Early Stirrings of Student Development in the Community College: The Role of Central Florida Community College

Terry O'Banion

October, 2007

Introduction

In the 1960s my colleagues and I at Central Florida Community College, Santa Fe Community College, and the University of Illinois found great comfort in the Chinese Proverb, *"If we don't change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are heading"* and we used it to preface all the articles on the "Emerging Model of Student Development" with which we were experimenting and about which we were writing. We were not satisfied with the current state of student services in the community college, and we strongly believed we needed to find a new direction, or we would continue with the same sort of dull and ineffective approach common in almost all of higher education in the 1960s and 1970s.

"If we don't change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are heading."

Chinese Proverb

Where we were heading then was down the path of functions and services as the way to identify our work. Student development was simply a list of functions, services, or practices; colleges were judged on the basis of how many of these they supported and the extent to which students used the services.

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

The designation for our profession—Student Services or Student Personnel Services—confirmed the approach to lists. The great leaders of the day confirmed the approach further in their writing: In 1962 J. W. McDaniel listed the 13 *Essential Student Personnel Practices for Junior Colleges* in a monograph published by the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC). In 1964 the Carnegie Corporation awarded AAJC $100,000 to study student personnel programs in the community college. Max Raines headed the study that identified 36 student personnel functions or services for evaluation; I was fortunate to be one of the evaluators on this national project. In the 1965 report on the Carnegie project, *Junior College Student Personnel Programs: Appraisal and Development,* T. R. McConnel, Chairman of the national advisory committee for the project and luminary researcher at Berkeley, said: "The conclusion of these studies may be put bluntly: when measured against criteria of scope and effectiveness, student personnel programs in community junior colleges are *woefully inadequate* (italics added). In 1968 Jane Matson continued the approach to functions and services with the publication of *Guidelines for Student Personnel Services in the Junior College,* prepared by a task force she chaired for the California State Department of Education. In 1969 John Ravekes produced *Functions of Student Personnel Programs in Maryland Community Colleges* for the Maryland Association of Junior Colleges. Many states parroted the national approach: the student personnel program is a series of services or functions scattered around the campus.

Director's Note

The Office of Community College Research and Leadership (OCCRL) at the University of Illinois is delighted to feature Dr. Terry O'Banion's reflections on student development. During our tenure as the National Office of the National Council on Student Development (NCSD) from 2002 to 2007, our staff rekindled a longstanding relationship between the University of Illinois and Dr. O'Banion, who worked here as a higher education professor early in his esteemed career. Having known and admired his work, we are pleased to share his special experiences and reflections with the field – both as a tribute to the past and as a vision for the future.

Debra D. Bragg
OCCRL Director
and Past Executive Director, NCSD

ncsd NATIONAL COUNCIL ON STUDENT DEVELOPMENT
an affiliate council of the american association of community colleges

OCCRL
office of community college research and leadership

In retrospect, what was missing in this approach was a unifying philosophy and purpose for these disparate functions. That is quite surprising given the strong and purposeful philosophy articulated in the famous 1936 statement on the *Student Personnel Point of View* published by the American Council on Education (ACE). This statement was the *Bible* for student personnel staff in higher education, but its vision failed to capture the attention of the more practical leaders in the two-year college sector who were tied to functions and services and who were still somewhat mired in the "guidance" approach they had learned in the high school from which most migrated. For the status of student personnel services in the 1960s "woefully inadequate" was right on target.

A New Direction Begins to Emerge

In the late 60s and early 70s it became increasingly clear to leaders and to practitioners of student personnel that we were headed in the wrong direction with our list of functions and services as the only roadmap. A number of leaders began to ask for a new direction:

- Student personnel workers must assume appropriate responsibility in this monumental effort. This may require almost complete re-designing of the structure or framework and even the content or practices of student personnel work (Matson, 1968).
- Many of the old cherished ideas that guided student personnel workers are being questioned, remodeled, or cast aside as no longer 'relevant' to this day (Ravekes, 1969).
- As the student personnel profession enters the 70s there is a clear call for a new model for the profession—a new model for the role of the student personnel worker. What is called for is a new kind of person, a person who is hardheaded enough to survive the battles that rage in academe, and yet one who is warm-hearted and deeply committed to the full development of human potential (O'Banion, 1971).
- In this call for a new direction we hear the first echoes of a call for the Learning College idea which was based in the Student Development Movement: "*The focus is shifting from instruction to learning*" (O'Banion, 1971).

