

RECRUITMENT OF RESIDENCE HALL STAFF

Penni Johnson

Throughout the 1968-1969 academic year, Indiana University has devoted considerable time to a basic theme, FOCUS: BLACK AMERICA. In addition to the obvious educational benefit for the University community, the FOCUS project apparently will result in a more cosmopolitan student body encompassing greater numbers of students from all races and ethnic backgrounds. To keep pace with this changing population, the Residence Halls Counseling and Activities Office would like to achieve greater representation of all races and ethnic backgrounds on its residence hall staff.

In the past, recruiting procedures that relied in large part upon the initiative of the applicant have not produced large numbers of staff from minority groups. Thus, in hopes of achieving a more cosmopolitan staff and in hopes of providing greater opportunity for graduate study at Indiana University, a more active plan for staff recruitment is now underway.

Personal contact has been made already with students and staff at Alabama State College, Stillman College, and Tuskegee Institute. At present, recruiting teams from the residence hall staff would like to visit Wilberforce University, Central State University of Ohio, Fisk University, George Peabody College, and Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University. Included in the proposed recruitment teams will be representatives of the several levels of staff currently operating in the residence halls, as well as individuals knowledgeable about the graduate school and life at Indiana University.

Teams will be seeking to recruit not only black students who are interested in Student Personnel Administration, but also those who are interested in other areas of graduate study with the possibility of working as a Resident Assistant. In addition to this effort, alumni and friends are asked to encourage interested and qualified black students to consider graduate study at Indiana University and to seek graduate assistantships in the residence halls.

COULD OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM BE WORKING

Thomas R. Fiutak

Across the country, college students absorb the brunt of their parents' attack on the American system of higher education. This is because of the apparently flagrant violation of the objectives of higher education by conspicuous students. The problem that the students confront in defense of being students is a matter of definition. What past generations have termed "objectives" of higher education, and what is the current objective may differ in two ways: First, from the standpoint of relevancy and second, from the viewpoint of whoever is defining the objectives. It is this discrepancy of viewpoints which accounts for the reaction of the general population toward the attitudes of today's college students.

The problem of relevancy is opposed to time-honored ethics. Denying one's own immediate pleasure for higher future goals is a basic rationale for hard work. Denying the immediate is viewed by today's student as being superficial. Therefore, to define the goals which the past generation thought appropriate a rhetoric has been used which pictured the student as looking beyond the present and toward some greater, often vague, reward.

These goals have become irrelevant to many students and because of this students have incurred the wrath of adults who use the rationale of hard work as the basis for life. Students who enter college today have a scope of interests provided by today's communications that is as varied as the world news and as current as "now". This awareness has crept onto campuses because as members of a micro-community in the larger society of the world, students come to college with a desire to learn what life is all about, as well as p-orbitals, tensile strengths, and shorthand. Not satisfied to learn about a subject, students demand to experience sociology, to see a virus, and to challenge a computer. In short, students demand that the campus be relevant to life.

The second differential in defining the objectives of education stems from the redefinition of the old rhetoric. The educational process of college was constructed in such a way that by infusing such predetermined objectives as "awareness," "concern," and "patriotism" (as mere examples) the end package would be a neatly bound product of approximately the same size, shape, and color as the other student products. Awareness meant knowing where one was going, concern meant placing great stock in what the past generation was concerned about, and patriotism meant holding one's country above all else save God.

Those were the quiet days when original definitions were consistent with the end results of education. Can that truly be called education? Education does not imply sameness. By its very concept, it produces differentiation, and that means all size packages of varying shapes and shades.

Awareness could then be shifted from the viewpoint, "where I am going," to being aware of how many different shapes there are and the direction in which they are going. Concern is no longer relevant to the past. Students now are more concerned with the new colors which our educational machine is producing and where these new people can find peace. Patriotism would lose its shape. It would expand to a devotion to world safety above that of mere geographical boundaries.

If this is the case, could our educational system be working? Could it be that those idealistic objectives of the "aware student" and the "socially concerned citizen" have blossomed before our very eyes? Has education worked too well if it means revolt and upheaval?

The results of this redefinition can be seen across the country. The constant exposure of the public to problems of Columbia, Berkeley, Wisconsin, and San Francisco State has served to reinforce those who, preferring to view education as the social leveler of students (according to their level), are prepared to make laws which reduce any deviation. They make the simple fallacious equation that these uprisings are the inevitable turn of events once the leftists, long-hairs, protestors, and communists are allowed inside our doors.

We have become the nation's sideshow for those whose myopic vision pictures these products as the faults of education rather than the effect of a viable system of redefinition. One can be sealed in an office, ordained by tradition and authority, fortified by theories of life and education, and be totally blind to the experiences that characterize college life today.

If the goal of education is to induce an intellectual growth, a process which implies change, and if education should stimulate differentiation, then it is folly to attempt to construct an everlasting definition of the "straight and narrow path to a well-rounded individual."

EXPERIMENTAL STAFFING ARRANGEMENTS

Final preparations are now being made for a new staffing arrangement in two residence centers for next fall. In McNutt Quadrangle, a new division of responsibilities between hall directors, resident assistants, and student assistants will mean that no staff will be directly responsible for floor environment. In this case, student officers will assume responsibility for orientation of freshmen to units, quiet hours, and enforcement of any University regulations within the units.

Teter Quadrangle, also developing a new staffing plan, will hope to utilize a full-time resident counselor working with residents in the center. In addition, a new hall director system will develop a great deal of building autonomy within the Quad in matters of discipline, programming, and administration. Resident assistants, one in each building, will work with their hall director and a staff of undergraduate assistants. The undergraduate assistant will work closely with individual floor programming and will have virtually no responsibilities in the area of discipline. Matters of discipline will be handled by the resident assistant and hall director in cooperation with student government.