The coordination of student personnel and academic programs is one need of American higher education. The best possibilities for integrating the efforts of student personnel workers and academicians lie in the initiation and maintenance of programs of organized faculty advisement. The applied task of advising and counseling students draws upon five inheritances: (1) the philosophic, (2) the curricular, (3) the vocational, (4) the psychological, and (5) the spiritual. All these legacies have conditioned the college of the present. In the coordination of academic programs and programs of student personnel work, teachers are an important agent, providing students with assistance for their academic problems. The above belief is applied to advising in the liberal arts college with the statement of 10 constructs of faculty advising (WR).
That the program-promoters and theme-dreamers of this Workshop have chosen a topic which emphasizes the need for coordinating student personnel and academic programs is indeed to be commended. It was in 1950, lacking only a few years of being two decades ago, that selected (1) college and university presidents, (2) student personnel deans, and (3) personnel from the U.S. Office of Education met in Washington to identify future needs in student personnel work. The proceedings of that conference appearing in this form (see copy) are now extant, but students in our graduate program at the Florida State University are given duplicated copies of the proceedings as guides to study of one aspect of the field.

Second among the twelve recommendations appears this one:

To achieve a higher degree of integration between the student personnel services and instructional programs. In their effects upon the student, these two aspects become parts of one and the same educational program. Among the methods recommended are (a) the use of policy committees with strong representation from the teaching faculty; (b) the making available of facts about students and student needs to academic administrators and faculty curriculum committees; (c) in-service training programs for selected members of the faculty interested in improving their interviewing and counseling techniques; (d) case conferences involving instructors, faculty advisers, and personnel workers; (e) study groups of teachers and personnel workers, dealing with areas of common ground, such as group dynamics, general education, extra-class aspects of the learning process, and the like.

In assessment of needs of American higher education at this time, one will agree that the coordination of student personnel and academic programs looms large. The goal has not been fully accomplished, or to put it more realistically, the goal must be recurring faced with each new wave of academic administrators and of student personnel practitioners.

As for a base for presentation to this Workshop, may I say that I believe the best possibilities for integrating the efforts of student personnel workers and
academicians lie in the initiation—and maintenance—of programs of organized faculty advisement. This is nothing new in pontification, for I have been making this statement with varying degrees of vehemence for twenty years, as witness, Counseling and Guidance in General Education; The Faculty in College Counseling, and in journal articles and convention program releases of one kind or another, time without seeming end. But the adaptation of my beliefs has varied with my audiences and with the temper of the times, i.e., sometimes with temperamental listeners who do not believe that faculty members can adequately advise in the educational times of this century. (Mr. Chips, in his day, yes, but not the modern Chipsees in contemporary pace.)

If there is anything ecumenical in education this day, it is the world-wide push for change in the old order, more specifically, a re-evaluation of the goals of the institution in light of the goals of society, and thereafter an orientation to and an implementation of the new or renewed goals. That the old order (or disorder) has NOT stood up under scrutiny is obvious. There are many perceptions—those of trustees and governing boards; campus-based or itinerant administrators; student personnel workers—full-time, part-time, over-time; service personnel in other categories; students—part-time, full-time, campus-based or commuting; their parents, their mates, their off-spring; the press; the townspeople—collective constituencies. Like the two housewives arguing over the fence each in her own backyard, both argue from a different premise. So with educators and constituents in this era, multiple promises will call forth multiple precepts for change, and not even the most astute educator can, unerringly, select that means which is at all times best for all in the longest haul.

Certainly, any student of history will affirm that what has gone before—and sometimes a long time before!—has shaped the issues and solutions of the day. And, with this, I approach the assignment of today, chopping the topic in halves, speaking in Part I of the inherited responsibility for counseling and advising multi-faceted and two-dimensional. In Part II, I will speak of the applications which derive for faculty from such an inheritance. I have limited the applications to those relevant to faculty advising, giving only a nod to the other dimension—i.e., professional counseling. This is not to derogate the importance of the latter but rather to shed somewhat more light on the murky processes of the former.

