

A SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND NEEDS
FOR STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL STAFF
IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

By

ELIZABETH JEANETTE MURRAY

Bachelor of Science

Central State University

Edmond, Oklahoma

1980

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1982

Thesis
1982
M9823
cop. 2



A SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND NEEDS
FOR STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL STAFF
IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

Hayne B. James

Thesis Adviser

W. Ben Smith

[Signature]

Norman N. Duncan

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express gratitude to all who have helped to make this study possible. More than the usual gratitude is expressed to Dr. Wayne James, major adviser. Without her continuous support and sense of good judgment this study would not have been possible. Thanks to the members of my committee, Dr. Deke Johnson, and Dr. H. Gene Smith, for their time and expert critiques.

My gratitude also extends to many others: for ideas, inspiration, and motivation, Dr. Lewis Irving and Dr. Alberta Goodman; for enthusiasm, understanding, support, and encouragement, my family and special friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Reason for Staff Development	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Problem of the Study	3
Need for the Study	3
Objectives of the Study.	4
Scope and Limitations.	4
Assumptions.	5
Definition of Terms.	5
Organization of the Study.	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	7
Need for Staff Development Programs.	7
Definition and Goals of the Community-Junior College.	8
New Role of the Student Personnel Worker in the Community-Junior College	11
Review of Staff Development: Past, Present and Future	13
Organization of Staff Development Programs	18
Assessment.	18
Design and Development.	20
Implementation.	21
Evaluation.	22
Summary.	23
III. METHODOLOGY	25
Population and Sample.	25
Data-Gathering Instrument.	26
Administration of the Instrument	26
Summary.	26
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS.	28
Response Rate.	28
Institutional Characteristics.	29
Program Characteristics.	31
Evaluation	31
Staff Development Topics for Student Services Personnel	37

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
Summary.	56
Institutional Characteristics	57
Program Characteristics	57
Evaluation.	58
Conclusions.	59
Further Practice	60
Further Research	61
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	62
APPENDICES	65
APPENDIX A - INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED.	66
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE.	70
APPENDIX C - COVER LETTER	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Frequency and Percent of Responses to Institutional Characteristics	30
II. Frequency and Percent of Responses to Program Characteristics	32
III. Frequency and Percent of Responses to Evaluation.	33
IV. Responses to Knowledge of Students Attending Community Colleges by Student Personnel Services	37
V. Responses to Questions Related to Knowledge of Multi-purposes of the Community College by Student Services Personnel	39
VI. Responses to Question Concerning Open-door Philosophy by Student Services Personnel	40
VII. Responses to Question Concerning Supervision Skills by Student Services Personnel	41
VIII. Responses to Question Concerning Participative Management Skills by Student Services Personnel.	42
XI. Responses to Question Relating to Change by Student Services Personnel.	43
X. Responses to Question Concerning Goal Setting Process by Student Services Personnel.	43
XI. Responses to Question Concerning Staff's Ability to Deal with Conflict and Stress by Student Services Personnel	44
XII. Responses to Question Relating to Human Relations Skills	45
XIII. Responses to Questions Relating to Communication Skills	46

XIV.	Responses to Question Concerning Delegating Authority and Responsibility by Student Services Personnel	47
XV.	Responses to Questions Relating to Proper Use and Collection of Data	47
XVI.	Responses to Questions Dealing with Budget by Student Services Personnel	48
XVII.	Responses to Question Relating to Staff's Ability to Effectively Manage Time	49
XVIII.	Responses to Question Concerning Planning Short and Long-Range by Student Services Personnel	50
XIX.	Responses to Questions Concerning Staff's Abilities to Work Effectively with Faculty by Student Services Personnel	50
XX.	Responses to Question Concerning Clerical Skills by Student Services Personnel	51
XXI.	Responses to Questions Relating to Creating Positive Image of the Student Personnel Office by Student Services Personnel	52
XXII.	Responses to Questions Relating to Teamwork by Student Services Personnel.	53
XXIII.	Responses to Questions Relating to Student Personnel Staff's Knowledge of Federal and State Regulations by Student Personnel Services.	54
XXIV.	Responses to Questions Relating to Training, Retraining, Cross-training by Student Services Personnel	54

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A community college is designed to facilitate that life long process we call education. We train, we counsel, we provide for discussion, we test, we aid in the development of the arts and sciences. But, in each case, our prime responsibility is to satisfy a specific human need. . . the individual need to reach the highest possible level of personal achievement (Hoffland, 1976, p. 20).

This study was prompted for two reasons. The first was the difficulty of the responsibility of student personnel staff in meeting the diverse needs of the student body of the community and junior colleges in the 1980's. The second reason was twofold: a) the changing job market has lowered considerably the number of new professionals coming into the student personnel field, and b) the high turn-over and attrition rate in classified positions. At the same time these changes are taking place, the profession is charged with refinement of a series of services designed to meet student needs.

The implication for administrative staff in higher education is that the period of creation of new jobs is acknowledged to be over and that many of the same people in jobs now will be in the system in the next ten years. They will get older and the previous opportunities for promotion may not be readily available. Compared with the 1970's the problem will be less how to keep staff up-to-date than how to keep them interested, alert and not frustrated (Rhodes, 1980). An influx of new

staff members can no longer be counted on as a primary source of valuable ideas and fresh insights into emerging issues and trends. Classified staff have a need to improve interpersonal skills and also have training needs.

At the same time the student personnel profession faces these staffing needs, it also has begun to provide opportunities for the full development of human potential of the constituency it serves. The model student personnel worker must not only be committed to positive human development, he/she must also possess the skills and the expertise that will enable him/her to implement programs for the realization of human potential. Present services and functions within student personnel offices would not be disregarded. These are needed because they serve students in important ways. The emphasis of the program would be different. The program would be focused on positive change in student behavior rather than on the efficient functioning of services.

Staff development encompasses all those systematic efforts designed to aid staff members in improving their ability to function personally and professionally (Rhodes, 1980). Staff development is a logical extension of the community college goal of commitment to improved learning for students and to provide a climate in which that learning can best take place; therefore, one hopes that staff development leads to improved student development (O'Banion, 1978).

If the community-junior college is to grow in quality as it has in quantity; if the needs of minority groups are to be met; if the undereducated are to have a second chance; if the needs of business, industry, and government are to be provided for; if communities are to be given opportunities for renewal and rehabilitation; and if all human beings are to be given opportunities to explore, extend, and experience their hopes and dreams; then it is

imperative that immediate and considerable attention be given to the educational needs of those who staff democracy's college (O'Banion, 1971, p.15).

If the staff fails, the college fails. And if this college fails, this democracy will be obligated to produce other institutions to accomplish the proper work of the community-junior college (O'Banion, 1971).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was twofold: 1) to determine the extent to which formal and informal staff development programs exist in public two-year colleges in the southwest region of the United States and 2) to assess specific needs for such programs for student personnel non-teaching professional and classified staff.

Problem of the Study

The specific problem of the study was the lack of comprehensive information concerning both staff development programs and needs of student personnel staff.

Need for the Study

The need for this study was to identify specific topics of a staff development program for student personnel workers and to make a comprehensive assessment of existing staff development programs at the community-junior colleges.

This survey was intended basically to provide information on inservice training needs rather than on preservice preparation of new professionals. The major reason for this limitation has already been mentioned: the shift on most community college campuses away from the

need to assimilate large numbers of new personnel to the necessity of refreshing and updating a relatively stable staff. There is also a need to provide a vehicle for renewal of classified staff to decrease their high attrition rate.

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of this study were to gather data to answer the following questions:

1. What types of staff development activities are being used in different sized institutions?
2. What is the budget of staff development programs?
3. How are staff development programs administered?
4. What methods are used to evaluate the staff development programs?
5. What are specific staff development topics for student personnel services staff?

Scope and Limitations

The scope and limitations under which this study was conducted included:

1. Information was gathered from a select group of community and junior colleges with enrollments of 5000 or more in Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Kansas.
2. Limitations inherent in the questionnaire technique.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions accepted by the investigator were that:

1. Institutions selected for the study were representative of the other community-junior colleges in the United States.
2. The responders could provide accurate evaluations of the staff development programs at their institutions.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms are furnished to provide, as nearly as possible, clear and concise meanings of terms as used in this study:

Staff Development - Encompasses all those systematic efforts designed to aid staff in improving their ability to function personally and professionally (Rhodes, 1980).

Classified Staff - Employees in this category are individuals who are employed in positions such as clerk typist, file clerk, mail coordinator, receptionist, secretary or who are assigned similar responsibilities and tasks (Beeler, 1978).

Non-Teaching Professional Staff - Employees in this category are directors, assistant directors, or individual staff members who have management responsibilities and duties or who perform and provide direct professional services such as psychological, medical, financial aid, academic records, registration, admissions, career counseling or who are assigned staff responsibilities and duties (Beeler, 1978).

Student Personnel Program - A series of services provided to the

student including but not limited to admissions, registration and records retention, academic advising, financial aid and student activities (Ancheta, 1978).

Community-Junior College - An educational institution offering a two-year course beyond high school. It represents the fulfillment of the American promise to its citizens for universal education at a low cost to the student but not necessarily low cost to the public. The community college contains a comprehensive curriculum, open-door policy of admissions, and community-oriented in all its aspects and practices (Monroe, 1972).

