I ✦ U ✦ S ✦ P ✦ A

Journal of The Indiana University Student Personnel Association

1987 ✦ 1988

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 236
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(812) 335-0212

The Journal of the **Indiana University Student Personnel Association** is published by the IUSPA with support from the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs, the Department of Residence Life and the Office of Student Activities. The **Journal** is published expressly to provide an opportunity for Higher Education and Student Affairs master's degree students to publish articles pertinent to the field of Student Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

1988 Edition

CONTENTS

FACULTY ADVISORS

Dr. Elizabeth Greenleaf 1960-1977
Ms. Wanda Deutsch 1970-1971
Dr. David DeCoster 1972-1976
Dr. George Kuh 1977-1982
Dr. John Schuh 1983-1987
Dr. Don Hossler 1987-1988

EDITORS

Susan Mears, 1965
Bill Ehrich, 1966
Ann Paloney, 1967
Michael J. Wiener, 1967
Marilyn Liechty, 1968
Dallas Bauman, 1969
George C. Dehne, 1971
Jane A. Lundahl, 1972
Helen Mamachev, 1973
Winnifred Weeks, 1973
Elizabeth Brannon, 1974
Robert Cieslicki, 1974
Dann Lobsinger, 1974
Barbara Moudy, 1974
David Stacy, 1974
Ann Deborah Alter, 1975
Dann Lobsinger, 1975
Karen Farmer, 1976
Diane Burnside, 1976
Richard Scott, 1976
Susan Hopp, 1977
Frank Ardaiolo, 1977
Vince Carunchia, 1977
Elizabeth A. Zavodny, 1978
Jim Scroth, 1978
Marc Kaplan, 1978
Jim Scroth, 1979
Laurie Bell, 1979
L. E. Wegryn, 1980
B.J. Bischoff, 1981
Brian Pisaro, 1981
Rodney P. Kirsch, 1982
Janet R. Wright, 1982
Nedra Hartzell, 1983
Daniel W. Salter, 1983
Susan Buffington, 1984
Diane Ledger, 1984
Margaret O'Brien, 1985
David Stewart, 1985
Lora Burnett, 1986
James Vander Putten, 1986
James J. Holmen, 1987
James J. Hurley, 1987
David J. Strauss, 1988
J.J. Thorp, 1988

EDITORS' COMMENTS

The guiding philosophy of the Journal is to provide master's degree students in Higher Education and Student Affairs with an avenue to expose outstanding written work they have produced during their time at Indiana University. With this philosophy in mind, we set out to publish material reflecting the diversity of the education we receive and the students we are. We also strived to involve all students, in essence, "downplaying" the idea that a publishable journal article must be of great length.

We hope that in the pages which follow you will find challenging, thought provoking writing. The articles vary in length, style, and purpose. Two articles are longer research papers which present questions and concerns regarding the future of student affairs: one regarding fraternities, sororities, and residence halls, and a second investigating gay and lesbian students on campus. A third in-depth article reminds us of the always important legal considerations involved in our profession.

In our quest for diversity in publication, we are pleased to publish a reflective piece of transitions for the new professional and a needs assessment model for campus child care. We thank Jim Lyons for his contribution as this year's alumni author and welcome the opportunity to learn more about our newest faculty member, Dr. Frances Stage, from her interview with J.J. Thorp. We are very excited about this year's journal and congratulate those authors whose articles were published.

On behalf of all students, we would like to extend thanks and praise to our faculty. Drs. Philip Chamberlain, Donald Hossler, George Kuh, Gerald Preusz, and Frances Stage have continued to uphold and support the tradition of quality student affairs preparation at Indiana University. We are excited about George Kuh returning to the department as a full-time faculty member this fall and have enjoyed the courses Gerald Preusz has offered in Bloomington. We also would like to thank the Higher Education and Student Affairs office secretary, Luanne Terrell, for her assistance in publishing *the Journal.*

We are indebted to the Indiana University Fund for Excellence in Education for their financial contribution which makes this publication possible. Any donations to the fund are welcomed; a tear-off contribution form is enclosed. Contributions may be earmarked to the Greenleaf/Shaffer fund, which provides financial support for student personnel education. In addition to those offices listed on the inside cover, we thank the I.U. Alumni Office for providing us with complete alumni lists.

