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The comprehensive community college is a complex organization which serves a diverse population including liberal arts/transfer, career vocational, and continuing education students. This diversity of students requires a diversity of student services. The student affairs subunit, which is generally referred to as "student services" is assigned the task of managing the affairs of students from pre-enrollment through graduation and alumni affairs.

Student services serves two masters: the institution and the students. The institution needs bureaucratic management and control of students and obtains this through such services as admissions and enrollment services, financial aids, records, and student conduct and judicial programs. Students need advice and advocacy in dealing with the bureaucracy, activities for out of classroom time and developmental programs designed to maximize the potential for human growth.

Most people associated with higher education accept the bureaucratic management function of student services. These are seen as necessary for the health and survival of the institution. There is less acceptance for services which are designed to intentionally bring about student development (Elsner and Ames, 1983). Student development is believed to be a function of classroom instruction by faculty and they do not appreciate student affairs professionals taking credit for what they see as their contribution. Other services which are purely developmental such as personal counseling and support programs for non-traditional students
and students with special needs are acceptable, but only if they do not compete with classroom instruction for budgetary resources. Since these latter programs are quite expensive, it has been suggested that they not be offered at college expense (Chait, 1983). Students needing those services could access them through providers in the community and at their own expense.

Thus, a debate concerning the role of student affairs is being conducted on the campuses and in the literature of higher education. Student affairs professionals have defined their role as that of student development (Brown, 1972; Cooper, 1972; Miller and Prince, 1976). Other groups, including faculty, do not accept this definition of student affairs. They prefer more traditional models that are less threatening (Roth, 1986).

Statement of the Problem

Student service units within the comprehensive community college suffer from role ambiguity which in turn leads to role conflict with other groups such as faculty. Historically, student affairs has never clearly articulated its role and purpose in higher education (Wrenn, 1949; Koile, 1966; Shober, 1967; Penny, 1969). Attempts within the profession to deal with this problem led to the development of first, the student personnel point of view (American Council on Education, 1937) and later to the student development model (Miller and Prince, 1976). Neither of these models have gained universal acceptance.

The failure of the profession to deal with this issue effec-
tively has brought the problem to both the institutional and organizational levels. The community college as an institution has been evolving since its inception and the role of student services has evolved with it (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Generally, the theories of student development which were derived from studies of four-year colleges have been applied to two-year colleges; however, there are unique problems which apply specifically to the two-year college. For example, the "cooling out" controversy (Clark, 1960) arose from the guidance function, which intended to match applicant to programs best suited to their abilities (Medsker, 1960; Thornton, 1972).

Another problem which surfaced in the late 1970's due to the unclear role definition at the community college came about after the Proposition 13 experience in California. Taxpayers were less willing to fund public programs including community colleges. The resulting retrenchments across the country created a situation where faculty and administration were looking for programs to cut. The ambiguity of their role left student services vulnerable to budget cuts.

The failure of defining the place of student services at either the professional or the institutional levels leaves the problem to be solved at the organizational level and it is this level with which this study is concerned. Ultimately, role definition is an organizational problem which must be dealt with specifically within each organization since each college has a unique
organizational culture which creates unique organizational dynamics.

Classical/rational organizational theory assumes that organizations are goal attaining entities in which all members of the organization, despite their diversity of tasks, are working toward common goals based on shared values. Organizational management, in this theory, consists of controlling the behaviors of the members of the organization so as to maximize the efficiency of accomplishing goals. Ideally, members either accept the values of the organization or quickly learn them through a process called socialization. The literature on student affairs organizations supports the legitimacy of control and the need for greater rationality in student affairs, though this has been challenged (Strange, 1983).

According to the classical/rational theory, the purpose and functions of student services at the community college should be accepted and understood by all members of the organization. This is often not the case (Kuh, 1983). Student affairs professionals perceive their role as that of student development educators as expressed in the student affairs literature (Brown, 1972; Cooper, 1972; Miller and Prince, 1976). From this point of view, the goal of student affairs is the holistic development of college students. The services themselves are the means toward accomplishing the goal. All of the traditional student personnel services such as admissions, academic advising, career counseling, and placement can be delivered from a student development point of view. Other services, such as
services for non-traditional students and special programs for women, minorities and other groups have been created.

Faculty, on the other hand, perceive the developmental role of student services as secondary to what they perceive as the primary mission of higher education which is classroom instruction. The purpose of student services from this point of view is to provide support to the faculty and contribute to the health of the institution through the bureaucratic management of students. People who hold this point of view would tend to value these services which serve the institution such as admissions, retention programs and student conduct. Other student personnel programs would be acceptable, if they did not compete for resources with classroom instruction (Elsner and Ames, 1983).

These differences of perceived role are due to the fact that different groups come from different backgrounds and have different values. Contrary to traditional organizational theory, the diversity of values can never be completely controlled especially in an organization as complex as a comprehensive community college. Socialization can never be one hundred percent effective, nor should it be. A less confrontive, but perhaps more effective approach would be to manage the conflict rather than eliminating it completely (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). Conflicts between institutional divisions are organizational problems which demand administrative responses. This pilot study attempts to identify the real and potential conflicts within one community college organization, the North
Iowa Area Community College of Mason City, Iowa. It focused on one group, the faculty, by surveying their perceptions of student services concerning three variables: (1) the importance currently placed on specific services, (2) the quality of the services delivered, and (3) what the future priority of the service should be.

These data were analyzed and interpreted to give an indication of how much or how little the faculty value individual student services. This information can then be used for future decision making and conflict management.

People make judgments about their perceived world based on their values. Perceptions are interpreted according to one's value system (Weick, 1979). Thus, the perceptions of a group are determined by the specific values which the group holds. It is possible that two groups could observe exactly the same phenomenon and derive opposite conclusions, not only about interpretations of the phenomenon, but what was actually perceived. This phenomenological interpretation of reality helps explain how conflict is inevitable in a diverse organization such as a community college. Faculty, who come from diverse academic backgrounds, would not be expected to share the values of the student services professionals who have had special training and are currently following student affairs trends in the professional literature.

Given this assumption, it was expected that faculty would not highly value developmental services such as personal counseling, student activities, and support services for special groups such as
non-traditional students and students with special needs. It was also expected that faculty would value institutional services such as admissions, financial aid and judicial programs because these are tied directly to the health and survival of the organization.