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the study and presented the problem, need and purpose of the study, the objectives, the scope, and definitions of terms. Chapter II includes a review of related literature including the definition and goals of the community-junior college; the new role of the student personnel worker in the community-junior college; a review of staff development: past, present and future; and the organization of staff development programs. Chapter III explains the methodology used for the research for this study by describing the population and sample; reviewing the instrument used to collect the data; and explaining how the instrument was administered, the data analyzed, and the results reported. Chapter IV describes the findings of the study. Chapter V contains a summary, conclusions and recommendations for further research and practice.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature in the following areas:

- (1) the definition and goals of the community-junior college;
- (2) the new role of the student personnel worker in the community-junior college;
- (3) a review of staff development: past, present, and future, and
- (4) the organization of staff development programs.

The dramatic growth experienced by America's colleges and universities during the past several decades is coming to an end. During the next several decades America can expect to witness much introspection and reflection by the educational establishment.

A primary concern during this coming period will be institutional renewal. As priorities are reordered and as "steady state" becomes the way of the future, it will be essential to discover new and better ways to meet contemporary needs (Appleton, 1978).

Community colleges have always provided opportunities for their faculty members to learn about the students attending the institution, to keep up with new developments in their fields, and to explore new approaches to teaching. Now there is a new realization of the need for assisting student affairs staff in the institution to become better prepared for facing the toughest tasks of higher education (McCall, 1977).

Definition and Goals of the
Community-Junior College

At the beginning of the twentieth century, no public, two-year junior college is known to have existed; yet the idea behind such an institution had been fully developed. This "junior college idea" was a product of both foreign influences and domestic needs.

The model of the German system of higher education was employed consistently by early advocates of the junior college--Tappan, Folwell, Harper, and Jordan, to mention only four (O'Banion, 1972). The German Gymnasium educated academic-minded youngsters in the liberal arts, taking them past adolescence to about their twentieth year. At that point the student could enter specialized study at the university or professional school or he/she could begin a career elsewhere. This convenient point of separation, when applied to the American system of higher education, came between the sophomore and junior year of the four-year college course. Since the first two years of college tended to be general survey level courses, with specialization coming later, American educators were able to appreciate the logical divisions in the German system. Jordan was the first to label this "lower segment" of higher education the "junior college," and Harper was the first to actually establish such a junior college at the University of Chicago (O'Banion, 1972).

The greatest challenge to junior college educators during the 1920's and 1930's was one that has not since diminished. Despite their conviction that terminal education was necessary for a strong economy and an improved society, junior college students persisted in following the American dream of success, a dream that increasingly

included a four-year baccalaureate degree. Terminal programs were developed in junior colleges which were ideal in the minds of their creators, but the educational consumers--the students--still selected university-parallel programs. Educators placed more and more reliance upon guidance workers to lead students to more realistic choices. At this time guidance workers did not have enough preparation to counsel students effectively.

After World War II, community-junior college leaders (the term community was instigated) developed a preoccupation with general education. This was, in part, a continuation of the emphasis upon citizenship in terminal education, but it avoided the negative connotation that education actually terminated at any point in life. Characteristically, the schools, including community-junior colleges, were expected to play the major role in strengthening and unifying American attitudes and ideals (O'Connell, 1968).

Throughout the various stages of growth in the community-junior college movement runs a common theme---the democratization of higher education. The community institution plays a unique role; increasingly it is becoming the only social institution that cuts across racial, socioeconomic, and other distinct segments of the community in an attempt to reflect community needs (O'Banion, 1972).

The first qualification of a community college is service primarily to the people of the community. The community institution goes to the people who live and work where it is located; makes a careful study of the needs of these people for education not being offered by any other institution of learning, analyzes these needs and builds its educational programs in response to the analyses.

A community college is a junior college--two years of educational curriculum. Usually it is coeducational. Usually it is only for commuting students--no dormitories. It serves a wide variety of students; that is an asset as well as a limitation. But there are essentially two groups of students: those who plan to transfer as juniors to four-year institutions and those who plan to take jobs after two years of college (O'Connell, 1968).

The diversity of its student body imposes on the two-year college the responsibility of providing an equally diverse educational program. This is difficult because of the extent to which two-year college students differ in their goals and in their preparation for college work. Some plan to transfer to four-year colleges, others do not. Some will enter with educational deficiencies others will have all the requisites for college. All will live in a complex world in which they will have personal, civic, and occupational responsibility to discharge and leisure time activities to perform. The task is further complicated by the fact that many junior colleges are called upon to serve adults and render special community services. Adult learners have many unique characteristics that should be considered in learning styles and in providing educational services. To meet all these obligations is a major challenge for the junior college (Medsker, 1960).

Rather than molding the diversity of community-junior college students into a common citizenry, the colleges began to tailor more diversified programs for their diversified student bodies. With the goal of each student developing those skills which would allow him/her to contribute his maximum productive capability to society, the ideal curriculum was seen as one which would assess varying potentials of students and train them accordingly (O'Connell, 1968).

Guidance programs were expanded to help each student find his or her most efficient level of instruction as well as realistic vocational and life goals (O'Banion, 1971).

Typically a community college has a transfer liberal arts program containing the same balance among the social sciences, the sciences, and the humanities that one would find in the first two years of a liberal arts college or university (O'Connell, 1968). Many other programs are available such as technical, vocational and career-oriented, culminating in certificates or licenses with the expertise to enter the job market using the skills obtained in the junior college curriculum. The philosophy of the community-junior college is that all adults should have an opportunity for higher education; therefore, applicants enter the junior college with varied backgrounds of previous educational experience. The community-junior college, with a self-proclaimed reputation for the "open door," attracted the majority of these "new students" in higher education (Clark, 1960).

Proponents of the movement generally agree that community-junior colleges are characterized by (1) open-door admission policies; (2) comprehensiveness; (3) community orientation; (4) emphasis upon teaching; (5) student centeredness; and (6) innovation (O'Banion, 1972). The staff of the community-junior college is expected to be cognizant of and perform in each of these areas.

New Role of the Student Personnel Worker

In the Community-Junior College

The purpose of education is to help each man or woman experience more fully, live more broadly, perceive more keenly, feel more deeply, to pursue the happiness

of his own self-fulfillment and to gain the wisdom to see that this is inextricably tied to the general welfare (Richardson, R. C., 1975, p. 303).

The community college is at a critical crossroad in its history. Can it provide a learning climate in which the above statement can be accomplished?

Traditionally, student personnel workers in community-junior colleges have operated on a service model; that is, they offered counseling, financial aids, health-services, college orientation, and other services which would foster students' success in a college. The models of student personnel work--regulatory, servicing, therapeutic--are inappropriate to students' needs in a changing society (O'Banion, 1971). A new type of student personnel worker might be labeled a human development facilitator; one who is less service-oriented and more individual-oriented. The emphasis has changed from psychoanalytic and behavioristic theory to existential and humanistic theory.

Student personnel work is no longer passive; student personnel work is active. The new student personnel worker is active in confronting students with new ideas and alternative forms of behavior. These two fundamental changes, a growing humanistic ethic and a developing action-oriented life style for the student personnel professional, provide innovative development in student personnel work.

The student personnel worker that is needed has been described by Maslow as self-actualizing, by Horney as self-realizing, by Privett as transcendent-functioning, and by Rogers as fully functioning. They should have healthy personalities open to experience, democratic,

accepting, understanding, caring, supporting, approving, loving and non-judgmental. The student personnel worker as a human development facilitator has a high degree of self-confidence and self-acceptance out of which emerges a strong trust in others (O'Banion, 1971).

However, the student personnel worker must not only be committed to positive human development; he/she must also possess the skills and the expertise that will enable him/her to implement programs for the realization of human potential. These programs should be geared toward individual's needs.

In effect, student personnel programs are closely related to the lack of personal and professional identity of student personnel workers themselves. Once a staff has developed a sense of community among its members, it is then possible to focus on the mission and commitment of the student personnel program. Improved personal development leads to improved program development.

An institution's staff is the expression of its purposes, the collective manager of its missions. As the colleges' purposes change and adapt to the social needs of its community, its staff deserves opportunities to adapt and change, too. It is agreed that increased staff development makes for increased student development.

A Review of Staff Development:

Past, Present, and Future

The personnel manager of the early 1900's was basically a product of the traditions of the 18th and 19th centuries and therefore, was generally autocratic and usually self-trained. Basically, these managers subscribed to a theory of personnel management which emphasized

that the average worker lacked ambition, disliked work, sought to avoid responsibility, and was not interested in personal growth (Beeler, 1978).

The modern personnel management movement had its beginnings at the turn of the century. Taylor (1919) suggested that the practices of tradition-bound management were outdated and that changes were needed for better managerial results.

During the 1940's and 1950's employees were considered as complex human beings who possessed a wide variety of personal needs. Motivating people to perform effectively on the job soon came to be viewed as a function of adequately satisfying their needs for belonging, status, and financial regard (Beeler, 1978).

The impact of organizational environments on workers was identified. The goal was to design work climates in which human needs could be satisfied while at the same time decreasing inefficiency within the organization. This set the stage for the concept of maximizing employee potential through on-the-job training and ongoing staff development (Miles, 1975).

