**Paper citation:** Gaston-Gayles, J., Wolf-Wendel, L., Twombly, S., Ward, K & Tuttle, K. (2005). From disciplinarian to change agent: How the civil rights era changed the roles of student affairs professionals. NASPA Journal, 42(3), 263-282.

**Abstract:** Little has been written about the roles and functions of student affairs administrators during the civil rights era. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine how the civil rights era influenced the student affairs profession, paying particular attention to the roles played by student affairs administrators in relation to students, other administrators, and the community. A secondary analysis was conducted based on interviews with 18 student affairs professionals who served on a variety of college campuses during the civil rights era, primarily from the 1950s through the 1970s. Our findings suggest that these administrators took on roles such as educator, advocate, mediator, initiator, and change agent in order to effectively and efficiently resolve issues that arose on their campuses as a result of the civil rights era and the student protest movement.

Colleges and universities have been the battleground for many important civil rights concerns, and many authors have chronicled student social movements of this era (Adelman, 1972; Altbach, 1973; Strauss & Howe, 1997). In both northern and southern colleges and universities, integration of African Americans into higher education was a slow and difficult process (Clark, 1993; Cohodas, 1997; Exum, 1985). Once on campus, African American students had to deal with segregation in all types of out-of-class domains including housing, cafeterias, social activities, organized student groups (including athletics, fraternities, and sororities), availability of scholarships, on-campus and off-campus jobs, and access to barber shops and beauty parlors.

Student affairs administrators were in the middle of this battlefield and played a key role in representing student demands to the administration and sometimes advocating for change to occur (Clark, 1993; Laliberte, 2003; Tuttle, 1996). Simultaneously, the presidents of many college and university campuses expected the student affairs staff to represent the institutions' views to the students and to mete out discipline to students who failed to follow the campus rules. These conflicting demands--the desire to support students and the desire to be seen as effective administrators--put many student affairs administrators in precarious positions (Nichols, 1990). Nevertheless, student affairs professionals in the civil rights era served as communication links between the administration and students and experienced enhanced status and advancement to higher administrative positions. In the process, their experiences exerted considerable influence on the student affairs profession itself. By examining the stories of student affairs administrators, we learn firsthand how the civil rights era affected the profession. This article provides a glimpse into civil rights struggles on campus as seen through their eyes.

Unfortunately, little has been written about the roles and functions of student affairs administrators during the civil rights era. One study by Crookston and Atkyns (1974) found that during the period of unrest in the 1960s, many senior student affairs officers left their positions. They also concluded that during this period student affairs administrators became known as crisis managers, and most colleges and universities elevated the chief student affairs officer from dean to vice president. In recent research that examined student affairs during the turbulent years of 1968-1972, Laliberte (2003) confirmed the crisis manager and student advocate roles of student affairs administrators. For the purpose of this article, a secondary analysis of the data collected for the book Reflecting Back, Looking Forward: Civil Rights and Student Affairs (Wolf-Wendel et al., 2004) was conducted to examine how the civil rights era influenced the student affairs profession, paying particular attention to the roles played by student affairs administrators in relation to students, other administrators, and the community. The book told

the stories of individuals in first person narrative form; however, this article focuses specifically on how participation during the civil rights era affected the profession itself.

**Text of paper:**

**Method**

This study was based on 18 interviews with student affairs professionals who served on a variety of college campuses during the civil rights era, primarily from the 1950s through the 1970s. Table 1 identifies the participants, their institution, position title, and the dates of service at their respective institution. The interviews were conducted in person or on the phone and lasted approximately 1.5 to 2 hours. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. The participants signed a consent form and granted permission for their names to be used. Some of the participants provided institutional documents or personal notes to supplement the interviews. We used these additional materials as appropriate. In conducting the interviews, we asked the participants to describe their role in responding to civil rights concerns and to elaborate on their relationships with students, other administrators, faculty members, and the community. We asked them to walk us through an event (or several events) to give us a sense of what their lives were like on a daily basis during this time period (see interview protocol in the appendix). Because much more has been written about other aspects of the protest era, such as anti-Vietnam War protests, we attempted to keep the focus on civil rights concerns. Most of our respondents admitted separating out these different issues was not always a simple proposition.