In the early 60s, at Central Florida Junior College in Ocala, Florida, a group of student personnel professionals came together, and through their shared philosophy and collective action, they began to identify for themselves a new direction in student services. In the beginning they were fairly insular in their approach, but as the model began to take form they connected with others who were also engaged in experimenting with a new direction. The Central Florida group was deeply influenced by the Humanistic Education philosophy, by student personnel organizations and leaders, and by innovative practitioners such as Harold Grant and Don Creamer. As they began to create the framework for a new model of student development for the community college, the Central Florida group was aware that it was engaged in a significant effort—and they were modest in their claims: *The emerging model described, then, is only a tentative statement. It needs considerable modification, testing out in practice, and rounding out with the concepts of others* (O'Banion, 1971).

The Central Florida group included Joseph W. Fordyce, President; Terry O'Banion, Dean of Students; and counselors Charles Merrill, Gayle Privette, and Les Goldman. These five Central Florida staff members were the key players in the "first stirrings" of the student development idea that emerged at Central Florida in the early 60s.

The Overarching Philosophy

A number of conditions made Central Florida a crucible for the early stirrings of an emerging model of student development:

1. **Presidential support.** The student personnel program was championed and supported by the college president, Joseph W. Fordyce. We were the envy of many of our colleagues who longed for similar support from their presidents. In many community colleges presidents were actually antagonistic to the student personnel program. Without Joe's support, his connections, and his vision there would be no Central Florida role in the emerging model of student development.
2. **Youthful energy and beliefs**. We were very young, in our middle 20s, and we had the energy of strong belief often associated with the young. I was 25 years old and the youngest dean of students in the state at that time. We said that student personnel services was our religion, and we were zealots in its cause.
3. **A profitable merger.** We also had the benefit of merging two points of view about student services in higher education. In the beginning we were all counseling advocates steeped in client-centered therapy and humanistic education influenced by the University of Florida. In the middle 60s the emerging model was deeply grounded in humanistic education, but it was also couched in the higher education student personnel service model championed by Florida State University with its leading spokesperson, Melvene Hardee. Mel was my mentor and chair of my doctoral committee at Florida State, and she opened up the world of higher education to me, introducing me to such leaders as E. G. Williamson, Esther Lloyd-Jones, Betty Greenleaf, and Miriam Sheldon, all of whom participated in my dissertation to evaluate COSPA's statement on the preparation of student personnel workers for higher education. Mel Hardee connected me to ACPA and other national student personnel organizations in which I was active until I dropped all affiliations in 1970. Miriam Sheldon helped

bring me to the University of Illinois in 1967. The merging of the two points of view at Florida and Florida State strengthened the foundation of our work to create a new model.

4. **Later influences.** The Florida State influence came after most of our original group had left Central Florida, but that later influence is important in reviewing the role of Central Florida, as is the later influence of Santa Fe Community College. Nothing is likely to have come of the early stirrings at Central Florida had the emerging model not been influenced by Florida State and especially had the emerging model not had a full test of implementation at Santa Fe. What began as mere "stirrings" at Central Florida blossomed into a full-blown national model at Santa Fe founded in 1966. El Centro College in Dallas was also founded in 1966, and under the leadership of Don Creamer the emerging model began to take form there as well. There was a bond between the two programs and others that helped each to grow and improve. In 1967 the details of the Santa Fe model were captured in a 45-page document *A Senior Partner in the Junior College: Student Personnel Services at Santa Fe Junior College.* Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., president of AACC, copped the title *A Senior Partner in the Junior College* for a major speech to the First Annual Junior College Student Personnel Workshop held in Dallas in April 1967; we had arrived big time!

