

THEORIES [AND PRACTICE] OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT
AHE 552, Spring 2013, 3 credits
College Student Services Administration, Oregon State University

**Note: This syllabus, class notes, and additional resources are/will be available via Blackboard at
< <http://my.oregonstate.edu> >**

“Theories are made to be destroyed. Theories give birth to new knowledge which cannot be encompassed by the parents. New theories are then needed to give this knowledge form and meaning. A theory is useful to a researcher because it gives him [sic] a benchmark from which to start, not a mooring against which to rest”
(Spady & Bell, 1996, p. 105).

Spady, R. J., & Bell, C. H. (1996). *The search for enlightened leadership*. Olympia, WA: PanPress.

Class Meeting

Day/Time: Wednesday 4:00pm-6:50pm
Location: 303 Furman Hall

Instructor

Jeff Kenney, M.Ed.
Coordinator of LGBTQ+ Outreach & Services
Snell 245
Phone: 541.737.6342 (office)
Email: Jeff.Kenney@oregonstate.edu
Office Hours: By appointment

Statement of Accessibility

This class represents an environment that is open and welcoming to all students. If you believe you may need accommodations during this class that may not traditionally be available, please contact the instructor within the first week of classes to plan a way to meet these needs. Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty and Disability Access Services (DAS). Students with accommodations approved through DAS are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations but who have not yet obtained approval through DAS should contact DAS immediately at 737-4098.

Statement of Expectations for Student Conduct

You will be expected to conduct yourself in a professional, honest, and ethical manner and adhere to OSU academic policies. As such you will be held to the highest standards regarding academic integrity. Academic dishonesty includes: cheating (the intentional use of unauthorized materials, information, or study aids); fabrication (falsification or invention of any information); assisting (helping another commit an act of academic dishonesty); tampering (altering or interfering with evaluation instruments and documents); and plagiarism (intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of another person as one's own). For additional information about academic dishonesty at OSU please go to: <http://oregonstate.edu/studentconduct/faculty/facacdis.php>

Course Description

This course is meant to offer opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of adult student populations and development theory (*specifically cognitive theories and typologies*) and its application to practice. The exploration of student development theory is not intended to provide strict parameters for action, but rather a solid foundation for practice and further discovery.

Learning Outcomes for the Course

As a result of successfully completing the learning experiences and assignments associated with this course, it is intended that you will have the skills and abilities to:

- Identify, explain, and critically discuss cognitive-structural student development theories and learning and personality typologies
- Compare, contrast, and evaluate the merit and utility of cognitive-structural student development theories and typologies
- Identify the connections and interrelationships among student development theory families
- Apply various student development theories to your work in student affairs

Course Requirements

- Attendance and *active, thoughtful* participation in all class discussions and activities.
- Timely and thorough completion and submission of all course assignments, including adherence to APA guidelines for specified written assignment.

Course Assignments [200 possible points]:

Assignment	Due Date	Points Possible	Grade Percentage
Participation	Weekly	20	10.0%
Think Cards	Week 2 – Finals	40	20.0%
Midterm Exam	Week 7	50	25.0%
Current Issues Theory Paper			
Submission 1 – Prospectus	Week 4	5	2.5%
Submission 2 – Draft	Week 8	5	2.5%
Submission 3 – Final	Week 10	30	15.0%
Submission 4 – Blog Submission	Week 11	10	5.0%
Professional Job Talk	Week 10	40	20.0%

1. Participation [20 points]:

You are expected to read all assigned readings, come to class prepared to contribute actively and intelligently to class discussions and exercises, and be present and engaged during class time. This means you are expected to be free from technological distractions. Please refrain from using cell/smart phones and other similar devices in the classroom out of respect for your classmates and your instructor. If you choose to take notes or access readings via your laptop during class please refrain from surfing the web, reading email, and engaging in other activities not related to the class.

Anticipated absences from class should be communicated with the instructor at least one week in advance. Unanticipated absences should be communicated as soon as is possible given the circumstances. Each absence will result in the deduction of one point unless you demonstrate within one week of the absence that all missed work, including the missed “lecture,” has been addressed. It is your responsibility as the student to initiate and negotiate the terms of the make-up assignment. Please contact the instructor with ideas you have for doing so.

Attendance and participation will be evaluated in terms of: (a) in-class attendance [10 points; 2 points for each on-time and full day of attendance] and (b) level of demonstrated engagement within the course [10 points].