We used various sources to identify interviewees--including recommendations from professional association members and referrals from those we interviewed. The study was limited to people who were still alive, which also limited our ability to fully capture the role of student affairs in the civil rights activities of the 1950s. Many, whose stories should have been told, are unfortunately no longer living.

The transcribed interviews were mailed back to the participants (often with some additional questions); and participants were instructed to add to, delete from, or amend their story as they saw fit. In many cases we exchanged multiple drafts until all were satisfied with the transcript. We used the transcripts to construct a case study of each participant that addressed the individual's background, his/her experiences relevant to the civil rights movement, and his/her reflections on those experiences. The cases were unique, representing the varied types of experiences and perspectives of the interviewees. We then worked with the interviewees again using an iterative process to assure that we had represented their stories faithfully (Jones, 2002). For this article, we reanalyzed the individual cases, looking for ways in which the civil rights era had an effect on the student affairs profession. We relied on the constant comparative approach outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1990) to assist us in identifying salient themes.

Throughout the data collection and analysis process we did not seek to verify the "truth" of the interviewee's recollections. Indeed, the case studies represent the participants' memories and impressions of the time as framed by their past and present experiences. As such, their depictions may not be 100% accurate from the standpoint of the historical record. They do, however, accurately reflect the perspectives and memories of the individuals involved.

Although we made an effort to attain diversity in terms of gender, race, institutional type. and geography, our goal was not to provide a comprehensive, definitive study of the role of student affairs in the civil rights era. Thus, we do not presume that the stories we heard are generalizable to all student affairs professionals or situations experienced during the civil rights era. Nor do we claim they present a comprehensive view of the era. However, we do believe that the interview themes represent the experiences of many who served in student affairs roles between 1950 and the mid-1970s.

**Findings**

The civil rights era changed the student affairs profession in a myriad of ways, but two major changes in particular influenced the roles and functions of student affairs administrators during this time. First was the shift from in loco parentis to independence and empowerment. The revolution in the 1960s prompted the death of in loco parentis and the birth of students' legal rights. Many deans cited the push for students' legal rights--in the areas of due process; free speech, including free press rights; access to their own educational records; the rights to protest, demonstrate, and organize; and involvement with institutional governance--as having the most profound effect on the roles and functions of student affairs administration. The administrators we interviewed were called upon to see students in a different light--as maturing adults who wanted to have a say in the way the university and world worked--rather than as incapable of exercising good judgment and an entity over which the university had complete control.

A second major change during this era was that the senior student affairs administrator became a part of the president's cabinet (although some earlier deans of men and women had reported directly to the president prior to the 1960s). Because of their important role in addressing student-related "crises," student affairs attained more prestige and the senior student affairs officer joined the president's cabinet. The shift had a substantial influence on the way in which student affairs interacted with students, faculty, and other administrators. As a member of the power structure, student affairs now had an increased responsibility to represent the concerns of the students (or help students represent themselves) and became a forceful advocate for student needs and interests. In the same vein, student affairs administrators were looked upon by the administration to help manage student unrest and bring peace to the institution. Because of this change, the position of vice president for student affairs is present on campus today, particularly at larger universities, and reports directly to the president of the university.

The student affairs professionals we interviewed undertook a number of roles--often simultaneously. We identified the following roles: disciplinarian; advocate, mentor, and friend; educator and resource; mediator; initiator, and change agent. Next, each of these roles is briefly discussed.

**Disciplinarian: Our Legacy, a Necessary Evil**

Maintaining order on the campus and meting out discipline was the least favorite role of student affairs administrators we interviewed. This was a role, however, that was strongly identified with the profession, especially in relation to student unrest. As Robert Shaffer explained, the traditional role of student affairs was to be the "institutional officer who kept

order and maintained appropriate behavior ... the keeper of the morals." He added, "Once I got the job, I realized that my job was to help students express themselves, not to suppress them."

