CHAPTER ONE

"A LONG AND HONORABLE HISTORY"

Student Affairs in the United States

Michael D. Coomes and Janice J. Gerda

Student affairs is a profession with a long and proud history of service. Today's student affairs professionals walk in the footsteps of women and men who, for more than 100 years, have loved learning so much that they dedicated their lives to colleges and universities and to their students. With creativity and grit, they quietly pushed the larger enterprise to adapt to new students and imagined better things in the service of students and the mission of a college or university. At its core, student affairs is the work of helping each and every student get the most out of his or her unique college experience.

It does not stop there, however. The ability of students to thrive and graduate is a short-term goal. As a profession, student affairs strives for nothing less than to change the world for the better. Although most student affairs work is done in the context of the college years, its goal is to be a catalyst for lifelong growth and curiosity, for worldwide citizenship and care for one another, and for a more just and humane society for generations to come. This work is done through seemingly mundane, day-to-day teaching moments and the very down-to-earth sharing of the student experience. All of the college experience is a learning lab for life. It is this paradox of audacious limitless goals and right-now pragmatism of the present that ties together student affairs professionals through its history.

To be sure, all good teachers care deeply about the educational experiences of their students. In that sense, student affairs shares its mission with the faculty. But over time, as higher education expanded, some positions were created that called for someone whose primary purpose was to step back and view both students and the college experience as a whole rather than in the context of a specific course or discipline. So, student affairs professionals are specialists in a larger universe of teachers and helpers. Not all who help students are student affairs professionals, but all student affairs professionals have as their primary purpose helping students.

In this chapter, we lay out some of the stories of those who have contributed to the development of student affairs as a profession. We also tell the story of how the profession has remained committed to its goal of helping all students realize the most from their higher education experience while adjusting to new students, new institutional forms, and new learning imperatives. We encourage readers to dig deeply into student affairs' professional history and values and write their own version of our profession's story.

Time proceeds linearly; however, stories do not. This is especially the case of a story as complex as the development of a profession. Rather than one event leading clearly to another, events occur sequentially, concurrently, and recursively. The image of a tree with many roots helping to develop a trunk and a trunk supporting many branches may be a better metaphor for the story we tell in this chapter than that of a river that flows inexorably from source to sea. Our story does not unfold in strict chronological order because we have focused our attention on how the work of serving students has changed over time—different sources of influence have shaped that work at the same point in time. Rather than leaving one story to join another for the sake of chronological consistency, we have decided to complete the different story lines and present the facts in nonchronological sequence.

The First Student Affairs Professionals

When did student affairs start? This is a natural question, and a deceptively difficult one. Because we have retroactively named and defined this profession, we can not simply look up what those in the past wrote. We must make some judgments about what fits our definition and identify our professional ancestors from the perspective of the present. So, in the past, who on a college campus did the job of helping students to get the most out of their college experiences?

For much of the history of American higher education, colleges and universities were very small communities with student bodies that numbered in the dozens or hundreds. For example, in 1770, 413 students were enrolled at Harvard College and 338 were enrolled at Yale (Thwing, 1906). The small number of faculty members and the president or a few other administrators could easily facilitate the entirety of the whole student experience (Leonard, 1956). More important, their students were very much like younger versions of themselves (that is, male, White, and Christian), and imagining what it might be like to be a student was a fairly easy and intuitive activity.

In 1833, the leaders of Oberlin College started a daring experiment. They decided to admit women and men, and in 1835 they expanded their experiment in equality by admitting African American students. Although today we might imagine that the African American men had unique needs, what stood out then was the new idea of a woman college student. Suddenly, faculty and other leaders could not just rely on their own personal experience to intuit what a student needed. As women students entered more colleges, and some colleges were founded just for them, male leaders were at a loss to decipher the mysteries of what women students needed. To solve this problem, a number of presidents began to create positions largely filled by women who would focus only on women students and their needs. Some of the first titles for these positions were preceptress and lady principal (Gerda, 2007).

At first, the most obvious unmet needs to be addressed by these new women administrators were social, such as how to protect women students from the kinds of social errors that could ruin their reputations for life, or how to maintain the expectations of restrictive and modest clothing with the need to study and live in the college community. But over time these early professionals and their students made it clear that the deeper issues of available career paths, employment opportunities, and mentoring were also factors in whether or not women students got the most out of their college experience (Nidiffer, 2000).

By the 1890s, the women who filled these positions were increasingly well educated and were given roles pertaining to the academic needs of women students so that they could address issues beyond just the social. To reflect this broadening of responsibilities, the title of dean of women was created. In 1892, President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago tapped Alice Freeman Palmer (then president of Wellesley College) to be the dean of women, signaling the prestige and importance of the position. Palmer negotiated to begin the job with an associate, Marian

Talbot, who ultimately crafted the position and set a standard for the many deans of women across the country. In a 1910 speech, Gertrude Martin of Cornell University remarked, "I am sure that it was the University of Chicago that really made it fashionable, though her dean of women was by no means the first" (Martin, 1911, p. 66). The position proliferated.