Finally, it was expected that faculty would indicate higher priorities for those programs that directly supported their individual academic classes. For example, career instructors would indicate higher priorities are needed for placement and career counseling; transfer instructors would indicate higher priorities are needed for academic advising; and all faculty would indicate higher priorities are needed for academic assessment, learning services, and student orientation.

Significance of the Problem

Organizations and individuals have the tendency to work toward equilibrium states which preserve the present value structure or status quo (Caple, 1987). This equilibrium has certain psychological benefits for the people within the organization. If there is little change within the organization, people will know what is expected of them from day to day. There is little uncertainty and little equivocality; therefore, individual anxiety levels are lower than would be expected in a dynamic organization. Organizations that remain in a state of equilibrium will inevitably decline and eventually become extinct (Caple, 1987).

The environment outside the organization is in constant flux. It is a stream of experience that never remains the same. Organi-
organizations, if they are to remain vital, must continually change and adapt to keep in step with the changing external environment.

Change is a process; and planning is an attempt to control that process. Outcomes are important in that they allow organizations to evaluate the process; however, it is the process itself that is important.

Planning should not result in a reduction of uncertainty and complexity, according to Caple (1987). As the system evolves toward non-equilibrium, uncertainty, and complexity; the range of choices is broadened and members become more creative. The organization then can transcend to the larger environments of society, culture, and the world.

Community colleges generally have experienced great success since their beginning in the early 20th century. They have done so by continual expansion from a high school extension to a comprehensive community college. Student services have contributed to this growth and expansion by developing and delivering more service to a larger and more diverse student population.

There is now a growing number of community college researchers and practitioners who are calling for a less comprehensive mission that would focus attention and energy on a less diverse student population (Tillery and Deegan, 1985), abandoning the comprehensive mission. This debate is a part of the process of renewal that has made the community college the dynamic and vital institution that it is today. The controversy has shaped the process and
the process has made the community college what it is.

Student services are right in the middle of this debate. Community college administrators, faculty, and even student service staff have called for a reduction in the number and amount of services delivered to students. According to the detractors some student services are important and should be continued; others, however, could be either eliminated or else delivered more effectively through public and private agencies in the community, thereby conserving scarce resources for educational programs (Chait, 1983).

The student affairs profession, on the other hand, is calling for just the opposite. It sees student development as an equal and parallel function with classroom educational programs (Miller and Prince, 1976). Student development and student advocacy will lead to happier student consumers; retention will be higher and recruitment would be more effective. What is needed is more student services, not less.

It remains to be seen how this debate will be resolved. In any event, the debate itself is healthy and should be participated in by all members of the community college.

This study will attempt to contribute to this debate by focusing on the faculty attitudes at one organization. Knowledge of these attitudes can be used to build more effective services at that organization and contribute to the debate concerning the role of student services at the community college and within the student affairs profession.
Faculty are a significant group within the community college. They depend on student services for the bureaucratic management of the students and yet they often compete with the student service division for resources. They clearly perceive student services as secondary to the primary function of classroom education. This is significant considering the fact that they are a powerful political force within the college decision making structure. Their perceptions of the role of student services are critical to the decisions made concerning the future of student services in the community college.

Student affairs professionals have responded to faculty resistance in a variety of ways. Borland (1977) saw the debate as a struggle over economic resources and, as such, purely political. Thus, a political response through the organizational political structure is required. Others have defined the conflict as a human relations problem in which the conflict may be resolved through organizational development by changing the values of one or both of the conflicting groups (Conyne, 1983; Bennis, 1973).

Political and organizational development strategies for dealing with conflict have their place. However, political game playing can often be counterproductive especially when dealing with a politically powerful and active group such as faculty. Organizational development deals with the correct problem. It attempts to change the values of a specific group through group and counseling techniques. It is however, an expensive and time consuming process and
it is questionable how effective it really is (Ouchi and Price, 1978).

Conflict management is an attempt to move the organization toward its goals without completely eliminating all conflict. It is not necessary to convince all faculty members that student development is a legitimate function. It is necessary, however, to develop support for at-risk programs that serve what appears to faculty as unnecessary.

Assumptions

As suggested above, the debate concerning the role of student services is partly a political issue and partly a human relations issue, but it is wholly an organizational solution. Organizational theory has been dominated by two schools of thought, the classical/rational school and the human relations school. The classical/rational school focuses on formal organizational design, rational behavior, hierarchy of authority and division of labor. Efficiency is valued and best obtained through economic rewards as workers tend to be extrinsically motivated. The human relations school focuses on informal organizational patterns including human relationships, communications, motivation, and group behavior (Etzioni, 1964).

Both of these schools of thought have been challenged by a growing body of literature on organizational theory (Cohen, March, and Olson, 1972; Cohen and March, 1974; Ouchi and Price, 1978; Weick, 1979; Peters and Waterman, 1982). This body of literature
challenges certain core assumptions of the traditional schools and offers alternatives which give us a new way of looking at organizations and organizational behavior. Three of these alternative assumptions are relevant to student affairs and are used in this study.

Traditional theory assumes that healthy organizations have clearly defined goals based on shared values. All members within the organizations have clearly defined goals based on shared values and work toward common goals. The goals direct planning activities, staff behavior, and program development (Kuh, 1983). In reality, most institutions of higher education (Gross and Grambach, 1968) and most student affairs units (Kuh, 1981) have multiple goals within any one organization. Weick (1979) explained that, contrary to common assumption, organizations do not form because people want to pursue common ends. Rather, people have diverse ends which they want to pursue; they come together because they can share common means to attain their desired diverse ends. Once an organization of diverse ends forms, common ends develop, including the common goal of organizational survival. However, even after the common ends are determined, the diverse ends remain (Weick, 1979).

The history of the community college is a good example of this type of organizational development. The community college had its beginnings in the junior college movement of the early 20th century. It began as an extension of community high schools
for students who were underprepared and underfinanced for traditional residential college (Thornton, 1972). The junior college eventually became independent of the community high school and acquired its own infrastructure, faculty, curricula, and technology which were means toward college parallel education. Later, other needs were identified in the community: vocational training, community education, adult basic education, business and industry training, and many others. None of these needs were included in the original purpose of the junior college; but, the colleges had the means to provide solutions to these additional needs. The junior college mission grew in scope to eventually become the mission of the comprehensive community college. All of the diverse goals remain with additional common goals added.