That is not to say that student affairs administrators in the '60s and '70s were not called upon to discipline students. Most believed that students ought to be held accountable for their actions and many believed that student protesters ought not to disrupt the educational mission of the institution to further their aims. Dave Ambler, for example, explained that one of his guiding philosophies was that students ought to "be held accountable for [their] behavior." Under most circumstances, student affairs professionals did their best to warn students of the ramifications of certain actions. As Jim Appleton explained, "It was necessary to make clear that if an illegal protest continued, the university was going to act to clear the blocked hallway and the disruption of business."

Many of the individuals we interviewed, however, were quite bothered by what they saw as the edict by higher level administrators to "keep the peace and maintain order at all costs." For example, Philip Hubbard stated that, "the president looked to student affairs to keep things under control so that the students did not embarrass the university or college and did not offend the trustees." Harris Shelton, who, because of his junior position, was called upon to do things such as patrol the Black cultural center at night looking for students who were defying the administration by living in the house, explained his frustration with having to deal with the "procedural issues, the protection issues, and not the civil rights or student need issues." He added:

There is no question that one element of the staff of FSU, including faculty, wanted to retaliate against disruptive behavior. Some folks wanted to teach the culprit students a few lessons. At our best, we abandoned a position of educators in favor of one of defense of the university.

Lee Upcraft's perspective was particularly instructive. He believed that the discipline system that was being utilized in the 1960s and 1970s was in need of an overhaul because it was designed to deal with "normal acting-outers" rather than responding to "students, who out of conscience, take a stand and get arrested but who are really not criminals." He added:

All of a sudden, the discipline system was flooded with people of conscience instead of your garden variety drinkers and academic dishonesty folks. What we found was that our old systems of discipline weren't capable of dealing with these new problems.

Upcraft and many others saw the need for student affairs officers to look differently upon their role as disciplinarians, to view behavior in a more contextual light that looks at both the kind of "infraction" as well as the "intent of the perpetrator" when determining consequences. There was also a general sentiment that student affairs administrators, while needing to maintain some sort of order at the institution, should not abandon the more lofty goals of helping students to learn and grow.

**Advocate, Mentor, and Friend: Providing Support Within Reason**

Serving as an advocate, mentor, and friend for students were roles that all of the individuals

interviewed learned as a result of their experiences in the civil rights era. Many felt like Judy Chambers, who indicated that she "wanted to be an advocate for students." She added:

I tried to support their points of view when they were reasonable.... Student affairs professionals are not in the business to be police officers, even though at certain times we may need to act like one. We are there to be advocates for students. We are there to make sure the out-of-class life is a positive experience.

James Rhatigan also believed that his job was to advocate for student needs. He explained, "I believed that you should look for ways to say 'yes' to students, not ways to say 'no.' Finding ways to say 'yes' to students has been the theme song of my entire professional life, really. When you can say 'yes,' then students will recognize that they are being heard. Now they could turn to making their ideas work."

Still, most recognized that advocacy has its limits. James Appleton was clear that he was not an advocate for students, but that he "was in a position where I ought to be most sensitive to students and their needs and perspectives." He added, "Student affairs professionals were in a difficult position because students expected us to be their advocate, but the presidents and chancellors also rightfully expected us to be on their team." Further, there were times when student affairs administrators could not satisfy student demands. In these cases, they made it clear that their job was to listen, support, and explain how and why they could not respond affirmatively. Judy Chambers explained:

I would not have advocated for everything, particularly if I did not think it was reasonable. I would have been reluctant to support a battle I did not think we could win. One needs to carefully select the hill one is going to go down on.

There were some tangible benefits to being seen as a student advocate--including the trust that was bestowed upon administrators by students. Harris Shelton stated:

Coupled with a willingness to listen to students, I probably had more credibility than most administrators around me.... I had good student trust and students wanted to talk, they wanted to converse with someone who would listen. They wanted me to approve of what they were doing or to explain why I did not approve.

Robert Shaffer added:

Knowing that we were going to at least be neutral if not actually aggressively supportive, the activists would tell us what they were going to do. Administratively, most of the trouble occurs when participants spring something in the way of a demonstration without preparation.