So, in the vernacular of collegiate hipsters of the day, I would ask, "Now are you turned on to the tune of the topic?"

Part I: Inherited Responsibility for Counseling and Advising the College-Age Student

There are at least five inheritances we can identify in this deliberation: (1) the philosophic legacy; (2) the curricular legacy; (3) the vocational; (4) the psychological; and (5) the spiritual. All apply to the applied task of advising and counseling students as viewed in Part II.
In the presentation of the five "legacies", I will cite the selected historical reference or set of references, and following the citation, present a short consequence of a general nature. Finally, in each consideration, I will speak with some specificity of the role of liberal arts college, insofar as I am able to make judgments or predictions.
The Philosophic Legacy: The Young Nation Takes Account of Its Young

Our colonial society (1660-1780) set itself early to care for the welfare of the young. A striking example of this "caring" can be read in the Charter of the University of Pennsylvania, 1749, wherein it was noted that the institution would be

...a nursery of virtue and wisdom that will produce men of dispositions and capacities beneficial to mankind in the various occupations of life...suited to the infant state of North America.

It was further stated that

...the trustees make it their pleasure and business to visit the institution often, to encourage and countenance the youth, countenance and assist the masters and by all means in their power to advance the usefulness and reputation of the college...that they will look on the students, as in some measure, their own children treating them with familiarity and affection.

These words, "nursery", "infant," "familiarity," and "affection" brush the ear pleasantly. With regents setting a pattern for benevolent advising of undergrads, the faculty picked up where they left off, and in loco regentis assumes unusually weighty responsibilities for the feeding, disciplining, and character-molding of the collegians of the day.

Consequence 1: The colonial college, vowing to make men out of boys, took on the "foundling" collegian (an adolescent of 15 to 18 years), so recently separated from home and hearth. Thereafter, the institution provided him with "surrogate" parents numbering the president himself and the faculty members, in this collegiate-style incubator.

While the liberal arts college of the day would not advertise itself as "educational incubator" for students too timid to thrive in the campus carnage of the megalopolis universities of the day, there is the tacit assumption that this is what the smaller, liberal arts institution does do...provide nurturance and succorance in greater amounts for a longer period of time. That this is not the exclusive, over-riding goal of the liberal arts college is to be continually demonstrated.
2. **The Curricular Legacy: The FSM--Free Selection Movement of 1824**

The curricular legacy consisted of two reforms which (1) divided the universities into school and departments and (2) allowed students to pursue an elective curriculum. First, the early crusaders for student liberty in America hailed the University of Virginia's statement, circa 1824:

> Every student shall be free to attend the schools of his choice and no other than he chooses.

Within the university, every student was a free agent, making his own decision for enrolling in any one of the eight independently operating schools designated as

- ancient languages
- modern languages
- mathematics
- natural philosophy
- natural history
- anatomy and medicine
- moral philosophy
- and law.

A second type of emancipation occurred when, in the years 1872 and 1897, an academic innovator, President Charles Eliot of Harvard, proposed an elective system to cope with what he termed "the problem of student motivation." Jettisoned was the prescriptive, classical curriculum. Taking its place was the elective principle contending "the student is self-reliant and self-expressive . . . allow him to choose what is best for himself."

**Consequence 2:** These 19th century innovations permitting students (1) freedom of choice among the schools of the university and (2) freedom in selecting courses within schools resulted in strong appeals from students bewildered by decisions now their own. Frederick Rudolph, historian, notes: "The creation of a system of faculty advisers at Johns Hopkins in 1877 and the appointment of a board of freshman advisers at Harvard in 1889 were apparently the first formal recognition that size and the elective curriculum required some closer attention to undergraduate guidance than was possible with an increasingly professionally oriented faculty."