Before closing, our sincere gratitude is extended to this year's Editorial Review Board. Their editing, reviewing, and selection skills were superb and greatly appreciated. Any editor would be lucky to work with such a fine group of people.

Finally, we invite Alumni to provide comments and suggestions regarding this and future editions. We hope you will enjoy the 28th edition of the Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association.

David J. Strauss
J.J. Thorp

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Nominations of individuals for the 1989 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf award and Robert H. Shaffer award are now being accepted.

The Greenleaf award is presented annually to the alumnus/a of the masters degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs, "exemplifying the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth characteristic of the distinguished professor for whom the award is named."

The Robert H. Shaffer award is presented to an alumnus/a of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession.

Nominations for both awards will close on February 1, 1989. The awards will be presented at the 1989 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g. vita) to Dr. George Kuh at the address listed in the *Journal*. Thank you.

****

THE ROBERT H. SHAFFER QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE ENDOWMENT

Indiana University's College Student Personnel Administration (CSPA) program is one of the largest and most prestigious in the country. Nearly one-third of all current student personnel administrators hold Indiana University degrees.

The success and reputation of the program are due in large measure to the many contributions of Robert H. Shaffer. Dean of Students from 1955-1968, Bob Shaffer has made a career of caring about students. His students regard him as a mentor as well as a teacher; a number of them have claimed that having a class with Bob Shaffer or doing graduate work under his direction significantly changed their lives.

In tribute to the many contributions Bob Shaffer has made to student life at Indiana University, the **Robert H. Shaffer Quality of Student Life Endowment** has been established. The fund supports student services and programming in leadership and personal development.

Contributions to the **Shaffer Endowment** will ensure that future students will enjoy the developmental opportunities Bob Shaffer emphasized throughout his career. For information about the fund, contact the **Dean of Students Office, Student Services 108, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405, telephone (812) 335-8187.**

GAY AND LESBIAN COLLEGE STUDENTS: IDENTITY ISSUES AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

Sarah B. Westfall

A major issue for many college students is the development of identity. Chickering's (1969) theoretical framework of student development is based on the notion that college students are faced with a variety of developmental tasks which contribute to their overall formation and sense of identity. Lesbian and gay students face many of these same developmental issues. Additionally, the "minority" experience of gay college students creates developmental tasks/dilemmas not faced by non-gay students. This paper will examine the development of identity in gay and lesbian college students and how student affairs can respond more effectively. It is hoped that this information will encourage further inquiry and ultimately, action.

Like the college population in general, the gay and lesbian college population is very diverse. Gender, age, cultural background, and experience are four factors that combine to create very distinct gay identities and experiences. Gender is the factor most researched (Henderson, 1984; Crooks and Baur, 1987) and provides the most significant demonstration of diversity within the gay and lesbian population. Most of the research on gay and lesbian students has been done with men and generalized to women (Henderson, 1984). This method is in some ways helpful, but does not always provide relevant or accurate information. Henderson (1984) published an article based on clinical observations of lesbians and gay clients over a number of years. Several general differences between men and women were cited in the article. Among them, during the process of identifying oneself as lesbian or gay, men seem to become concerned and anxious about the possibility that they *might* be gay more so than women. Once the identification of oneself as gay has been made, men view it as a "discovery" or that they finally "admitted" their homosexuality. When women identify themselves as lesbian, they "reconstruct" the past by examining and emphasizing their significant friendships/relationships with other women. Lesbians tend to have more heterosexual experience than gay men and the discover of lesbianism frequently develops from the sexualization of a very close same-sex friendship.

In addition, studies indicate that lesbians have fewer relationships than gay men and lesbian relationships are monogamous more often than gay male relationships. This phenomenon is explained by the American socialization process; men are socialized to be interested in sex before love, while women are socialized to be interested in love before sex (Groves and Venture, 1983; Crooks and Baur, 1987). These differences among lesbian and gay students are helpful to keep in mind as background information.