At about the same time that the University of Chicago was implementing the position of dean of women, another prestigious university was redesigning ways to think about the student experience as a whole. Harvard University did not have women students. It did, however, have women graduate students, and they had new and different needs from the men of the college. In 1890, President Charles Eliot decided he could not manage student relations and his burgeoning responsibilities for faculty, finances, and facilities, so he created a position titled dean of the college and appointed the well-respected and beloved faculty member LeBaron Russell Briggs to the position. Briggs's primary responsibilities were to attend to undergraduate student needs (as opposed to focusing on subject matter or teaching) making him unique at Harvard for his focus on students (Findlay, 1938).

The appointment of many deans of women across the country and Briggs's appointment as dean of the college at Harvard prompted a re-examination of the needs of male students (Findlay, 1938). Men could see the advantages that women students gained from having an advocate, and administrators elsewhere wanted to emulate Harvard's model. As the twentieth century began, some institutions tapped a faculty member who already had a student orientation to focus on the student experience as a whole. Thomas Arkle Clark, an English professor at the University of Illinois, had already gladly worked on student life projects. In 1901, President Andrew Sloan Draper began to formalize some of those roles, and Clark would become legendary for his oversight of the men of Illinois. In 1909, he was given the title of Dean of Men (Fley, 1978; Gaytas, 1998; Schwartz, 2010).

The Beginnings of a Profession

These early student affairs pioneers conducted their important work of helping students "face the academic rigors and social freedom of campus life" individually and independently (Schwartz, 2010, p. 3). However, what establishes a profession as a profession is not the work of any single person (regardless of how professionally that work has been conducted), but

rather the desire of a group of individuals to work collectively to establish, maintain, and enhance a professional identity. This work includes deciding who is allowed to claim membership, set expectations for members, study the nature of the work, and set long-term goals. In student affairs, the first collective meeting of professionals we can find took place on November 3 and 4, 1903, when eighteen women met on the campuses of the University of Chicago and Northwestern University to talk about their work (Gerda, 2007).

Most of the attendees of this meeting were deans of women, but some were there because their college had not yet appointed a dean and so they were doing the work until that happened. They talked about ideas, concerns, and topics in ways that probably seem very familiar to today's student affairs professionals. A few topics surprise, showing that 100 years does change some things, but the bedrock issues included safe on-campus housing that was conductive to academic work, good health, self-governance and equity among the student community, and building alliances with (and judicious independence from) national sororities and religious organizations that shared a mission of helping students. Just as important, they clearly found support, solace, and renewal in each other's company as they shared their challenges. At the end of the meeting, they voted on a set of resolutions that represented their collective opinion about best practices, and made plans to meet regularly ("Minutes," 1903). Although vastly simpler than the association activity of student affairs today, the basic components of this meeting happen at student affairs conferences today. For inaugurating collective professional activity and for setting a tone of collegiality that carries through student affairs to this day, the 1903 Conference of Deans of Women of the Middle West is remembered as the birth of the profession of student affairs (Gerda, 2007).

A New Approach: Deaning

If the first approach to student affairs work was the pragmatic social tutelage provided by lady principals and preceptresses, then the first big new idea was the concept of *deaning*. The president of Oberlin, when giving advice to the University of Michigan as it explored creating a position of dean of women, said she should be a "wise and pious matron" (Holmes, 1939, p. 6; Nidiffer, 2000, pp. 16–17). The new dean model required a woman who was an academic in her own right. This allowed a dean of women to advocate for students as a scholar and teacher, but more

important to act as a peer to faculty and other administrators (Mathews, 1915). Deans of women often reported directly to the president, and they worked closely together to do the politically delicate work of changing higher education to better fit women students in a time when coeducation was still being hotly debated. The Association of Collegiate Alumni (ACA), an organization for women who had graduated from college, pushed colleges and universities not only to create the dean of women position, but also to make sure the job description had the high standards needed for the position to be valued and respected. They withheld valuable membership and "refused to recognize and recommend an institution which did not have a dean of women who qualified under the Association standards" (Iva L. Peters, as cited in Findlay, 1938, p. 28). All together, this set the bar very high for prospective deans, and institutions invested great resources in national searches for candidates. Public universities in the Midwest were among the first to fully invest in this new idea, while others simply appointed a woman faculty member to perform some of the functions. Deans at women's colleges and coordinate colleges had different challenges, but their work was similar enough that they joined to share professional improvements and speak as a group to presidents. From 1903 to 1922, the Conference of Deans of Women refined the idea of deaning, producing scholarship, mentoring and teaching new deans, and spreading best practices with their higher status in the academy (Gerda, 2007).

The proliferation and success of the position of dean of women spurred a slightly later but parallel version of the deaning approach. In the early twentieth century, society (and by extension, higher education) had very different expectations of men than of women. This affected how each was educated. So, although deaning approaches were developed for both women and men students, they took on slightly different flavors. James Findlay (1938) has suggested that the development of the position of dean of men usually came as a direct result of the position of Dean of Women, and at least at its inception was intended to provide parallel services and advocacy for male students.