While the liberal arts college of the day does not present a staggering cafeteria of course offerings--and contraction, rather than proliferation of courses has been the general trend--nonetheless, orientation of students to the diversity of "uses" for which a given course or courses can be put presents a task. In a day when "instant utility" is sought by many students, instant argument for one or another choice is not easily given. Perhaps the most striking need is for helping students to integrate the aspects of their
study--of fitting the languages, ancient or modern--with the sciences--of the sciences with the philosophy--of the history with the humanities--of making the educational experience, a four-year immersion in differing subjects, and something more than casual, like the daily bath.
3. The Vocational-Technical Legacy: The Great Society of Agricultural-Industrial Visionaries.

(Although I am speaking in these remarks about an institutional type markedly different from the liberal arts college, the presence of the land-grant institution—and of its product in the great society—compels comparison.)

The year is 1862 and the event bears the governmental designation FLGA—or Justin Morrill's Federal Land Grant Act. With it, reforms for freeing the curriculum (see earlier noted) and extending and enlarging the curriculum to include scientific-technical-vocational subjects are joined.

With each state of the Union having been given public lands or script equal to 30,000 acres for each senator or representative, "the people's university" was in business.

- animal husbandry
- veterinary medicine
- agronomy
- horticulture
- plant pathology
- farm management--

These were the brash newcomers to the curriculum. As Morrill himself put it—"lopped off were studies of European scholarship, and added were those of less antique value."

The land grant college united two schemes of life: agriculture and industry. The sons and daughters of farmers, tradesmen, craftsmen and semi-skilled workmen, in increasing numbers, went to college.

Consequence 3: This pre-Civil War innovation opened the way to the great technologies of the 20th century. However, as the opportunities for careers in science and technology opened for increasing numbers of students, the student turned to question science—"For what am I fitted? Are my abilities better used in the farm or office, the field of laboratory, library or observatory? What can science tell me?"

The college administrators and the faculty member in varied collegiate settings became "surrogate" human engineers, speculating about the endowments of students they taught and advised—attempting to account for placement of these students in hundreds of emerging occupations yet to be classified and described.

That the real liberal arts college—in the highest sense of freeing and liberating—is no longer to be found; that in its place is a college playing
down its occupation-job preparation and trumpeting its goal as one wherein "the individual finds himself-herself in reference to the world about, investing his interests and energies in problems and issues of mankind, etc." (which is, of course, the matter of how man shall both exist and subsist)--these are contentions. Does the liberal arts college aim to prepare students for some "calling" in the professions, business, technologies? If so, then whatever is recognized to be of merit in both science and art in respect to vocational counseling deserves to be installed.
4. **The Psychological Legacy:** There's No Other Like ME!  
(Really a sub-point of Legacy #3)

This legacy reaffirms the view that the outstanding characteristic of man is his individuality. Educators were urged to accept the biological assertion that no two human beings (with possible exception of identical twins) have the potentiality for developing alike, particularly when to all genetic differences are added differences in environment and experience.

The psychology of individual differences of the 20th century was forcefully summarized by William Rainey Harper, first president of the University of Chicago, when he said . . .

"In order that the student may receive the assistance so essential to his highest success, another step in the onward evolution will take place. This step will be the scientific study of the student himself . . . In the time that is coming, provision must be made, either by the regular instructors or by those appointed especially for the purpose, to study in detail the man or woman to whom instruction is offered . . . This study will be made: (1) with special reference to his character . . . to find out whether he is responsible or careless, or shiftless or perhaps vicious; (2) with special reference likewise to his intellectual capacity; (3) with reference to his special intellectual characteristics to learn whether he is independent or original; (4) with reference to his special capacities and tastes; (5) with reference to the social side of his nature. The feature of the twentieth century education will come to be regarded as of greatest importance, and fifty years hence, will prevail as widely as it is now lacking."

And so—a science of individual measure was invented, and students were placed under microscopes for analysis of interest patterns, abilities, aptitudes and personality traits.