Dillon (1986) compiled a list of issues or areas of concern for young lesbians and gays. One of the issues cited in the list is "grieving loss of membership in the dominant heterosexist culture and entry into a permanently stigmatized group (p. 38)." The experience of being a minority, especially an invisible minority, can be a powerful shaping force in one's life. For many people, the revelation that they are gay does not occur until adolescence or later (Sophie, 1982), so coping as a minority in a majority population is, for many, a new skill to be mastered. Unlike other minorities who are more easily identified (i.e. blacks, Hispanics, Asian Americans, disabled students), lesbian and gay students frequently have no familial support or modeling to help them deal with the dominant heterosexist culture as a minority member. As a result, lack of peer support and isolation can become almost overwhelming to newly self-identified lesbian and gay students. Finally, gay and lesbian students are not in any way physically distinguishable from non-gay students (Crooks and Baur, 1987). Unless a gay or lesbian student is self-identified, there is no way for others, especially non-gay people, to know when they are interacting with a gay student. This makes the occurrence and derogatory message of anti-gay jokes and comments an isolating and alienating experience for many gay and lesbian students.

"Coming out" is a term used to describe the process of and extent to which one identifies oneself as lesbian or gay (Crooks and Baur, 1987; Miller, 1980; Sophie, 1982). This process occurs in addition to the generally understood identity issues faced by college students as an aggregate (Miller, 1980; Chickering, 1969). Sophie's (1982) article details coming out as two-part process - coming out to oneself and coming out to others. Coming out to oneself is the most important step to developing a positive lesbian or gay identity. Women, for example, who are in a lesbian relationship may deny that the relationship is homosexual. They may see the homosexual component of the relationship as being a natural extension of friendship or a one-time only experience. This type of denial can be very painful and debilitating to the formation of a positive self-identity. The second part of the process is coming out to other people. As with non-gays, acceptance by others is important to self-esteem and self-acceptance. The challenge for gay and lesbian students is to recognize the consequences of coming out.

Coming out to others is an experience unique to gay and lesbian students. The decision to come out to another person involves disclosing one's sexual side which in our culture is viewed as a private matter. One risk is that the sexual nature of a gay or lesbian student's identity will become the overriding focus or frame of reference for subsequent interaction between the student and the other person. Another very real risk is that the other person will reject the gay or lesbian student. This scenario has the potential to be very damaging to the student, especially if the other person is a valued friend or family member. The

cultural norm of viewing homosexuality as an aberration of sorts makes it difficult for the gay or lesbian student to incorporate their sexuality into a larger sense of self; if the dominant culture is always reminding gay and lesbian people that they are different because of their sexual orientation, then that very issue might become the focus of their identity rather than a component of their total sense of self (Miller, 1980).

Other issues related to coming out are decisions about the extent of the revelation (should everyone know that one is gay or should disclosure be selective?), timing, anticipated consequences, and the reality that there are dangers and losses as well as relief and a sense of closeness to be encountered coming out to others (Dillon, 1986). The decision not to come out to others is called "passing." The dominant culture tends to assume heterosexuality (Edelman, 1986) and lesbian and gay people who do not actively correct the heterosexual assumption are considered to be "passing" as heterosexuals.

Dillon (1986) and Edelman (1986) wrote about the delivery of health care services to lesbian and gay students and noted that many of the traditional health care forms for medical histories, gynecological exam questions, and hospital regulations which define family members as blood relatives or heterosexual spouses, leave gay and lesbian people with no vehicle to correct the heterosexual assumption. Edelman went on to say that this assumption of heterosexuality may alienate gay and lesbian students to the point where they avoid medical care that is integral to their maintenance of good health. No doubt, this example can be generalized to other service and support areas which attempt to meet student needs. For lesbians and gay men who have a well-developed support structure and a knowledge of lesbian and gay resources in the community, the issue of the heterosexist bias mentioned above is probably more manageable than for a student who is currently in the process of establishing his/her gay identity. Confidence and assertiveness about their specifically gay or lesbian needs may not be developed enough to deal with the heterosexual assumption and still have their needs met.