However, the men who filled these positions held different statuses and therefore did the work differently than did deans of women. By virtue of their gender and because many of them were already faculty members at the institution when they were appointed, they were more able to function as insiders to the core group of administration and faculty. Their work was less about advocating for men as a group and more about advocating for individual men who were struggling because of a lack of funds, a family

emergency, youthful indiscretions, or peer pressure. Deans of men worked through force of personality, functioning as wise uncles shepherding older boys into manhood (Schwartz, 2010). They met one on one with students for personal consultations and saw fraternities and athletics as allies in their goals. Presidents and boards needed someone to discipline male students when they misbehaved and charged the dean of men position with taking care of conduct issues. However, for the most part the deans of men resisted the role of disciplinarian as antithetical to the familial mentor personae they wished to project (Schwartz, 2010).

We know about these approaches because in 1919, a group of deans of men founded a professional association (the Conference of Deans and Advisors of Men) to share their challenges and ideas. The first meeting was spurred by their mutual relief that World War I had ended. The Student Army Training Corps (SATC) was finally leaving their campuses, and student life could once again be guided by the principles of deaning. It was a casual and collegial group of carefully selected colleagues who gathered in Madison, Wisconsin, but they kept near-verbatim records that allow us to almost hear their discussions even today. Their organization still exists, much changed, as NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Together, the development of the positions of dean of women and dean of men constitute an approach we call *deaning*, enacted by a collection of professionals others (for example, Rhatigan, 2009) have called *early deans*. From the early deans, the profession retains the goals of advocacy for struggling students, the pragmatic focus on individual student crisis response, and the desire to address all the basic needs of students with little staff and few resources.

A New Approach: Vocationalism

Even as deaning spread and strengthened, a new idea was developing and slowly making an impact on student affairs work. The vocational movement was the effort to use scientific psychological principals to match students with their best possible jobs and career paths. Frank Parsons is considered the founder of vocational psychology in the United States and was the author of the 1909 book *Choosing a Vocation* (Hoff, Kroll, MacKinnon, & Rentz, 2004). Vocational work was an ideal theory base for student affairs, and it translated into the pragmatic administrative work of placement.

The deans of women, in particular, adopted this approach as a large part of their work, perhaps because of the challenges of helping young alumnae to plan and implement careers. Some deans of women became vocationalists, and some vocationalists from outside academe became deans of women. What we might now call "career services" became a significant part of the work of higher education in general, and of the work of student affairs professionals in particular. It did not replace deaning but altered and added to it. The work became more organized and scientific and required more knowledge of the world of work beyond college. Academic expertise and experience in history or chemistry became less useful to a student affairs professional than expertise in psychology, business, sociology, or even teacher placement.

In 1913, this need for different expertise led a small group of deans of women to approach the faculty at Teachers College, Columbia University, to ask about creating a curriculum that would help them draw from new and different disciplines to be better prepared for the new kind of work. This resulted in the first degree program in student affairs targeted at "special training exclusively on a graduate level, designed to train 'deans, and advisors of women'" (Lloyd-Jones, 1950, p. 262). This interdisciplinary program employed faculty members with backgrounds in psychology, home economics, family relations, religious education, and the problems of youth (Lloyd-Jones, 1950). In 1914 a course in vocational guidance was offered, and the Teachers College bulletin listed a course in "Dean of Women in Colleges and Normal Schools" (LaBarre, 1948). In 1928, the academic department changed its name from Deans and Advisors of Women and Girls to Student Personnel Administration. By 1945, fifty-three personnel work graduate degree programs had been developed that offered some courses preparing personnel workers for employment on college campus; five of these (Cornell University, Mount Holyoke College, University of Pittsburgh, Radcliffe College, and Southern Methodist University) offered courses only for those seeking employment in a college or university. In total, 105 universities had personnel preparation programs preparing practitioners for elementary, secondary, or higher education. An additional seventy-seven colleges and universities offered graduate training in personnel work in such noneducation fields as business, government, industry, religious life, rehabilitation, social work, and psychological services (LaBarre, 1948).

In 1916, some of the same women who pushed for the creation of the Teachers College deaning degree began a new professional association, called the National Association of Deans of Women (NADW). From its

inception, it was a large, structured organization, which grew rapidly as it brought together a wider constituency. Seeking influence through open membership rather than exclusivity, organization leaders invited as speakers and participants anyone who was doing the work or related work. In contrast to the early deans, the new members of NADW included women deans from two-year colleges and normal schools, high school deans, vocational bureau directors, government officials who worked with career issues and education, and faculty who studied vocational choice. Notably, they actively sought male speakers and experts who could add to the discussion (Gerda, 2004). This openness eventually extended to inclusion of professionals of color such as Lucy Diggs Slowe, Dean of Women at Howard University, whose steadfast challenge to segregation led to some of the profession's earliest self-struggles with social justice and inclusion based on race and ethnicity (Miller & Pruitt-Logan, 2012). More so than the deaning associations and their meetings, the conferences of the NADW resemble the national student affairs conferences and conventions of today. The NADW continued with a strong vocationalism bent, then adopted many of the principles of the next big idea, *student personnel*, and other new approaches after that. It grew, shifted its mission, and changed its name several times, all while playing the role of one of three major student affairs associations throughout the twentieth century. In 2000, as a result of a significantly smaller membership base, brought about to some degree by a confusing and unclear mission and the cooptation of women educators who worked in higher education by other organizations, the organization disbanded (Gangone, 2008).

