. Develop a comprehensive goal statement for the student affairs division based upon each staff member's goals. | 18 81.8 | 4 18.2 | 1  4.5 |

C. Have A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year? | 12 54.5 | 10 45.5 | 0  0 |

**Stage 4**

A. Formulate specific plans of action to achieve the goals of the student affairs program... feasible? | 21 95.5 | 1  4.5 | 0  0 |

B. Would you employ the following methods:

1. Have each staff member formulate plans of action to achieve his/her goals. | 17 77.3 | 5 22.7 | 2  9.1 |
2. Have each staff member present his/her plans of action to you. | 16 72.7 | 6 27.3 | 1  4.5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each plan of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop a master schedule for the implementation of the plans of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 5**

A. Identify the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary for the staff to achieve their specific plans of action...feasible?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>6 27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Would you employ the following methods:  

1. Have each staff member identify the knowledge and skill necessary to achieve his/her plans of action.  
2. Share your perceptions of the necessary knowledge and skill with each staff member.  
3. Negotiate with each staff member a prioritized list of the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve his/her plans of action.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>11 50</td>
<td>8 36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 59.1</td>
<td>9 40.9</td>
<td>7 31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 40.9</td>
<td>13 59.1</td>
<td>8 36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 6**

A. Assess the needs of the individual student affairs staff member in the areas of knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills...feasible?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 68.2</td>
<td>7 31.8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Item | Yes | No | No
--- | --- | --- | ---
B. Would you employ the following methods:
1. Design a short rating instrument to assess the knowledge and skill needs of each staff member. | 8 36.4 | 14 63.4 | 9 40.9
2. Have each staff member complete the rating instrument for him/herself. | 8 36.4 | 14 63.4 | 10 45.5
3. Complete the rating instrument for each staff member. | 8 36.4 | 14 63.4 | 9 40.9
4. Discuss the results of the knowledge and skill needs assessment with each staff member. | 8 36.4 | 14 63.4 | 10 45.5
5. Develop a prioritized list of knowledge and skill needs for each staff member. | 9 40.9 | 13 59.1 | 8 36.4
C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year? | 3 13.6 | 19 86.4 | 1 4.5

Stage 7

A. Plan a staff development activity which will address each of the top priority knowledge and skill needs of the student affairs staff... feasible? | 15 68.2 | 7 31.8 | 0 0
B. Would you employ the following methods.
1. Identify the knowledge and skill needs common to the entire staff. | 12 54.5 | 10 45.5 | 9 40.9
2. Have the entire staff brainstorm a list of staff development activities which would address the knowledge and skill needs. | 15 68.2 | 7 31.8 | 7 31.8
3. Outline for the staff the resources available to support staff development activities. | 13 59.1 | 9 40.9 | 7 31.8
4. Have your staff plan a feasible staff development activity which specifies the desired behavior change which the activity should achieve. | 9 40.9 | 13 59.1 | 9 40.9
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5. Meet with an individual staff member to assist him/her plan a feasible staff development activity which would address his/her individual needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 8

A. Implement and evaluate the staff development activities... feasible?

B. Would you employ the following methods:
   1. Plan a timing schedule for the implementation of the staff development activities.
   2. Have a staff member coordinate the implementation of each staff development activity.
   3. Have the staff coordinator prepare and submit to you a description of his/her observations concerning the immediate outcomes of the activity.
   4. Complete, at a later time, a description of your own observations concerning the long range outcomes of the activity.

C. Has A been completed since the 1975-76 academic year?

Stage 9

A. Review the effectiveness of each staff development activity... feasible?

B. Would you employ the following methods:
   1. Compare the intended outcomes and the observed outcomes of the staff development activity.
In the analysis of data which follows, the task feasibility, method desirability, and task completion aspects of the questionnaire are presented. In the discussion of the data, a greater than 50% Yes response was reported as positive support for the response item while a 50% or greater No response was reported as a rejection of the response item.

**Analysis of Task Feasibility**

The purpose of each stage of the staff development model was the completion of a specific task. The respondents to the questionnaire perceived that the task was feasible in each of the nine stages of the model. The data related to task feasibility were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Positive Support</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review the professional literature to identify the developmental needs of college students.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assess the student development needs of the institution.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Articulate the goals of the student affairs program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Formulate specific plans of action to achieve the goals of the student affairs program.