One final issue in the development of gay and lesbian identity is homophobia. Homophobia is an irrational fear or hatred of homosexuality in others and/or homosexual feelings and behaviors in oneself (Crooks and Baur, 1987). The dominant heterosexist culture is biased against homosexuals and many negative stereotypes concerning gays and lesbians exist. Homophobia can be a major stumbling block to the development of a gay identity, especially if the homophobe is also gay or lesbian. Homophobia on the part of the lesbian or gay student can result in self-loathing, loss of esteem, and behavior inconsistent with one's true feelings but consistent with heterosexual societal expectations (Sophie, 1982; Groves and Venture, 1983). Homophobia on the part of heterosexuals can result in harassment and discrimination against gay men and lesbians.

A study of college students by Yarber and Yee (1983) found that people who are intolerant of gays are typically male, more cognitively rigid, intolerant of ambiguity, more authoritarian, and more supportive of the double standard for men and women than people not intolerant of gays. The study also indicated that erotophilic (persons who associate primarily positive feelings with sexuality) heterosexuals had more positive attitudes toward gays and lesbians than erotophobic (persons who associate primarily negative feelings with sexuality) heterosexuals (Yarber and Yee, 1983).

The irrationality of homophobia and the unpredictability of homophobes can be difficult for gay and lesbian students to manage. Fear of homophobic reactions keeps many gay and lesbian people from coming out to others. Coming out to homophobic parents and family can result in disapproval, expulsion from the home, disinheritance, or any number of other negative reactions (Sophie, 1982). In other settings, coming out to or being "suspected" of homosexuality by homophobic people can result in the loss of a job, discrimination in housing, excommunication from a religious body, or harassment. In most cases, gay and lesbian people have no legal or institutional protection against such actions.

At this point, it is prudent to consider how student affairs can effectively meet the needs of lesbian and gay college students. Robert Schoenberg, at the University of Pennsylvania, is currently researching lesbian/gay identity formation and management in college. Through interviewing self-identified gay juniors and seniors at three different institutions, Schoenberg has concluded that student services have a significant impact on students who are exploring and discovering their sexual orientation. He has compiled a list of fourteen suggestions for administrators to help improve the campus environment for gay and lesbian students. They are:

1. The establishment of a non-discrimination clause to protect the rights of gay and lesbian students. An institutional commitment of protecting gay people (like we protect other minorities) is vital for affirming the presence of gay people on our campuses.

2. A sensitivity statement and training for staff and faculty working with students. People need to become aware of and educated about gay people and their experiences.

3. A university statement against homophobia, letting people know that hostility toward gay people will not be tolerated.

4. Staff screening against homophobes to prevent biased people from harming gay students.

5. Intolerance of anti-gay or heterosexist language. This is a form of discrimination, just as racist and sexist language is.

6. A campus liaison between gay staff and students and the administration to help communicate the specific needs and perceptions of gay people to those who shape policy.

7. Increased gay and lesbian library resources so people have the chance to learn as much as possible and read literature which speaks to the gay and lesbian experience.

8. Orientation activities for gay and lesbian students to help acclimate them to their new environment and to let them know of resources which may be of use to them.

9. Literature to prospective students about gay organizations. This is to let students know what activities are available, etc., like numerous other campus organization publications.

10. Invitation and action to meet the needs of gay and lesbian students. We need to seek out needs and stop merely reacting to occasional student complaints.

11. Retention study of gay and lesbian students.

12. Carefully trained and sensitized security people. Careless comments or action by law enforcement people can be particularly damaging to people. The better sensitized law enforcement people become, the more constructively they can deal with gay and lesbian students.

13. Abolishment of the fraternity system. This system is perceived by some to perpetuate negative, heterosexist stereotypes and to widely discriminate against gay and lesbian people.

14. Availability of gay publications. Gay and lesbian students should have publications that address their sexuality and resulting issues available.