One of the most difficult tasks for student affairs administrators was that of supporting the legitimate needs of students while not compromising the mission of the institution. Much of their effectiveness in dealing with race on campus came as a result of their close relationships with students. The nature of these friendships is interesting because during the 1960s and

1970s the relationship between the institution and its students was often highly contentious, with administrators often cast as the enemies of students. Despite this perception of conflict, many of the student affairs administrators knew students by name and considered themselves as friends and mentors to the student population. A benefit of having such close relationships with students was a level of openness and honesty about issues of race, protest, and unrest.

**Educator and Resource: The Essence of Our Work**

Educating students and serving as a resource were primary purposes, and the most popular roles, of all of the student affairs administrators interviewed. Examples abound of trying to teach students how to be leaders, how to bring about change, and how to make the most of the educational experience. James Lyons, for example, stated, "We should be sensitive to the need for nurturing learning environments. As long as we can get beyond regulating students and taking care of the bureaucratic trivia, we can move to creating an environment that supports learning." Charles Whitten was proud of the fact that the president at South Carolina introduced him as "my vice president in charge of all education outside the classroom."

The role of educator took on a very specific function during the 1960s and 1970s: that of preparing students to protest effectively. For example, Augustine Pounds helped the students during the cafeteria takeover at Oakland University to refine their concerns into specific requests. She worked with them to identify appropriate decision makers to consult and to identify appropriate solutions to their concerns. Judy Chambers also saw her job as "helping students behind the scenes.... I can remember working with the students helping them to frame statements and questions in such a way that the president or the board would not find them offensive." Harrison Morson added:

Many students were unable to present their views in a manner that avoided being received as confrontational by those already operating from a seat of power.... I urged student spokespersons to present themselves in a posture that promoted a search for positive outcomes through mediation and tolerance.

Not everyone was happy when student affairs administrators took on this particular educational role. Robert Shaffer recalls being accused by more conservative students of stirring up trouble for his work in helping activists to organize an effective protest. Nonetheless, he believed strongly in providing such assistance:

We suggested how to get publicity, how to involve students and how to make appeals. By doing this we guided them, you might say; and most demonstrations were relatively orderly as a result. I feel we were discharging our obligation to the institution and to students in a more productive way than just trying to keep order.

**Mediator: Always in the Middle**

One of the most important roles played by student affairs professionals was that of mediator--either between opposing student groups or students and administrators or the university and the surrounding community. Every single interviewee talked about the need to translate the demands and concerns of students to others and to translate the concerns of the university to

students. They used terms like "middleman," "conduit," "mediator," "negotiator," and "translator" to describe how they worked with students, faculty, other administrators, and the community. James Appleton explained, "Student affairs professionals across the country were the persons who were at the intersection between the students, faculty, and the administration." Similarly, Lee Upcraft captured this "middleman" relationship well. He explained:

I often felt like I was in the middle of the students and the other administrators on most issues. I would attend meetings with Black students when they discussed their demands, and I would go to administrative meetings where I was the person who was most relied upon to tell the administration what the students were all about.... I felt like somebody caught in the middle, like nobody was happy with me.... Our involvement in these kinds of things [played] a very important role in helping institutions better understand students and helping students better understand institutions.

As mediator, student affairs professionals had to be able to communicate with multiple constituencies and serve as translators from one group to another. Sometimes this involved working with administrators and faculty to help them see that student demands were not going to disappear and merited a constructive response. Carl Anderson eloquently explained:

Part of the role of student affairs administrators was to help faculty and staff understand the students and interpret their views, perceptions, goals, and aspirations. We tried to help them appreciate the fact that not every demand was intended to be a challenge to their authority. Instead, it was a challenge to their way of thinking.

On the other hand, student affairs professionals needed to communicate with students and let them know that not all their demands would be met. Judy Chambers captured this idea when she explained:

It was our job to try to interpret the positions the university had taken on certain issues that were not what the students wanted. Oftentimes we were explaining to students why change couldn't take place, even though we didn't support the decision that had been made.

The colleges and universities in which the participants worked were deeply affected by the external climate of the United States, as well as by the communities in which the institutions were located. Although each participant's experience varied by institutional type, geography, and time period, the nature of the specific context of each institution affected the kind of interaction the college had with the larger community. The town and gown relationship characterized by most of the participants was such that the college in which they worked was more liberal than the town in which the institution was located. Injustice in the larger community often created the conditions for protest and activism on campus, as well as off campus. Consequently, a more liberal campus climate often created tension between the college and its surrounding community. Blackburn described the University of Alabama as, "an oasis of integration in an otherwise burning state."

