Fall 1998

Koinonia

Skip Trudeau
Tim Johnson
Brent D. Ellis
Mary Jayne Allen

Follow this and additional works at: https://pillars.taylor.edu/acsd_koinonia

Recommended Citation
https://pillars.taylor.edu/acsd_koinonia/24
Putting Student Learning Theory Into Practice

Status of Alcohol Use in Employment Recruiting

Collaboration in the Common Curriculum

The Paradox of Leadership

Annual Conference Highlights

CoCCA Hot Ideas

News from the Regions

Association for Christians in Student Development
It is a privilege to serve as an officer of ACSD. Having benefited as a member for almost 20 years, it is now a joy to serve the organization as President, along with Everett Piper, President-Elect; Denise Bakerink, Vice President; Mark Troyer, Treasurer and Membership Chair; Sharon Givler, Editor; and Mary Ann Searle, Secretary. Mark and Sharon were elected in the spring and are beginning their first year as officers. ACSD has been blessed with leaders who have volunteered their time and faithfully served the organization. Please pray for us during the next year that we would seek to provide wise and faithful leadership for the membership of ACSD.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, I want to express appreciation to Jim DeJong and John Witte for serving as co-chairs of the annual conference at Calvin in June. Over 500 members enjoyed a very stimulating program and warm fellowship. I would also like to thank Tim Herrmann and Norris Friessen for co-leading the New Professionals Retreat for the past two years. Please pray for the staff at Biola as they prepare for the 1999 annual conference. As we enter the new millennium, Taylor University will host the twentieth annual conference, and we will travel to Northwestern College in Orange City, Iowa in 2001.

Two Distinguished Service Awards were established three years ago in honor of Don Boender and Ruth Bamford, past Presidents of ACSD. I had the pleasure of presenting these two awards on the opening evening of the conference to Jane Higa and Mark Troyer. Jane received the Boender Distinguished Service Award for more than ten years of service, and Mark, who has served less than ten years, received the Bamford Distinguished Service Award. Jane and Mark have been exemplary in serving as student development professionals.

One of the most encouraging experiences of the annual conference for me was the dialogue with minority staff. For the third year in a row, the Executive Committee scheduled a meeting in the program for people who were interested in multicultural perspectives and issues. About twenty of us met and this was probably the most encouraging discussion we have had on broadening the membership of ACSD to be more representative of the body of Christ. One woman came to Calvin as a result of attending the ACPA prayer breakfast and hearing about the annual conference. We also discussed the possibility of networking with historically black colleges and universities. The Executive Committee will continue to be committed to listening and working toward the goal of enabling ACSD to be an organization that welcomes people from different ethnic backgrounds and sponsor annual conferences which have programs and speakers reflecting this priority. Each of us has challenges within our own institutions related to diversity concerns, and ACSD must be proactive in addressing these same issues.

Prior to the annual conference at Calvin, the Executive Committee met and discussed several new items related to the future of ACSD. An effort will be made to offer a mid level managers retreat, as well as the new professionals retreat, either at Biola next year or at Taylor in two years. The Executive Committee will meet with some of the past officers to focus on the future direction of ACSD as an organization. This special meeting will take place after the first of the year or just prior to the annual conference at Biola. Some of the items to be discussed include: scope and limitations of a volunteer-based organization, engagement with the secular academy, establishment of institutes for professional enhancement, and stewardship of funds.

A final word of encouragement. God is faithful to promises in His Word. Proverbs 8:17 reads: "I love those who love me, and those who seek me find me.” This is a reminder that in the midst of challenges we face in our work, God loves us, and when we seek Him, He responds to us. May the Lord bless your ministry with students, and may you be encouraged to seek Him.
As I’ve had a little time over the past few months to collect myself with respect to what the Koinonia editor does and how I might serve the membership of ACSD through this publication, I must admit that panic made an occasional appearance in my day. This is a daunting task!

Always eager to try to do something new and maybe just a little different from what has preceded, I launched into this position in similar fashion. At first glance you’ll notice a new look which both Sharie Schnell, our informed and dedicated designer, and I hope will invite you inside the cover. And then there is the organization of the content. In addition to two or three feature articles, we are including two new sections. One of those sections, Around Campus, is being introduced in this issue and will showcase programs of note in our colleges and universities. The other section, In The Field, will be introduced in the winter edition and will feature articles of research and scholarship primarily from administrators, professors, and current students in student affairs and related graduate programs. I also expect to begin an expanded resource and book review section for our next edition.

Bottom line? What might you have to contribute to our publication in any of these areas?

I look forward to hearing from many of you. Call or write me at 716-567-9623 or sgivler@houghton.edu.