While these four conditions were important in the early stirrings of the student development model at Central Florida, the most crucial condition was lodged in the overall philosophy that gave us direction and courage to experiment and explore. When a core group in an educational institution shares a common philosophy and value system and chooses to act on that base to implement new programs it is a powerful force that can bring about considerable change—especially when there is not much organized opposition. On this principle Joe Fordyce and I created a statement, *The Santa Fe Commitment,* that articulated our values, philosophy and commitment and was used as a template for selecting all new staff. We sought a group of colleagues who would ensure the improvement and expansion of student learning. The statement was used in national advertising to attract candidates and became the primary document that all candidates (in the first year 40 new faculty and staff were selected from approximately 1,000 applicants) would react to, in writing, as part of the selection process. Clearly, the statement struck a cord with faculty and staff who wanted to join this new effort. In later years Robert Schepack, who worked at Santa Fe and later became the President of El Paso Community College, completed a dissertation on the faculty selection process at Santa Fe and concluded that *The Santa Fe Commitment* and the selection process played the major role in creating Santa Fe's special culture—a Learning College before its time. Reflecting now about 40 years later on what happened at Santa Fe, I realize we have Central Florida to thank for the opportunity to explore the first elements of what would eventually become the student development model and the Learning College.

The overarching philosophy that guided our efforts at Central Florida is generally summed up in the term **Humanistic Education**. Our heroes were Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Arthur Combs, and Sydney Jourard. The concepts we bandied about to explain Humanistic Education included unconditional positive regard, self-actualization, self-concept, self-esteem, transcendent functioning, self-disclosure, Maslow's hierarchy of needs, client-centered therapy, and *gestalt* therapy.

> The humanists opted for a more liberated view of human beings, one in which people were innately good and innately self-directing. The role of education, in the eyes of the humanists, is to free the human spirit to become all it is capable of being, by providing opportunities for the practice of new behaviors. (O'Banion in *A Learning College for the 21st Century*, 1997, p. 43)

The zealous rhetoric used to convey these ideas in speeches across the country is also epitomized in my 1971 statement in *The Junior College: A Humanizing Institution* in *A Day at Santa Fe.* (See page 4)

The Santa Fe Commitment

1. The student is the central focus for the process of learning.
2. Teaching occurs only when students learn.
3. Effective educational experiences will modify human behavior in a positive manner.
4. All human beings are motivated to achieve that which they believe is good.
5. Education should be an exciting, creative, and rewarding experience for the student and the teacher.
6. All human beings have worth, dignity, and potential.
7. Experimentation and innovation are reflections of attitudes; when they are translated into practice, the process of education can be significantly advanced.
8. Traditional concepts of education (the lecture, the thirty student class, the fifty-minute period, the standard textbook, the term course, the "F" grade, the rectangular classroom, the student desk) are suspect and in need of careful trial and evaluation at least equal to, and perhaps more than, new and innovative practices.

> In the dehumanizing production model of education, we have developed a society in which the old are plagued by heart attack and the young by heartbreaks. Our non-cognitive capacities have atrophied like an appendix. But no man is so diminished, so emaciated, so retarded or polluted that he can escape responding to be himself, to be natural, to be more fully human when others call to him to be so and allow opportunities for him to answer that call. And there is a clear call today across the land for a new kind of education…. We are at the crest of a new humanistic education, and if the junior college will but respond to this call, this demand, for human liberation, it will live up to its claim of being 'the people's college.' (Fordyce, 1971)

One of Arthur Comb's last major projects (1978) was to chair a committee for the National Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development on the assessment of Humanistic Education. His preface to the report captures the definition of Humanistic Education in rational and measured tones:

> If education is to place high priority on the development of humane people, it must utilize and expand those methods and practices that are known to facilitate positive growth and eliminate those administrative structures, policies, and teaching procedures that make the achievement of humanistic goals difficult. (Combs, *Humanistic Education: Objectives and Assessment,* 1978).