We have chosen to discuss vocationalism as its own new approach, but it really became a force when a new approach called student personnel came on the scene. Student personnel used all of the core ideas of vocationalism plus a broader approach to higher education (indeed, administration as a whole). Although vocationalism can be seen as a sub-idea of student personnel, it remains in student affairs today as the functional area of career services and as a part of many student affairs administrative units.

A New Approach: Student Personnel

Student personnel is arguably the most powerful and influential idea to have been brought into the student affairs profession. It was more than just an idea or even an approach; it was referred to by its proponents as a Movement (with a capital M) and was part of the larger Personnel Movement

that permanently changed the direction of other professions, including business management, military operations, and human resources. The student personnel idea was so influential when it arrived that the whole profession adopted the term as its name from the 1920s until the 1970s. Even today, you will find that publications, graduate degree programs, and job titles have or recently had the term *student personnel* in their official names (ACPA: College Student Educators International, 2012).

To understand student personnel, it is necessary to retrace our steps and examine ideas that were shaping other fields when student affairs was still creating and refining deaning. In the 1890s, Walter Dill Scott was studying in the relatively new field of psychology as it applied to business. He noticed that some men were better salesmen than others, not because of differences in training, but because of their personalities and natures (Wright & Dimsdale, 1974). He developed a set of questions that could help an employer determine which men would be better salesmen even before they were hired, saving an employer money, time, and supervisory effort (Biddix & Schwartz, 2012; Lynch, 1968). Scott was not the only person exploring ways that the science of psychology could make industry more efficient, but he spread his ideas through consulting and recruited a number of other people to spread his ideas. They developed a larger scheme of personnel through the use of scientific psychology, intelligence and personality testing, time studies, and efficiency analyses, which matched the right person with the right job.

During World War I, Scott observed the way that the British military assigned its soldiers to tasks; he thought it was inefficient and could benefit from personnel principles. When the United States entered the war, Scott approached US military leadership and offered his services as a consultant. They were skeptical at first but soon adopted personnel as a philosophy for sorting and assigning soldiers to the work that needed to be done. In retrospect, Scott's more efficient assignment process has been credited with nothing less than American success in World War I (Mathews, 1937).

When the war ended and the soldiers came home, the idea of personnel was very quickly applied to colleges and universities. Former military officers took positions on campuses and began to organize student life in a way that was far more efficient and able to manage the large number of students then flooding higher education. Scott himself aided the movement by accepting an offer to become president of Northwestern University, where he not only implemented student personnel, but also actively promoted it across the nation (Biddix & Schwartz, 2012). Building on commonalities with vocationalism and layered over the basics of

deaning, student personnel rapidly became the driving conceptual framework for student affairs.

In 1924, personnel workers under the leadership of May Cheney adopted the constitution of the National Association of Appointment Secretaries. Cheney had started her own commercial venture for teacher placement in California, and was reported to be "the first woman in the country to begin a college appointment service" ACPA: College Students Educators International, 2012, p. 9). In 1929, the name of the organization changed to the National Association of Placement and Personnel Officers to reflect a more contemporary understanding of the work of "placing teachers and other college graduates" and the increasing influence of the Personnel Movement (Sheeley, 1983. p. 180). The organization was to undergo one more name change in 1931 when it became the American College Personnel Association. The goals of ACPA included bringing all those who were involved in personnel work together in a single organization while still maintaining its unique divisions and the development of professional meetings that would bring together personnel workers for the purpose of "the interchange of ideas, … by formulating and maintaining standards; and by cooperative effort in research, experimentation and service" (American College Personnel Association, 1933, p. 87). The association is currently ACPA: College Student Educators International.