—Sharon Givler, Editor
Collaboration: Putting Student Learning Theory into Practice

By Skip Trudeau and Tim Johnson

Student Learning Theory may well be on its way to replacing developmental approaches such as Chickering, Kohlberg, etc. as the dominant theoretical base for student affairs practice in American higher education. The call for the centrality of student learning is being heard from the major professional organizations in the field, i.e. NASPA's "Reasonable Expectations" (1993) and ACPA's "Student Learning Imperative" (1994), as well as several writers (Astin, 1996, Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994, Calhoun, 1996, Guthrie, et al. 1997, & Kuh, 1996). One reoccurring theme throughout these publications is the notion that student Affairs personnel need to become collaborative partners with faculty and academic affairs in pursuing student learning. The purpose of this paper is threefold. First, to provide a general overview of Student Learning Theory as presented in two seminal works, Student Learning Imperative, (1994), and Student Affairs Reconsidered: A Christian View of the Profession and its Contexts (ed. D. Guthrie, 1997). Second, to discuss student learning theory's apparent utility in comparison to developmental theories. Finally, present our rationale for the need for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs.

STUDENT LEARNING: A PRIMER

According to the Student Learning Imperative (SLI) released by ACPA in 1994, the student affairs division that is focused on both personal development and student learning exhibits the following five characteristics:

1. The student affairs division mission complements the institution's mission with the enhancement of student learning and personal development being the primary goal of student affairs programs and services.

   The SLI calls for student affairs practitioners to take as seriously their role as facilitator of student learning as they do their role as facilitator of personal development. The practitioners' view of learning and development must be congruent with the mission of the institution. The authors of the SLI suggest that if the quality of an undergraduate education is to be measured by what and how much students learn, then that should also be the criteria by which student affairs programs are judged, not by the number of programs offered or clients served.

2. Resources are allocated to encourage student learning and personal development.

   The SLI suggests that student affairs divisions should recruit and reward individuals who "design programs, services, and settings that encourage student involvement in activities that have the potential to foster a wide range of learning and personal development outcomes." The SLI calls upon staff members to model collaboration and reflection and to participate in professional development opportunities.

3. Student affairs professionals collaborate with other institutional agents and agencies to promote student learning and personal development.

   The student learning oriented student affairs division strives to create collaborative efforts that are more intentional and less serendipitous. We all espouse the position that the more involved our students are in a wide variety of activities, the more they benefit. As professionals in the field of student affairs we work very hard to provide learning experiences for students outside of the classroom. The SLI calls for us to be more creative and intentional about blending the in-class and out-of-class experiences to create what George Kuh calls a "seamless learning environment" (1996). Involving faculty in our residence hall or campus ministry programs and offering our expertise and assistance in in-class experiences may be ways to initiate this collaborative relationship.

4. The division of student affairs includes staff who are experts on students, their environments, and teaching and learning processes.

   We would argue that this is fundamental to any student affairs staff member at any institution. We suspect that most faculty members expect us to be the experts on the students, at least outside of the classroom. We should know who our students are, where they come from, and what their needs are. We should know how they spend their time and to what extent they utilize the institution's resources and programs that are at their disposal. The learning centered student affairs staff member should also be familiar with different teaching and learning styles. At least, the informed staff member should be able to "put their hands on" current research and trends in the area of teaching and learning styles. A working knowledge of these issues could certainly increase the "value" of student affairs staff within the classroom.
5. Student affairs policies and programs are based on promising practices in the research on student learning and data on institution-specific assessment.

We believe “institution specific” to be the key component of this characteristic. Staff members must be cognizant of their institutional mission and be able to apply the research surrounding student learning and personal development to their situation. Of course, the other necessary component of this characteristic is being up-to-date with current research and thought in our own field and in related fields. The idea of professional development once again surfaces here. As student affairs professionals we must continue to periodically “touch” all that is current in the vast field of higher education, and specifically that which is current in student learning, an area we may have previously ignored.

In Student Affairs Reconsidered, David Guthrie et al (1997) offer Wisdom Development as the course that should be followed by both student affairs and academic affairs at our Christian colleges. From our reading of Student Affairs Reconsidered, the definition of Wisdom Development evolves from the application of Guthrie’s six principles of student learning to a whole-person approach to learning that is couched in a Christian context. Thus, the six principles of student learning/wisdom development are:

1. A Christian view of student learning seems to point away from rationalist credentialist, maturationist, and moralist goals and toward a more holistic notion of the telos of learning. Learner leaders at Christian institutions must determine how to shape, reshape, and strengthen students’ mooring to a Biblical worldview; cultivate students’ abilities to discern; and equip students for the glories and glitches of further exploration.