The same kind of analysis can be used on the student affairs profession. Initially, student affairs served as a parent substitute controlling the lives of students at residential colleges. As other diverse needs were identified, such as career guidance and academic advising, they were assigned to student affairs. Although these additional services had little to do with the original purpose of in loco parentis, it was logical to assign them to staff already familiar with students at another level.

The problem with this kind of organizational drift is that the diverse goals are not necessarily shared by other members in the organization. It is necessary that roles be defined clearly in terms of common goals shared by all rather than diverse goals which may
not be shared by people outside student services. Student development services are not valued by all members of the community college. Effective recruitment and retention is valued by all. If student development services can be defined in terms of recruitment and retention of students, then support for those programs should follow.

A second assumption of traditional organizational theory is that decision making in an organization should be rational. Although organizational decision makers attempt to be rational, they often are not. Peters and Waterman (1983) suggested that organizations are actually more effective when they are not slaves to reason. Rational decision making requires appropriate information, accurate interpretation of the information, and common values on which to base the decisions (Kuh, 1983). Seldom are all these things possible within the time frame of most decision making. It is realistic to expect contradictory policy within an institution, however, this is not necessarily bad. A little internal competition could lead to a higher level of creativity. In this case, internal competition is not dysfunctional but rather good for the organization.

A third assumption concerns interdependence. Rational theory posits that each division within an organization performs a different function (division of labor) in an effort to accomplish common goals. All divisions are interdependent with each other and assumed to be "tightly coupled." In reality, divisions are at best "loosely coupled" (Weick, 1976). An example of this in the community college would be the scheduling process. Faculty may
insist that rules concerning maximum class size be strictly adhered to, because over enrollment creates ineffective teaching situations. An academic advisor knows the rules and their rationale, and yet overrides the class limit anyway because a student needs the class which is filled and cannot take it later. In a tightly coupled organization, this should not happen, but in reality, it happens all the time.

Limitations of the Study

This study measures the faculty's perceptions concerning current institutional priorities, subjective future priorities, and quality of service from one institution, the North Iowa Area Community College of Mason City, Iowa. From data gathered on these three variables, an interpretation is made to determine faculty values concerning the desirability of these services. The instrument measures only the degree of desirability and not why or why not they value the particular service. Thus, the interpretations are based on a review of the relevant literature and are not derived directly from the survey.

Definition of Terms

Much of the ambiguity concerning both the community college and the student affairs profession lies in the development of these two fields. Both have undergone many changes which have resulted in ambiguous terminology which contributes to the problem of role definition.
For the purposes of this paper, a comprehensive community college is defined as an educational institution which serves the educational needs of local citizens in the areas of liberal arts, vocational education, and continuing education (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Junior colleges, vocational-technical institutions, and adult education programs serve similar educational functions, but of a more limited scope, and therefore, do not share the complexity of organizational behavior. Thus, the conclusions of this study would not apply to those organizations.

Student affairs refers to a major administrative subdivision in higher education parallel with academic affairs and business affairs. Student affairs professionals are administrators and counselors within the student affairs division.

Student development is the goal of student affairs units which prescribe to the student development model and theories. Alternative theories include in loco parentis, the student personnel point of view, and the student consumer model. These alternative theories will be discussed in depth in the review of the related literature.

Student services is defined as the student affairs unit of a community college (Cohen and Brawer, 1983). Student services in the community college is a part of the larger student affairs profession and shares common values with student affairs professionals at four-year colleges and universities. Community college student services are unique, however, in that they deliver services to
clienteles, e.g., high school dropouts and displaced workers, that are not typical of four-year colleges and universities.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature concerning this problem is addressed on three levels: from the point of view of the specific organization and from the point of view of the student affairs profession. The former identifies why ambiguity occurs and possible solutions. The latter give specific examples of role ambiguity as it exists in higher education.

The Nature of Organizations

If the classical/rational model and the human relations models fail to describe the true nature of organizations, what are the alternatives and how can these alternatives better deal with the problem of role conflict within the community college? Cohen, March, and Olson (1972) suggested a "garbage can" metaphor. Organizations are garbage cans in which are dumped problems, people, choice situations, and (hopefully) solutions. There is a continual flow of garbage thrown into the garbage cans from the outside environment. Sometimes the garbage is acted upon; often it is not.

Community colleges, as are other American educational organizations, are classic garbage cans. Every problem imaginable, educational organizations, are classic garbage cans. Every problem imaginable, from illiteracy, to technological changes, to the information explosion, to drunk driving, have been thrown into the
garbage can which is the community college. Pervasive in American society is the belief that education solves the problems of society (Cremin, 1965), and where better to deliver this education than the local community college (Cohen and Brawer, 1982)?

Although most organizations are more garbage cans than they are rational decision making structures, they are nevertheless guided by the rational rules of bureaucracy which often creates dysfunctional organizational dynamics due to the fact that administrators are making decisions based on false assumptions. Peters and Waterman (1982) have taken an alternative point of view toward management. Although rational planning and decision making are not totally eliminated, they become secondary. Differences of opinion among members is allowed so long as certain core values are held by all members of the organization. Peters and Waterman call this "simultaneous loose-tight properties." They are tight in the sense that core values must be held by all members within the organization. They are loose in the sense that members are free to implement the core values in independent and creative ways.

The core values of the North Iowa Area Community College are clearly spelled out in the mission statement: "... education is the fabric of a democratic society in which a major objective is the optimum development of all human potential. ... The mission ... is to provide a greater quality of life to the people of North Iowa. The college strives to be a resource for the enhancement of the abilities and self image of its people and the develop-
ment of its communities through programs and services" (North Iowa Area Community College General Catalog, 1987-1988, p.6). It is clearly evident that "human development" is a core value of this organization. This is a "tight" property.

How this value is implemented is not clearly spelled out other than "through programs and services." This is the "loose" property referred to by Peters and Waterman. Human development can take place in both the classroom and the student services program. It can take place without the complete support of other groups within the institution so long as the efforts of members are not in conflict with the core values. This means that a little competition is admissible.