5. Identify the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary for the staff to achieve their specific plans of action.

6. Assess the needs of the individual student affairs staff members in the areas of knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills.

7. Plan a staff development activity which will address each of the top priority knowledge and skill needs of the student affairs staff.

8. Implement and evaluate the staff development activities.

9. Review the effectiveness of each staff development activity.

### Analysis of Method Desirability

The model suggested specific methods which the chief student affairs administrator could employ to achieve the task in each stage. For the 33 methods included in the model, the respondents to the questionnaire reported positive support for the employment of 19 methods and rejected the employment of 14 methods. The data related to method desirability were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Positive Support</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Identify the theorists to be reviewed after consulting the staff.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Positive Support</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assign theorists to be reviewed to each member of your staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Have each staff member prepare a critique of the theorist reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Have each staff member present a critique to your entire staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1.</td>
<td>Assign selected staff the task of designing and implementing a student needs assessment study.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Have the selected staff report the results of the needs assessment study to your entire staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1.</td>
<td>Have each staff member formulate goals for his/her area of responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Have each staff member present his/her goals to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive goal statement for the student affairs division based upon each staff member's goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1.</td>
<td>Have each staff member formulate plans of action to achieve his/her goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Have each staff member present his/her plans of action to you.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each plan of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Develop a master schedule for the implementation of the plans of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1.</td>
<td>Have each staff member identify the knowledge and skill necessary to achieve his/her plans of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Share your perceptions of the necessary knowledge and skill with each staff member.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Positive Support</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negotiate with each staff member a prioritized list of the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve his/her plans of action.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1. Design a short rating instrument to assess the knowledge and skill needs of each staff member.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have each staff member complete the rating instrument for him/herself.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Complete the rating instrument for each staff member.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Discuss the results of the knowledge and skill needs assessment with each staff member.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Develop a prioritized list of knowledge and skill needs for each staff member.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1. Identify the knowledge and skill needs common to the entire staff.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have the entire staff brainstorm a list of staff development activities which would address the knowledge and skill needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Outline for the staff the resources available to support staff development activities.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Have your staff plan a feasible staff development activity which specifies the desired behavior change which the activity should achieve.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Meet with an individual staff member to assist him/her plan a feasible staff development activity which would address his/her individual needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1. Plan a timing schedule for the implementation of the staff development activities.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have a staff member coordinate the implementation of each staff development activity.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Have the staff coordinator prepare and submit to you a description of his/her observations concerning the immediate outcomes of the activity.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Complete, at a later time, a description of your own observations concerning the long range outcomes of the activity.  

9 1. Compare the intended outcomes and the observed outcomes of the staff development activity.  
2. Use the results of this staff development effectiveness review for future planning.

**Analysis of Task Completion**

The respondents to the questionnaire reported that the task had been completed in two stages and had not been completed in seven stages since the 1975-76 academic year. The data related to task completion since the 1975-76 academic year were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Not Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review the professional literature to identify the developmental needs of college students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assess the student development needs of the institution.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Articulate the goals of the student affairs program.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formulate specific plans of action to achieve the goals of the student affairs program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary for the staff to achieve their specific plans of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess the needs of the individual student affairs staff member in the areas of knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Plan a staff development activity which will address each of the top priority knowledge and skill needs of the student affairs staff.

8 Implement and evaluate the staff development activities.

9 Review the effectiveness of each staff development activity.

Completed  Not Completed
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review of the Study

The problem of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges and to determine the implementation feasibility of the model. The study included a review of the literature on staff development philosophies and programs for administrators in higher education. The model was designed by integrating the major characteristics of staff development programs reported in the professional literature with the perceptions of the investigator.