This same preface could have been written for *A Learning College for the 21st Century.*

Early Experiments Leading to the Emerging Model

Academic Advising was where we began our first experiments in change at Central Florida. It was the function or service that demanded attention since it took place for every student every semester—and often involved the entire institution. I remember rolling tub files from the administration building to the gymnasium and setting up tables staffed by faculty who "advised" students waiting in long lines; it was the same model I participated in as a student at the University of Florida, and it must have been the universal model of academic advising in higher education. Several days before classes began students were herded into long lines for "advising," financial aid, registration, etc.; they moved from station to station with their lists and their schedules. By some miracle classes began with students sorted into the right places; for another week "late registration" provided opportunities for changes, and many changes were made in student schedules.

The state of information technology in the early 60s consisted of punch cards ("Do not fold, staple, or mutilate"), a precursor to the more sophisticated technology of today. If we wanted to sort out the students taking a certain number of hours or a certain course we poked a long needle through the appropriate holes and shook out the punch cards that did not apply. We were advanced at Central Florida because we also had color-coded papers with program requirements for transfer to the various state universities; we knew how to "articulate."

Our main emphasis in those early days focused on "who" should do the academic advising. We were strongly influenced by Melvene Hardee at Florida State who had written *The Faculty in College Counseling*—the national Bible for academic advising. No one questioned the assumption that all faculty should be involved in the advising process until we heard Hardee address this issue at a state conference in Florida, and in the question and answer period asked her about this assumption. The details are lost in history, but it was at this point that some of us began to question the value and effectiveness of involving all faculty as academic advisors. It was obvious that some faculty did not want to perform these tasks, and others were poorly qualified to provide the service. Perhaps at the university level the assumption holds, but we questioned its application at the community college level.

So we launched several experiments to check out the assumption. In my first year at Central Florida all faculty provided academic advising. In the second year we selected faculty who were interested and trained them to do academic advising. In the third year we selected adults from the community, some matriculated at the college, and trained them to do the advising along with some faculty and counseling specialists. In the fourth year we simply allowed students to advise themselves with staff available if they wanted help. Each year we evaluated student perceptions regarding the value and effectiveness of the academic advising experience—and we discovered that it did not make a difference on our evaluative instruments (and in our observations of the process) "who" did the advising. It worked but still seemed inefficient and somewhat mundane. Then we concluded that we were asking and creating the program around the wrong question. We believed we needed to understand what was involved in the academic advising process as a better approach to improving the experience for students. "What" is academic advising became our focus rather than "who" should do academic advising, and we were fortunate to connect the two.

Our question became: If we could create the ideal academic advising process what would that process look like for the students? We agreed that ideally students needed to move through the following processes:

- Exploring life goals
- Exploring vocational goals
- Deciding on a program
- Selecting courses
- Registering

The beauty of this model is that we could decide on "who" should help students with each step along the way. To us it was obvious that professional counselors were needed to help with "exploring life goals." Selected faculty could provide sound guidance for the next two steps, and trained students or paraprofessionals could help students select the courses needed for their program and register—making decisions about when to take the courses. We went a step further and listed the competencies and skills required of the personnel who would deliver each of the steps in the model. It was a simple construct, and it resonated with the needs of the profession.

I organized our work in a March 1972 article published in the *Junior College Journal*, "An Academic Advising Model"—and it became a model in higher education, especially in the community college. In 1994 the National Academic Advising Association selected two classic models of academic advising in a 25-year retrospective and published a special journal on the models and their influence. One model was a developmental model of academic advising by Burns Crookston; the other was what American College Testing had come to call "The O'Banion Model." In the Fall of 1994 I wrote a special review for the *The Journal of the National Academic Advising Association* titled *Retrospect and Prospect* about how the model emerged, and I keynoted the national conference for NACADA that year. Over the years dozens of community colleges, maybe hundreds, have referenced this model and have adapted and implemented variations on its themes.