2. Student learning as wisdom development is filled with purpose.

The author argues that when an institution decides that its purpose is to help “students build a framework for understanding, sharpen their discernment, and become more prepared for continued exploration” (p. 57), it gives that institution a clear path toward deciding upon, and measuring, student learning outcomes. We also believe that this is yet another reminder that student learning theory/wisdom development can be and needs to be institution specific. Obviously, how an institution chooses to mold a student’s framework for understanding will depend upon the mission and ethos of the institution.

3. Student learning as wisdom development is clearly multidimensional.

Here Guthrie reminds us that we cannot just assume that student learning will be enhanced because we offer, and they attend, a myriad of programs and activities. This aspect of wisdom development resonates with the call from the SLI that student affairs divisions become more intentional. It appears crucial to us that we not only recognize the multidimensionality of wisdom development, but that we also develop intentional goals and strategies for presenting these dimensions, and as the next principle commands, for blending them.

4. Developing wisdom is an integrative enterprise. Growing in wisdom necessitates making connections: among past, present, and future; among beliefs, ideas and actions; among people, experiences, and events; among classroom, student organization, and personal relationships.

Guthrie asks us here to give “constant attention” to aiding our students in making the connections that exist within their college experience and the world beyond. Departments within student affairs have the opportunity to provide the moments when students can “connect” with our residence hall programming, student activities, and campus ministries. We must not, as the SLI cautions, operate as “functional silos” on campus. We are obligated to have an awareness of what is going on in other departments as well as the classrooms. If we can provide programs that “piggy back” on class sessions, we have the opportunity to enhance student learning.

5. Developing wisdom and the communal nature of student learning are related concepts. Remembering, discerning, and exploring are most beneficial to the extent that students, faculty, and staff work-and learn-together.

Collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs is a recurring theme for us in this article. We believe that it is time to re-examine our existing paradigms by which student affairs and academic affairs operate. Some might argue that achieving Kuh’s “seamless environment” is impossible. However, we would argue that for the staff member dedicated to the ideals of wisdom development, creating those opportunities for collaboration with academic affairs is essential.

6. Wisdom development reflects the process aspect of student learning. Forging a framework for understanding and orienting one’s life is clearly an ongoing process.

Modeling learning as a process may be the most effective way to teach our students about the importance of life-long learning. By outwardly embracing life-long learning we communicate through our actions that learning and wisdom development is a process. Our own professional development and our collaborative efforts provide excellent examples of possible modeling. Our involvement and attendance at campus events in the arts or various disciplines can demonstrate our love of learning and scholarship.
Collaboration: Putting Student Learning Theory into Practice

UTILITY

A basic premise to our belief in the utility of Student Learning Theory to student affairs rests in our conviction that developmental theoretical approaches have not proven as useful and therefore a more utilitarian approach is needed. To underscore this point we felt it necessary to start this section with a brief discussion of why we believe current practice based on developmental approaches lacks utilitarian value in comparison with student learning theory. To this end we pose the following rationales for consideration.

First, there is some indication that even though many student affairs programs may claim an adherence to a developmental approach or theory there is little evidence that these theories actually inform or impact practice in a significant manner (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994, and Bult De Jong, 1997). Whether it is due to a lack of time, energy, resources, or a lack of practical application, student affairs practitioners may have been utilizing developmental theory far less than they claim. Second, there is a lack of evidence that this philosophical adherence to development theory has been effective. Instead of being a substantive metatheory, student development approaches have been more accurately described as "...a loose collection of many hypotheses regarding young adult development" (Loy & Painter, 1997, pg. 27). In other words, these theories have been more descriptive about what happens to college students as opposed to being prescriptive of effective approaches to impact their development. Finally, there is some indication that student development's adherence to these theories has created a gap between the field and other sectors of higher education (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994, and Loy & Painter, 1997). Rather than establishing student affair's educational niche within the academe, it appears developmental approaches have created a chasm between student affairs and others by unintentionally emphasizing a difference between the in and out of classroom experiences of college students.

Aside from the previously mentioned deficiencies in the traditional student developmental paradigm, a student learning theoretical approach is compelling to the Christian student affairs practitioner on its own merits. The current re-definition of student affairs work (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994, Guthrie, 1998, and Guthrie et al. 1997) does not appear to be a simple case of out-with-the-old, because it is not working, and in-with-the-new because we have to have some theoretical base on which to hang our hats. There are several reasons to believe this new approach will work.

First, Student Learning Theory calls upon student affairs in all sectors, including Christian and secular, to be viewed within the context of the overall academic mission of an institution (Bloland, Stamatakos, and Rogers, 1994 and Guthrie et al., 1997). In other words, instead of developing and maintaining our own individual and potential conflicting mission statements, student affairs departments should find their sense of purpose in the overarching academic mission of an institution. Think of it this way: Can partners (collaboration) with different mission statements really be partners?