The key to a successful organization is the role the organization plays in satisfying these needs (Hadley, 1978). New employees had to learn much about their roles within each respective organization; and regardless of background, few employees would be completely trained and ready to fill their position the first day on the job. It was also known that the need for learning and developing would not stop with employees new to the organization. Continued personal development would be important (Stine, 1977).

It was realized that if an organization was to be dynamic and successful, the people who compose the rank and file must know more

than narrow job skills and must have the opportunity to increase their knowledge and expertise (New Careers, 1968). By promoting staff development activities, managers would increase the ability of staff to take on additional responsibility, develop enthusiasm for their work, and respond with allegiance to the organization as a whole, thus, creating benefits both for the organization and the employee.

The development of people within organizations is too important to be left to chance.

Consequently, today's personnel specialists are very much concerned about worker satisfaction and actualization. A common management theory is that higher levels of employee efficiency are achieved when staff are treated as human beings with complex motivational drives as well as different levels of emotional makeup, ability, goals, and levels of aspiration. Most workers, regardless of their current level of ability have untapped resources. It is the manager's responsibility and the organization's task to maximize this unused potential, not only in the interest of the organization's goals, but in the interest of human development (Miles, 1975).

Most professions now require some continued educational effort on the part of their members as a condition for continued certification or licensing. In contrast to this formalization existing in the academic ranks, there have been few standard requirements for entry into student personnel positions or requirements for continuing education in this area. As a result, many individuals who originally filled the ranks of the student personnel profession lacked the specific training needed to effectively exercise their duties and responsibilities

(Bender, 1980).

Certain conditions made it clear that programs of inservice education and staff development in student personnel services would be needed on college and university campuses. The combination of rapidly expanding knowledge, changing social conditions, growing and changing student populations, and advancing management techniques would require that each institution update and retrain its staff on a regular basis.

The staff of a college is its single greatest resource. In economic terms, the staff is the college's most significant and largest capital investment. It is good sense that the investment should be helped to appreciate in value and not be allowed to wear itself out or slide into obsolescence by inattention or neglect. It would seem that staff training and renewal would receive high priority in the overall management of student services (Richardson, R. C., 1975).

In 1962, a survey was conducted of inservice education practices at the 100 colleges and universities holding membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The findings showed that little attention was being given to the development of comprehensive division-wide, inservice education programs (Gross, 1963).

Truitt and Gross concluded in 1962 that while divergent viewpoints and even strong disagreement exist regarding the role of student personnel work and staff functions, there is distinct agreement that student personnel administrators are responsible for developing means for constant improvement of individual workers and programs (Gross, 1963).

The 1970's witnessed an increasing, though limited, interest in the topic of designing programs to improve staff skills. In order to

meet the demands of the future, staff members will need to possess special skills, poise, and confidence in addition to the usually expected technical competencies (Shaffer, 1972). It was suggested that inservice development of staff was more a major function of an effective student personnel program than a service to staff members. Specific procedures were outlined by which chief student personnel administrators and individual staff members could work together to produce a successful inservice program (Stamatokos, 1972). Also, the importance of retreats was discovered (Harvey, 1972).

Wanzek and Canon dealt with the professional growth of both managers and clerical staff and discussed the process by which a professional growth committee at Northern Illinois University designed a program to provide staff members the opportunity to develop new tools to ultimately impact the student environment. Techniques such as improving communication through newsletters, the awarding of mini-grants for improvement of staff skills, and the creation of mini-courses were identified. These activities resulted in noticeable development of professionalism and improvement of programs designed to serve students (Wanzek, 1975).

The ultimate goal regarding human development in the realm of student personnel staff development would be to learn about one's self while impacting the lives of students. This would allow for both personal and professional growth.

The literature on this subject may very well be a reflection of the lack of activity in the field; or at the very least it implies that much of what is happening in the area of staff development, inservice education, and continuing education is not being communicated to the

profession as a whole. Most of the staff development programs that have been tried are only attempts to implement some sort of staff development activity on a limited and somewhat periodic basis.

Organization--Staff Development

Programs

Staff development programs are idiosyncratic. Designed to reflect institutional and personal needs, they may differ dramatically from one institution to another. A staff development program that relies primarily on internal resources will be very different from one that relies primarily on external resources. Although a staff development program must and should reflect the special needs of the institution and the staff for whom it is designed, there is beginning to emerge a set of constants for organizing a staff development program that may be helpful to most community colleges.

Assessment

Some kind of assessment is the initial step in the organization of staff development programs. Such assessment usually describes informally the need for the person.

At least four kinds of assessment are helpful to make, if a sound program of staff development is to be organized: assessment of (1) administrative views and support, (2) present level of staff development, (3) institutional and personal/professional needs, and (4) internal and external resources available to the institution.

The organization of a staff development program that works is a

major undertaking for an institution and requires strong administrative support; therefore, a plan for assessment should be presented to the president and his first level staff for their support (Polk, 1980).

The initiator should begin planning a program at a very specific level.

Some traditional approaches to staff development are: a professional library, institutional support for staff members to attend conferences, an occasional visiting consultant, increase in salaries for faculty members who accumulate graduate credit, and sabbaticals (O'Banion, 1978). Many colleges have implemented these methods but have not formalized a structured program.

It is important to know what the institution is currently doing. Interviews with the president and the chief student personnel administrator will provide information on the extent to which the institution is already offering staff development activities. An examination of the institutional budget would determine, as far as possible, the exact amount of funds allocated to and used for staff development.

The most important assessment to be made is of the institutional and personal/professional needs regarding staff development. A questionnaire or personal interview are the most common methods of obtaining this information (Hammons, 1976).

As part of the assessment of personal and professional needs of staff members, it is helpful to gather information regarding the competencies and skills of current employees that could be made available for the staff development program (Miller, 1975). Internal resources are beneficial in two respects: cost effectiveness and knowledge of the institution.

In addition to internal resources, some assessment should be

made of the resources from nearby universities and from special agencies. Most major business and industrial groups have well organized staff development programs. It may be possible to use some of the resources from the community.

Once these various assessments have been made, program planners should prepare a statement outlining views and needs identified and make a recommendation to the administration regarding the necessity of organizing a staff development program.

Design and Development

Stage two of organizing staff development programs that work involves program design and development. A good program design provides the basic framework for an entire program. Staff members should be totally involved in establishing the focus of their staff development program by writing a statement of philosophy which should relate to the mission statement of the college (Houston, 1980). The college, of course, is committed to improvement of learning for students and to providing a climate in which that learning can best take place. Staff development is a logical extension of that commitment, in that improved staff development leads to improved student development.

A good program should include specific goal statements, needed resources, targets for change, program scope and content, details of program management, decision-making parameters, time frames, program activities, outcome indicators, and evaluation techniques. The identification and assignment of specific personnel and resources to specific program activities should also be considered (Beeler, 1978).

The division of student affairs can be classified according to

the following employee categories: (1) Non-teaching professionals-- Employees in this category are directors, assistant directors, or individual staff members who have management responsibilities and duties or who perform and provide direct professional services such as psychological, medical, financial aid, academic records, registration, admissions, career counseling or who are assigned staff responsibilities and duties (Beeler, 1978); (2) Classified staff--Employees in this category are individuals who are employed in positions such as clerk typist, file clerk, mail coordinator, receptionist, secretary or who are assigned similar responsibilities and tasks (Beeler, 1978).

Staff training and development programs should also include these overall objectives: (1) to provide an environment that will enhance communication at all levels so that a general knowledge and perspective of the department and the college may be developed, (2) to provide inservice training opportunities for all employees in order that they may improve and upgrade their work skills, and (3) to provide continuing educational opportunities for all employees in order to emphasize and encourage professional advancement and personal growth.

Implementation

The third stage, program implementation, is probably the most important. The master design becomes action. The program activities start to influence the work environment such as to bring about the needed changes identified in the needs assessment. The implementation stage begins once all planning elements are in harmony and the decision has been made to proceed with the program.

Evaluation

The last stage in the process of developing a program involves evaluation. Evaluation is essential to determine the effectiveness of the planning that went into assessing needs, designing and developing program elements, and putting the program into action. Evaluative judgments should be used to monitor program progress in relation to established program goals.

There are three levels of evaluation of outcomes that should be considered in designing an evaluation plan for any staff development program. Simple counting devices can be used to ascertain participation and attendance. Direct feedback from participants on questionnaires regarding the value of the activity is another important and basic approach to evaluation (Bishop, 1976).

An attempt to discern changes in staff members as the result of the development program is very necessary. Evaluation at this level becomes more complex. If the program is successful, it is assumed that there will be changes in the behavior of staff members. They will have new understanding of and attitudes towards students. They will manage more effectively. They will type more efficiently. They will listen more attentively. They will relate more warmly and openly. It is difficult to measure such changes because it is difficult to control the variables in this occasional process (O'Banion, 1977).

The most non-threatening approach to measuring changes at this level is self reports in which staff members determine the changes in their knowledge, attitudes, and style that are related to their participation in staff development activities. These reports assist by allowing each individual to verbalize the results of the

activity.

In summarization, the four basic stages of assessing needs, design and development, implementation, and evaluation logically follow one another in the process of creating a successful staff development program. Evaluation takes place during each stage. This way decisions may be made which can result in program modification or termination throughout the total program not just after the end result.