Also in 1972 Joe Fordyce and I and one of my students at the University of Illinois, Gregory Goodwin, conducted the first national survey of academic advising programs in community colleges. Our joint article in the *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1972, "An Overview of Academic Advising: The National Survey", helped make our case about the value of the new model. It was a cornerstone of the emerging model of student development. We had incorporated one of the most challenging functions/services of student personnel work into a larger perspective involving humanistic education ("Exploring life goals") and an efficient approach to academic advising.

The Personal Development Course, the precursor to **The Human Development Curriculum** and the Student Success Course, was a second area in which we explored new approaches at Central Florida, early "stirrings" that would lead to the emerging model of student development. When I came to Central Florida the curriculum included a personal psychology course for 3 credits that was fairly standard across higher education institutions. The course was taught didactically and included sections devoted to study habits and career development. I remember a particularly boring text at the time published by Science Research Associates, *So You Are a College Student Now,* brimming with advice and homilies. Central Florida offered several sections a term, and I decided to teach one of these. It was not a happy experience since I was often called away for administrative responsibilities, and I had little background for teaching personal psychology. I wanted to make the course experience meaningful for the students (as I had done in a high school course in psychology in LaBelle, Florida several years earlier), but I had no approach for this more formal college-level course.

I needed experience working with groups so I went to the local Ocala School for Girls, and talked the administrator into allowing me to do "group therapy" with five girls. I had no idea how to apply my client-centered therapy with individuals to this group, but there was no time to noodle about it. The girls ran away with my first sessions easily revealing the most intimate and difficult challenges in their lives to anyone who would listen. They had run away from home, usually from abusive fathers, and they had committed crimes and had been in jail. They were street smart, and I was pretty dumb about most everything. Way over my head I went to the University of Florida and asked Ted Landsman, a professor in the Counseling Psychology department, to listen to tapes I made of the sessions and help me develop some skills. My secretary transcribed tapes that became part of my training to be a psychotherapist.

I never had an opportunity to apply my group encounter skills in the applied psychology course at Central Florida, but they came into full bloom at Santa Fe where we took Central Florida's personal psychology course and made it the heart of the required general education curriculum. The 3-hour credit course, *The Individual in a Changing Environment*, was required of every entering student and was framed in the context of group encounter. To staff the program we employed 15 to 20 counselors in training from the Counseling Psychology program at the University of Florida; we also had a strong core of full-time counselors who advocated for humanistic education and client-centered therapy. There were no textbooks to incorporate the delivery of our student services (academic advising, registration, financial aid, career counseling, student activities, etc.) into our course emphasizing personal development and involvement in the encounter group process. Students loved the course and gave it high marks. I was convinced it made a difference in the lives of many students, and Joe Fordyce supported our efforts. We were beginning to create the Human Development Curriculum that was an experiment in many colleges at that time.

We needed a text for the course so April O'Connell, who taught in the Psychology Department, and I wrote *The Shared Journey: An Introduction to Encounte*r (1970). The book met a need and was eventually used by over 200 community colleges and universities as a basic text for personal psychology courses and basic communication courses. The book emerged in part out of our work at Santa Fe and with 16 Kentucky community college faculty members who met with me and others in monthly marathon encounter groups to learn how to teach a personal development course. The experience was possible with my first grant of $50,000. We trained the faculty and created the course which was offered in eight Kentucky community colleges. Later the **National Council on Student Development (NCSD)** and the League for Innovation created the Terry O'Banion Shared Journey Award which still recognizes the innovative programs of student personnel practitioners at the NCSD annual convention.

A journal article on "A Junior College Course in Self-Development" (1971) in *Improving College and University Teaching* provides detail about the course we were teaching at Santa Fe and urging others to teach across the country. The course offered an example of what came to be known as the Human Development

Curriculum, another key thread of the emerging model of student development that had its first "stirrings" in a personal psychology course at Central Florida Community College.

The third "stirrings" at Central Florida had to do with **Rules and Regulations.** The College was established in 1958, and the original staff created the philosophy and structure before Joe Fordyce and I arrived several years later. In great part, the college catalog was a duplicate of many of the regulations from the University of Florida. Like most other colleges there were many rules about student behavior, and at Central Florida there were several staff members who made sure they were enforced.