Often as a consequence of protesting in the community and on campus, students were subject to jail and physical abuse. In frequent dealings with the police and other local authorities, it was important for student affairs administrators to establish a good relationship with such entities. Ron Beer emphasized the importance of developing "an open and candid relationship with key authority figures in the community, police, fire, mayor, city manager, sheriff, district attorney, constable, state police, national guard, etc."

Despite the tension between the university and its surrounding community, student affairs administrators also functioned as mediators between local communities, particularly with the African American community, and the campus community. For example, Beer described recruiting Hispanic and Black students by visiting local churches and attending pow-wows to recruit Native American students. At institutions like Haverford, Indiana, and Howard, students were involved in protests to open up barbershops and public transportation to Black students. According to Lyons, Haverford created a camp, which "involved the coming together of two groups with great cultural differences--a Quaker meeting and two local Black churches." Rhatigan noted that the Black community often kept the pressure on the university to ensure that the university would keep trying to improve the situation for Black students.

**Initiator: Creating Programs to Facilitate Student Success**

Not content to merely mediate problems, student affairs professionals created and initiated programs and policies that responded to the concerns raised by students. These programs and policies took a number of different forms, but they all served to meet the needs of students. The creation of TRIO programs, for example, was a popular response to serving the needs of historically underrepresented students. John Blackburn's creation of Mallett Hall with a leadership program to support integration stands as an example of the kind of forethought and planning undertaken by student affairs administrators during the civil rights era. Blackburn recognized the need to be proactive in teaching future leaders how to create community and think about values as a means to facilitate integration of African Americans at the University of Alabama.

The other interviewees also created programs and policies that were responsive to student needs. Many of these, like Camp Serendipity at Haverford, the Community Involvement Program at the University of the Pacific, and the Commission on Human Rights and Responsibilities at Oregon State University, still exist today. Their continued existence is a testament not only to the creativity of their founders and the initial need for such programs, but also to the continued need to respond proactively to student concerns.

**Change Agent: Working to Bring about Change**

The student affairs professionals we interviewed saw themselves as "change agents," working towards making higher education a better place. They were not content with the status quo and felt that it was important for their institutions to respond positively to the challenges raised during the civil rights era. Even Charles Whitten, who claimed to be engaged in integration only because the "law" dictated that he do so, eventually came to realize that a fundamental component of his job was to create a positive educational climate that allowed all students at the University of South Carolina to be successful. Dave Ambler, for example, admonished the field saying:

If we do not make it possible for change to occur in our institutions then students will once again use inappropriate methods to achieve justice and equity. It is a fundamental responsibility of student affairs to make the processes of change in our institutions work for students.

The interviewees saw the students' desires as legitimate aspirations that while difficult to achieve, were worth doing. Carl Anderson stressed, "If it meant making some changes, then they [the institution] were prepared to do that." Some of the individuals, like Harrison Morson and Augustine Pounds actively participated in student-led protests, while others were supportive from afar. Yet, while the approach followed by different student affairs administrators in bringing about change varied, the passion to see change occur and to support students was unified. Harris Shelton seemed to speak for everyone when he said, "Each of us as educators had a personal stake, a personal role in the battle for human rights." Similarly, Emily Taylor agreed, saying "I believe in equality, and our sole function is to produce as many autonomous adults as we can." Finally, Augustine Pounds expressed this belief:

Integrity, fairness, equity, and hope are perhaps the words most often associated with my memory of the Oakland experience. We never lost hope that the increased activism and criticism by students would make the institution take a look at itself and change.

**Conclusion**

The civil rights era and the student protest movement promoted the maturation of student affairs as a profession, namely adding the roles of educator, advocate, mediator, and change agent to the mix. In addition, student affairs professionals' relationships with students as well as with faculty, administrators and the community also changed as a result of mutual involvement in the civil rights era. Student affairs professionals served an important role of mediating conflicts between students, the administration, faculty, and the community. Further, they were resources in helping all constituent groups better understand one another. The student affairs profession changed from exercising a parental relationship with students to one in which students were viewed as having rights and responsibilities in the institution. Students assumed a role in institutional decision-making, and institutions had to take student views into account. Additionally, the civil rights era had an impact on the profession itself. The dean of students position was elevated to vice president status and became part of the president's cabinet to reflect the growing importance and increased level of responsibility of the role. Further, reaching out to students of different racial backgrounds forced colleges to work and build bridges with local communities.