Cohen and March (1972) question the assumptions of rational organizational theory. In a study of college leadership they have observed that colleges and universities experience ambiguity of purpose, power, experience, and success. Ambiguity of purpose indicates that there is seldom a clear mission or a consensus of what should be done. College leaders who attempt to narrowly define institutional mission find themselves overwhelmed by resistance.

Ambiguity of power indicates that no one has absolute power over anyone else in an institution. A superior has power over his/her subordinates only to the degree that the subordinate is willing to accept the authority of the superior. Non-acceptance of authority takes many forms including insubordination. More common forms of non-acceptance take the forms of resistance or negativism.
Ambiguity of experience indicates that, given the changing environment of the organization, knowledge from experience is often unreliable. What worked once now may fail miserably.

The ambiguity of success indicates the difficulty of measuring success even when it does occur. This is especially true for a goal as vague as human development.

These ambiguities all exist in the community college. They clearly indicate the difficulties an administrator has in leading a complex organization. They also point out the weaknesses in classical/rational organizational theories.

Student services professionals must be cognizant of these ambiguities as they participate in the decision making process. They must realize the difficulty of defining mission and be flexible and accepting creative roles for faculty and other groups so long as they operate within the core values of the institution. At the same time they must be assertive in defining their own roles (Plato, 1977). They must accept the fact that the environment is constantly changing and work toward changing the organization to keep the organization viable (Caple, 1986).

Finally, they must define and evaluate the services which they perform in terms which are clearly understandable to all people within the organization and relate directly to the core values (Leach, 1986).
Role Theory

In an organization, all members occupy a position which is associated with a set of activities that are required or expected as part of the job. These required or expected activities are called roles. Roles include not only formally defined, but also informal activities. When members behave according to the expectations of their role, they are rewarded. When they behave contrary to their role, that is when they behave out of role, they are punished or ignored (Kohn et al., 1964). Since all members of the organization are interdependent, it is necessary for members to have an understanding of the role of everyone else. If someone acts out of role, it could have negative consequences for other members.

Role conflict occurs when one person or group does not behave according to expectations. This is an outgrowth of the ambiguities within organizations. Role conflict creates stress and tension and can be damaging to the productivity of the organization. In traditional organizational theory, role conflict is dealt with through the socialization process. New members of an organization are socialized, i.e. They learn appropriate behaviors expected of persons in their roles. During the socialization process, members learn the shared values and appropriate behaviors, and develop loyalty for the organization. Once a member is effectively socialized, appropriate role behavior is expected to follow. This theory does not account for acceptance theory, however. It is
assumed that an employee will accept the values of the organization as a result of socialization, but this does not necessarily follow. Role theory is significant to this study, because in an ambiguous organization such as a community college, it is difficult to define and control the role of each member of the organization. Two problems are possible: (1) an employee may resist the role assigned to him/her and attempts to redefine the role or (2) the employee may play his/her official role, but other members do not accept it. In either case, role conflict occurs.

An Alternative Model of Organizing

Weick (1979) explored the relationships and discontinuities between interdependent groups within organizations and developed an alternative model to explain why it is so difficult to control relational variables such as role.

Organizing is what people do individually and what groups do collectively. The environment is a changing stream of experience that does not have meaning unless it is organized. People organize their world through a process similar to natural selection and evolution. Each individual must first choose what events to organize. This is called enactment. Second, the event must be interpreted in a process called selection. Finally, the interpreted event (selected enactment) must be either retained or forgotten.

The most important step in the process is the interpretive selection stage. People store values and beliefs which they use to
interpret the world. These values and beliefs are templates which Weick calls causal maps. Causal maps allow people to efficiently organize a chaotic environment. Problems occur when information contradictory to the person's causal map is presented. When this happens, efficiency is lost. The person must either change his/her causal map, which is unlikely, or he/she must attempt to re-interpret the contradictory information.

Organizations as defined by Weick are collective attempts to develop causal maps (values and beliefs) which allow the organization to bring order out of chaos. Socialization is an attempt to get organization members to accept the causal maps of the organization. As discussed above, organizations are only partially successful in superimposing the organizational causal maps on the employees' causal maps.

Individuals with cause maps different from the organization have two alternatives. The individuals can change their causal maps, thereby adapting to the organization's causal map, or they can resist. If they do resist, they often do so by forming informal groups with shared values different from the organization (Ouchi and Price, 1978).

An example from a community college illustrates the organizing theory. An institution officially implements a student development model of student services. The student services staff accepts this organizational causal map as their own causal map. Faculty, who do not have any understanding of or value for student
development, may openly or covertly reject the official organizational stance. Their resistance takes the form of dysfunctional behavior such as non-participation, resistance to change, and non-acceptance to authority. They do not accept the role of student services as defined by the organization and they support their non-acceptance by forming an informal support group.

An alternative example of role conflict exists when the organization defines the role of student services as being strictly administrative and bureaucratic. The student services staff, trained in developmental theory, may reject the official role and develop an unofficial role as student developer.

The Many Roles of Student Affairs

The role conflict experienced by student services units in the community college is due, in part, to the ambiguity of the student service profession. Student affairs serves many functions and roles and a variety of clients (not just students). The role of student affairs has evolved over time, most of the evolution occurring since the turn of the century. At least three stages of development have been identified and a fourth has been suggested (Leach, 1985). Each of these stages describe different purposes and roles for student affairs staff. It is no wonder that faculty and staff do not have a clear understanding of this role. They are likely to look back into their own experiences and interpret present roles from past points of view.
Leach (1985) identified the three historical stages of student affairs as: (1) in loco parentis, (2) student services, and (3) student development and suggest a fourth stage as (4) a consumer model.

**In Loco Parentis**

The earliest colleges were based on the English residential models that entailed closed communities and strict control over every aspect of the lives of the students (Appleton, Briggs, and Rhatigan, 1978). Initially, there were no professional student administrators. Rather, in loco parentis duties were the responsibilities of faculty, administrators, and trustees of the colleges. As faculty and administrators became interested in other areas, they began to delegate the in loco parentis function to persons identified as Deans of Men or Deans of Women. These deans were recruited from the ranks of faculty and had no formal training specifically in student affairs. Consequently, student affairs was not considered a profession. The deans eventually were delegated additional duties as needs arose: vocational guidance, remedial services, activities coordination, and others. As duties accumulated, the deans acquired staffs in order to carry out the many functions. These early deans and their staff provided the core groups which later formed the student affairs profession. In loco parentis remained a dominant function of student affairs up until the end of World War II when returning veterans began entering college. In loco parentis continued declining up
through the 1960's when college students achieved legal adult status. The decline of *in loco parentis* was gradual and not obvious. It is likely that several faculty and administrative staff may feel that *in loco parentis* is still a primary purpose of student affairs.