The format design of the staff development model was a series of nine sequential stages which are task oriented. The model represented a systematic and comprehensive approach to staff development since each stage included descriptions of the following common components: (1) the task of the stage; (2) specific methods to complete the task; (3) potential problems which may occur in the stage and possible solutions to the problems; (4) the type of staff involvement in the stage; (5) the time elements necessary in the stage; (6) the budget elements necessary in the stage; (7) the final product of the completed stage; and (8) the evaluation method for the stage.
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An essential component of the study was to determine whether the implementation of the staff development model was feasible in student affairs units at private colleges. A questionnaire, the Student Affairs Staff Development Survey, was developed and administered to chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges in the Midwest. The purposes of the survey were threefold: (1) to determine whether the completion of the task in each stage of the model was perceived as feasible by the chief student affairs administrator; (2) to determine whether the methods to accomplish the task in each stage of the model was perceived as desirable by the chief student affairs administrator; and (3) to determine whether the task in each stage of the model had been completed at each institution since the 1975-76 academic year. A positive response was anticipated from the respondents concerning the perceived feasibility of the tasks in each stage of the model and a negative response was anticipated from the respondents concerning task completion in most stages of the model. A positive response was anticipated from the respondents concerning the methods in each stage of the model.

Summary of the Findings

The chief student affairs administrators who responded to the Student Affairs Staff Development Survey perceived that the task was feasible in all nine stages of the model. The respondents reported that the task had been completed for only two stages in the model.
In each stage of the model, specific methods to achieve the task of the stage were outlined. The respondents to the questionnaire reported positive support for the employment of 19 methods but rejected the employment of 14 methods. A further examination of the data related to the methods outlined in the model was undertaken.

The data were reexamined in an effort to determine why there was such a large number of negatively rated methods on the questionnaire. Two possibilities were formulated as plausible explanations for this outcome. The first possibility was that the respondents would prefer to use different methods than those suggested in the model. The second possibility was that the respondents would prefer to use neither the suggested methods nor alternative methods of their own design to achieve certain tasks in the model. Clearly, either of these two possibilities could be operating to explain the negative responses to 14 of the methods in the model.

Additional scrutiny of the data revealed that many negative responses to methods were concentrated in stages 5 (Identify needed knowledge and skill to achieve goals), 6 (Assess staff knowledge and skill needs and prioritize), and 8 (Implement and evaluate staff development activity) of the model. This finding suggested
that a commonality might exist between the various methods in those stages which might elicit a negative response from the respondents. Each method description in the model was reviewed to determine (a) what action was supposed to occur and (b) who was suppose to take the action. The result of this review was the development of a two dimensional grid in which each method was plotted under one of three administrative functions on one axis and under one of two types of authority on the other axis. The administrative functions which were inherent in the model and represented on one axis of the grid were: (1) planning, (2) implementation, and (3) evaluation. The authority types which were inherent in the model and represented on the other axis of the grid were: (1) authority delegated to the staff by the chief student affairs administrator and (2) authority retained by the chief student affairs administrator. Each method was plotted in this function-by-authority grid and the type of support reported by respondents was recorded. Since the anticipated response from the respondents was positive support for each method, plotting the methods on the grid provided an opportunity to analyze the method related results. Table 5.1 shows the function-by-authority grid.

The administrative function of planning was composed of 15 methods. The respondents reported positive support for the employment of 12 methods and rejected the employment of 3 methods. There were 6 methods of the 15 in the delegated authority cell and the respondents reported positive support for 5 of these methods. There were nine methods in the retained authority cell and the respondents reported
### TABLE I

Two Dimensional Grid of the Methods Outlined in the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Authority Functions</th>
<th>Planning Stage-Method (+)</th>
<th>Implementation Stage-Method (+)</th>
<th>Evaluation Stage-Method (+)</th>
<th>Totals Methods (+) (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegated Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 x</td>
<td>1 2 x</td>
<td>4 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 x</td>
<td>1 3 x</td>
<td>4 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1 x</td>
<td>1 4 x</td>
<td>5 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 x</td>
<td>2 1 x</td>
<td>6 2 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2 x</td>
<td>2 2 x</td>
<td>8 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 4 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retained Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 2 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 4 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 5 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 3 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 4 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 5 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>(+) 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A positive sign (+) means the method was judged desirable.
2. A negative sign (-) means the method was rejected.
positive support for 7 of these methods. These results suggested that the respondents were generally positively supportive of the planning function and were not averse to either delegating or retaining the authority to plan.