**Implications**

Unfortunately, many of the participants in this study noted that advances made during the civil rights era concerning the student-institution relationship seem to be reversing. Student affairs professionals once again find themselves controlling student behavior in order to minimize negative publicity for the institution. Student affairs professionals sometimes act in loco parentis and may not even know the interests and needs of their students. There are several possible explanations for this shift. First, the student affairs profession has become

increasingly bureaucratized, especially within large institutions. Further, external constituencies (e.g., parents, governmental agencies, alumni, funding agencies) demand more institutional control of students. In addition, as financial constraints increase and state funding decreases, institutions are becoming much more concerned with their external image as they see their image affecting their ability to recruit students and garner necessary resources to maintain operations. Demographic shifts of students also feed the change in this relationship. Today's students are more consumer-oriented than ever before and are demanding that institutions be more "customer-focused" (Dey & Hurtado, 1995). These realities have all led to the changes seen in the relationship between institutions of higher education and students--but it does not make the shift any less troublesome.

So what is the lesson for today's student affairs administrators? Based on the findings from this study, the lesson is that the relationship between students and institutions ought to be one that empowers students, treats them like adults, and transcends concerns about institutional image. To accomplish this, student affairs professionals at all levels need to know what students are thinking and doing; they must be in a position to listen to students and respond to their concerns in a respectful manner. Keeping lines of communication open between students and the institution is essential to stave off dissent and other problems. Such respectful communication also will facilitate student growth and learning. We learned during the civil rights era that the more open and student-oriented campuses were less likely to experience crises. As such, the student affairs mission must not be to only maintain order, but also to educate students.

Institutions of higher education are by their very nature averse to innovation. There is nothing like a sit-in or a good protest, however, for getting institutions to bring about change in a timely manner. But another important lesson that many of the student affairs professionals we interviewed suggested is that it is unwise to fear the unknown. Further, they suggested that one does not need to wait for students to submit a list of demands to recognize the need to make institutional improvements; rather, student affairs professionals should be in a position to know what ought to occur (e.g., by means of assessment) and be willing to undertake proactive change. Institutions of higher education and student affairs professionals in particular need to think about who their students are (and will be) and what those students will need to have in place in order to be successful. This involves finding resources to fund such endeavors but more importantly, and perhaps more difficult, being creative and proactive in determining what changes are necessary to bring about desired outcomes.

In conclusion, there is some concern that the current generation of student affairs professionals, especially those at the highest levels, may have lost focus concerning the purpose of the profession--in particular heeding the needs of the individual student. Student affairs programs are often million dollar enterprises with large numbers of responsibilities and huge staffs hired to carry out a wide array of duties. In recent years, the practice of student affairs is also shaped by fear of litigation and concerns about institutional image, among other external factors. Yet, underneath these layers of complexity exists the individual student. We must remember, through the roles played by and lessons learned from those who have gone before us, that our main job is to assist the university in meeting the educational needs of all students by fostering student growth and development.

ADDED MATERIAL

Joy L. Gaston-Gayles is an assistant professor at Florida State University; Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel is an associate professor, Kathryn Nemeth Tuttle is associate vice-provost for student success, and Susan B. Twombly is a professor at the University of Kansas; and Kelly Ward is an associate professor at Washington State University.