2. Think Cards/Blackboard Discussion Forums (due weeks 1-9 (Except Week 7)) [40 points] (APA not required)

Based on the assigned readings, you will submit a 1-page virtual “Think Card” for class each week with: (a) reactions/points of interest and (b) questions for further class discussion. *At a minimum*, Think Cards should include one well-developed comment for each of the two categories listed above. **“Cards” are to be shared via Blackboard by Sunday at 5:00pm of each week (prior to class that Tuesday) and then a copy to share brought to class on Tuesday. The expectation is that you will submit your own “card” and then respond to at least three other classmates’ cards online by Tuesday at 12:00pm (prior to class that afternoon).**

Think Cards will be evaluated in terms of: (a) quality, professionalism, and demonstrated understanding of the course material [32 points/4 points per card] and (b) whether think cards and responses were submitted and submitted on time [8 points/1 point per card].

3. Current Issues/Case Study Theory Paper (draft of section 1 and outline of section 2 due week #4, completed draft due week #8, final version due class #10) [60 points] (APA required)

You are asked to identify a *specific and current* critical issue or case in higher education through credible published scholarship (articles, reports, conference presentations, books) and then to analyze the current issue from a student development perspective. You may include one theory from AHE 552 Part I, but the paper should focus on demonstrating understanding of the theories studied specifically in this class.

Facets of the assignment include (8-12 pp., not including title page, abstract, references, and any appendices):

- Thorough yet concise description of the current critical issue selected and rationale for selection supported through credible published scholarship [Section 1]
- Identification of at least four theories (at least three of which must be from this term's class specifically) from which analysis will be made [Section 2]
- Thorough analysis, consideration, and discussion of the selected current critical issue from each of the selected four theoretical perspectives that demonstrate students' knowledge of the theories and their practical applications toward understanding current issues in higher education

The *Current Issues Theory Paper* will be evaluated in terms of:

- a) **Submission One: PROSPECTUS - Week 4 [5 Points]**
 - whether draft of section 1 and outline of section 2 were submitted on time and overall quality of the document
- b) **Submission Two: COMPLETED DRAFT - Week 8 [5 Points]**
 - whether completed draft was submitted on time and overall quality of the document
- c) **Submission Three: FINAL DRAFT - Week 10 [40 Points]**
 - (a) clarity and organization of the final version [5 points], (b) success in thoroughly addressing all facets of the assignments in the final version [25 points], and (e) adherence to APA guidelines (including grammar) in the final version [10 points].
- d) **Submission Four: PROFESSIONAL BLOG SUBMISSION - Week 11 [10 Points]**
 - *"It [blogging] remains a courageous act of publicly sharing an often too private process of understanding our students, our institutions and our field. In sharing our process, we, in some small yet meaningful way, encourage others to do the same"* - Lisa Endersby
 - Blogs serve as a way for professionals to review current and emerging issues, review best practices, and update the profession on the impact of new policies/practices. For this submission you are asked to re-imagine your case study paper as an 800 – 1,200 word blog post. This will require you to synthesize the information you gathered into a concise persuasive paper.
 - Blog submissions will be prepared for publication through the OSU CSSA Blog:
 - i. <http://education.oregonstate.edu/college-student-services-administration>

4. Exam (week #7) [50 points]

A midterm exam will be administered, through which you will be asked to demonstrate your comprehension of the previously reviewed theories. You will be provided a series of essay questions, for which you will be given the entirety of a class period [170 minutes] to complete. You may not use texts, notes, or other references during the exam. You may hand write or type this exam. You may not access the internet [For reference/research purposes], through computer, phone, or other electronic device during the exam.

5. Professional Job Talk (due week #11) [40 points]

As a final demonstration of your comprehension of student development theories, you are asked to prepare a formal job talk to be presented before your peers, faculty, and other community stakeholders. To frame your talk,

find a currently available position description which best represents your 'ideal' position after graduation. With this position description as a framework, you are asked to prepare your presentation as though you are a candidate participating in an on-campus interview. Each student is asked to develop their talk with the following prompt:

Dear Candidate,

We are so excited to have you join us on campus next week. I am pleased to share that your flight and housing arrangements have been set, and your host is scheduled to pick you up from the airport. Attached you will find your interview itinerary and additional information regarding the position.

Your interview day will conclude with a public forum, in which we invite department staff, students, and key stakeholders to attend. We would like for you to prepare a presentation detailing your understanding of student development theory as it relates to this position. We are interested in learning more about your intended strategies and their theoretical underpinnings. You will have 20 minutes to present to the group, with 10 minutes remaining for audience questions.

Please let us know if you have any audio/visual needs, or if we may make copies on your behalf. As well, please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions you may have.