Second, student learning theory allows for flexibility in application. In contrast to the more rigid student development approach (i.e. I am of Chickering, I am of Kohlberg, etc.) in which Christian student affairs appear to be forced to Christianize existing theories, student learning is more institutional mission sensitive. In other words, student learning can be defined through an individual institution's mission statement.

Finally, and maybe most compelling to us is that student learning requires collaboration between student affairs and other areas of higher education. To our thinking this is especially true in Christian higher education. A very helpful metaphor in thinking about a collaborative student learning approach is the "Seamless Learning Environment" (Kuh, 1994). George Kuh, a leading proponent for student affairs adoption of student learning theory, has best described this concept as follows:

"The word seamless suggests that what was once believed to be separate, distinct parts, (e.g., in-class and out-of-class, academic and non-academic, curricular and co-curricular, or on-campus and off-campus experiences) are now of one piece, bound together so as to appear whole or continuous (p. 136, 1996).

Collaboration between all areas of a campus including faculty, administration, staff, and students are necessary ingredients for the creation of such an environment. This leads us to a discussion on collaboration.

COLLABORATION

What is collaboration between student affairs and other areas in terms of Student Learning Theory? To begin with let us consider what it is not. Collaboration is not student affairs departments existing in our own little fiefdoms and complaining about how under valued and unsupported we are as we have tended to in the past (Credon, 1989 and Smith 1989). Nor is it student affairs attempting to solidify its position in an economically restrained environment as we have tended to in recent times (Kalsebeck, 1989). To our thinking, collaboration infers a complete and true partnership in the pursuit of student learning. It is not a bridge between the
academic and non-academic domains but rather a merging where each side permeates the other to the point it is difficult to determine where one begins and the other ends. In other words, it is the creation of a "seamless environment" (Kuh 1996). Another helpful way to consider it is as the connection between the classroom (cognitive development) and life (affective development) in which students are challenged to apply their classroom knowledge experiences in "real life" situations (Astin, 1996 and Calhoun, 1996). It goes much further than just a social bumping into one another on campus as we go about separate and unconnected tasks. It requires a very intentional effort on the part of everyone involved in terms of time, effort, and other resources.

**STUDENT LEARNING/WISDOM DEVELOPMENT ON OUR CAMPUSES**

We believe that Christians working in the field of higher education have several things in common, one being a genuine love for the students with whom we are privileged to work. We know that each of you care deeply about students as individuals and as learners. Another commonality we share is the recognition of the Lordship of Jesus Christ. As Christ's followers, we have expectations and obligations as to how we interact with His children. We recognize the awesome responsibility that each of us carries in trying to develop our students into lifelong learners who are centered in a Biblical worldview. We suspect that each of you diligently work to provide those programs and services that best meet the needs and goals that you have for your students and your institution.

Again, we believe that one of the appealing aspects of SLI and wisdom development is the fact that at the foundation of these approaches is the directive to make them institution or mission specific. From the outset, as one studies these works, the challenge comes in thinking

"How does this apply at my institution?" and "How can I use these approaches to enhance the mission of my institution or my department?"

With all of this in mind, we do not want to suggest that you must do more. We also do not have the answer for the best path to follow if you choose to adopt student learning/wisdom development as the philosophical basis for your student affairs division. Our goal is to stimulate you and your colleagues' thinking and questioning about student affairs' role in student learning and wisdom development on your campus by summarizing some of the current thought on the subject.

The SLI offers questions that student affairs divisions should ask when assessing their departments commitment to student learning. The questions can be used as "jumping off points" for your staff as you examine your role in student learning. These include:

- Does the division's mission statement explicitly address student learning and personal development as the primary objectives of student affairs?
- Do staff members understand, agree with and perform in ways congruent with this mission?
- What is the role of professional organizations in preparing student affairs staff to focus on student learning as a primary goal of student affairs?
- How can student affairs help students and faculty to intentionally connect academic work and out-of-class experiences?
- How can student affairs staff obtain and synthesize information about student performance?
- What must student affairs staff know and do to assist faculty in creating cooperative learning environments?
- Do student affairs staff have the knowledge and expertise in student learning theory and student development research needed to shape policies and practices that will lead to increased levels of student learning, personal development, and institutional productivity?

At Anderson, we have been reviewing our program in light of student learning and wisdom development. Have we thrown out our commitment to a program model that resembles Chickering's seven vectors? No. But we have committed to being more intentional, particularly in the areas of educational programming and collaboration (see *Around Campus: Cooperative Learning Environments for the Campus Community* in this issue).