Summary

A review of the literature highlights a number of points important for successful staff development programs. Staff development and inservice training for student personnel workers have become critical elements especially in the community-junior college in order to meet the institution's unique goals and the diverse needs of its constituency.

Currently, events and forces are thrust upon the community-junior college scene with such speed that responses must be made almost reflexively. Effective student personnel programs must be planned to insure the ability to act rather than react to these demands and should include provisions for the constant assessment of program needs and just as importantly they must include a continuous staff development program that will constantly equip staff members with the skills, attitudes, and knowledge necessary to meet those needs.

Goals for inservice staff development programs should be to: develop a greater understanding of the national mission and role of the local community college, develop greater professional competence in each staff member, develop the potential of becoming a human potential facilitator, develop a sense of "community" among the staff members and

develop an understanding of the needs and characteristics of community college students. Well organized staff development programs could be implemented to combat building an effective, competent staff and then just surviving on a day-to-day basis.

The essential elements of organizing successful staff development programs are assessment, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. Once this cycle has been established, an on-going process each year would ascertain new needs of the staff and the effectiveness of current methods of implementation of staff development programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was twofold: 1) to determine the extent to which formal and informal staff development programs exist in public two-year colleges in the south central region of the United States and 2) to assess specific needs for such programs for student personnel non-teaching professional and classified staff. This chapter includes: 1) the description and selection of the population used in the research; 2) the instrument used to collect the data; 3) the explanation of how the instrument was administered; and 4) the method used to report the results.

The Population

The population from which the subset of community colleges was chosen consisted of all publicly supported community-junior colleges in Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas. The colleges to be surveyed were determined to be all the community-junior colleges in these states with enrollments of 5000 or more for a total of 22 colleges. The researcher considered only community-junior colleges with 5000 or more students because it would be more likely that larger institutions would have staff development programs and, if that proved to be true, to be able to compare and draw conclusions from staff development activities already in operation for development of staff development programs

at the researcher's institution. A complete listing of the institutions surveyed is included in Appendix A.

The Data-Gathering Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a seven-page questionnaire compiled by the researcher. Several questionnaires developed by others (Brennen, 1976; Hammons and Wallace, 1976) were reviewed and adapted to meet the specific objectives of the study. The instrument was field tested by six student personnel administrators in two community colleges. Minor revisions were made. A sample of the final questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Administration of the Instrument

A cover letter was prepared by the researcher to explain the purpose of the questionnaire and method for returning it to the researcher. See Appendix C for a copy of the cover letter. The cover letter and questionnaire were mailed to the 22 selected institutions. A self-addressed return envelope was enclosed for the participants' convenience. Of the 22 questionnaires sent out during January, 1982, 12 were returned. A follow-up post card requesting return of the remaining surveys was sent in February with a return rate of two. The researcher then called the remaining eight colleges that had not responded; an additional two questionnaires were returned. This was a response rate of 73 percent of the total subset for a final response of 16 questionnaires.

Summary

The questionnaire for this study was designed and distributed by the

researcher to all the community-junior colleges with enrollments over 5000 students in the south central region of the United States. In Chapter IV responses to each item of the questionnaire are totaled, reviewed and summarized in both chart and narrative form, using percentages and arithmetic means when appropriate. The results of the "comments" questions are also reported in narrative form.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which formal and informal staff development programs existed in public two-year colleges in the southwest region of the United States and to assess specific needs for such programs for student personnel non-teaching professionals and classified staff. This chapter presents the findings of the study in this order: (1) Response Rate, (2) Institutional Characteristics, (3) Program Characteristics, (4) Evaluation, and (5) Staff Development Topics for Student Services Personnel.

Response Rate

Questionnaires were mailed to all 22 community-junior colleges with student enrollments over 5,000 in the south central region. Twelve colleges (55%) completed and returned the data-gathering instrument. A reminder post card was mailed to the remaining 12 colleges. A follow-up call was made to each institution that had not responded. A total of 73 percent (16 of 22) of the questionnaires were returned by the polled colleges. For a total listing of the community junior colleges that met the stated criteria, see Appendix A. The colleges responding to the questionnaire are indicated by asterisks.

Institutional Characteristics

The total enrollment of the colleges that responded ranged from 5,000 to 27,000 students. A comprehensive listing of institutional characteristics is presented in Table I. A high percentage (62%) or ten colleges indicated there was not a staff development program (SDP) designed specifically for the Student Personnel Services Division but six colleges (38%) responded there was that specific type of program on their campus. Of the six colleges that had a staff development program for student personnel services, three (19%) had formalized programs and three (19%) had informal programs. Most of the ten colleges (62%) that did not have a specific staff development program for student personnel services had a staff development program for the total institution that was available to the student personnel staff. Two colleges (or 13%) did not have any staff development programs at their institution.

The person responsible for coordinating the staff development program at the 14 institutions that had such programs ranged from five deans (31%), one division chairperson (6%), one director of information systems (6%), two directors of student development (13%), two vice-presidents for student services (13%), one director of research (6%), and two institutions (13%) that had full-time directors of staff development. The administration of staff development programs was performed by the following administrative units: four deans of college (25%), four deans of instruction (25%), three vice-presidents for instruction and student services (19%), two presidents (13%), and one human resources and employee relations offices (6%). Of the two colleges that

TABLE I
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENT RESPONSES TO
 INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Total enrollment		
5,000 - 10,000	12	75
10,000 - 30,000	4	25
S.D.P. student personnel services		
yes	6	38
no	10	62
Formal S.D.P. student personnel services		
yes	3	19
no	3	19
Institutional S.D.P.		
yes	14	88
no	2	13*
S.D.P. administrator		
dean	5	31
division chairperson	1	6
director of information systems	1	6
director of student development	2	13
vice president of student services	2	13
director of research	1	6
director of staff development	2	13
no programs	2	13
S.D.P. administrative office		
dean of college	4	25
dean of instruction	4	25
vice president for instruction and student services	3	19
president	2	13
human resources and employee relations	1	6
no programs	2	13
Plans to develop a S.D.P.		
yes	1	50
no	1	50

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

did not have a staff development program, one responded that there was the possibility that a staff development program would be developed at that institution on an indefinite time frame and one institution had no plans for a program.

Program Characteristics

The money budgeted annually for staff development activities in the student personnel services area ranged from \$1,000 to \$93,000 as shown in Table II. On-campus workshops (32%) ranked as the highest choice of the main activities on which staff development money was spent, while in-service training programs (23%) and professional conferences (27%) were also top choices. Only four colleges (25%) had a formalized missions statement regarding staff development at their institutions. Several unique program features for which respondents felt especially proud were listed as: direct input from staff involved, release time granted, innovative classified staff development program, cross training programs implemented for all student services, staff's involvement in institutional annual goal setting, seminars held on legal and liability issues, and availability of career education training. At 12 colleges (88% of those responding) staff development activities for classified staff.

Evaluation

A complete listing of the responses of evaluation methods is shown in Table III. Most of the colleges (56%) expressed that their institutions had a moderate commitment to staff development in terms of dollars allocated, number of activities available for staff, and encouragement

TABLE II
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES
 TO PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Budget		
\$1,000 - \$3,000	4	25
\$5,000 - \$8,000	5	31
\$80,000*	1	6
\$93,000	1	6
unknown	3	19
no program	2	13
Main activities in S.D.P.		
on campus workshop	14	32
in-service training	10	23
professional conferences	12	27
consultant	2	5
college courses	1	2
grants	1	2
individual requests	1	2
media	1	2
no programs	2	5
Formalized missions statement		
yes	4	25
no	12	75
Unique program features		
direct input from staff involved	4	40
release time	1	10
innovative classified S.D.P.	1	10
cross training program for student services	1	10
involvement in institutional goal setting	1	10
seminars on legal issues	1	10
career education training	1	10
S.D. activities for classified staff		
yes	14	88
no	2	13**

* total institutional S.D.P. budget

** Does not total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE III
 FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF RESPONSES
 TO EVALUATION

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Institution's commitment to S.D.P.		
high level of commitment	4	25
moderate commitment	10	63
little commitment	2	13*
Commitment to student personnel services to S.D.P.		
high level	3	19
moderate	10	63
little	3	19*
S.D.P. activities--student services personnel		
formalized S.D.P.	3	19
some staff development activities	6	38
a number of informal activities	6	38
no staff development activities	1	6*
Most important S.D. activities		
in-service training	10	63
personalized specific topics	2	13
retreats	2	13
professional conferences	1	6
no response	1	6*
Least Important S.D. activities		
formal academic courses	7	44
outside experts	3	19
retreats	2	13
general topics	1	6
professional conferences	1	6
no response	2	13
Effectiveness of evaluation of S.D. activities		
participant reports	8	50
surveys	7	44
individual interviews	1	6
amount of participation	1	6
money spent	1	6
no formal evaluation	4	25
Current status of S.D.P.		
continue to grow and receive support	11	69
remain stable	4	25
receive less support in the future	1	6

TABLE III (Continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Most valuable benefits of S.D.P.		
exchange of information and ideas	7	44
exposure to new approaches	3	19
development of specific skills	3	19
professional growth	2	13
no response	1	6
Least valuable benefit of S.D.P.		
opportunity for introspection	6	38
theory	5	31
development of specific skills	3	19
professional growth	2	13
no response	1	6
Implementation problems of S.D.P.		
time	6	38
motivation of staff	4	25
locating resource persons	1	6
choosing appropriate and timely topic	1	6
faculty non-supportive	1	6
no response	1	6

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

to improve their skills. Four colleges (25%) felt their institution had a high level of commitment for staff development programs and two (13%) responded that their institution's commitment was of minimum concern. Consistent with the responses listed above, ten colleges (56%) felt that the division of student personnel services had a moderate level of commitment to staff development programs, while three colleges (19%) indicated a high level of commitment and three colleges (19%) responded that commitment was insignificant.