**The Student Services Model**

The second model, student services, developed out of the first, *in loco parentis*. As student administrators became more professionalized, they identified common values and goals. Their role now included offering a variety of services such as admissions, registration, counseling, advising, and out-of-classroom activities. They began thinking of themselves as professionals.

This process can be interpreted using Weik's model (Weick, 1979). The early student administrators were assigned *in loco parentis* responsibilities. That is, they designed and implemented strict behavioral and academic codes to control students' behavior. Other institutional needs concerning students were later identified such as recruitment and enrollment services (admissions), career guidance, academic advising, and student activities. These needs were not directly related to the original function of student control; however, the deans and their staff were student administrators and thus were a means toward filling these additional needs. These additional services came to be known as student personnel services and became an alternate function of student affairs. This alternate function coexisted with the original function for many years.
The deans and their staff were becoming more professional. In 1939, The American Council on Education presented the "Student Personnel Point of View" which was later revised in 1949. This was a philosophical statement for the student affairs profession whose purpose was to provide services to college students and operated under four assumptions: "(1) the individual student must be considered as a whole; (2) each student is a unique person and must be treated as such; (3) the total environment of the student is educational and must be used to achieve his or her full development; (4) the major responsibility for a student's personal and social development rests with the student and his or her personal resources" (Miller and Prince, 1976, p.4).

Many members of the academic community were not willing to grant student affairs full professional recognition. Wrenn (1949) concluded that student affairs did not meet sociological criteria for a profession. Shaben (1967) stated that the field was essentially contentless and that it should leave functions such as counseling to counseling professionals. Koile (1966) stated that student affairs had neither a clear body of knowledge, skills, and ethics nor a central place in American higher education. Penny (1969) stated that student affairs had had time to prove itself but had not done so, and he accused the profession of having a housekeeping emphasis with no areas exclusive to the field. As the debate raged on in the pages of professional journals, student affairs professionals continued to deliver service to students and
institutions; and as they did so, they continued to develop its professional identity.

The Student Development Model

Much of the criticism of the field centered around the accusation that the profession was not built upon a body of theoretical knowledge. Attempts to address this issue appeared from the Council of Student Personnel Associations (Cooper, 1972) and The American College Personnel Association (Brown, 1972). These efforts were followed by The Future of Student Affairs (Miller and Prince, 1976) which presented a student development process model for student affairs practitioners which was based on human development theories. The model describes four primary functions of implementing student development: goal setting, assessment, procedural strategies (including instruction, consultation and environmental resource management), and program evaluation.

Miller, Winston, and Mendenhall (1983) identified three schools of thought that guide the student development process: (1) intellectual and moral development theories including Piaget (1952), Perry (1970, 1981), and Kohlberg (1969) which focused on cognitive process; (2) the psycho-social theories including Erikson (1963, 1968), Havinghurst (1953, 1972), Chickering (1969, 1981), Sanford (1967), and Sanford and Axelrod (1979) which focused on content of the developmental process; and (3) person-environment interaction theories including Moos (1979), Holland (1973), Pace (1979), Banning (1978), and Huebner (1979, 1980) and focused on behavior as a direct function of the relationship between individuals and the
environment.

Although student development has become popular with student affairs professionals as an organizing theory, it has received much less acceptance with faculty who perceive student development educators as "mystical do-gooders" who are, at best, on the periphery of the educational enterprise and are at worst, counterproductive to the educational enterprise (Leach, 1985).

Astman (1975) found that, despite records of service to students, support for student services programs is often outweighed by faculty who claim that their activities are at the true center of the college. Elsner and Ames (1983) found that faculty believe that student services are competitors with faculty for dollars that could be utilized to support instructional programs that are more important to their own personal welfare as well as to their students' welfare. Elsner and Ames identified three kinds of services: (1) institutionally based, those that are essential to the functioning of the college; (2) situationally based, those that are required for special situations; and (3) special interest or developmental, those that provide services to special groups. They found that only the institutionally based services have wide institutional support.

In a similar study, Roth (1986) identified three types of services: (1) administrative, (2) student personnel, and (3) student development. When asked to rank these three groups of services, administrators ranked student personnel and administrative services
highly, but gave much less support to services identified as student development.

Borland (1977) suggested that developmental student services are the victims of "aggressive neglect." Faculty and administrators give verbal approval to the ideals of student development but no financial support. By doing so, they would diminish the support available for areas deemed more important.

Chait (1983) called for a campus wide review of needs, priorities, and fiscal resources and asserted that services not necessary to the institution could be either discontinued or delegated to community agencies. Other services could be delegated to other divisions; for example, financial aids could be delegated business affairs, academic advising could be delegated to academic affairs and so forth.

Student affairs professionals are concerned about the lack of support for student development. Reaction has ranged from a call for further development of purpose (Stamatakos and Rogers, 1984), to an integration of student development into the purpose of higher education in general (Plato, 1977), to a more active political participation by student affairs in the organizational decision making process (Plato, 1977; Borland, 1977).

Leach (1985) suggested an alternative strategy based on alternative delivery mode. He identified the in loco parentis model as being too narrowly defined in favor of the institution and the student service and the student development models as being too
narrowly defined in favor of the student. He suggested a compromise in the consumer model.

A Consumer Model of Student Services

In looking at the debate over the role of student services, Leach (1985) observed that faculty were incensed by the idea that student services should take credit for what they felt went on in their classes. Faculty do not perceive student services professionals as student developers. They do not share the values or the beliefs of the student affairs profession; hence, the conflict and competition.

Kotler (1982) explained that institutions of higher education are in fact organizations which exchange values with their various publics. Each public will exchange time and money for the products of higher education. Success of the exchange is determined by the publics perception of return. If the return is perceived as commensurate with the investment, then the exchange is judged to be satisfactory. In this model, to be effective, the organization must ask four questions: (1) Who are the consumers? (2) What are the consumers' needs? (3) What are the appropriate responses? (4) How can effectiveness of response be evaluated?