As we think about the possibilities and challenges of collaboration and the larger picture of student learning and wisdom development, we find ourselves grappling with the same issues and questions that we always face when standing at the brink of something new and bold. "Where do we begin?" "What does it mean for our staff?" "Who should be involved?" "How will we fund it?" Let us resist the temptation to be overwhelmed by the logistics. Rather, let us be encouraged by what Russ Rodgers called "messy collaboration" at the 1997 ACSD conference. Remember that we can make strides toward new opportunities, even without having the entire plan before us.

Skip Trudeau, Associate Dean of Students, and Tim Johnson, Coordinator of On-Campus Housing and Hall Director, serve at Anderson University. Their article was generated from an ACSD research grant. For ideas on some of the collaborative educational programs being conducted at Anderson, refer to the article "Cooperative Learning Opportunities For The Campus Community," found in the AROUND CAMPUS section of this publication.
toward professional faithfulness

ACSD 1998 enjoyed by more than 500 members

First time, volunteer Gospel Choir leads in Closing Worship and Commissioning Service

Jane Higa and Mark Troyer receive Distinguished Service Awards
"A Night on the Town" at the Van Andel Museum Center

Keynoters David Guthrie, M. Lee Upcraft, Kathleen Storm, and Dennis Sheridan challenge and inspire conferees

River City Improv and Harrod and Funck provide great entertainment
NACE Says ‘No’ to Alcohol
In Recruiting Students, Alumni

Alcohol has no place in the process of interviewing and hiring college seniors or new college graduates, according to the NACE Board of Governors.

At its semi-annual meeting in Bethlehem in late July, the Board announced that it would add a phrase to the NACE ethics document, the Principles for Professional Conduct, indicating that serving alcohol to job candidates is inappropriate. The Board’s action was in response to a recommendation by the NACE Principles for Professional Conduct Committee after it received reports of an increasing number of employers holding receptions for students where alcohol is served.

The announcement comes at the beginning of the fall recruiting season, when employers will go on campus to recruit members of the Class of 1999.

The committee recommended changing “Principle 5” in the recruiter’s section of the Principles to read: “Serving alcohol should not be part of the recruitment process.” The Board agreed.

“The old Principles said you shouldn’t serve alcohol, but if you do, be careful,” said Alan Goodman, Chairman of the Principles Committee and director of career services at Catholic University. “It was like saying, ‘so go ahead and do it if you want to.’ The new one says it’s simply not appropriate.”

“The new Principles [document] says organizations should not use alcohol as a tool in the recruitment process. That means having an open bar, a paid bar, or holding [a recruiting] event in a bar is inappropriate,” Goodman said. “It doesn’t mean that a candidate out on an interview can’t choose an alcoholic beverage on his or her own.”

The Principles Committee discussed a number of reasons why employers might serve alcohol at a reception, including as a way of helping students relax in a social setting while getting to know the company representatives and as a way of testing the job candidate’s sophistication.

“Alcohol can be more of a distraction than an attraction during the interviewing and hiring process,” said Marilyn Mackes, NACE executive director. “Some students worry if they are offered an alcoholic beverage, they are being tested in some way. They wonder if they should accept the offer, what they should order, and whether their behavior will affect the way prospective employers view them.”

Principles Committee members also noted that some college students are under the legal drinking age, and some college campuses forbid alcohol on campus.

“Given the whole notion of alcohol abuse and the problems campuses are having with alcohol among students, serving alcohol at a reception is sending the wrong message, that alcohol has to be part of the business,” Goodman said.

Many employers, however, have also said they don’t need to serve alcohol to recruit successfully.

Alcohol isn’t served at Tellabs functions, according to Julie Cunningham, manager of corporate college relations, A NACE Principles Committee member, and Employer Vice President of the NACE Board.

“We sponsor on-campus or near-campus events,” she said. “Some of the things we do include information meetings in a classroom or in the student union. We serve soda and cookies or pizza or sub sandwiches. Students always like food and eating together tends to relax people.”

Tellabs also brings speakers to college campuses, offers facility tours to prospective job candidates, and sponsors on-campus events as a way of marketing to students.

“My guess is, the majority of employers don’t use alcohol anyway,” she said. “I think the employers this will affect are those [smaller employers] who don’t do big wine and cheese parties, but take students out for happy hour.”

She suggests that companies that want to sponsor a happy hour while eliminating the alcohol dilemma can offer soda and iced tea in pitchers on the tables when students arrive rather than asking students to order a drink one glass at a time.

NACE general counsel Rochelle Kaplan says a contradiction in serving alcohol to job candidates and then requiring them to take a drug and alcohol test to be hired.