**Consequence 4:** In a brave new world of intelligence and personality quotients, faculty members have picked their way discretely. Tests and their interpretation have come to be viewed—if not with enthusiasm—at least with mounting credence. Students, in alternating worship and distrust, have queried:

"And who's afraid of a bad I.Q.? Tell me what's good about a 132?"

Thereupon, faculty members have been advanced to "surrogate" psychometrics, relating individual traits, as measured, to accomplishment in the undergraduate years.

It is here in the stimulation of the process for self-discovery
and self-actualization that the liberal arts college should rightfully claim its expertise. The "journey into the interior" (Freudian-inspired) or man's search for self-knowledge is done best in a company of freedom-loving men with knowledge of life extracted from the arts and sciences. If liberal arts institutions exist to liberate, then the unexpendable mission is that of freeing man from the shackles of his own ignorance concerning psychological-self.
The Spiritual Legacy: Somebody on Campus is Watching Over Them!

In the early colonial period, religion dominated student life. There followed periods of alternating ill and zeal: with conditions of campus infidelity, thereafter outbursts of orthodox religiosity—up to and after the First World War to the present. In all the seismographic ups and downs, the colleges have continued to provide group experiences, i.e., formal classes in religion, chapel and vesper services, revivals, convocations, religious emphasis weeks. The college student has been tracked in his pilgrimage as he moves from rational humanism, to idealism, to realism, to pragmatism.

The quickening current has moved the collegian to the existentialist writings of Kirkegaard, Buber, Tilich, Jean Paul Sartre, de Chardin, all calling for a return to inward man. One observer of the higher education scene comments that for knowledge to be at all meaningful, students must be morally perceptive, learning the art of living with self, fellow men and nature. To some extent, this emphasis on religious concern has been related to the guidance and student personnel movement. The assertion that higher education must concern itself with the "whole person" has dictated that the religious life of the collegian must not be slighted.

Consequence 5: A remarkable change, not some historians, has occurred in faculty members who affirm a belief that the student is inherently good—rather than the earlier declaration as to his natural depravity. In this day, faculty members engage in earnest conversation with students, coming at the question of man's prevailing (Faulkner-inspired) through various aspects of the curricular kaleidoscope—the physical and social sciences, the humanities, communications. Faculty members have become, at times, "surrogate chaplains". Suspect at times, are administrators—both academic and student personnel, and professionals in counseling.

In a day of frenetic behavior, the liberal arts college has one important possession—i.e., TIME... time to "take up time" with persons. The liberal arts college has been "paced to persons" and this does not, or should not mean it has been slow, meandering, aimless or wasteful. In the important studies in the behavioral sciences of the past decade, there is much to be read about learning climates, campus environments. What is lacking, of course, is the more-to-be-determined by personnel from all disciplines working in-combination to discern "the spirit of the learner in the climate of his learning." I believe the liberal arts college has the best chance of contributing this knowledge.
An Intermediate Summary:

I began with a recognition of the importance of studying the means for coordinating the work of academic and student personnel programs. I stated thereafter that in long-expressed opinion the best means for effecting such coordination is through programs of faculty advising whereby (and I state qualifications hitherto unexpressed)--

1. Faculty members, carefully selected, and
2. Given proper in-service assistance, and
3. Supported by academic administrators and general faculty and all service personnel can --
4. Assist students in matters of academic adjustment.

I have been arguing (in citing the five legacies) that there is work cut out for the faculty member who advises alongside the professional counselor who counsels. The need is apparent for reasons of historical review--

1. The young are free to choose their educational goals
2. They have freedom of career and curricular choice
3. They are free to explore occupational-vocational areas
4. They are free to explore self-psychological, spiritual, and other aspects not considered here biological, physical, economic, etc.

Speaking to and with students on the process and price of these accumulated freedoms are administrators (academic and student personnel), faculty members, professionally-trained counselors, and other service personnel of the institution. Most especially, in a day of confessed "alienation" of students and administration, there is need for the faculty member to resume an earlier advisory role, to be "recalled to life." (Dickens-inspired.) The faculty member has been recalled to do what the term "mentor" implies--to guide. Never has faculty advising had such an opportunity to prove itself. And now, to Part II and a consideration of the application of beliefs about faculty advising to liberal arts institutions.