After almost two decades of haphazard implementation of student personnel, there was a national effort to encourage the profession to fully adopt the student personnel approach. In 1937, nineteen student personnel workers, faculty members, elementary and secondary school educators, businessmen, and government officials met under the auspices of the American Council on Education to develop a statement on the "philosophy and development of student personnel work" (American Council on Education [ACE], 1937; Gerda, Coomes, & Asimou, 2012). The 1937 *Student Personnel Point of View* (SPPV) (American Council on Education, 1937), grounded in a "long and honorable history," provided the clearest statement of the philosophy of the Student Personnel Movement to date by emphasizing that colleges and universities were obligated to "consider the student as a whole … [with] an emphasis, in brief, upon the development of the student as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone" (ACE, 1937, p. 1). The document also detailed twenty-three functional responsibilities (for example, academic and career advising, extracurricular activities) that should constitute the student services function and advocated coordination between and among professionals, institutions, and associations (ACE, 1937, p. 9). As

Gerda et al. (2012) argued, this document represented more that just a statement of philosophy. It was the articulation of the history of the Student Personnel Movement; a record of the 1937 ACE-sponsored conference; and, perhaps, an attempt by the American Council on Education to stake out a leadership position in student affairs. Regardless of its intent, the 1937 SPPV has become known as the foundational document that advanced the idea that "*student affairs professionals are educators*" [emphasis in the original] focused on "transformational thinking for the benefit of developing the whole student" (Torres, DeSawal, & Hernandez, 2012). By comparison, deaning and earlier, less structured approaches began to look like "sentimentalized intuition" (Brubacher & Rudy, 1958/1997, p. 335).

As the United States faced entry into another World War, student personnel was a broad and influential conceptual framework for student affairs work. Leaders were still spreading the word to campuses that had not yet converted as the entire country turned its attention to World War II. During the Second World War, college campuses were forced to respond to smaller student enrollments, and professional associations declined to meet so as to save resources that would otherwise have gone to travel. When the war ended, Student Personnel would remain, but it would need to adapt to the postwar world.

Student Personnel, Continued and Deeper

As the war ended and the nation's focus returned to domestic concerns, higher education found itself in a very different world. Among the changes that significantly influenced student affairs were the flood of veterans into higher education; the return of military leaders to student personnel administration; and a re-examination of the nature of student personnel, resulting in a new point of view and a call for refocusing on deeper teaching.

The passage of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act—more commonly known as the G. I. Bill—resulted in one of the most significant periods of growth in the history of higher education. This explosive growth fostered the creation of new student affairs functional areas and the evolution of new administrative forms. Department of Education statistics showed that college enrollments "nearly doubled between the fall of 1945 and the fall of 1946, and by 1947 enrollment was 70 percent higher than its prewar levels" (Stanley, 2003, p. 677). By the time the bill expired, "a total of 1,232,000 veterans utilized their GI Bill" for college (Olson, 1973, p. 602). Like other

"outsiders" (Lefkowitz Horowitz, 1987, p. 14), these students demonstrated "maturity, increased initiative, greater sense of purpose and social consciousness and wider experience" than their traditional-age counterparts (Olson, 1973, p. 603). The rules that guided student affairs practice on college campuses were designed for younger, less worldly students, and the veterans found those restrictions constraining and insulting. They were eager to get on with their lives after the interruption of the war. They were attuned to vocational ends and frequently began families before finishing their education. These factors required campuses to expand services such as family health care, build extensive new residence hall systems, and reconsider the student-institution relationship, as more mature veterans were demanding greater autonomy and individual rights.

During the war the primary responsibilities for student support fell to the dean of women (Coomes, Whitt, & Kuh, 1987), but with the return of men to campus, senior administrators determined that these women were ill fitted for the job of directing services for men and placed the dean of women in a subservient relationship to the dean of men or, more frequently, developed the new position of dean of students and almost always filled that position with a man. As Schwartz (1997) noted, "The position of dean of women was an inevitable victim of the pervasive hostility that greeted women in general on campus, while the position of dean of men assumed new administrative importance" (p. 433). The appointment of men to these newly created positions was compatible with the student personnel tenet of efficiency and was probably also a result of acknowledged or unacknowledged sexism (Tuttle, 1996). Although a small number of dean of women titles still exist today, postwar student personnel generally ended the dean of women position.

Finally, student personnel was affected by pressure for change from within. A committee reviewed and reissued the *Student Personnel Point of View* in 1949 and added language to emphasize citizenship and global democracy. Esther Lloyd-Jones, who had been a primary author of the 1937 SPPV and was a protégé of Walter Dill Scott at Northwestern, joined with others to question whether student personnel needed to readjust to account for some of the weaknesses that had become apparent over the decades and especially as a result of World War II. At its extreme, student personnel aimed toward efficiency and organization in a way that glossed over the individual student and his or her unique, qualitative, unclassifiable challenges and identities. As the enrollments at institutions climbed well into the thousands in the 1950s and 1960s, the approach was in danger of missing the trees for the forest. Lloyd-Jones and Smith

(1954) called for keeping the core principles of student personnel while being careful to keep the deeper teaching of the individual student at the center of the work of the profession.

Another New Approach: Student Development

In the late 1960s and early 1970s another new approach emerged: that of the student developmentalist. This approach was similar to previous approaches in that it was still committed to the larger educational goal of educating the whole student. However, like the previous approaches it differed on tactics and sources of insight.