Travel safe!

- The Hiring Supervisor

.....

The candidate forum will be held during week 11. This event is open to anyone at Oregon State University. Guests attending your job talk will have the opportunity to fill out a feedback form, similar to those we use here at OSU, to rate your performance and qualification for the position. We want to underscore the formal nature of this presentation as you consider your demeanor, dress, and level of preparation for the job talk.

In addition to preparing your presentation, you will be responsible for bringing printed copies of your position description for your audience to review and use as a framework for evaluation. Further, you are encouraged to personally invite friends, colleagues, and mentors to your job talk to enrich your level of feedback and support.

Course Evaluation

You are responsible for demonstrating your understanding of the basic concepts of the principles and theories and practice of student development and for meeting the course requirements. In accordance with University policy, you will be graded on a standard A-F system: A = 93% -100%; A- = 90%-92%; B+ = 87%-89%; B = 83%-86%; B- = 80%-82%

Required Texts

American Psychological Association. (2009). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington DC: Author.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, M. E. (Ed.) (2011). ASHE reader series: *College student development theory* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Other readings will be posted on Blackboard, available through the Valley Library's ejournals or ERIC databases, or available for borrow from the instructor.

Suggested Course Outline

Class #1 (April 2, 2014): What's all this about theory?; Review of student development theory; Course overview

Required Reading:

- Thomas, G. (1997). What's the use of theory? *Harvard Educational Review*, 67, 75-104.

- Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2011). The nature and uses of theory. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (3-16). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Strange, C. (2011). Student development: The evolution and status of an essential idea. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (17-33). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Assignment Due:

- Think Card #1

Class #2 (April 9, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: Perry's Theory of Intellectual and Ethical Development

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 82-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (2011). Patterns of development in thought and values of students in a liberal arts college. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (299-320). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (2011). Sharing in the costs of growth. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (321-324). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Marra, R., & Palmer, B. (2004). Encouraging intellectual growth: Senior college student profiles. *Journal of Adult Development, 11*, 111-122.
- Kloss, R. J. (1994). A nudge is best. *College Teaching, 42*(4), 151-159.

Optional Reading

- Knepfelkamp, L. L. (1999). Introduction. In *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme*. (pp. xi-xlv). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Love, P. G., & Guthrie, V. L. (1999). Perry's intellectual scheme. In *Understanding and Applying Cognitive Development Theory* (pp. 5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Assignment Due:

- Think Card #2

Class #3 (April 16, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's Women's Ways of Knowing

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Later cognitive structural theories. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 119-124). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clinchy, B. M. (2011). Revisiting women's ways of knowing. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (325-341). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Clinchy, B. M. (2011). Connected and separate knowing: Toward a marriage of two minds. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (342-366). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Khine, M. S., & Hayes, B. (2010). Investigating women's ways of knowing: An exploratory study in the UAE. *Issues in Educational Research, 20*(2), 105-117.
- Hayes, E. R. (2001). A new look at women's learning. In *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Learning: The New Update on Adult Learning Theory, 89*, (pp. 35-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Optional Reading

- Love, P. G., & Guthrie, V. L. (1999). Women's ways of knowing. In *Understanding and Applying Cognitive Development Theory* (pp. 17-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Introduction: To the other side of silence. In *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind* (pp. 3-20). New York: BasicBooks.

Assignment Due:

- Think Card #3

Class #4 (April 23, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: King & Kitchener's Reflective Judgment Model

Cognitive -Structural: Baxter Magolda's Epistemological Reflection/Self-Authorship

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Later cognitive structural theories. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 124-135). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2011). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (367-384). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Development of self-authorship. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 176-193). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). Complex lives. In *Making Their Own Way* (pp. 3-36). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Creamer, E. G., & Laughlin, A. (2005). Self-authorship and women's career decision making. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 13-27.

Optional Reading

- Love, P. G., & Guthrie, V. L. (1999). King & Kitchener's reflective judgment model. In *Understanding and Applying Cognitive Development Theory* (pp. 41-51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2011). Evolution of a constructivist conceptualization of epistemological reflection. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (385-400). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Assignments Due:

- Think Card #4
- Current Issues Theory Paper, Submission 1: *Prospectus*

Class #5 (April 30, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Moral development theory. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 99-118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kohlberg, L. (1991). My personal search for universal morality. In L. Kuhmerker, U. Gielen, & R.L. Hayes (Eds.), *The Kohlberg legacy for helping professions* (pp. 11-17). Birmingham, AL: R.E.P. Books.
- Kohlberg, L. (2011). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (401-422). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Verhoef, H., & Michel, C. (1997). Studying morality within the African context: A model of moral analysis and construction. *Journal of Moral Education*, 26(4), 389-407.
- Jambon, M. C., & Smetana, J. G. (2012). College students' moral evaluations of illegal music downloading. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 33, 31-39.