Part II Applications of Belief for Advising in Liberal Arts Colleges

Constructs of Faculty Advising:

1. The importance of a program of faculty advisement shall be stated and supported by the chief administrator(s) of the institution.
2. There shall be clear, straightforward definition of the role which the adviser assumes.

3. There shall be careful selection of the faculty members who advise.

4. There shall be provision of adequate clerical assistance to the adviser.

5. There shall be a system for advising with expectations plainly stated and directions clearly supplied.

6. There shall be flexibility in order that advising programs adjust themselves to institutional change.

7. There shall be recognition of the fact that some students can develop and demonstrate the ability for advising themselves in some areas.

8. There shall be recognition of the contribution of faculty members who advise--i.e., monetary, or other reward such as load reduction, equation of advising in reference to general professional productivity, etc.

9. There shall be coordination of the program of advising with other services for assisting students--i.e., psychological, psychiatric, health, residence living, etc.

10. There shall be continuous evaluation of the program of advising.

Summarizing the constructs of faculty advising, I state my high-frequency belief--

The faculty adviser is a coordinator--first and last--of the student's academic problems.

Coordination, as I view it, is the process of keeping intact a central design or operating relationship in a process. Through proper referral and adequate follow-up, the adviser becomes an activator and thereafter a moderator, stimulator, evaluator of student progress. The faculty adviser knows the resources of the campus and utilizes them through referral--the speech clinic, reading remedial services, counseling center, financial aids office, chaplain's office, academic dean's domain--to name but a few. (These facets I do not discuss in detail here. They are relevant to our later Workshop discussion, of course.)

Terminal Summary

In an article written five years ago, I categorized four kinds of faculty advising which should never have happened! They are, in brief:
1. **The automat stereotype:** This is the common "slip a coin in and get a schedule out" process wherein the student and adviser interact solely in a mechanical process of working out a program suitable for a given period of registration.

2. **The thousand-mile check-up:** This stereotype is one which conceives of an adviser as active in "arranging a program of courses" and subsequently checking a month or six weeks thereafter to see how the program has worked.

3. **The patch-after-crash stereotype:** In this role, the faculty adviser is galvanized into action at moments of crisis . . . and races to the rescue of the student. Too little and too late is usually the appraisal of this well-intentioned but ill-planned maneuver.

4. **The malevolent benevolency:** This is the overdrawn image of the faculty adviser as a mother hen, with the wingspread of an eagle, hovering over the student by day and by night, protecting, preventing, paternalizing. All of these stereotypes--and some others that you can know as well--miss the point of real importance--the consideration of the spirit of the learner in the climate of his learning.

With the heritage of the past examined for institutions of higher education in America today . . .

With the recognition that today's issues and practices are rooted, in measure, in the nation's past . . .

With the identification of five legacies which condition the college of our day . . . philosophic legacy; curricular; vocational; psychological; and spiritual . . .

With contention that teachers are an important "agent" in the coordination of academic programs and programs of student personnel work . . .

With only a nod, in this address, to the professional counselor (admissions, residence hall, foreign student advisement, counseling center, etc.) who figures in the "guidance" of students in the contemporary liberal arts college . . .

With the repeated observation that the task of advising-counseling students is one of "coordination" of the efforts of many who assist students . . .

With the belief that not all faculty advising is worth its salt in time and money expended . . .

I affirm, nonetheless, that faculty advising ought to be initiated if it is lacking and given professional blood plasma if it is about to expire.

And, finally, I observe that the liberal arts college has the best of all climates.
for expressing the concern of educators for students, and consequently, for implementing this task in ways that have not yet been tried.

The liberation and utilization of its own resources for the good of the students are the greatest challenges before the liberal arts community.