University counseling centers usually follow one of a variety of themes or "models," although not in pure form. Perhaps the oldest is the vocational counseling model, which concentrates on helping students find suitable careers. In the psychotherapy model, most student concerns are seen for their personal content. Another model, student affairs counseling, finds counselors handling student services in addition to counseling. In a training model, most of the counseling is done by student-trainees. Both the research model and religious counseling model have dubious validity. In the cloister model, both student and counselor are secluded. Finally, the student development center model is characterized by (1) a goal of maximizing human effectiveness, freedom, and growth, (2) movement into the college community in an effort to prevent problems, and (3) mobilization of campus resources. (KP)
I want to focus largely on different types or kinds of service that Counselling Centres tend to emphasize and not spend much time on administrative structure, hiring, etc. Therefore, some of you may prefer that, rather than the term "models", I use "themes" or "directions" of service. I think these would be equally correct. However, I will adopt some of the structure and terminology of a forthcoming APGA monograph by Eugene Oetting, whom many of you know, and Allen Ivey. They have referred to types of service as models, so I will too.

To begin somewhat historically, perhaps the oldest, though still a popular model for university counselling centres, is the Vocational Counselling Model--helping students to find suitable careers. Career oriented centres generally deal in great quantities of information; they want both to obtain predictive data from students and to give them information relevant to their future. Therefore, they commonly make extensive use of tests and perhaps hire a full-time psychometrist. They will also often have well developed files of occupational information and university calendars.

Sometimes these centres feel that psychotherapy has no place in university counselling and they may make quite a point of it. Indeed, I know of one Canadian school where, at one time, the administration felt that receiving psychotherapy implied mental illness and illness was incompatible with the life of a student. Anyone known to have had therapy prior to admission was to receive psychiatric clearance before his application was considered.

A second model is suggested by the converse of these circumstances and we could call this a Psychotherapy model. In a therapy oriented
centre most student problems and concerns are seen for their personal content. And certainly, it cannot be denied that even such matters as vocational choice and educational achievement often are deeply personal. There is correspondingly less emphasis on tests and information. This is a fairly common model. At least two counselling centres in Ontario have psychiatrists as directors and about a year ago I heard that a school in British Columbia was looking for a quote, clinically oriented, director.

I don't believe any Canadian Services go to this extreme but I once heard the president of a prominent university in Connecticut say that the students who wanted testing or vocational help could go downtown to one of the commercial counselling agencies. His idea of a counsellor was someone who worked closely with deans and took over for them when they became uncomfortable with specific personal relationships. His model for counselling is probably unique.

However, counsellors are sometimes intimately involved with the work of university deans, and this suggests another model—a model of student affairs counselling. These will be found almost exclusively in smaller institutions. When a school is too small to keep two or three persons busy, the solution is often not as simple as reducing the number of counsellors. First of all, the entire staff of smaller schools are typically involved in more than one educational role. The counsellors are too. And in some ways it is to their advantage. It may take two, or even three persons to carry the counselling load of one full-time counsellor, which adds variety to the job, enlarges the resources for developing ideas, and if the counsellors are well chosen, may yield a
little professional stimulation as well.

Thus, the usual solution for a counselling centre in a small college is to staff it with two, or three, counsellors and give them duties in addition to counselling. These counselling services have been responsible for housing, financial aids, discipline, adviser-advisee programs, foreign students, academic probation, freshman orientation, recruiting of students, admissions, and generally anything else that might be viewed as potential problem areas for students.

The disadvantages are fairly obvious -- most of them have to do with the fact that these things are of less interest to counsellors. Some may actually damage the counsellor's counselling role. And once you take on these extra duties, they are rather difficult to shed as the college grows. We know this to be true in at least one large Canadian centre as pointed out to us by Rempel, Sartoris and Vander Well in their article which appeared about two weeks ago in the Journal of our organization (p. 30).

It is somewhat compensating that the counsellor is more totally aware of those things which touch the students' lives. But there may be other ways to gain this kind of appreciation and we will discuss some of these in a few minutes.

A model which could certainly have very large overlap with others is the Training Model. This is usually distinguished by being administratively a part of a Psychology or Education department and by the fact that most of the actual counselling is done by student-trainees, under supervision.

I don't believe we can be immediately critical of this model
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on the basis of inexperienced counsellors. Trainees often have energy and devotion which may more than compensate for the experience of older but sometimes "burned out" counsellors. Also, we might consider the evidence being brought to us by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) which suggests that experience is not a relevant variable to some criteria of counselling effectiveness.

An interesting variation of the training model is reflected in a major American centre where it is alleged that all of the regular counsellors, even the Ph.D.'s, are in training to the extent of receiving some supervision from the director.

One model that may not be worthy of mention is a Research Model. Oetting and Ivey include this in their list but go on to say that it really doesn't exist. Occasionally, a large portion of counsellors in one setting become more interested in research than counselling. But they either leave counselling or they talk the school into creating an office of student life studies, institutional research, or some such thing.