While these suggestions are very specific, the underlying message is that we in student affairs need to be informed and sensitive to the needs of lesbian and gay students. One important thing we can do is create an environment where gay and lesbian mentors can evolve and be supported by their gay and non-gay colleagues. Schoenberg's (1987) report indicated that gay and lesbian students feel a lack of gay and lesbian role models. As a profession which values individuals, it is imperative that we learn as much as possible about the varied students we serve and work with.

We must be cautious of pat assumptions of heterosexuality in our demeanor, training, publications, and policies. The development of the whole student can occur only if we recognize the whole student, sexuality and all. We need to read, ask questions, and learn as much as we can. We must publicly support and act as advocates for gay and lesbians students with the same fervor we advocate the needs of minority, non-traditional, and disabled students. We pride ourselves in making a difference in students' lives. That difference must extend to all students, without reservation.

REFERENCES

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crooks, R. & Baur, K. (1987). *Our sexuality* (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, California: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc.

Dillon, C. (1986). Preparing college health professionals to deliver gay-affirmative services. *Journal of American College Health, 35*(1), 36-40.

Edelman, D. (1986). University health services sponsoring lesbian health workshops: Implications and accessibility. *Journal of American College Health, 35*(1), 44-45.

Groves, P. A. & Venture, L. A. (1983). The lesbian coming out process: Therapeutic considerations. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62*(3), 146-149.

Henderson, A. (1984). Homosexuality in the college years: Developmental differences between men and women. *Journal of American College Health, 32*, 216-219.

Miller, R. (1980). Counseling the young adult lesbian. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, & Counselors, 43*(3), 44-48.

Schoenberg R. (1987, March). *Unlocking closets in the ivory tower: Lesbian/gay identity formation and management in college.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American College Personnel Association and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Chicago, IL.

Sophie, J. (1982). Counseling lesbians. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*(6), 341-344.

Yarber, W. L. & Yee, B. (1983). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbianism and male homosexuality: Their affective orientation toward sexuality and sex guilt. *Journal of American College Health, 31*(5), 203-208.

Sarah B. Westfall graduated from DePauw University in 1985 with a degree in communications. Prior to coming to Indiana University, she was a Residence Hall Area Coordinator at Ohio University and this past year she worked at the Indiana College Placement and Assessment Center. She received an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs this past May and aspires to obtain a generalist position at a small, liberal arts college.

GREEK ORGANIZATIONS AND RESIDENCE HALLS: A MODEL FOR GREEK LIVING IN THE RESIDENCE HALLS

David J. Strauss

Greek letter organizations have been part of the American college and university for over 200 years. They began as literary societies designed for additional academic study and intellectual debate, and eventually developed into the social organizations as we know them today. Greek letter organizations began providing residence in the middle of the 19th century when a number of universities were unable to provide housing for their students. Consequently, campus communities were saturated with boarding houses where students secured their own lodging and meals. By this time, many greek chapters had grown too large to meet in a student's room and had started renting meeting halls. Recognizing the need for meeting rooms and living quarters, fraternities began to first lease, then build and own their own homes.

Greek organizations currently maintaining chapter houses have faced difficult times. Increasing insurance premiums, costs for maintenance, and liability concerns have forced several organizations to look for alternate housing options. A potential solution to the need for fraternity and sorority housing is possible through the cooperation of university residence hall administrators and greek leaders (Sutherland, 1983, p. 4). Universities with partially filled residence halls could convert this empty space into campus housing for greek.

Is it possible that the philosophies and goals of residence halls, as well as the beliefs of student personnel administrators, will "harmonize" with those ideals on which greek organizations were founded and greek leaders espouse? This question serve as the basis for the balance of this paper. The philosophies and goals of both groups are examined, followed by a model for greek living in the residence halls. A scenario already in place at several colleges and universities, if successful, may create a new era for greek organizations and residence hall systems.

Residence Halls-Philosophy, Objectives and Goals

In residence halls, students encounter diverse experience, learn to make individual choices, develop their own schedules, and become more self reliant.