By the late 1960s, previous dominant approaches were viewed as inadequate to meet the rapidly changing face of higher education caused by a significantly different student-institutional relationship (Harvey, 1974), the increasing post–World War II emphasis on science in the academy and the role that emphasis played in shaping the priorities of faculty members (Committee on the Student in Higher Education, 1968; Wilson, 1983), and new sources of insight into the nature of the American college student through formal theories on individual development and the college experience (Chickering, 1969; Feldman & Newcomb, 1969; Perry, 1970, Sanford, 1962). Student affairs practitioners questioned their foundational beliefs as campus events of the 1960s and early 1970s shook long-held cultural, educational, political, and sexual norms. With the civil rights, women's rights, antiwar and anti-draft movements, and the newly recognized status of students as adults, the nature of the student-institution relationship changed, and the role of student affairs professionals became ambiguous (see Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978; Wolf-Wendel, Twombly, Tuttle, Ward, & Gaston-Gayles, 2004).

This professional identity crisis was clearly reflected in the titles of numerous articles published in the period's professional journals and newsletters, including "Identity Crisis—1965" (Kirk, 1965); "Whither Student Personnel Work from 1968 to 2018" (Shaffer, 1968); "Student Personnel Work: A Profession Stillborn" (Penny, 1969); "Student Affairs Administration in Transition" (Chandler, 1973); and "Student Personnel—All Hail and Farewell!" (Crookston, 1976).

Reviews of contemporary documents laying out the developmentalist approach (for example, Brown, 1972) frequently noted that new challenges and an unclear identity could be addressed by focusing the work of student affairs educators on the developmental needs of students. This

new approach was heralded as "a promising omen" that included the "increasing summons from within the profession for student personnel workers to view themselves as behavioral scientists and the growing volume of research and thought on what influences and promotes student development" (Brown, 1972, p. 10). The Tomorrow's Higher Education (T.H.E.) Project defined and justified the student development approach:

> Student development in the higher education context, is the application of human development concepts in the post-secondary setting. Human development is a patterned, orderly, lifelong process leading to the growth of self-determination and self-direction, which results in more effective behavior … The goal of the [T.H.E.] Project is to reconceptualize student affairs work in a way that will provide a measure of creative input from the student affairs profession toward the shaping of post-secondary education for the future. Student development must be the keystone of future programs and … incorporate student development into and throughout the institution. ("A student development model," 1975, pp. 336, 341)

The student development approach would dominate the 1970s and 1980s. By the early 1990s, it had its detractors (Bloland, 1986a, 1986b; Crookston, 1976; Plato, 1978), but it had become such a pervasive perspective it would eventually be called an "essential ideal" guiding higher education (Strange, 1994).

The fluid nature of student affairs during this period can also be seen in a number of attempts to consolidate or strengthen the collaborative bonds between proliferating student affairs professional organizations. Perhaps the most active collaboration was the Council of Student Personnel Associations (COSPA), which included ACPA, NASPA, NAWDC (the former NADW), the Western Personnel Institute, the Association of College Unions, the Association of College and University Housing Officers, and the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors. COSPA existed from 1963 to 1970 when NASPA departed the organization to "pursue significant relationships with ACPA and NAWDC through joint executive committee meetings" (Bloland, 1972, p. 487). Other examples of collaborative efforts among the three largest student personnel associations during this time period include the publication of the *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* (American Association of University Professors, 1967) and occasional cosponsored professional meetings.

One More New Approach: Student Learning

With the 1980s came increasing criticism that higher education had lost rigor, content knowledge transmission, and its competitive edge in preparing American students for jobs. As an echo of the Cold War, some worried that other countries were producing smarter and more scientifically adept students than was the United States. A series of documents identified by Coomes, Forney, Keim, Kuh, Rodgers, and Stamatakos (1987) trace pressure from government and society for the full spectrum of the American education system to focus on such essentials of education as math, reading, writing, science, and cultural literacy (Hirsch, 1987). The key focus on maturation and individual development advocated by the student development approach was criticized as peripheral by core learning advocates. But student development was still important to student affairs, and as with previous ideas, it was kept in large part even as new approaches were proposed.

While holding fast to the utility of student development approaches to the end goal of helping students, a new document called for a readjustment to bring intellectual development theories closer to the forefront, and for student affairs professionals to work closely with faculty to feature learning theory more prominently in student affairs expertise. *The Student Learning Imperative* (American College Personnel Association, 1994) envisioned pairing an out-of-classroom understanding of learning processes with the formal teaching processes of the university to bring student affairs closer to the learning mission. It called for a review of all student affairs activities to make sure they were in support of this goal, and in a way harkened back to the deaning approach's strong connection to the faculty and curricular decisions.

Approaches for the Twenty-First Century

Inherent in an urgent call for change is the assumption that something is not working. As the twentieth century came to a close and the twenty-first began, many within and outside of higher education were asking whether all the activities of higher education were necessary to the missions of institutions, or whether resources should be allocated to other activities. Too little time has passed yet to put these questions in focus or cluster them into an identifiable new approach to help the profession adapt. These questions

are offered as clues to understanding the current era, and how it might look from a future vantage point.