Leach answered the first question by identifying three publics of community college student services: (1) the institution, (2) the students, and (3) the community. Literature from the field generally makes a mistaken assumption that students are the exclusive public of student affairs. Faculty, being a part of the institution, are
seen as both peers and as customers.

After identifying the publics Leach answers the second question (what are the public's needs) and the third question (how are the needs addressed). The institution's needs include: (1) enrollment management (implemented through recruitment and retention programs); (2) records management (implemented through timely access to information for decision making on strategic planning, public information, and facilities usage); (3) governance (implemented by participation in planning and decision making); (4) staff development (implemented through facilitation of institutional renewal and personal and professional growth programs for faculty and staff); and (5) resource development (implemented through a fee structure for services delivered to students and the community).

Students' needs include: (1) entry services (implemented through skills assessment, financial aids, and registration); (2) support services (implemented through personal support for survival, co-curricular programs, health care, crisis intervention, educational support and student development programs); (3) transition services (implemented through placement, career counseling, and alumni services).

Community needs include: (1) information services (implemented through public information); (2) facilities and programs (implemented through campus visits, community programs, and cultural programs); (3) economic development (implemented through employer information, employer placement service, and fee based services).
The final question, "How do we evaluate effectiveness" is important in that it will be used to communicate to faculty and staff exactly what the contribution of student services is to the institution. This is difficult especially with services that are purely developmental.

The evaluations should be defined in terms which the particular public can understand. If success can be communicated to the public, the public is more likely to perceive a satisfactory return on its investment in the exchange.

Faculty and other members of the institution are consumer publics of student services. They recognize an investment by the college in student services. They expect a return on the investment. The purely institutional services have the most obvious return in the form of enrollment management (recruiting and retention) and bureaucratic administration (records, registration, financial aids, judicial programs). These institutional services are perceived as contributing to the health and survival of the institution and therefore are considered a good return on the investment.

Student development programs, on the other hand, are not perceived as a good investment because they are difficult to evaluate in terms of organizational health and survival. Personal counseling is perceived as a very expensive service which serves a small number of students. Support programs for re-entering women, non-traditional students and special needs are also perceived as expensive and serving only small numbers. Student activities are
viewed as fun and games and nice but maybe not necessary. Even if these services are successful, how can they be evaluated?

The answer to that question is the same as with the institutional services; that is, in terms of meeting the needs and accomplishing the goals of the institution. This can be done by asking two questions: (1) How has this service contributed to the health and survival of the organization? and (2) How has this service contributed to the mission? This latter evaluation is especially significant if human development is mentioned in the mission as it is at the North Iowa Area Community College. Thus, personal counseling's contribution is that it reduces attrition and leads to student development. Other developmental programs can be evaluated similarly.

A serious problem lies in the fact that faculty and administration do not have the understanding of student development that the student services staff has. When developmental activities are ambiguously evaluated in developmental language that few people outside of student services understand, it becomes clear why there is little support.
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify the values of community college faculty concerning student services. This was done by measuring faculty perceptions of three variables: (1) current institutional priority (current importance), (2) quality of service delivered, and (3) respondents opinion of what the institutional priority should be (future priority). A survey instrument designed to measure these variables was developed and administered to all full-time regular faculty. Data were then analyzed to determine faculty values as indicated by the support of services.

Thirteen services were identified as relevant for the purposes of this study. They were grouped into three areas identified by Roth (1986) as follows: (1) institutional services (admissions, financial aids, and judicial programs); student personnel services (academic advising, career counseling, housing, learning assistance, orientation, and placement); and (3) student development (non-traditional student services, personal counseling, services for students with special needs, and student activities).

The Sample

The group whose values were measured included all full-time regular faculty at the North Iowa Area Community College. This group was defined as all teaching faculty with full-time permanent contracts. At the time of the study, 78 full-time permanent faculty were employed. All 78 were given surveys of which 72 (92%) were
completed and returned. Fifty-five surveys were distributed and completed at staff meetings. The remaining 17 were distributed and returned through the campus mail with an attached memo explaining the purpose and procedures. The data were analyzed according to academic divisions: Business, Health Related, Humanities, Natural Science, Social Science, and Trade and Industry.

The Instrument

The instrument was designed to measure faculty perception concerning the three variables in 13 services. The 13 services were chosen in consultation with student services staff. The North Iowa Area Community College identifies 27 services in its Student Handbook (North Iowa Area Community College, 1987-1988). Of these seven were included as described: Admissions, financial aids, housing, student orientation, placement, judicial services and programs and learning assistance and assessment. Counseling is described as one service in the handbook but was sub-divided in the survey instrument to include academic advising, personal counseling, and career counseling. Six services listed in the Student Handbook (clubs and activities, intramurals, student government, student lounge, student publications and student ceremonies) were grouped under the general service called "student activities". Cooperative education and follow-up studies were included as a part of placement. Handicapped student services, veterans affairs and vocational rehabilitation liaison were grouped under the heading
"special needs": Child care was not included, since it was recently dropped as a college supported service. Intercollegiate athletics and physical education were not included in as much as they technically are not student services although they are administered by the student services division at NIACC. Articulation, records, and enrollment were not included because they are administrative functions. Finally, non-traditional student services was added even though it is not identified in the student handbook as this was recently identified as a need in the institutional strategic plan.

The final thirteen services were defined using CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Student Development Programs (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Student Development Programs, 1986). The thirteen student services and their definitions were listed alphabetically down the side of the survey instrument. Across the top were listed the three variables and questions asking the participants to describe their perceptions using a Likert Scale.

For the variable "current importance", participants were asked: "How important is this service at NIACC at this time?" Respondants could choose from a five point scale where 1= not important, 3= moderately important, and 5= very important.

For the variable "quality" participants were asked: "How well does NIACC staff do in the delivery of these services? Respondants could choose from a five point scale where 1= needs major
improvement, 3= adequate, and 5= excellent. For this particular variable respondents could also choose "don't know".

For the variable "future priority" participants were asked: "What priority should be placed on these services in the future?" Respondants could choose from a five point scale where 1= much lower priority needed, 3= same priority as now, and 5= much higher priority needed.