The administrative function of implementation was composed of 6 methods. The respondents reported positive support for the employment of 3 methods and rejected the employment of 3 methods. All six methods were in the delegated authority cell. These results suggested that the respondents had some uncertainty about either the implementation function itself or the delegation of authority for the implementation function. The nature of the data precluded a more definitive interpretation.

The administrative function of evaluation was composed of 12 methods. The respondents reported positive support for the employment of 4 methods but rejected the employment of 8 methods. Of the 12 methods, 5 methods were in the delegated authority cell and only one of those methods received the positive support of the respondents. Seven of the 12 methods were in the retained authority cell and the respondents reported positive support for 3 of them. Although the data in the retained authority cell was slightly more positive than the data in the delegated authority cell, rejection of the methods related to the evaluation function was dominate in both cells. Therefore, the concentration of negative responses was not related to authority and appeared to be related to evaluation functions. Consequently, the fact that most of the evaluation methods were from stages 5 (Identify needed knowledge and skill to achieve goals),
6 (Assess staff knowledge and skill needs and prioritize), and 8 (Implement and evaluate staff development activity) in the model appears to explain the negative concentration in these stages. The results suggested that the respondents rejected the evaluation function although the literature reviewed indicated that evaluation is an important aspect of any staff development program (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Nejedlo, 1977; O'Banion, 1974). The nature of the data collected for this study precluded examining "Why" the respondents rejected evaluation.

The function of delegating authority was composed of 17 methods. The respondents reported positive support for the employment of 9 methods and rejected the employment of 8 methods. While these results suggested some hesitation in delegating authority, it should be noted that the evaluation cell accounted for one-half of the total rejection responses.

The function of retaining authority was composed of 16 methods. The respondents reported positive support for the employment of 10 methods and rejected the employment of 6 methods. While these results suggested moderate support for retaining authority, it should be noted that the evaluation cell accounted for two-thirds of the total rejection response.

Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this study was to design a staff development model for student affairs administrators at private colleges and to
determine the implementation feasibility of the model. The model was
designed on the basis of the findings of a literature review and the
perceptions of the investigator. A questionnaire was developed and
administered to chief student affairs administrators at selected
private colleges in the Midwest.

The results of the survey verified that the completion of the
task in each of the nine stages of the model was perceived feasible
by the respondents. The respondents to the questionnaire reported
positive support for the employment of 19 methods outlined in the
model and rejected the employment of 14 methods suggested in the model.
The respondents reported that the task had been completed in only two
stages of the model since the 1975-76 academic year.

Since the method related results of the questionnaire showed
a pattern of negative method ratings, a more comprehensive analysis
of the methods data was completed. The results of this analysis
suggested that the respondents were averse to methods in the model
which were related to the evaluation function. Although this suppo­
sition could not be proven conclusively by the data, the possibility of
a relationship between the methods related to evaluation and the
rejection responses by the respondents was a significant finding. If
ture, this relationship would explain why response to the methodology
of the model seemed to be less positive than was anticipated.

Recommendations for Further Study

The results of this study revealed two specific issues which
warrant further investigation. First, the professional literature indicated that the effectiveness of staff development activities should be evaluated (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Gross, 1963; Nejedlo, 1977; O'Banion, 1974). Since the results of this study suggested that chief student affairs administrators at selected private colleges were resistant to the evaluation aspects of the model, a comprehensive investigation which examines "why" evaluation techniques were rejected should be completed.

Second, the professional literature indicated that staff development should be an ongoing process for administrators (Beeler & Penn, 1978; Canon, 1977; Claxton, 1976; Gross, 1963; Nejedlo, 1977; R. C. Richardson, 1975; Shaffer, 1967; Stamatakos & Oliaro, 1972). The model designed in this study represents a systematic and continuous approach to staff development for student affairs administrators which involves the completion of specific tasks. Since the task in each stage of the model was judged to be feasible by chief student affairs administrators, the model appears to be feasible for implementation. Recognizing that the methodology of the model may need local modification, a case study of the actual implementation of the model in a student affairs unit at a private college should be undertaken.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTATION
A STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL
FOR A PRIVATE COLLEGE

Bart Merkle, Kalamazoo College

Shown below is a summary of a nine stage staff development model for a student affairs division of a private college. Please review the model and use it as a reference as you complete the attached survey.