- How do we balance student needs and student wants? Deaning sometimes imposed structure on students for their own good. Vocationalism and student personnel steered students to their best fit, sometimes discouraging unrealistic paths. Student development challenged growth to the next developmental stage, even if it was uncomfortable. How will we resolve the question of balancing student needs and student wants?
- How will new forms of institutions and new students change our work? The entry of new constituent groups into higher education created the profession and changed it over time. Will online education, for-profit start-ups, and job-focused institutions fundamentally change student affairs?
- How will higher education value and fund student affairs' role? Student personnel and student development both benefited in times of increased resources and expanded accordingly. As higher education struggles to justify the levels of student debt, how will student affairs' roles fare?
- How will student affairs respond to shifts in what society expects from higher education? Laws about how universities must treat students changed the profession drastically in the 1960s, and governmental attention is increasing today. Expectations of students and their parents have played a role in each approach. How will student affairs change to adapt?
- Until recently, learning was almost always delivered face to face, from teacher to student, and in place-bound settings. The advent of distance learning and asynchronous mobile technology has forced student affairs practitioners to once again reconsider the nature of how we do our work and with whom we do it. Technological advances force us to ask, How will we build relationships with students on our virtual campuses? How can we assist students who are not there physically but still require our support, encouragement, and direction?

Conclusion

We wonder whether we will keep the term *student affairs* or some future historian will see our current methodology as yet another type of approach on the historical list. But whatever the future holds, we believe that there

will always be a need for professionals who dedicate their hearts to helping each and every student to get the most out of her or his college experience. We are excited to do that work, in whatever form it might take. We do it in concert with our colleagues, in honor of our professional ancestors, and for our students, past, present, and future.

The history of student affairs is still being written! If you feel enlightened by what you have read, or curious about something omitted, or want to challenge something we have written, we invite you to contribute to the scholarship of our history by contributing your own stories and visiting and supporting the Student Affairs History Project (Bowling Green State University, 2006).

References

ACPA: College Student Educators International. (2012). *Mary Cheney (1924-1925): First President.* http://www.myacpa.org/mary-l-cheney.

American Association of University Professors. (1967). Joint statement on rights and freedoms of students. *AAUP Bulletin*, *53*(4), 365–368.

American College Personnel Association. (1933). *Tenth annual report.* Minneapolis, MN: Author.

American College Personnel Association. (1994). *The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs.* Washington, DC: ACPA.

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view: A report of a conference on the philosophy and development of student personnel work in college and university* (Series 1, Vol. 1, No. 3). Washington, DC: Author.

Appleton, J. R., Briggs, C. M., & Rhatigan, J. J. (1978). *Pieces of eight: The rites, roles, and styles of the dean by eight who have been there.* Portland, OR: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Biddix, J. P., & Schwartz, R. A. (2012). Walter Dill Scott and the student personnel movement. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *49*(30), 285–298.

Bloland, P. A. (1986a). Student development: The new orthodoxy? (Part I). *ACPA Developments*, *13*(3), 1, 13.

Bloland, P. A. (1986b). Student development: The new orthodoxy? (Part II). *ACPA Developments*, *13*(4), 1, 22.

Bloland, P. A. (1972). Ecumenicalism in college student personnel. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *13*(2), 102–111.

Bowling Green State University. (2006, November). *The student affairs history project.* http://ul2.bgsu.edu/sahp/.

Brown, R. D. (1972). *Student development on tomorrow's higher education—A return to the academy.* Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). *Higher education in transition: An American history, 1636–1956.* New York, NY: Harper. (Original work published 1958)

Chandler, E. M. (1973). Student affairs administration in transition. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *14*(5), 392–398.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Committee on the Student in Higher Education. (1968). (J. F. Kauffman, Chairman). *The student in higher education.* New Haven, CT: Hazen Foundation.

Coomes, M. D., Forney, D., Keim, M., Kuh, G., Rodgers, R., & Stamatakos, L. (1987, October). *What messages do the national reports on higher education hold for the student affairs profession?* Paper presented at the Midwest Meeting of Graduate Faculty in Student Personnel, East Lansing, MI (October 1987).

Coomes, M. D., Whitt, E. J., & Kuh, G. D. (1987). Kate Hevner Mueller: Woman for a changing world. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *65(*8), 407–415.

Crookston, B. B. (1976). Student personnel—All hail and farewell!" *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *55*(1), 26–29.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. (1969). *The impact of college on students.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Findlay, J. F. (1938). *The origin and development of the work of the dean of men in higher education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.

Fley, J. A. (1978). Thomas Arkle Clark: Patriarch and dean from Illinois. *Journal of the NAWDAC*, *41*(3), 120–123.

Gangone, L. M. (2008). National Association for Women in Education: An enduring legacy. *Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 1–22.

Gatyas, K. (1998). Thomas Arkle Clark and the office of dean of men at the University of Illinois, 1901–1917. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *30*(2), 129–145.

Gerda, J. J. (2004). *A history of the conferences of deans of women 1903–1922.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University.

Gerda, J. J. (2007). Gathering together: A view of the earliest student affairs professional organizations. *NASPA Journal*, *43*(4), 147–163.