Validity and Reliability

A focus-group of student services staff gave feedback on the instrument concerning definitions, questions asked, the Likert scales, the services identified and the general form of the survey. Some definitions were altered to more accurately describe the services.

Data Analysis

The mean scores of the responses on each variable and for each service were calculated for the faculty as a whole and for the individual divisions. Variables included (1) perceived institution priority (current importance), (2) perceived quality of services delivered (quality), and (3) the respondent's opinion as to what the priority should be (future priority). Data from these perceptions were interpreted to determine the faculty's values concerning the individual services and the groupings.

If a respondent perceived current importance high and suggested higher future priority, it was assumed that the respondent values that particular service. It is seen as important now and important
in the future. If a respondent perceived current importance low but suggested a higher future priority, it was assumed that the respondent values the service but is not satisfied with levels of delivery. If a respondent perceived current importance as high but suggested lower priority, it was assumed that the service is not valued by the respondent and that the respondent would prefer a reduction in levels of delivery. Finally, if a respondent perceived a service as low in current importance and suggested an even lower priority, it was assumed that the respondent has no value at all for that service and would likely favor discontinuing it.

The variable "quality" allowed further interpretations. For services which were valued highly (high current importance and high future priority) and quality was also perceived high, then overall approval was assumed. However, if quality was perceived low, then it can be assumed that the respondent expects better quality for the highly valued service. The same assumptions can be made for services perceived as low in current importance but high in future priority. The "higher priority" is likely perceived as needed to improve quality.

Services rated low in future priority but high in quality are assumed to be services perceived as not necessarily bad but probably unnecessary, therefore, a lower priority is justified.

It should be noted that this survey only indicates perceptions by third parties and does not necessarily reflect reality. A service perceived low in quality may be quite satisfactory to the
students involved. Another possible misperception would be a service seen as not important when, in reality, it is considered very important. These misperceptions illustrate the complexity of organizational dynamics and need to make a variety of responses in the decision making process.
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data from the survey indicates that the faculty at North Iowa Area Community College overwhelmingly approve of the student services delivered at the college. The faculty as a whole rated all thirteen services between moderately important and very important and indicated that higher priorities are needed for every one. As for quality, 11 of the 13 services were rated adequate or better, while only two services, personal counseling and student housing were rated as only slightly below adequate.

The Faculty as a Whole

As a whole the faculty tended to see high institutional support for all thirteen services (refer to table no. 1). As expected, institutional services as a group received the highest rating for current priority (3.78).

Also as expected, the student development programs received a lower rating as a group (3.45) than either institutional services (3.78) or student personnel services (3.70). However, even these services were perceived as more than moderately important in every case.

Faculty as a whole indicated that every one of the 13 services should have a higher priority than they do now. As a group, student personnel programs were seen as being the highest priority for the future (3.86). Interestingly, both institutional services and student development services were indicated as having an equally higher priority needed (3.59). This again indicates that student
development programs have more support at NIACC then would be expected when compared to national studies.

When comparing current importance to future priority, all three groups are viewed as being currently important while at the same time a higher priority is seen as needed. This same trend follows for each and every service. This indicates that all of the services are highly valued both now and in the future.

When adding the variable of quality into the analysis, the same trend of approval follows. The group with the highest current importance rating (institutional services at 3.78) also had the highest quality rating (3.38). The group with the lowest current importance rating (student development services at 3.45) also had the lowest quality rating (3.14). This trend does not follow with individual services, however.

Faculty Divisions

Generally, the individual divisions ranked the services similar to the faculty as a whole. For example, the Business division and the Natural Science division rated the groups exactly parallel to the faculty as a whole on all three variables.

There are some exceptions that deserve comment. The Trade and Industry division, in contrast to all other divisions, ranked the student development group higher than either of the other groups in the quality variable. Upon closer examination it becomes clear that the Trade and Industry division does not rank student development especially high, but they do rank institutional services and
student personnel services as especially low. Financial aid (2.85), academic advising (2.33), career counseling (2.15), and personal counseling (2.91) were all ranked less than adequate. In both of the other variables, current importance and future priority, services were consistently ranked high for most areas. These data indicate that this division values most of these services, but they feel these services are not being adequately delivered and, therefore, a higher priority is required.

Another exception is the Health Related division which rates the student development services lowest in current importance but highest in future priority. Specifically they rate personal counseling lower than any other service in current importance but higher than any other service in future priority. Non-traditional student services and special needs have similar low-high rankings for current importance and future priority. They also rate these three services lower than any other service in quality. This would indicate that the Health Related division has a higher value for the student development programs than any other division at the college. It also indicates that they are not satisfied with the delivery of services offered.

Individual Services

Admissions was clearly the highest ranked service in both current importance (4.47) and quality (3.74). It can be assumed that admissions receives a great deal of attention at this institution.
Admissions was not as highly ranked for future priority (3.66) which was sixth.

Another institutional service, financial aid was also highly ranked, fourth in current importance (3.83) and sixth in quality (3.29). Financial aid, however, is lower than might be expected in future priority (3.63) at eighth.

Judicial services ranked much lower at 13th for current importance (3.04). It was also ranked 13th for future priority (3.48), and ninth for quality (3.11).

The student personnel services tend to be more in the middle of the road for current importance and quality but tend to rank highly for future priority. This result is similar to the results Roth (1986) received in his study of college administrators.

Learning assistance and assessment, academic advising, and orientation all ranked highly in all three variables. This follows Leach's (1985) assertion that programs which can demonstrate a clear contribution to organizational health are perceived as legitimate and important. Faculty are aware of these services and what they mean to retention efforts.

Another service, which generally is considered important for effective retention, is career counseling. This service, however, ranked only eighth in current importance (3.51), fifth in future priority (3.80), and eighth in quality (3.12). These rankings would indicate that career counseling is not perceived as a particularly strong service at NIACC. When we look at the two exclusively
career divisions, Health Related and Trade and Industry, we see that these divisions rate career counseling lower in current importance (Health 3.00; Trade & Industry 2.85); and higher in future priority (Health 4.11; Trade & Industry 4.46); than any other division at the college. It is interesting, however, that when we look at how Health Related and Trade and Industry rated career counseling for quality, we find that Health Related rated it highest (3.89) and Trade and Industry rated it lowest (2.15). A close examination may be called for.