Frederickson (In Wallace, 1980) states that:

> "our purposes for having residence halls are not only to provide places to eat and to sleep but also to provide educational support services to the university

> by creating and maintaining a learning environment and by ensuring an opportunity, through guided group living, for the personal, scholastic, and social improvement of the residents" (p. 23).

Residence halls strive to create an environment that meets the student's needs. They aim to provide an optimum environment for fostering educational growth, opportunities for diverse and numerous social contacts, and comfortable living and dining accommodations. Administrators involved with residential living recognize the importance of student development and ingrained into the philosophy of residential living is its influences on student development. Chickering (1969) proposes that it is in the context of friendships formed that values, future plans and aspirations, and decisions about current behavior are developed. He believes that the housing unit becomes a subculture molding behavior and attitudes to its own values and standards, and finds that opportunities are provided for a student to observe the impact of personal behavior on other individuals.

In a final look at residence hall ideals, Decoster and Mable (1980) present a hierarchical scale of five general philosophical objectives for college student housing.

Level One-Provision of a satisfactory physical environment through new construction and renovation.

Level Two-Adequate care and maintenance of the physical facilities.

Level Three-Establishment of guidelines that provide structure for compatible and cooperative community living.

Level Four-Development of an interpersonal environment that reflects responsible citizenship and a concern for others, as well as an atmosphere conducive to learning.

Level Five-Opportunities for individual growth and development. On the hierarchical scale presented, one level must be accomplished before moving on to the next. These objectives serve as an excellent outline to explain the philosophical beliefs of residence hall administrators.

Greek Organizations-Philosophy, Objectives and Goals

The goals of today's fraternity and sorority members are basically the same as those on which the organizations were begun. As Beach asserts, "Today's members of greek letter organizations assert that they seek a sense of community in an impersonal world, a sense of meaning on a large and heterogeneous campus, a sense of mission and coherence in a fragmented education" (1973, p. 111). The fraternity ideal remains committed to the task of helping students develop themselves as whole human beings, not merely as academic performers. Owen and Owen (1976) find that fraternity attempts to "shape individual character in relation to the values and ideals of human excellence" (p. 15). In the same idealistic vein, the National Interfraternity Conference Decalogue states that "the college fraternity accepts its role in the moral and spiritual development of the individual." It promotes fraternity as "the developer of social graces, the art of good living, the developer of courtesy and kindness, and aims for a social mind in a social body" (In Kuh, 1982, p. 6). While this idealistic philosophy is well intended and valid, more realistic goals and objectives have been designed for greek organizations. The goal statements of greek organizations tend to focus on three major elements: 1) "the growth of individual members in their academic, social, moral, and spiritual lives, emphasizing character building and realizing individual potential;" 2) "experience in human relationships and responsibilities of citizenship;" 3) "service to others, especially in the community adjacent to the campus" (Riker, 1983, p.63). A major aspect of this philosophy is the commitment to fellow members, the university community, and academics.

Academics and community, among others, are vital concerns for greek organizations and must be recognized and developed by fraternity leaders. For continued fraternity and sorority prosperity, greek leaders must "dedicate themselves to helping members understand their individual roles in maintaining an environment conducive to attaining personal as well as group or organizational goals" (Kuh, 1982, p. 2).

Chickering's three proposals for student development are easily applicable to greek organizations and prove themselves as fine standard statements for student development in group living situations. Greek organizations and residence halls attempt to develop a sense of community among residents and encourage social interaction and independence, and support the personal, scholastic, and social improvement of residents.

The hierarchical scale Decoster and Mable present is easily adaptable to chapter house living. Both residential facilities must strive to satisfy each objective in hierarchical development.

The basic difference between greek organizations and residence halls is the differing levels of commitment and interaction experienced. The greek ideal stresses strong commitment from members and ingrains this belief to those affiliated. The philosophy speaks of mutual trust and support obtained through hours of close interaction. It is the organization's mission and the member's interest to assist in each other's social, moral and academic development. This "tight bond' strengthens the group's homogeneity and commitment from within.