Here are some examples of the rules and regulations in place in 1961:

1. A dress code did not allow women to wear shorts or show their midriffs; no one was allowed to wear flip flops.

2. Campus parking was in early stages of development, and it was not totally clear where students should park. Nevertheless, some staff were quite sure about these areas and insisted that students who did not park in the correct places be cited.

3. The College was not yet totally "open door." Black students did not attend Central Florida and had to attend the college for Black students across town.

4. Another artifact of the closed door philosophy appeared to be a direct copy from the University of Florida catalog. If the designation "Not eligible for re-enrollment" appeared on a student's transcript that student would not be admitted. Students who had been dismissed from the University of Florida often applied for entrance to Central Florida, but this rule prohibited their admission.

5. The number of credits a student could take in a semester depended on his or her workload. If students were working 20 hours a week they could not enroll for more than 12 credits. While this rule had good intentions, it was impossible to enforce, and attempts to enforce it contributed to *in loco parentis* run amuck.

As the dean of students I tried to make these rules and regulations work. Every morning I walked the campus and left a mimeographed note on cars that were not in the right places indicating that repeat violations would be dealt with harshly; but we had no campus security and no way to enforce the warnings. For students who worked too many hours and had signed up for more credits than was allowed I called workplaces and tried to check on them. We began to establish relationships with the counselors for Black students, but it would be later in the 1960s before that college was closed and "integrated" into Central Florida.

It made no sense to me that we would not admit students who had been dismissed from the University of Florida and declare them "not eligible for re-enrollment." After all, the University required high scores on the state-wide high school exam before students could be admitted; these students, therefore, had the ability, but the match was not good or there were other reasons for their lack of success. I convinced the Admissions Committee to run an experiment and admit a group of these students and require them to participate in counseling sessions to ensure they would succeed at Central Florida. The Committee agreed, and we admitted the first group of about 30 students "on probation." These students participated in loosely structured counseling sessions, and the outcome was very successful. The majority of the students were highly successful in the personal environment at Central Florida and grateful for this chance. I am not sure whether Central Florida continued to require such students to be "on probation" and to participate in counseling sessions, but I believe the regulation faded away as an artifact of an earlier era.

What I learned from these experiences with rules and regulations is that a repressive environment does not contribute to sound learning—even though sound learning was often the intention of the rules and regulations in the first place. And I also learned that there were other ways to address student needs in a more positive way. Armed with the Humanistic Education philosophy from our work at the University of Florida, the new staff at Central Florida began to chip away at the rules and regulations to create a more supportive and humane environment. We were adding another thread to the new fabric of student development.

At Santa Fe Community College we implemented this new direction in some ways other observers in the state of Florida thought extreme. At Santa Fe we had no admissions requirements; we had no testing requirements; we had no rules and regulations that limited student participation in courses or in any activities; we created an A, B, C, grading system so there were no Ds and Fs. We did require an 18-hour core of General Education courses that included the *Individual in a Changing Environment* course featuring the encounter group experience, and we used this framework to create positive learning experiences that did not need to be "ruled and regulated." One of my earliest articles *Rules and Regulation: Philosophy and Practice* in the April 1969 *Junior College Journal* proposed doing away with the old regulatory architecture of earlier times. We were helping move student personnel professionals away from their historical beginnings as "wardens" toward new roles as "facilitators."

These three threads—**academic advising, human development curriculum, and rules and regulations**—are examples of services and practices with which we experimented at Central Florida to create new directions for the way we worked with and served students. We were weaving a new model of student personnel services that would eventually be called the Student Development Model. At the time we were not aware that we were involved in creating a new model, and we were not aware that there were similar "stirrings" in other community colleges and universities. We just did not like the way we were doing things at Central Florida, and we knew—through our commitment to Humanistic Education and to Client-Centered Therapy—that there must be a better way. Most importantly, we worked with Joe Fordyce, president at Central Florida, who provided room to experiment, support when we failed, and praise when we succeeded.