| Stage 1. Review literature to determine developmental needs of students. | Learning about developmental needs of students. |
| Stage 2. Institutional needs assessment study. | Learning about developmental needs of students at your institution. |
| Stage 3. Articulate goals of student affairs. | Planning intended professional goals for a specific staff position at your institution. |
| Stage 4. Formulate plans to achieve goals. | Planning student development strategy delivery. |
| Stage 5. Identify needed knowledge and skill to achieve goals. | Identify necessary staff knowledge & skills to achieve individual staff members' plans of action. |
| Stage 6. Assess staff knowledge and skill needs and prioritize. | Learning individual staff knowledge and skill needs required to implement plans of action. |
| Stage 7. Plan staff development activity addressing needs. | Plan staff development activity to enhance staff knowledge & skill. |
| Stage 8. Implement and evaluate staff development activity. | Learning knowledge and skills. |
| Stage 9. Review effectiveness of staff development activity. | Learning about effectiveness of staff development program and relate to student affairs goal achievement. |
STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Bart Merkle, Kalamazoo College

Directions: Please respond to each of the following questions which are related to the enclosed summary of a nine stage student affairs staff development model. Response items under A & B of each stage are to determine your judgment of the feasibility of the described activities. The response item under C of each stage is to determine whether you and your staff have engaged in the described activity since the 1975-76 academic year. Please respond to each question under A & C for every stage and respond to the questions under B if appropriate.

Stage 1

A. Review the professional literature to identify the developmental needs of college students. Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to accomplish the review of literature:
   1. Identify the theorists to be reviewed after consulting with your staff? Yes No
   2. Assign theorists to be reviewed to each member of your staff? Yes No
   3. Have each staff member prepare a critique of the theorist reviewed? Yes No
   4. Have each staff member present a critique to your entire staff? Yes No

C. Have you and/or your staff completed a review of literature to determine the developmental needs of contemporary students since the 1975-76 academic year? Yes No

Stage 2

A. Assess the student development needs of the institution. Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to assess the needs of students at your institutions:
   1. Assign selected staff the task of designing and implementing a student needs assessment study? Yes No
   2. Have the selected staff report the results of the needs assessment study to your entire staff? Yes No
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C. Has a student needs assessment study been completed at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year?  Yes  No

Stage 3

A. Articulate the goals of the student affairs program.  
   Is this task feasible?  Yes  No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to articulate the goals of the student affairs program:
   1. Have each staff member formulate goals for his/her area of responsibility?  Yes  No
   2. Have each staff member present his/her goals to you?  Yes  No
   3. Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each goal?  Yes  No
   4. Develop a comprehensive goal statement for the student affairs division based upon each staff member's goals?  Yes  No

C. Has a comprehensive goal statement for the student affairs division been completed at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year?  Yes  No

Stage 4

A. Formulate specific plans of action to achieve the goals of the student affairs program.  
   Is this task feasible?  Yes  No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to formulate plans to achieve goals:
   1. Have each staff member formulate plans of action to achieve his/her goals?  Yes  No
   2. Have each staff member present his/her plans of action to you?  Yes  No
   3. Have each staff member design an evaluation method for each plan of action?  Yes  No
   4. Develop a master schedule for the implementation of the plans of action?  Yes  No

C. Has a master schedule for the implementation of staff plans of action been completed at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year?  Yes  No
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Stage 5

A. Identify the knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills necessary for the staff to achieve their specific plans of action.
   Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to identify needed knowledge and skill to achieve plans of action:
   1. Have each staff member identify the knowledge and skill necessary to achieve his/her plans of action? Yes No
   2. Share your perceptions of the necessary knowledge and skill with each staff member? Yes No
   3. Negotiate with each staff member a prioritized list of the knowledge and skills necessary to achieve his/her plans of action? Yes No

C. Have the knowledge and skills necessary for staff to achieve specific plans of action been identified at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year? Yes No