“Why make alcohol part of your recruiting process if, in fact, your own company policies discourage such use?” said Kaplan. “It’s contradictory to host these parties and then ask applicants to take an alcohol test.”

“A company’s policy on alcohol use among employees should be reflected in its recruiting policy,” Mackes added. “If a company discourages alcohol use among employees, the company shouldn’t offer it to prospective employees.”

The updated Principles document is located on JobWeb at http://www.jobweb.org/nace/princip.htm. NACE members may download a copy for their offices.

Reprinted from the September 1, 1998 Spotlight, with permission of the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), copyright holder
The Paradox of Leadership

By Brent D. Ellis

In recent years the study of leadership has found a place in the academy. While Christian institutions attempt to distinguish secular and Christian leadership, it is becoming abundantly clear that there may not be much difference. Robert Greenleaf developed and wrote about what he called servant leadership. He states in his book, Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness (1971), "the servant leader is a servant first ... that person is sharply different from one who is leader first."

While attending a Greenleaf leadership seminar in January of 1997, I learned more about Greenleaf’s opinions on leadership. While Greenleaf’s ideas of servant leadership sound very similar to Christian servant leadership principles, they are similar only in how they are implemented. The difference, although subtle, is profound. The purpose behind the implementation of a servant leadership model, in Greenleaf’s opinion, is to increase productivity. By meeting the needs of people, they will in turn feel more secure, they will feel more committed, and therefore will produce more effectively than those who work under traditional forms of leadership. The purpose of Christian servant leadership is very different than increased productivity. It has to do with following the example of Christ, honoring God with our lives, and loving and serving people unconditionally. This is the paradox of leadership.

In the book of John this paradox of leadership is made abundantly clear. John 12:42-43 relates that, “many even among the leaders believed in Him. But because of the Pharisees they would not confess their faith for fear they would be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise from men more than the praise from God.” The motive behind the actions of the leaders was directly related to the response of the people. Their actions were a result of their desire to be loved and praised by the people. The motive was self-serving.

Jesus shows the opposite motive for his actions in the very next chapter. John 13:1b states, “Having loved his own who were in the world, he now showed them the full extent of his love.” Jesus then took off his outer clothing, wrapped a towel around his waist, and began to wash his disciples’ feet. Jesus’ motive for his leadership and service was centered on his love for others. His desire was not to gain anything for self, rather to meet the needs of those he loved. Jesus concludes this time with his disciples by challenging them with these words, “I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you.” The motive of a Christian servant leader should be to follow the example of Christ by serving others out of their love for God and people, expecting nothing in return.

Earlier in the book of John some people approached Jesus and asked what they must do to do the works of God? This question, posed from first century Jews who clearly thought that righteousness was found by upholding a very specific and rigid set of laws and duties, was aimed at finding out what they could do to find favor with God and be called righteous. Jesus’ response is wonderful. He states in John 6:29, “The work of God is this: to believe in the one he has sent.” There are two implications to this statement. The first is obvious. The only way to be deemed righteous is to believe in Jesus Christ, this is the one and only way to salvation. The second has to do with the work of God. As Christians training Christian leaders, we must keep in mind that our work, God’s work, must lead people to Christ. If it does not, it is not God’s work.

The lesson that Jesus gives is this; Christian servant leadership should be based on the example of Jesus Christ, who served others out of love for them, for the purpose of leading others to Christ. This leading is both leading to salvation and also aiding in the development or edification of the body of Christ.

While there are times when the difference between secular and Christian leadership is evident, most often the differences are hidden. This is why it is vitally important for each individual person to assess their motives for the actions they take. Richard Jewell and the Atlanta bombing are a good example of how the actions of an individual do not always give a clear indication of that individual’s motive.

Richard Jewell, while working security during the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta, discovered a lone backpack on the ground at the base of a press tower. He immediately began evacuating the area, thinking that there could be danger. Sure enough, soon after he started the evacuation process the bomb exploded sending nails and other sharps objects in various directions. At first, Richard Jewell was honored as a hero, but soon the investigation began to focus on him. Jewell fit the lone bomber profile. This profile typically consists of a retired or aspiring police officer or military man that stages a disaster only to save the day and become a hero. After the investigation Richard Jewell was exonerated.

The thing that is interesting about this case is that the actions that Richard Jewell took would have been the same whether he was attempting to lead the people in the Atlanta park to safety, or if he was staging the entire incident to serve
Christian servant leadership is the employment of the techniques modeled by Christ, motivated out of love for God and others, for the purpose of leading others to and helping them develop their relationship with God.