Thirty-eight percent, or six, of the colleges characterized staff development activities for student development personnel on their campus as consisting of no formal program but having some staff development activities. Another 38 percent, or six colleges, felt their campus had a number of informal activities such as staff attendance at workshops and conferences. Three of the 16 colleges (19%) indicated there existed a formalized staff development program with a staff person accountable for program activities. One college (6%) had no staff development activities.

The most important activities in staff development programs chosen by ten colleges (63%) was in-service training. Other important activities listed by two colleges (13%) were retreats, two colleges (13%) personalized topics, and one college (6%) professional conferences. Seven colleges, or 44 percent, listed the participation in formal academic courses as the least important staff development activity. Other choices included use of outside experts (19%), retreats (13%), general topics (6%), and professional conferences (6). The most frequently chosen tools for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development activities were participant reports (44%) and surveys (19%).

Other methods used were individual interviews (6%) and participation or attendance (6%). Four colleges (25%) did not use a formal evaluation process.

Most colleges (69%) felt their institutional staff development program would continue to grow and receive support while four (25%) indicated their programs would remain stable; only one college (6%) felt it would receive less support in the future. The most valuable benefits gained from staff development programs chosen by seven colleges (44%) was the exchange of information and ideas, the exposure to new approaches (19%), the development of specific skills (19%), and professional growth of staff (13%). The least valued benefits of staff development programs were the opportunity for introspection (38%), exposure to theory (31%) and the development of specific skills (6%).

There were several major problems the respondents confronted in implementing a staff development program at their campus with time listed as the greatest (38%). Also, motivation of staff (25%), locating resource persons (6%), choosing appropriate and timely topics, and faculty non-supportive of the programs (6%) were problems.

Several general comments about staff development activities and programs were made by the respondents: direct input of the staff affected is necessary, a need for more specific staff development for student personnel, staff development is important for staff vitality, a problem of faculty complaints, and staff development should be on-going, specialized, and mandatory. Every college listed counseling as one of the job functions included in the student personnel program. Other job responsibilities included were: financial aid (63%), student activities (63%), admissions (56%), testing (50%), veteran services (38%), career

placement (38%), athletics and intramurals (31%), registration (31%), academic records (25%), student publications (25%), food service (6%), security (6%), computer services (6%), and institutional research (6%).

Staff Development Topics for
Student Services Personnel

Responses to Question 1, Knowledge of characteristics and needs of students attending community colleges, are presented in Table IV. Nine colleges (56%) felt that the knowledge of characteristics and needs of students attending community college were presently at acceptable levels for non-teaching professional staff. Four of the colleges (25%) felt the need for some assistance in this area. On the other hand, one-half of the colleges (50%) reported that the classified staff needed some assistance, while 25 percent, or four institutions, felt that staff abilities were acceptable at present.

TABLE IV
RESPONSE TO KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS ATTENDING COMMUNITY
COLLEGES BY STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	9	56	4	25	1	6	0	0	2	13
Classified	4	25	8	50	1	6	2	13	1	6

Responses to Question 2, Knowledge about multi-purposes of the community college, are presented in Table V. Seven colleges (44%) indicated that knowledge of junior college's community services were presently at acceptable levels for non-teaching professional staff, while nine colleges (56%) responded that classified staff needed some assistance in this area. Only one college (6%) felt that a critical need for improvement of knowledge existed for both employee groups.

One half of the respondents (50%) answered the non-teaching professional staff abilities dealing with community college adult students were currently acceptable while another five colleges (31%) felt that the staff needed some assistance. Sixty-three percent, or ten colleges, felt that knowledge of the community college adult students by the classified staff needed some upgrading and only three institutions (19%) felt that the staff's current abilities were acceptable.

A majority of the institutions (63%) felt the knowledge of the community college's continuing education was acceptable by the non-teaching professional staff, but only two colleges (13%) felt the same about the classified staff. Eleven colleges (69%) felt that a need for assistance existed for the classified staff. Only four colleges (25%) indicated some need for assistance of the non-teaching professional staff.

Seven institutions (44%) responded that the classified staff needed some assistance in upgrading their knowledge of the community college's general education requirements; while five colleges (31%) concluded that classified staff abilities were acceptable. A majority of colleges (56%) felt the knowledge of community college's general education requirements was at acceptable levels for non-teaching professionals.

TABLE V
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATED TO KNOWLEDGE OF
 MULTI-PURPOSES OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 BY STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching Professional										
community services	7	44	6	38	1	6	0	0	2	13*
adult services	8	50	5	31	1	6	0	0	2	13
continuing education	10	63	4	25	0	0	0	0	2	13*
general education	9	56	5	31	0	0	0	0	2	13
voc-tech education	8	50	5	31	1	6	0	0	2	13
Classified										
community services	4	25	9	56	1	6	1	6	1	6*
adult students	3	19	10	63	0	0	1	6	2	13*
continuing education	2	13	11	69	0	0	1	6	2	13*
general education	5	31	7	44	0	0	2	13	2	13*
voc-tech education	4	25	8	50	0	0	2	13	2	13*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

One college (6%) indicated a critical need for improvement of knowledge of the community college's vocational-technical education program by the non-teaching professionals while one-half (50%) felt the staff abilities were acceptable. Another 50 percent, or one-half, felt the classified staff needed some assistance in this area.

Responses to Question 3, Purpose for and implications of open door philosophy, are presented in Table VI. The classified staff abilities were seen as acceptable at present by ten colleges (63%) in their understanding of the purpose for and implications of the open-door philosophy in community colleges. One person (6%) indicated there was a critical need to improve the comprehension of the classified staff. The majority of the colleges (12 or 75%) felt that the non-teaching professional staff greatly understood this philosophy, while only two (13%) indicated a need for some assistance.

TABLE VI
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING OPEN-DOOR
PHILOSOPHY BY STUDENT
SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	12	75	2	13	0	0	0	0	2	13*
Classified	10	63	2	13	1	6	2	13	1	6*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 4, Supervising and evaluating staff, are presented in Table VII. Fifty-six percent reflect the belief that classified staff and ten colleges, or 63 percent, felt the non-teaching professionals needed some assistance in improving their skills of supervision and evaluation of other staff members.

TABLE VII
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
SUPERVISION SKILLS BY STUDENT
SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	2	13	10	63	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	1	6	9	56	1	6	4	25	1	6*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 5, Participative management, are presented in Table VIII. One-half (or 50%) of the colleges indicated that both the non-teaching professional staff and the classified staff have deficiencies and needed some assistance in participative management skills. A critical need for improvement existed in three colleges (19%) for non-teaching professional staff and two colleges (13%) for classified staff. Four colleges (25%) indicated participative management skills were not applicable to their classified staff.

TABLE VIII
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING
 PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT SKILLS
 BY STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some Assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Non-teaching professional	3	19	8	50	3	19	0	0	2
Classified	1	6	8	50	2	13	4	25	1	6

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 6, Implementing and facilitating innovation and change, are presented in Table IX. The staff abilities of the non-teaching professional staff were currently acceptable in only three colleges (19%) with over one-half (56%) of the respondents from nine colleges saying that there was some need for assistance in implementing and facilitating innovation and change. Also, 63 percent, or ten colleges, said the classified staff needed some assistance in this area. Two colleges (13%) indicated this was not applicable to classified staff.

Responses to Question 7, Setting of goals, are presented in Table X. Thirty-one percent or five colleges, felt the staff abilities of setting goals were at acceptable levels for the non-teaching professionals; at the same time 38 percent, or six colleges, indicated a need for assistance. Twenty-five percent, or four colleges, perceived its classified staff as qualified to set goals while 44 percent felt the staff needed some assistance. One college (6%) did not involve its classified staff in setting institutional goals.

TABLE IX
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION RELATING
 TO CHANGE BY STUDENT
 SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	3	19	9	56	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	2	13	10	63	1	6	2	13	1	6*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE X
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING GOAL
 SETTING PROCESS BY STUDENT
 SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No Response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	5	31	6	38	2	13	0	0	3	19*
Classified	4	25	7	44	3	19	1	6	1	6

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 8, Dealing with conflict and stress, are presented in Table XI. At least one-half, or eight colleges, felt that both employee groups needed some assistance in learning how to deal with conflict and stress. Only five colleges (31%) felt their professional staff abilities were currently acceptable while four colleges (25%) indicated their classified staff's abilities were at an unacceptable level in dealing with conflict and stress.