Emerging Model of Student Development

The first attempt to organize the various threads of practice into a cohesive model of student development occurred with the creation of a plan for the new program at Santa Fe Community College. In a May, 1966 mimeographed document *Student Personnel Work: A Senior Partner in the Junior College* Joe Fordyce, in the preface, stated his position that allowed the rest of us to create the model:

> I am convinced that student personnel work can and must come to full fruition in the comprehensive junior college. No other educational institution can afford the expanse of educational opportunities that provide a setting in which students' choices can be so fully implemented. By the same token students have generally reached a level of maturity in a time of life when most important decisions can and must be made. Opportunities and necessities then combine to make the junior college the ideal setting for the most effective student personnel programs. (p. 1)

In the mid-sixties Joe chaired the Student Personnel Commission of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACA), and I was commissioned to prepare a statement on student personnel work in the community college. Drawing heavily on the original document we created for the Santa Fe program I asked my colleagues Alice Thurston (dean of students at Montgomery College in Maryland and first chair with Sadie Higgins of American College Personnel Association's (ACPA) Commission 11) and University of Illinois graduate student, James Gulden, to work with me to prepare the commissioned paper. The AACC Commission approved the paper, and in 1970, "Student Personnel Work: An Emerging Model", was published in the *Junior College Journal*. The paper was reprinted as the lead chapter in my 1971 ACPA monograph, *New Directions in Community College Student Personnel Programs,* which featured examples of practice from El Centro College and other leading student development programs. The paper was also a key chapter in my 1972 book, *Student Development Programs in Community Junior Colleges,* with Alice Thurston. In this book the chapter was retitled *Junior College Student Personnel Work: An Emerging Model.*

The emerging model provided a philosophical framework for student development; reviewed old models from the past; and suggested new goals for student learning, new titles and new responsibilities for counselors, new organizational structures, and new roles for the professionals. The article made a strong case for common values shared between student personnel work and the community college. Several quotes from the article (which reflects the use of gender in practice at that time) provide a flavor of the new approach to student development—the emerging model:

> Thus, the dimensions of a new model begin to emerge: Education becomes *educere* "to lead out of," so that education is not a pouring into, but the means of providing a learning climate in which the greatest possible development of potential and fulfillment can take place.
>
> In the new model of student development there are implications of climate and outcome. A student development point of view is a behavioral orientation in which educators attempt to create a climate of learning in which students have: 1) freedom to choose their own directions for learning, 2) responsibility for those choices, and 3) interpersonal interaction with the learning facilitator that includes challenge, encounter, stimulation, confrontation, excitement, warmth, caring, understanding, acceptance, support, and appreciation of individual differences.
>
> A term that may more accurately reflect some of the special dimensions of the emerging model is that of the "human development facilitator." "Facilitate" is an encountering verb which means to free, to make way for, to open the door to. The human development facilitator does not limit his encounter to students; instead he is interested in facilitating the development of all groups in the educational community (faculty, secretaries, administrators, custodians and other service workers, and board members). In the community college his concern extends into the community.
>
> Student personnel staff members should teach student development courses not usually available in instructional programs…. Such a course is a course in introspection: the experience of the student is the subject matter.
>
> The student personnel worker also should move directly into contact with the community beyond the campus if his impact is going to be significant.
>
> The student personnel worker should also consider means of getting students involved in the education of other students.
>
> Another important role for the student personnel worker in the community college is to be a guardian against the oppressive regulations that tend to develop unquestioned in most institutions…. He must function with a sound rationale, however, so faculty members will not regard him as one who wrecks standards.
>
> If the new technology frees instructors from the role of transmitting knowledge to a role of assisting students in integrating and applying knowledge, the student personnel worker will relate to instructors in important ways.
>
> The basic rationale that supports the importance of student personnel work in the community college is that the student

> personnel point of view and the community college point of view are one and the same…. Without doubt, student personnel work and the community college rank among the most important of American educational inventions. As such, they reflect the basic pattern of American democracy with its concern for individual opportunity.