Table 1 Participants, Institution, Title, and Dates of Interviewees

| **Participant** | **Institution** | **Title** | **Dates** |
|---|---|---|---|
| David Ambler | Kent State University | Dean of Students | 1966-1977 |
| | University of Kansas | Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs | 1977-2002 |
| Carl Anderson | Howard University | Dean of Students | 1958-1990 |
| James Appleton | Oakland University | Dean of Students | 1965-1972 |
| Ron Beer | Kent State University | President's Assist. | 1961-1972 |
| | University of Nebraska | Dean of Students | 1972-1980 |
| John L. Blackburn | University of Alabama | Dean of Men | 1956-1969 |
| Judith Chambers | Mount Union College | Dean of Women | 1960-1968 |
| | University of the Pacific | Dean of Students/VP for Student Life | 1973-present |
| Philip Hubbard (FN*) | University of Iowa | Dean of Academic/Student Affairs | 1965-1991 |
| James Lyons | Haverford College | Dean of Students | 1962-1972 |
| Harrison Morrison | Union County Community College | Dean of Students | 1969-1986 |
| Augustine Pounds | Oakland University | Student Services | 1971-1975 |
| James Rhatigan | Wichita State University | Dean of Students/VP for Student Affairs | 1965-2002 |
| Robert Schafer | Indiana University | Dean of Students | 1955-1969 |
| Harris Shelton | Florida State University | Dean of Men | 1968-1971 |
| Mark Smith | Denison University | Dean of Students | 1953-1972 |
| Emily Taylor (FN*) | University of Kansas | Dean of Women | 1956-1975 |
| Jo Anne Trow | Oregon State University | Dean of Women | 1966-1985 |
| Lee Upcraft | Michigan State University | Director of Student Relations | 1963-1969 |
| | Penn State University | Director of Student Activities/Dean of | 1969-1974 |

| | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Charles Whitten | University of South Carolina | Dean of Students | 1963-1975 |

**Footnote**

* Indicates deceased participant.

**References**

Adelman, C. (1972). Generations: A collage on youth culture. New York: Praeger.

Altbach, P. B. (1973). Student politics in America: A historical analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Clark, E. C. (1993). The school house door: Segregation's last stand at the University of Alabama. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohodas, N. (1997). The band played dixie. New York: The Free Press.

Crookston, B. B., & Atkyns, G. C. (1974, April). A study of student affairs: The principal student affairs officer, the functions, the organization at American colleges and universities, 1967-1972. (Technical Rep. No. 3). National Association of Student Personnel Administrators National Convention, Chicago, IL.

Dey, E. L., & Hurtado, S. (1995). College impact, student impact: A reconsideration of the role of students within American higher education. Higher Education, 30(2), 207-223.

Exum, W. H. (1985). Paradoxes of protest: Black student activism in a White university. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Jones, S. R. (2002). (Re)writing the word: Methodological strategies and issues in qualitative research. Journal of College Student Development, 43(4), 461-473.

Laliberte, M. R. (2003). The student affairs profession transformed: Catalytic events of 1968 to 1972. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Johnson & Wales University.

Nichols, D. D. (1990). The delirious decade, 1965-1975: A social history of a community college. Farmington, MI: Tri-Nic Press.

Strauss, A. L., and Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory techniques and procedures. Sage: Newbury Park.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1997). The fourth turning: An American prophecy. New York: Broadway Books.

Tuttle, K. N. (1996). What became of the dean of women? Changing roles for women administrators in American higher education, 1940-1980. Dissertation Abstracts International, 57(7), 2913. (UMI No. 963751)

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

**Appendix: Interview Protocol**

**Personal Experiences**

1. Walk through your professional path for us.

* What was your institution, position, and role (in relationship to students) during the period under question?

2. What was the institutional climate for students of color as this era began?

3. Tell me about your experiences dealing with civil rights issues. Explain the situation.

* What was your role?

* What did you do?

* What was the outcome?

4. How did your involvement in civil rights on campus shape the direction of policy in this area (on campus and in society as a whole)?

5. What change came about as the result of your involvement in the civil rights movement?

6. How did those experiences affect your views about:

* civil rights?

* your institution?

* your profession?

* your personal feelings?

7. How would you describe this period of "unrest" with others that you have experienced throughout your career?

* In what ways was the civil rights era unique?

8. Looking back, how do you think your campus handled the civil rights movement on campus? What could have/should have been done differently?

9. What role did the student affairs staff play in implementing and continuing to monitor issues raised in during the civil rights movement?

10. What lessons did you learn from those experiences?

11. When looking at your career as a whole, how does your role in civil rights movement fit into the big picture?