TABLE XI
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING STAFF'S
ABILITY TO DEAL WITH CONFLICT AND
STRESS BY STUDENT SERVICES
PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	5	31	8	50	1	6	0	0	2	13
Classified	4	25	8	50	2	13	1	6	1	6

Responses to Question 9, Human relation skills, are presented in Table XII. Respondents from nine colleges (56%) indicated that the classified staff needed some assistance in improvement of their human relations skills. Only five colleges (31%) felt the classified staff's abilities were currently acceptable. One-half, or eight colleges, felt

that the abilities of the non-teaching professional staff were currently acceptable while six colleges (38%) felt a need for improvement.

TABLE XII
RESPONSES TO QUESTION RELATING
TO HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	8	50	6	38	0	0	0	0	2	13*
Classified	5	31	9	56	1	6	0	0	1	6*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 10, Communication skills (internal, external, written, oral, and nonverbal) are presented in Table XIII. Only one college indicated a critical need for improvement of communication skills for the classified staff, while ten colleges (63%), representing the majority of the respondents, felt there was need for some assistance for the classified staff to upgrade their communication skills. The non-teaching professional staff abilities to communicate were currently acceptable as indicated by seven colleges, or 44 percent, and another seven colleges, or 44 percent, indicated that the staff needed some assistance.

TABLE XIII
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING
 TO COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	7	44	7	44	0	0	0	0	2	13*
Classified	4	25	10	63	1	6	0	0	1	6

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 11, Delegating authority and responsibility, are presented in Table XIV. As indicated by one-half of the respondents, or eight colleges, the non-teaching professional staff definitely needed some assistance of learning the technique of delegating authority and responsibility, while four colleges (25%) indicated that staff abilities were acceptable at present. Two persons (13%) felt a critical need for improvement. Five colleges (31%) responded that delegating authority and responsibility was not applicable to their classified staff; however, another 38 percent, or six institutions, indicated there was a need for some assistance in this area.

Responses to Question 12, Collecting and using data properly, are presented in Table XV. One college (6%) felt there was a critical need to improve the classified staff's skills necessary for collecting and using data properly, while two colleges (13%) indicated the same response for the non-teaching professional staff. Seven colleges (44%) indicated that the non-teaching professional staff needed improvement

in these skills; however, another 44 percent, or seven colleges, felt that proper collection and use of data was not applicable to their classified staff.

TABLE XIV
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING DELEGATING
AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY BY
STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	4	25	8	50	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	4	25	6	38	0	0	5	31	1	6

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE XV
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO
PROPER USE AND COLLECTION
OF DATA

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	4	25	7	44	2	13	1	6	2	13*
Classified	3	19	4	25	1	6	7	44	1	6

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 13, Budgeting--developing, controlling, and implementing, are presented in Table XVI. Non-teaching professional staff's skills dealing with the development, control, and implementation of the budget needed upgrading in eight colleges (50%) and two colleges (13%) felt a critical need in this area. Six colleges (38%) indicated these skills were not applicable to their classified staff and six colleges (38%) feel the staff's abilities were acceptable at present concerning the budget.

TABLE XVI
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH BUDGET
BY STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
	Non-teaching professional	4	25	8	50	2	13	0	0	2
Classified	6	38	3	19	0	0	6	38	1	6*

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 14, Using time effectively, are presented in Table XVII. Eight colleges, or 50 percent, felt the need for some assistance of the non-teaching professional staff's effective management of time. Four colleges (25%) indicated both employee groups were competent in using time effectively.

TABLE XVII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION RELATING TO STAFF'S
ABILITY TO EFFECTIVELY MANAGE TIME

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	4	25	8	50	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	4	25	7	44	4	25	0	0	1	6

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 15, Planning: short and long range, are presented in Table XVIII below. Nine colleges (56%) responded that their non-teaching professional staff needed some assistance in planning capabilities but 19 percent, or three colleges, felt that their professional staff abilities were currently acceptable. Forty-four percent, or seven colleges, indicated that classified staff needed assistance with both short- and long-range planning skills. Also, four colleges (25%) felt that planning was not applicable to its classified staff.

Responses to Question 16, Ability to work effectively with faculty, are presented in Table XIX. Thirty-eight percent, or six colleges, indicated both employee group's abilities were currently acceptable in working effectively with faculty. Two colleges (13%) felt a critical need and five colleges (31%) felt that the non-teaching professional staff needed some assistance in improving their working relationships with faculty. At least 44 percent, or seven colleges, responded that the classified staff needed some assistance in working effectively with faculty.

TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING PLANNING
SHORT- AND LONG-RANGE BY STUDENT
SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	3	19	9	56	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	2	13	7	44	1	6	4	25	2	13*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING STAFF'S
ABILITIES TO WORK EFFECTIVELY WITH
FACULTY BY STUDENT SERVICES
PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	6	38	5	31	2	13	1	6	2	13*
Classified	6	38	7	44	0	0	1	6	2	13*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 17, clerical skills, are presented in Table XX. Six colleges (38%) did not feel that clerical skills were applicable to their non-teaching professional staff while 19 percent, or three colleges, indicated they needed some assistance in this area. One-half, or eight colleges, responded that the classified staff abilities were currently acceptable and five colleges (31%) realized the need for some assistance for its classified staff's improvement of clerical skills.

TABLE XX
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING CLERICAL
SKILLS BY STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	2	13	3	19	0	0	6	38	5	31*
Classified	8	50	5	31	0	0	0	0	3	19

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 18, Creating positive image of the student personnel office, are presented in Table XXI. One-half, or eight respondents, concluded that there was some need for assistance in the non-teaching professional staff in improving skills to create a positive image of the student personnel office. Four colleges (25%) felt that the non-teaching professional staff abilities were sufficient at the

present time, while two respondents (13%) indicated a critical need for improvement. Five colleges (31%) indicated that the classified staff had a critical need for improvement of skills to effectively create a positive image of the student personnel office. Only two persons (13%) felt that the classified staff abilities were not acceptable levels.

TABLE XXI

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO
CREATING POSITIVE IMAGE OF THE
STUDENT PERSONNEL OFFICE BY
STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	4	25	8	50	2	13	0	0	2	13*
Classified	2	13	6	38	5	31	1	6	2	13*

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 19, Group dynamics, are presented in Table XXII. Over one-half of the colleges (50%) indicated the non-teaching professional staff abilities were acceptable at present in teamwork skills, but three colleges (19%) felt there was a critical need for improved teamwork and group dynamics. Sixty-three percent, or ten colleges, said that the classified staff needed some assistance in upgrading skills to build teamwork and group dynamics.

TABLE XXII
 RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO
 TEAMWORK BY STUDENT SERVICES
 PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	2	13	9	56	3	19	0	0	2	13*
Classified	1	6	10	63	2	13	1	6	2	13*

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

Responses to Question 20, Updated knowledge of federal and state regulations pertaining to student personnel office, are presented in Table XXIII. The majority of colleges (69%) felt that the non-teaching professional staff needed some assistance in updating their knowledge of federal and state regulations pertaining to the student personnel office. Also, over half of the respondents (50%) indicated that the classified staff needed some assistance. Only one college (6%) felt that both employee groups had a critical need for improvement. Two colleges (13%) felt that the non-teaching professional staff's abilities were at acceptable levels in updated knowledge of federal and state regulations pertaining to student personnel offices.

Responses to Question 21, Training, retraining, cross-training, are presented in Table XXIV. Ten colleges (63%) indicated that non-teaching professional staff needed some assistance in training, retraining, and cross-training and only three colleges (19%) felt that

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO STUDENT
PERSONNEL STAFF'S KNOWLEDGE OF FEDERAL
AND STATE REGULATIONS BY STUDENT
PERSONNEL SERVICES

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	2	13	11	69	1	6	0	0	2	13*
Classified	1	6	9	56	1	6	3	19	2	13

*Does not total 100 due to rounding.

TABLE XXIV

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO TRAINING,
RETRAINING, CROSS-TRAINING BY STUDENT
SERVICES PERSONNEL

Staff	Abilities acceptable now		Some assistance needed		Critical need now		Not applicable		No response	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Non-teaching professional	3	19	10	63	0	0	1	6	2	13*
Classified	2	13	8	50	3	19	1	6	2	13*

* Does not total 100 due to rounding.

staff abilities were acceptable at present. One half of the respondents (50%) felt that classified staff needed some assistance in training, retraining, and cross-training skills and three respondents (19%) felt a critical need for improvement in this area.

In response to Question 22, Other needs, one college indicated there was a critical need for the non-teaching professional staff to learn word processing skills. Also, this college expressed a critical need for its classified staff to upgrade skills in word-processing techniques.

Summary

The results of the responses of the 16 completed questionnaires have been tabulated in Chapter IV. Chapter V includes the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and practice.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the study by offering a summary and discussion of the results. A summary of the findings presented in Chapter IV is presented first, followed by the researcher's conclusions. Recommendations for further research and practice are presented in the final part of the chapter.

Summary

The problem of the study was the lack of comprehensive information concerning staff development for student personnel staff. The purpose of this study was twofold: 1) to determine the extent to which formal and informal staff development programs exist in public two-year colleges in the south central region of the United States and 2) to assess the needs for staff development programs for student personnel non-teaching professional and classified staff.

The population of the study was all the publicly supported community-junior colleges in Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Texas. All 22 community-junior colleges in these states with enrollments of 5,000 or more were the subset. Seventy-three percent or 16 of the 22 colleges of the subset responded to the questionnaire.