These quotes provide a flavor of the ideas in the model. Every paragraph is chock full of provocative dimensions of a new and emerging model. In rereading the article I am struck by the variety of issues we addressed and the range of new directions for roles and functions we suggested. We couched our ideas in the framework of Humanistic Education, but we were also realistic, practical, and cautious in ways that I had not remembered. We also recognized that colleges would adopt only parts of the model, and we recommended that leaders continue to explore ever-new approaches. Thirty-five years later I believe the model had significant impact on student personnel work in the community college for a period of time.

The model was published at a time the student personnel profession throughout higher education was undergoing major change. The ACPA and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) provided national leadership for the re-examination of the role of student personnel work. A number of significant documents have been published on these new roles, but the Emerging Model we created had little impact on these national statements. Perhaps we were too community college-centric; perhaps we were too ideal; perhaps we had not yet gained status at the table of higher education. In any case, the emerging model of student development referenced here had its early "stirrings" at Central Florida and provided a direction for many community college programs across the nation committed to better serving and influencing their students.

Postscript

Central Florida was the beginning of my professional life. I arrived in 1961 a naïve and inexperienced redneck from LaBelle, Florida who had never driven a car out of his county until his senior prom. Although I did not know student development from shinola I made leaps in my thinking, so when I arrived at Santa Fe Community College in 1964-65 I was much more mature and ready to implement new ideas that had "stirred" at Central Florida. In 1967 I joined the University of Illinois as an Assistant Professor of Higher Education; in 5 years I became a full Professor of Higher Education and a Visiting Professor at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1975 I took the job as Executive Director of the League for Innovation in the Community College and moved to Los Angeles overcoming my "dark horse" position because of my work in student services (most of the presidents on the search committee had great disdain for student services). Except for a 2-year period as Vice Chancellor of Education for the Dallas Community Colleges in 1980-82 I remained as CEO of the League until my retirement on December 31, 1999.

At the University of Illinois I continued my work in student development, sharpening and focusing ideas that had their beginnings at Central Florida and Santa Fe. By the time I joined the League in 1975 I had dropped out of the student personnel profession and did not write much more pertaining to the field. In the early 70s I had started writing about staff development and wrote a book *Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College* and many articles on staff development. My ideas regarding staff development were strongly influenced by student development. I worked with a construct that "Improved staff development leads to improved program and organizational development which leads to improved student development."

In the early 90s much of my work came together around the concept of "The Learning College," and I penned *A Learning College for the 21st Century* along with four monographs and many articles on this topic. The Learning College idea was the culmination of my work with student development and reflects many of the basic concepts of Humanistic Education and the Student Development Model. Although I was no longer engaged after 1975 in professional associations of student services and no longer wrote about student development, all my subsequent work was strongly influenced by my early experiences and my commitment to the values and philosophy of student development. My work in staff development and in the Learning College is deeply embedded in this arena; and I have been the richer for this early experience in student development.

President of the League for Innovation in the Community College for 23 years, Terry O'Banion "retired" on December 31, 1999. Under his leadership the League became an international organization serving over 700 colleges. In honor of his 41 years of service to education, three national awards have been established in his name: the Terry O'Banion Student Technology Champion Award (Microsoft); the Terry O'Banion Prize for Teaching and Learning (ETS); and the Terry O'Banion Shared Journey Award (NCSD). O'Banion has been a Professor of Higher Education at the University of Illinois, a Visiting Professor at the University of California at Berkeley, a Distinguished Visiting Professor at The University of Texas at Austin, a Distinguished Scholar in Residence at Antioch University, and was the 2000 Marie Roberts Fisher Distinguished Professor at the University of North Texas. He has written 12 books and 126 articles. He is currently the Director of Walden University's Community College Leadership program and is President Emeritus and a Senior League Fellow at the League for Innovation. Dr. O'Banion can be reached at *obanion@league.org.*