Perhaps a Religious Counselling Model should not be mentioned either because it may not exist outside of small American church colleges. Nevertheless, we could say it is a sometimes image of Canadian counselling, probably as a result of so many ministers and former ministers being in counselling and serving as counselling directors. Only in Canada have students asked me if I were a minister. Personally, I find nothing so distasteful as being called a missionary for the right way of life, but nothing so embarrassing as being told that as a Psychologist I don't have sufficient influence.
I have skipped one model that really should have been mentioned very early because it is quite old. But I have saved it until now to contrast it with a very current concept. I think the most descriptive name for this model would refer to its position in the University rather than to its function. I call it the Cloister Model. To create a thorough Cloister Service, first you stress that the Centre is a place where the student can truly relax, let his hair down and be absolutely protected with respect to the interview content. It is understood that if necessary, confidentiality will be defended with the counsellor's very job. Secondly, you hire very competent counsellors and give them the same secure circumstances you offer clients. These things are probably very positive and have helped to give counselling whatever respect it is accorded today. But, unfortunately, the Cloister serves not only to seclude the student but the counsellor as well. Typically, the counsellor makes little attempt to learn about what affects students outside of his office. And he probably prefers not to know professors and deans, let alone the community bartender or even other students- for fear that they might ask embarrassing questions about a client. Of course, this is overstated, but I'm sure you have been acquainted with such a counselling service.

The final model must be called the Student Development Centre. The term "developmental counselling" has been around quite awhile but is still in vogue, and is now being applied to a large constellation of counselling centre innovations. The purposes of these centres are usually described in terms such as "maximizing human effectiveness", 
"maximizing human freedom" (Blocher, 1966, pp. 5-6), or facilitating student "growth" (Oetting, 1967). Effectiveness, freedom and growth are very positive and forward-looking concepts. Nevertheless, my most serious criticism of the developmental model is that the shift in goals from "adjustment" and "mental health" to "effectiveness" and "growth" seems to imply an advance in psychological knowledge. In fact, it sheds no new light on the perpetually plaguing problem of a criterion for counselling success. The word "growth" is used thirteen times in a recent three-and-a-half page article on Developmental Counselling but a definition is not even attempted.

Aside from this movement away from a therapeutic framework toward a growth and development concept, Morrill, et al. (1968, p. 141) describe two other major characteristics of a Developmental Centre. These are movement into the college community in an effort to prevent problems, and secondly, mobilization of campus resources. Both the prevention emphasis and the mobilization efforts first require learning something about the student animal, in his natural state. So counsellors are getting out of their offices to find out what is important to students and what significant environmental influences are.

Among those taking the lead are two American universities. Kennedy and Danskin (1968) have described their long-term project to systematically "debrief" student volunteers from various segments of Kansas State University. And perhaps you noticed the ad that Michigan State University placed in the last issue of the APGA Placement Service Bulletin. I will read part of it to you. Wanted:
Student Ecologist: Ph.D. required. Duties involve research on the interaction between university students' development, and their university environment; consult with counselors to improve awareness of our client's milieu; consult or collaborate with counselors on student ecology research.

So counsellors are informing themselves -- by talking to students who are not counsellees, by doing pertinent research and by exchanging ideas with administrators, and by forming student-faculty advisory committees for counselling services.

With this knowledge, techniques and procedures are being designed to reach new groups of students -- decentralizing counselling services, offering telephone interviews, self-counselling manuals, groups for special-purpose counselling, audio-visual aids and simply holding informal conversations with groups of students where they are found.

Mobilization of campus resources first requires a greater degree of acceptance than counsellors find in many places. But, Developmental Centres claim that their counsellors are becoming more accepted as an integral part of University communities, by showing an interest in total educational development, by offering consultation to campus committees and interested faculty, and by asking for and getting academic rank as counsellors.

So, the emphasis of Developmental Centres is not limited to helping the disturbed or guiding the confused and indecisive. Rather, it is to take an active part in the educational process as a group of psychologists interested in students and their environment. They want to be informed persons, well accepted in the university with good lines of communication to the students and faculty alike. They want to make a demonstrable, educational impact that is not confined to treatment
and indeed prevents the need for much of it.

These are the major counselling models as I see them. It may be fortunate that none exists in a pure form. There is probably value in each. Vocational and educational counselling still make up the bulk of work in most of our settings. Psychotherapy or personal counselling must be offered, at least on a limited basis, for no more reason than that students have personal concerns. Involvement in other campus functions is important and informative. Training and research are important jobs and they are important services. Confidentiality is essential, but should not keep us excluded from other quarters of the campus.

We are not far enough down the road yet to see the Ultimate Model. If we ever do, we may find that it has retained the best of each of those with which we are familiar.
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