This list of the characteristics of natural and spiritual leaders provides a good tool for assessing the motives of a person’s leadership. We all want our students to employ the principles of servant leadership; put others needs before your own, seek first to understand before being understood, etc. We also must encourage our students to employ these principles with the proper motive.

Leighton Ford, in his essay, “Helping Leaders Grow”, in the book Leaders on Leadership (1997), edited by George Barna, records a conversation with a person who asked him to describe the aim of Ford’s work in one sentence. After careful reflection Leighton Ford replies, “We are seeking to help young leaders worldwide to lead more like Jesus and to lead more to Jesus.” This is exactly what we need to be teaching our students about servant leadership. Servant leadership, in a Christian context, is so much more than the utilization of certain techniques, it goes to the core of each individual person. Christian servant leadership is the employment of the techniques modeled by Christ, motivated out of love for God and others, for the purpose of leading others to and helping them develop their relationship with God.

Brent D. Ellis is the Director of Student Programs at Taylor University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Leadership</th>
<th>Spiritual Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident</td>
<td>Confident in God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows man</td>
<td>Also knows God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes own decisions</td>
<td>Seeks God’s will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates methods</td>
<td>Follows God’s example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys command</td>
<td>Delights in obedience to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks personal reward</td>
<td>Loves God and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Depends on God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cooperative Learning Opportunities for the Campus Community

By Skip Trudeau and Tim Johnson

Anderson University is attempting to be more intentional in programming, planning, and professional development to the issues of student learning, wisdom development, and collaboration. The following programs and initiatives have been implemented and are offered as suggestions for practical application.

Connections Breakfast Once a month the student affairs staff “hosts” a breakfast to which all faculty and staff are invited. On Fridays our food service has an all-you-can-eat buffet with made-to-order omelets. Our staff commits to being there and welcoming any faculty/staff member who attends. There is no agenda. We use the time to get to know others better and to explore ways in which we can be beneficial to one another.

Chapel Scheduling This year our campus pastor sent a mailer asking faculty and staff for suggestions for chapel speakers. He was particularly interested in guesses that academic departments may be bringing to campus. Often, chapel speakers are utilized in classes the day they are on campus. We have had good results having chapel speakers into the residence hall lobbies for “talkback” sessions the evening after their chapel appearance.

Faculty to R.A. Meetings Some of our hall directors have asked each of their Resident Assistants (R.A.) to invite one faculty member to a staff meeting. This allows the faculty to see how the R.A. staff works and get them into the residence hall for an evening. Feedback from both the hall staffs and the faculty has been very positive.

Educational Programming For the past two years, in addition to the programming that is required in the hall, each residential unit is required to pick a month and provide an all-campus educational program. Bringing faculty into the hall has worked well. Timely topics such as the Presidential debate, the death of Mother Theresa, and stress management have drawn good crowds and positive feedback from faculty and students.

Faculty/R.D. Discussion Group Our Associate Dean of Students and the Vice President for Academic Affairs sent a joint letter to all faculty inviting them to join the hall directors in reading and discussing Mable and Scroeder’s Realizing the Educational Potential of Residence Halls. Ten faculty members responded to the letter. Eight faculty members have joined the hall directors. The discussion has been lively and encouraging. We have discussed programming, academic and lifestyle expectations for students, the faculty’s role in residence life, student activity philosophy and much more! This group meets once a month for two hours. One of the faculty members has established a list serve for the group that allows discussions to continue between meetings. We are very excited about the possibilities of this endeavor.

Residence Life Staff and Faculty Collaborate in the Common Curriculum

By Mary Jayne Allen

The Residence Life Staff at Seattle Pacific University is committed to finding collaborative ways of working with faculty members to promote student learning and academic success. In 1995 we began looking for a way to do this, assuming that we would need to create a new program. After some initial investigation we discovered an academic program already in existence on our campus that focused on helping first-year students make a successful transition to the University both relationally and academically. This program, called the Freshman CORE, utilized a cohort model to allow groups of 50 first-year students to take a class together for their first three quarters at the University.

Initially Residence Life professionals and faculty members met to discuss how we could work together in the CORE program to accomplish our common goals. Beginning in Fall of 1996, four Residence Life Coordinators (i.e. Resident Directors) partnered with the faculty members who were teaching in each of the four Freshman CORE cohorts. Residence Life Coordinators attended class three to five days a week, led small group discussions, organized study groups in the residence halls, gave faculty members feedback, attended class outings and occasionally made class presentations in related areas of expertise.

In proposing our collaborative efforts to the CORE program, we attempted to do several things. 1) increase student learning by connecting students’ experiences inside and outside the classroom, 2) give residence life professionals an opportunity to interact with students in the context of the classroom and about specific academic material, 3) offer our support to faculty members in their educational endeavors with students, and 4) introduce residence life professionals and their expertise to faculty members. We are pleased that our efforts have positively impacted each of these areas.