Optional Reading

- Gielen, U. (1991). Kohlberg's moral development theory. In L. Kuhmerker, U. Gielen, & R.L. Hayes (Eds.), *The Kohlberg legacy for helping professions* (pp. 18-38). Birmingham, AL: R.E.P. Books.
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (2011). A Neo-Kohlbergian approach to morality research. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (449-460). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Assignment(s) Due:

- Think Card #5

Class #6 (May 7, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: Gilligan's Theory of Women's Moral Development

Required Reading:

- Gilligan, C. (2011). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (423-448). Boston, MA: Pearson
- Gilligan, C. (1993). Reply to critics. In *An Ethic of Care* (pp. 207-214). New York: Routledge.
- Bruess, B. J., Pearson, F. C. (2002). The debate continues: Are there gender differences in moral reasoning as defined by Kohlberg? *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21, 38-52.
- Cook, K. V., Larson, D. C., & Boivin, M. D. (2003). Moral voices of women and men in the Christian liberal arts college: Links between views of self and views of God. *Journal of Moral Education*, 32(1), 77-89.

Optional Reading

- Ellis, S. J. (2002). Moral reasoning and homosexuality: The acceptability of arguments about lesbian and gay issues. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(4), 455-467.
- Foos, C. L. (1998). The "different voice" of service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 5, 14-21.

Assignment(s) Due:

- Think Card #6

Class #7 (May 14, 2014): Mid Term Exam

Required Reading:

- N/A

Optional Reading

- N/A

Assignment(s) Due:

- N/A

Class #8 (May 21, 2014): Cognitive -Structural: Fowler's and Parks' Faith Development

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Development of faith and spirituality. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 194-211). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Love, P. G. (2011). Comparing spiritual development and cognitive development. In M. E. Wilson (Ed.), *ASHE reader series: College student development theory* (2nd ed.) (104-118). Boston, MA: Pearson
- Miller-Perrin, C., & Thompson, D. (2010). The development of vocational calling, identity, and faith in college students: A preliminary study of the impact of study abroad. *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 19, 87-103.

Assignment(s) Due:

- Think Card #7
- Current Issues Theory Paper, Submission 1: *Completed Draft*

**Class #9 (May 28, 2014): Typologies (Personality) Myers-Briggs Personality Type [with Adry Clark]
Typologies (Personality) Holland's Theory of Vocational Personalities & Environments**

Required Reading:

- Nauta, M. M. (2010). The development, evolution, and status of Holland's Theory of Vocational Personalities: Reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(1), 11-22.
- Aviles, C. B. (2001). *A review of the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory: A potential training tool for human services organizations*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED 449436)
- DiRienzo, C., Das, J., Synn, W., Kitts, J., & McGrath, K. (2010). The relationship between MBTI and academic performance: A study across academic disciplines. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 70(5), 53-66.

Assignment(s) Due:

- Think Card #8
- *Complete the MBTI via OSU Career Services [fee is \$14]
- *Complete the Strong Interest Inventory via OSU Career Services [fee is \$14]

**Class #10 (June 4, 2014): Typologies (Learning): Kolb's Theory of Experiential Learning
Typologies (Learning): Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning**

Required Reading:

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., Guido, F. M., Patton, L. D., & Renn, K. A. (2010). Kolb's theory of experiential learning. In *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.) (pp. 136-152). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. A. (n.d.) Experience based learning systems. Retrieved from <http://www.learningfromexperience.com/> [Read FAQs section]
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles: Concepts and evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 9(3), 105-119.

- Fallahi, C. R., & LaMonaca, F. H., Jr. (2009). The evolution of educational objectives: Bloom's taxonomy and beyond. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*, 20(1), 71-86.
- Granello, D. H. (2001). Promoting cognitive complexity in graduate written work: Using Bloom's Taxonomy as a pedagogical tool to improve literature reviews. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40, 292-307.

Assignment(s) Due:

- Current Issues Theory Paper, Submission 1: *Final Draft*
-

Class #11 (June 11, 2013): Job Talks

Required Reading:

- N/A

Optional Reading

- N/A

Assignment(s) Due:

- Professional Job Talk
- Current Issues Theory Paper, Submission 1: *Blog Submission*