Stage 6

A. Assess the needs of the individual student affairs staff member in the areas of knowledge of clientele, student development strategy skills, and administrative skills.
   Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to identify the knowledge and skill needs of your staff:
   1. Design a short rating instrument to assess the knowledge and skill needs of each staff member? Yes No
   2. Have each staff member complete the rating instrument for him/herself? Yes No
   3. Complete the rating instrument for each staff member? Yes No
   4. Discuss the results of the knowledge and skill needs assessment with each staff member? Yes No
   5. Develop a prioritized list of knowledge and skill needs for each staff member? Yes No

C. Has a staff knowledge and skill needs assessment been completed at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year? Yes No
Stage 7

A. Plan a staff development activity which will address each of the top priority knowledge and skill needs of the student affairs staff.
   Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to plan staff development activities which would address the knowledge and skill needs of staff:
   1. Identify the knowledge and skill needs common to the entire staff? Yes No
   2. Have the entire staff brainstorm a list of staff development activities which would address the knowledge and skill needs? Yes No
   3. Outline for the staff the resources available to support staff development activities? Yes No
   4. Have your staff plan a feasible staff development activity which specifies the desired behavior change which the activity should achieve? Yes No
   5. Meet with an individual staff member to assist him/her plan a feasible staff development activity which would address his/her individual needs? Yes No

C. Have staff development activities which address the knowledge and skill needs of staff been planned regularly at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year? Yes No

Stage 8

A. Implement and evaluate the staff development activities,
   Is this task feasible? Yes No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to implement and evaluate staff development activities:
   1. Plan a timing schedule for the implementation of the staff development activities? Yes No
   2. Have a staff member coordinate the implementation of each staff development activity? Yes No
   3. Have the staff coordinator prepare and submit to you a description of his/her observations concerning the immediate outcomes of the activity? Yes No
   4. Complete, at a later time, a description of your own observations concerning the long range outcomes of the activity? Yes No
C. Have staff development activities been implemented and evaluated regularly at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year?  
Yes  No

Stage 9

A. Review the effectiveness of each staff development activity?  
   Is this task feasible?  Yes  No

B. If your answer is yes in A, would you employ the following methods to review the effectiveness of staff development activities:
   1. Compare the intended outcomes and the observed outcomes of the staff development activity?  Yes  No
   2. Use the results of this staff development effectiveness review for future planning?  Yes  No

C. Have you regularly completed an effectiveness review of staff development activities at your institution since the 1975-76 academic year?  Yes  No
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APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATIONS

Cover letter
Reminder letter
March 18, 1979

Dear Chief Student Affairs Administrator:

I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation research on the topic of staff development. The purpose of this dissertation was to construct a staff development model for student affairs administrators at GLCA/ACM type institutions and to determine the implementation feasibility of the model. As a result of this work, a nine stage staff development model has been constructed. A summary outline of this model is included with this letter for your review.

The specific purpose of this letter is to ask you to complete the enclosed Student Affairs Staff Development Survey. Please use the summary outline of the model as a reference. Completion of this questionnaire will involve only a few minutes of your time since all questions are the yes/no type. Your responses will enable me to determine whether the implementation of this model is judged to be feasible by the GLCA/ACM chief student affairs administrators. It is important for you to understand that the primary purpose of this survey is to examine the implementation feasibility of the staff development model which I constructed and not to scrutinize the staff development activities at your institution.

Since the population for this feasibility study is limited to the chief student affairs administrators at the GLCA/ACM institutions, the completion and return of your questionnaire is extremely important. Enclosed with the questionnaire is a stamped, return envelope for your convenience. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your prompt consideration. I am looking forward to seeing you in Washington in April.

Cordially,

Bart Merkle

BM:bav

Enclosure
April 18, 1979

Dear Chief Student Affairs Administrator:

Help!! This is a follow-up to my recent letter and telephone call. I am in the "home stretch" of collecting data for a part of my dissertation research in the area of staff development at a GLCA/ACM type institution. The purpose of this letter is to ask you to complete the enclosed questionnaire. I have enclosed a stamped return envelope for your convenience. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

Since the population for this part of my research is limited to the chief student affairs administrators in the GLCA/ACM, your completed questionnaire is essential for the successful completion of this research. To date, I have received a completed questionnaire from twenty of the twenty-five GLCA/ACM institutions. I hope that you will assist me in this research venture.

Thank you for your prompt consideration.

Cordially,

Bart Merkle

BM:bav

Enclosure