This fall SPU will begin implementing a new Common Curriculum model for students (replacing a General Education model). Members of the Common Curriculum planning committees have been quick to invite Residence Life staff representatives to the table to discuss how we can collaborate in this new model (which will supercede the previous Freshman CORE program). We are excited about what is ahead at SPU as Residence Life works to partner with faculty in these strategic ways.

Mary Jayne Allen is the Assistant to the Director of Residence Life at Seattle Pacific University. She also serves as the Residence Life Coordinator for Campus Apartments and Houses.
ACSD Northwest Regional Activity

On Friday, February 27, 1998, the ACSD Northwest Region held a one-day conference on the campus of Western Baptist College (WBC) in Salem, Oregon. Forty student development professionals attended, with 10 public and private colleges and universities represented.

Dr. David Miller, President of WBC welcomed the group and opened our meeting in prayer. WBC staff members Brenda Roth, Resident Director and Marty White, Director of Campus Ministries, led us in a meaningful time of praise and worship with a devotional encouragement on the importance and necessity of humor and not taking ourselves too seriously.

A morning workshop on “Using Student Outcomes to Translate Purpose In To Practice” was presented by Alan Muia, Residence Life Coordinator from Seattle Pacific University (SPU). He shared what SPU is doing in the area of assessment and challenged us as to the importance of this function in our work. In the afternoon, Eileen Hulme, Vice President of George Fox University presented another workshop titled “Hope Revisited.” Her presentation was a follow-up to last year’s Regional Activity where she presented aspects of her emerging doctoral dissertation on the topic of “hope.” Having completed her degree in December 1997, Eileen was asked to return and present her findings.

To close the day, Shaun McNay, Dean of Students at George Fox University, facilitated a time for sharing praises and led us in a time of prayer. Campus tours, including a visit to Western’s newest residence hall, were available to those interested.

Special thanks are extended to Joany Haws and her student staff and to all the Western Baptist College staff who made the Northwest Regional Activity a success. The next regional activity is scheduled for Friday, February 25, 1999.

Submitted by Becky Leithold, Assessment Counselor at Western Baptist College in Salem, OR.

The ACSD Electronic Discussion Group

The electronic discussion group (or list serve) concept may be new to you so we hope the following introduction to the group’s purpose and use will help you utilize this new tool which we believe will have a positive impact on your work with students.

The purpose of the ACSD Discussion Group is three fold:

1) To provide a forum for convenient and FREE conversation with other Christian student development professionals;

2) To facilitate rapid sharing of information. As the group grow numerically, subscribers will be able to quickly receive numerous responses to their questions from all over the country;

3) To promote the goals and mission of the Association for Christians in Student Development.

Here is how it works:

Membership to this group is free, but limited to ACSD members. To subscribe, send a message from your E-mail account to LISTPROC@SPU.EDU. In the body of the message, type only “subscribe ACSD your-firstname your-lastname” (without quotes).

You should start receiving messages from the group within a day. To send a message to the group which will go to all subscribers, simply send it to ACSD@SPU.EDU if you want to respond to a message sent to the group, you may do so by replying to all subscribers or just to the individual who sent the original message.

If you wish to stop receiving messages from us, send a message to LISTPROC@SPU.EDU saying only “unsubscribe ACSD” (without quotes).

We hope this discussion group will be a valuable tool to its users so we encourage you to use it but not to “clutter” it with information or questions not pertinent to the group’s purpose.

If you have questions or suggestions about the operation, purpose, or use of the discussion group, please send an E-mail message to Alan Muia at annua@paul.spu.edu. Enjoy!

Submitted by Brad Bowsen, Director of Student Activities, Anderson University.
ACSD Pre-Conference Workshops — Monday, June 7, 9:00 a.m. - 12 noon

TOUR OF THE MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE, LOS ANGELES
A unique opportunity to take a historical journey into the Holocaust of World War II. The museum also includes many interactive exhibits that confront bigotry and prejudice in our society.

TOUR OF THE HSI LAI BUDDHIST TEMPLE
The Hsi Lai Buddhist Temple is the largest Buddhist temple in the Western Hemisphere. The tour of this temple promises to be an important educational experience.

WOMEN OF THE NEW MILLENNIUM: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
Presenter: Denise Marcel Campbell, Vice President of Student Life, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo

HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE STUDENT
A team from Desert Stream Ministries will conduct this workshop focusing on the serious and challenging issues that many college students face today.

For more information, please call: (562) 903-6000, ext. 5845
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