Institutional Characteristics

The total enrollment of the colleges that responded ranged from 5,000 to 27,500 students. Fourteen colleges (88%) indicated there was a staff development program at their institution but only six colleges (38%) had a specific staff development program for student personnel services staff: three formalized programs and three informal programs. Only two colleges or 13 percent did not have any staff development programs presently; one had plans to develop staff development programs and one had no plans to do so.

Various administrators and administrative units were responsible for coordination of the staff development programs. Five colleges (31%) indicated that Deans were responsible at their respective institutions.

Program Characteristics

The money budgeted annually for staff development activities in the student personnel services area ranged from \$1,000 to \$93,000. The highest ranked choice of staff development activities was on-campus workshops (32%), with in-service training programs (23%), and professional conferences (27%) as second and third choices. Formalized missions statements regarding staff development had been developed at four colleges. Several unique program features were listed: direct input from participants, cross-training programs, special sessions for classified staff, release time, seminars on legal and liability issues and career education training. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents had on-going staff development activities for classified staff.

Evaluation

Ten colleges (63%) expressed that their institutions and the division of student personnel services had a moderate commitment to staff development in terms of dollars committed, number of activities available to staff, and encouragement to improve their skills. Thirty-eight percent of the colleges characterized staff development activities for student development personnel on their campus as consisting of no formal program but having some staff development activities and another 38 percent felt their campus had a number of informal activities such as staff attendance at workshops and conferences.

The most important activity in staff development programs was in-service training (63%) and least important activity listed was participation in formal academic courses (44%). The most frequently chosen tools for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development activities were participant reports (44%) and surveys (19%). Eleven colleges (69%) felt their institutional staff development programs would continue to grow and receive support. The most valuable benefits gained from staff development programs were the exchange of information and ideas (44%), the exposure to new approaches (19%), the development of specific skills (19%), and professional growth of staff (13%). The least valued benefits of staff development programs were the opportunity for introspection (38%), exposure to theory (31%) and the development of specific skills (6%). There were several major problems the respondents confronted in implementation of a staff development program at their campus with time listed as the greatest difficulty (38%), motivation of staff (25%), locating resource persons (6%), choosing appropriate and timely topics, and faculty non-support of

the programs (6%).

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from this study were as follows:

1. Most responding community-junior colleges do have an interest in staff development programs for the entire institution but not specifically designed programs for student personnel services staff.
2. The three main activities on which staff development money was spent were workshops, in-service training and professional conferences in all institutions ranging from 5,000 to 27,500 students.
3. Budgets of staff development programs were adequate to meet the responding institutions' needs. Monies allocated for staff development activities for student services personnel ranged from \$1,000 to \$93,000.
4. Staff development programs operated under the auspices of various administrative units within the responding colleges with Deans of the College the most frequently indicated as the accountable administrator.
5. Most of the colleges that responded used participant reports and surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of staff development programs.
6. Specific topics to be used in staff development activities that would meet critical needs of the non-teaching professional staff in student services areas were participative management

skills and teamwork. Topics that would meet critical needs of the classified staff were setting of goals, using time effectively, creating a positive image of the student personnel office, and training, retraining, and cross-training.

Recommendations for Further Practice and Research

The following recommendations for further practice and research are made based on the results of this study:

Practice

1. As a result of the identification of the critical needs of the student services personnel at the researcher's institution, a staff development program should be developed to meet those needs.
2. The information collected from this study should be used to design a guide for staff development programs in student personnel services in community-junior colleges and distributed through the American Association of Community And Junior Colleges.
3. Student development organizations within the south central region of the United States should be made aware of the specific topics for staff development activities that would meet the critical needs of both non-teaching professional and classified staff for use in development of the programs for their annual organizational meetings.
4. An article should be written by the researcher for publication

in the "College and University," the official organ of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, to disseminate this collected data to other student services professionals for use in their respective institutions.

Research

It is recommended that:

1. Another study should be performed as an evaluation of on-going staff development programs to determine if each individual student services staff member is better prepared to be a human facilitator and to meet the needs of the students as a direct result of staff development programs.
2. A comparison study of staff development programs by length of time program has been in operation should be conducted.
3. A survey be developed to determine if the attrition rate of student services' classified staff members has declined after participation in staff development activities.
4. A follow-up questionnaire should be sent to the institutions surveyed in this study to ascertain if the needs of the student personnel staff that were identified in this survey have been addressed. Methods of dealing with the difficulties (time and token attendance) of implementation of staff development programs should be solicited. Other areas to explore would be the effectiveness or non-effectiveness of retreats as a staff development activity.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ancheta, Bernard. "Staff Development for Student Personnel Services in the Los Angeles Community College District." (Paper presented at the California Community College Counselors Association Conference, San Mateo, California, 1978.)
- Appleton, James R., Channing M. Briggs, and James J. Rhatigan. Pieces of Eight. Portland, Oregon: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1978.
- Beeler, Kent D. and J. Roger Penn. A Handbook On Staff Development In Student Affairs. Corvallis, Oregon: OSU Book Stores, Inc., 1978.
- Bender, Barbara. "Job Satisfaction in Student Affairs." NASPA Journal, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Aug, 1980), pp 2-9.
- Bishop, Leslie J. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement Plans and Procedures. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.
- Brennan, William J. Personal Conversation, Corvallis, Oregon, November 3, 1981.
- Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College: A Case Study. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Gross, R. F. "A Study of In-service Educational Programs for Student Personnel Workers in Selected College and Universities in the United States." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1963.)
- Hadley, Ollie B. and Andrews James. "The Development of a Questionnaire for an Organizational Development Program at Los Angeles Southwest College." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Nova University, 1978.)
- Hammons, James O. and Terry H. Smith Wallace. An Assessment of Community College Staff Development Needs in the Northeastern United States. University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1976.
- Hammons, James O. Personal Conversation, Little Rock, Arkansas, November 1, 1981.
- Harvey, V.P., T. A. Helzer, and J. W. Young. "The Retreat: Keystone to Staff Development." NASPA Journal, Vol. 9, 1972, pp 274-278.

- Hoffland, Ginger. Parallels: A History of the Los Angeles Community College District. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Community College District, 1976.
- Houston, W. Robert and Robert Pankratz. Staff Development and Educational Change. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980.
- Medsker, Leland. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- McCall, Michael Baxter. "A Comparison of Staff Development Programs in Two Year Colleges." (Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.)
- Miles, R. E. Theories of Management: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Miller, T. K. "Staff Development Activities in Student Affairs." Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 16, 1975, pp 258-264.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.
- New Careers: A Manual of Organization and Development. Washington, D. C.: University Research Corp., 1968.
- O'Banion, Terry. New Directions in Community College Student Personnel Programs. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1971.
- O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow, Staff Development in the Community-Junior College. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1972.
- O'Banion, Terry. Developing Staff Potential. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1977.
- O'Banion, Terry. Organizing Staff Development Programs That Work. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1978.
- O'Banion, Terry. Personal Conversation, Dalas, Texas, November 2, 1981.
- O'Connell, Thomas E. Community College: A President's View. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1968.
- Polk, Charles H. "Getting Administrative Support for Non-Academic Programs for Career Employees." (Paper presented at the Convention of the Florida Association of Community Colleges, Orlando, Florida, 1980.)

- Rhodes, Dent and Dai Hounsell. Staff Development for the 1980's: International Perspectives. Normal, Illinois: Illinois State University Foundation, 1980.
- Richardson, T. E. "What Do You Teach Here: Staff Development." NASPA Journal, Vol. 13, 1975, pp 36-38.
- Richardson, R. C. "Staff Development: "A conceptual framework," Journal of Higher Education, Vol XLVI., 1975, pp 303-311.
- Shaffer, R. H. "Staff Development-Key to Survival." NASPA Journal, Vol. 9, 1972, pp 261-262.
- Stamatakos, L. C. and P. M. Oliaro. "In-service Development: A Function of Student Personnel." NASPA Journal, Vol 4, 1972, pp 269-273.
- Stine, Vance. "Los Angeles City College-Job Attitude Survey for Classified Personnel." (Unpublished Research Report, Los Angeles City College, California, 1977.)
- Taylor, F. W. Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Row, 1919.
- Wanzek, R. P. and H. Canon. "Professional Growth in Student Affairs," Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 16, 1975, pp 418-421.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONS SURVEYED

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES WITH
ENROLLMENTS OVER 5,000 IN THE SOUTHWEST REGION

KANSAS

Johnson County Community College
*Ms. Linda L. Dayton
Dean of Student Services
Col Blvd at Quivira Rd
Overland Park 66210

Enrollment: 5,908

LOUISIANA

Delgado Community College
Mr. Henry J. Nebe
Vice Pres. Rehab-Stdnt Affairs
615 City Park Avenue
New Orleans 70119

Enrollment: 8,154

OKLAHOMA

Oscar Rose Junior College
*Mr. Joe M. Johnson
Vice Pres. for Student Affairs
6420 S. E. 15
Midwest City 73110

Enrollment: 7,913

South Oklahoma City Junior College
*Dr. Gary L. Rankin
Vice Pres. Student Development
7777 S. May
Oklahoma City

Enrollment: 6,481

OKLAHOMA (continued)

Tulsa Junior College
*Dr. Tony Cagle
Dean of Student Personnel Svcs
909 South Boston Street
Tulsa 74119