Gerda, J. J., Coomes, M. D., & Asimou, H. M. (2012). "A report of a conference": When, who, and questions of philosophy. In K. M. Boyle, J. W. Lowery, & J. A. Mueller (eds.), *Reflections on the 75th Anniversary of The Student Personnel Point of View* (pp. 29–34). Washington, DC: ACPA—College Student Educators International.

Harvey, T. R. (1974). Some future directions for student personnel administration. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *15*(4), 243–247.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Hoff, K. S., Kroll, J., MacKinnon, F. J. D., & Rentz, A. L. (2004). Career services. In F.J.D. MacKinnon (ed.), *Rentz's student affairs practice in higher education* (pp. 108-143). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Holmes, L. A. (1939). *History of the position of dean of women in a selected group of co-educational colleges and universities in the United States.* New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications.

Kirk, B. B. Identity crisis—1965. (1965). *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *6*(4), 194–199.

LaBarre, C. (1948). *Graduate training for educational personnel work* (Series VI, Vol. *12*, No. 11). Washington, DC: Author.

Lefkowitz Horowitz, H. (1987). Campus life*: Undergraduate cultures from the end of the eighteenth century to the presen*t. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Leonard, E. A. (1956). *Origins of personnel services in American higher education.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lloyd-Jones, E. (1950). The beginnings of our profession. In E. G. Williamson (ed.), *Trends in student personnel work* (pp. 260–264). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lloyd-Jones, E., & Smith, M. R. (1954). *Student personnel work as deeper teaching.* New York, NY: Harper.

Lynch, E. C. (1968). Walter Dill Scott: Pioneer industrial psychologist. *Business History Review, 42*(2), 149–170.

Martin, G. S. (1911). The position of dean of women. *Journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, 4,* 65–78.

Mathews, E. J. (1937). The registrar and the dean of men. *Secretarial Notes, Nineteenth Annual Conference of the National Association of Deans and Advisors of Men.* University of Texas, Austin. April 1–3, pp. 77–84.

Mathews, L. K. (1915). *The dean of women.* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Miller, C. L. L., & Pruitt-Logan, A. S. (2012). *Faithful to the task at hand: The Life of Lucy Diggs Slowe.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Minutes of the Conference of Deans of Women of the Middle West. (1903). Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, Center for Archival Collections, National Student Affairs Archives, NAWE MS-218.

Nidiffer, J. (2000.) *Pioneering deans of women: More than wise and pious matrons.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Olson, K. W. (1973). The G.I. Bill and higher education: Success and surprise. *American Quarterly, 25*(5), 596–610.

Penny, J. F. (1969). Student personnel work: A profession stillborn. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 47*(10), 958–962.

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Plato, K. (1978). The shift to student development: An analysis of the patterns of change. *NASPA Journal, 15*(4), 32–36.

Rhatigan, J. J. (2009). From the people up: A brief history of student affairs. In G. S. McClellan & J. Stringer (eds.), *The handbook of student affairs administration* (3rd ed., pp. 3-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, N. (Ed.) (1962). *The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Schwartz, R. (1997). How deans of women became men. *Review of Higher Education, 20*(4), 419–436.

Schwartz, R. (2010). *Deans of men and the shaping of modern college culture.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shaffer, R. H. (1968). Whither student personnel work from 1968 to 2018. *NASPA Journal, 6*(1), 9–14.

Sheeley, V. L. (1983). NADW and NAAS: Sixty years of organizational relationships (NAWDAD—ACPA: 1923–1983). In B. A. Belson & L. E. Fitzgerald (eds.). *Thus, we spoke ACPA—NAWDAC 1958–1975* (pp. 179-189). Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Stanley, M. (2003). College education and the midcentury GI Bills. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118*(2), 671–708.

Strange, C. (1994). Student development: The evolution and status of and essential idea. *Journal of College Student Development*, *35*(6), 399–412.

A student development model for student affairs in tomorrow's higher education. (1975). *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *16*(4), 334–341.

Thwing, C. F. (1906). *Higher education in America*. London, UK: Sidney Appleton.

Torres, V., DeSawal, D., & Hernandez, E. (2012). The importance of *The Student Personnel Point of View* in honoring the past and acknowledging current perspectives. In K. M. Boyle, J. W. Lowery, & J. A. Mueller (eds.), *Reflections on the 75th Anniversary of The Student Personnel Point of View* (pp. 25–28). Washington, DC: ACPA—College Student Educators International.

Tuttle, K. N. (1996). *What became of the dean of women? Changing roles for women administrators in American higher education, 1940–1980*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Department of Policy and Leadership.

Wilson, J. T. (1983). *Academic science, higher education, and the federal government, 1950–1983*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Twombly, S. B., Tuttle, K. N., Ward, K., & Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2004). *Reflecting back, looking forward: Civil rights and student affairs*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Wright, J. S., & Dimsdale, P. B. Jr., (1974). *Pioneers in marketing*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University.