Placement ranked third in current importance (3.98) and future priority (3.81) and second in quality (3.59). This service is perceived as one of the strongest at the institution. Both Health Related and Trade and Industry rank placement near the top in all three variables.

The final student personnel service, housing, is ranked 12th in current importance, ninth in future priority and 11th in quality. These low rankings may indicate a weak program or they may indicate inaccurate perceptions. In either case, corrective action may be necessary.

Consistant with both Roth (1986) and Elsner and Ames (1983), the student development programs show the least amount of support overall. Special needs ranks sixth in current importance (3.76) and fourth in quality (3.39) but only ranked 12th in future priority. The other three (personal counseling, non-traditional student services, and student activities) were ranked at the bottom.
of all three variables. A good point however, is the fact that all ranked above moderately important in current importance, above adequate in quality, and all but personal counseling called for a higher priority for the future. This is a beginning to be built upon.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As expected, the developmental programs showed the least amount of support in all three variables than did the institutional or student personnel services. What was not expected was the fact that even student development received positive ratings in all areas. These facts indicate many things.

First of all, student services has a solid base of support from the faculty. Some programs such as admissions, academic advising, learning assistance and assessment and placement are solidly established with the faculty. These programs should be maintained at current levels as they are the core programs of student services which generate the most support from faculty.

Second, there are some programs, other than student development programs, which are perceived as weak and of low quality, specifically, career counseling and student housing. As stated above, these perceptions may be legitimate or they may not. In either case, assessment is called for. Should that assessment indicate a real problem, then corrective action is needed. If not, then it is important to communicate to faculty the more accurate situation.
It is interesting to note that despite the fact that human development is very clearly spelled out as an important part of the mission of the North Iowa Area Community College, student development is not mentioned once in the student services section of the NIACC general catalogue (1987-1988). What is included is six pages of lengthy descriptions of many student services. This would indicate that NIACC student services operates with a service rather than a developmental model. This could be a possible explanation for why there is so much support from faculty for all of the student services. This more traditional and conservative model is not so threatening to the faculty. NIACC has avoided the controversy by not overtly embracing the principles of student development.

This situation has both benefits and pitfalls. The benefits are, of course, that a conflict is avoided. Energy and resources are not wasted on debating the role of student services. The pitfall is the fact that student services is not the proactive and intentional force that it could be. It contributes to the mission only indirectly as the manager of the student bureaucracy rather than the developer of human potential. This is not to say there is a total absence of development in the services delivered, even the "Student Personnel Point of View" discussed student development. The goal, however, is not development but the service itself. The practitioners are not working to facilitate development but to manage the service.
A possible solution would be to adopt the student consumer model as described by Leach (1985). This model is proactive and intentional and yet it is not as controversial because it considers the needs of the institution as well as the students.

Another solution would be to incorporate faculty and staff into all of the student development process. Student development staff are the experts in student development. Yet, the faculty view the classroom as the primary delivery vehicle of student development. Student service staff should accept this as fact. After all, faculty has much more contact with students than does student service staff.

Student service staff have the responsibility to act as consultants to faculty in matters of student development. Miller and Prince (1976) describe consultation as an important part of their student development process model. By acting as consultants to faculty, student development could become more effective and more students could reap the benefits that a developmental program would have to offer.

Finally, faculty could become more involved in the delivery of the services as academic advisor, student activity sponsors and role models and mentors. A campus with a legitimate student development model would invite everyone on campus to participate. This is what a developmental environment is all about: faculty, staff, and students all working together, working toward the goal of development.
Appendix
Table 1  
Mean scores of Faculty's Perceptions of the Institutional Priority of Student Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Division</th>
<th>Health Division</th>
<th>Humanities Division</th>
<th>Natural Science Division</th>
<th>Social Science Division</th>
<th>Trade &amp; Industry Division</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>N=72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Programs</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale
1= Not Important 2= 3= Moderately Important 4= 5= Very Important
### Table 2

**Mean Score of Faculty's Perceptions of the Quality of Student Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Division</th>
<th>Health Division</th>
<th>Humanities Division</th>
<th>Natural Science Division</th>
<th>Social Science Division</th>
<th>Trade &amp; Industry Division</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>N=72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Programs</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Services</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Assessment</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale**

1= Needs Major Improvement
2=
3= Adequate
4=
5= Excellent
Table 3
Mean Score of Faculty's Subjective View of What Student Service Priorities Should Be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Division</th>
<th>Health Division</th>
<th>Humanities Division</th>
<th>Natural Science Division</th>
<th>Social Science Division</th>
<th>Trade &amp; Industry Division</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=10</td>
<td>N=9</td>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td>N=8</td>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>N=72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Programs</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Services</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Personnel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Counseling</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Assessment</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Orientation</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Service</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale
1= Much Lower Priority Needed
2=
3= Same Priority as Now
4=
5= Much Higher Priority Needed
Directions: Answer each question concerning importance, quality, and priority for each of the following student services by circling the number corresponding with your perceptions. Please write any specific comments or concerns on the back of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT SERVICES</th>
<th>A. IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>B. QUALITY</th>
<th>C. PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ACADEMIC ADVISING help students in developing meaningful educational plans consistent with life goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ADMISSIONS promote the institution and its programs and facilities to prospective students and parents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CAREER COUNSELING assist students in making career choices consistent with personal values.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FINANCIAL AID provide information and assistance to students in securing available financial aid and scholarships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. JUDICIAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES develop and enforce campus regulations; protect students' legal rights; administer grievance process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. LEARNING ASSISTANCE AND ASSESSMENT support students in the development of skills necessary for effective performance in college.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENT SERVICES (25 &amp; Older) providing special services to students with competing needs including family, work, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PERSONAL COUNSELING assist students in defining and accomplishing personal and academic goals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PLACEMENT assist students in preparing for job search and transition from education and world of work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SPECIAL NEEDS assist students in overcoming educational barriers due to physical, emotional, and learning disabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. STUDENT ACTIVITIES enhance students educational experience through social, cultural, intellectual, student government and recreational programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. STUDENT HOUSING (DORMITORIES) provide a living-learning environment that promotes individual growth and development.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. STUDENT ORIENTATION aid new students in transition to college; learn about opportunities and procedures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 X</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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