Enrollment: 10,164

TEXAS

Amarillo College
Mr. Darrell W. Truitt
Dean of Students
P. O. Box 447
Amarillo 79178

Enrollment: 5,101

Austin Community College
Mr. Clifton Van Dyke
Director Admissions & Records
P. O. Box 2285
Austin 78768

Enrollment: 11,036

Eastfield College
*Mr. Lee Graupman
Vice Pres. Student Services
3737 Motley Drive
Mesquite 75150

Enrollment: 7,740

TEXAS (continued)

El Centro College
Mr. Rick Abbott
Vice Pres. of Students
Main and Lamar
Dallas 75202

Enrollment: 5,999

El Paso County Community College
*Dr. William R. Williams
Vice Pres. Instrl & Student Affairs
P. O. Box 20500
El Paso 7998

Enrollment: 11,059

Houston Community College
*Dr. James Engle
Vice Pres. of Student Affairs
22 Waugh Drive
Houston 77007

Enrollment: 16,691

Lee College
*Mr. Charles Ed Moak
Dean Stdnt Pers. Serv.-Registrar
Box 818
Baytown 77520

Enrollment: 5,006

Mountain View College
Mr. James F. Horton
Vice Pres. Student Services
4849 West Illinois
Dallas 75211

Enrollment: 5,420

North Harris County College
*Dr. Roy L. Lazenby
Dean of Student Services
2700 W. Thorne Circle
Houston 77073

Enrollment: 5,468

TEXAS (continued)

Richland College
*Dr. Sharon Griffith
Vice Pres. Student Services
12800 Abrams Road
Dallas 75231

Enrollment: 10,758

Saint Philip's College
*Mr. William A. Hudgins
Dean of Student Affairs
211 Nevada Street
San Antonio 78203

Enrollment: 6,831

San Antonio College
Dr. Earl L. Write
Assoc. Dean for Student Affairs
1300 San Pedro Avenue
San Antonio 78284

Enrollment: 21,038

San Jacinto College
*Mr. Norman N. Rushing
Registrar
8060 Spencer Highway
Pasadena 77505

Enrollment: 10,253

Tarrant County Junior College
*Mr. Mitchell McEwing
Dean Stdnt Serv.-So. Campus
*Dr. Tom Stover
Dean Stdnt Serv.-NE Campus
*Dr. Judith Carrier
Dean Stdnt Serv.-NW Campus
Electric Serv. Building
Fort Worth 76102

Enrollment: 19,085

TEXAS (continued)

Tyler Junior College
*Kenneth D. Lewis
Dean of Admissions-Registrar
Tyler 75711

Enrollment: 6,794

*Institutions that returned the questionnaire

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions of terms are furnished to provide, as nearly as possible, clear and concise meanings of terms as used in this study.

Staff Development - Encompasses all those systematic efforts designed to aid staff in improving their ability to function personally and professionally.

Classified Staff - Employees in this category are individuals who are employed in positions such as clerk typist, file clerk, mail coordinator, receptionist, secretary or who are assigned similar responsibilities and tasks.

Non-Teaching Professional Staff - Employees in this category are directors, assistant directors, or individual staff members who have management responsibilities and duties or who perform and provide direct professional services such as psychological, medical, financial aid, academic records, registration, admissions, career counseling or who are assigned staff responsibilities and duties.

Student Personnel Program - A series of services provided to the student including but not limited to admissions, registration and records retention, academic advising, financial aid and student activities.

Community-Junior College - An educational institution offering a two-year course beyond high school. It represents the fulfillment of the American promise to its citizens for universal education at a low cost to the student but not necessarily low cost to the public. The community college contains a comprehensive curriculum, open-door

policy of admissions, and community-oriented in all its aspects and practices.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN STUDENT
PERSONNEL SERVICES ASSESSMENT SURVEY

SECTION I:
INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Name of college _____
2. What is your total enrollment? _____
3. At your institution is there a staff development program designed specifically for the division of student personnel services? _____
4. If so, is it a formal or informal program? _____
5. If not, is there a staff development program for the total institution that is available to the student personnel staff? _____
6. What is the title of the person responsible for coordinating the staff development program? _____
7. Under which administrative unit or office is the program located?

8. If there is not a staff development program on your campus are there plans to develop one? _____ when? _____

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

9. Approximately how many dollars are budgeted annually for staff development activities in the student personnel services?

10. List the three main activities on which staff development money is spent (professional conference, in-service education, etc.).

11. Does the student personnel services have a formalized missions statement regarding staff development? (Please attach copy if available.)
_____ yes _____ no

12. Identify any unique program features or things you are proud of regarding staff development activities on your campus.

13. Are there staff development activities for classified staff?

EVALUATION

14. In your opinion, what is your institution's commitment to staff development (in terms of dollars committed, number of activities available for staff, encouragement to improve skills, etc.)?

 High Level of Commitment Moderate Commitment
 Little Commitment

15. In your opinion, what is the commitment of the division of student personnel services to staff development (dollars committed, number of activities available for staff, encouragement to improve skills, etc.)?

 High Level of Commitment Moderate Commitment
 Little Commitment

16. How would you characterize staff development activities for student development personnel on your campus?

 A formalized staff development program (staff person responsible for program activities, ongoing formalized program, etc.)
 Some staff development activities but no formal program
 A number of informal activities (staff attendance at workshops and conference, etc.)
 No staff development activities

17. Many activities can be included in a staff development program (participation in professional conferences, bringing in outside experts or resource consultants, on-campus and in-service education, attendance at specialized workshops, attending formal academic courses, participation in staff retreats, etc.). In your opinion, which of these activities would you rank as the most important?
- _____
- Which would you rank as the least important? _____
- _____
18. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of staff development activities (Surveys, participant reports, dollars spent)? _____
- _____
- _____
19. In your opinion, what is the current status of staff development programs on your campus?
- _____ will continue to grow and receive support
- _____ will remain static
- _____ will receive less support in the future
20. Staff development programs are said to have a number of benefits (development of specific skills, exposure to new and varied approaches, exchange of information and ideas, opportunities for introspection, opportunity to become more familiar with new knowledge and theory, etc.). In your opinion, which of these benefits is most valuable? _____
- Which benefit is least valuable? _____
21. What is the major problem that you have confronted in implementing a staff development program or activities? _____
- _____
- _____
22. Please feel free to make any general comments that you have with regard to staff development activities and programs. _____
- _____
- _____
23. Please check here if you would like a copy of this final report.
- _____

24. What job functions are included in the student personnel program at your institution (admissions, financial aids, etc.)?

25. Name and title of respondent _____

SECTION II: Areas of Needed Staff Development for Student Personnel Staff:
 (Please check the most appropriate item concerning your staff)

	Non-Teaching Professionals				Classified Staff			
	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us
1. Knowledge of characteristics and needs of students attending community colleges								
2. Knowledge about multi-purposes of the community college, specifically:								
a) community services								
b) adult								
c) continuing education								
d) general education								
e) vocational-technical education								
3. Purpose for and implications of open-door philosophy								
4. Supervising and evaluating staff								
5. Participative management								

Non-Teaching Professionals

Classified Staff

	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us
6. Implementing and facilitating innovation and change								
7. Setting of goals								
8. Dealing with conflict, stress								
9. Human relations skills								
10. Communication skills (internal, external, written, oral, nonverbal)								
11. Delegating authority and responsibility								
12. Collecting and using data properly								
13. Budgeting-developing, controlling, and implementing								
14. Using time effectively								

Non-Teaching Professionals

Classified Staff

	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us	Staff abilities acceptable at present	We need some assistance	Critical need for us at present	Not applicable to us
15. Planning: short- and long-range								
16. Work effectively with faculty								
17. Clerical skills								
18. Creating positive image of the student personnel office								
19. Teamwork; group dynamics								
20. Updated knowledge of federal and state regulations pertaining to student personnel office								
21. Training, retraining, cross-training								
22. Other _____								

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

SOUTH OKLAHOMA CITY JUNIOR COLLEGE
OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS

7777 So. May
Oklahoma City, OK 73159
405-682-7517

January, 1982

Dear Chief Student Affairs Administrator:

As part of my master's thesis at Oklahoma State University, I am conducting research in the area of staff development for student personnel staff. The purpose of this survey is to collect data on existing staff development programs and to assess specific needs for staff development programs for both non-teaching professional and classified staff in student personnel job functions.

I am requesting your help in completing the attached questionnaire. Your responses will be anonymous in a final report which I will be happy to share. If you desire a copy of this report, please indicate so in the space provided.

Please complete and return the survey by January 29, 1982. An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you very much for taking your very valuable time helping me with this effort.

Sincerely,

Liz Murray
Registrar

VITA |

Elizabeth Jeanette Murray

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A SURVEY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND NEEDS FOR STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL STAFF IN COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Mercedes, Texas, January 7, 1953, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Blankenship.

Education: Graduated from Ada High School, Ada, Oklahoma, in May, 1971; received Bachelor of Science degree in Education from Central State University in 1980; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1982.

Professional Experience: Assistant Registrar, Oklahoma City Southwestern College, 1972-1975; Registrar and Director of Admissions, Oklahoma City Southwestern College, 1976-1980; Registrar, South Oklahoma City Junior College, 1980-present.

Professional Organizations: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Oklahoma Association of Community and Junior Colleges.