The residence hall philosophy lacks this sense of trust and continual dedication and commitment. The resident may choose to leave the residence hall while the greek member is a "member for life". Secondly, the residence hall philosophy considers the development of the student's interaction skills with many different groups of people a priority, while the greek organization simply continues to stress the "closeness" of fraternity. Lastly, a difference for consideration is the presence of staff in the residence halls, while there is no supervision (other than a house director in some situations) in the chapter house. Staff members are vital to the success of both philosophies' implementation.

A Model For Greek Organizations Living in University Residence Halls

Assuming that the two groups' philosophies are satisfactorily compatible, an attempt can be made to house fraternities and sororities in residence halls. Keeping the objectives and goals of each group in mind, a model has been developed which may serve as a guideline for implementation.

An outline presented by Schuh (1987) was used to develop the proposed model. Additional elements to those devised by Schuh include one concerning rules and governance and one addressing interaction development.

Element 1-Goals

a. To adequately accommodate the greek organization(s) within the residence hall setting.

b. To meet the needs of fraternities and sororities, based on those points which differ in the philosophies of greek organizations and residence halls.

c. To maintain positive relations among all residents of the residence hall.

d. To work toward programming which involves all residents.

The major goal of the residence hall staff is its most difficult one, to maintain positive relations among all residents. Staff must work to make the two groups compatible with one another without jeopardizing or compromising either groups objectives and goals.

Element 2-Program Nature

Greek organizations located in the residence halls.

Element 3-Interaction Development

Interaction among all residents should be developed, with particular emphasis on positive relations between greeks and non-greeks.

Interactive programming should be planned so all groups come into contact with one another. Programming to avoid any disharmony and stereotyping among residents is necessary.

Element 4-Administrative Structure

Residence life supervision through the central residential life office, as well as administrative support form the residence hall staff should be provided. Additional administrative support is necessary from a fraternity national office representative and/or alumni advisor.

The residence hall staff and greek organization leaders work in a cooperative effort. Each must understand the other's ideals and keep in mind the student's best interest.

Element 5-Staffing

A live-in, graduate advisor should be required for each greek unit.

The advisor will serve as the resident assistant for the greek organization. Preferably, it will be an individual who is affiliated with a greek organization, not necessarily the one in which he/she advises. This individual will be a part of the residence hall staff and attend all appropriate meetings. He/she will work with the chapter president, alumni/chapter advisor, national headquarters, and the residence hall director to monitor and supervise the living unit.

Element 6-Performance Criteria

The greek organization will participate in all regularly scheduled hall programming and hold bi-annual meetings with the residence team, comprised of the residence hall director, a representative of the residential life central office, and a member of the alumni board. At the spring meeting, a member of the national headquarters staff must be present. These meetings are to assess the chapter's status and any other concerns.

Element 7-Relationship to the University

The greek organization will report to those responsible for the residence halls, as well as to any officials in student life responsible for fraternities and sororities.

Element 8-Budget

No budget is needed. The chapter will provide monies for social activities other than those provided through the residence hall programming board.

Element 9-Facilities Required

The greek organization will need an area within the residence hall where they all may live together. This may consist of an entire floor, a section or wing of a building, or a separate building within the complex. Within each dwelling area a meeting room/lounge in which to socialize and conduct meetings should be provided.

Chapter members will dine in the designated cafeteria facilities. No tables will be set aside for the greek organizations or any other residence hall groups unless reservation request forms have been approved by the resident director.

Element 10-Rules and Governance

All university rules will be enforced, as well as any residence hall regulations. Fraternity and sorority members must be made aware of the rights and responsibilities involved with residence hall living, and be held fully responsible for them.

Element 11-Evaluation Strategies

To evaluate the residence hall organization, measure: student satisfaction (greek and non-greek), administrators' reactions, conduct continuing needs assessments and environmental assessments.

Yearly reports should be submitted by the residence hall director, the graduate student advisor, chapter president, and alumni advisor to gauge student feelings and views.

This model serves as an introduction to the development of a greek organization residing in a residence hall. This article has examined the ideals of two important student residences on campus, residence halls and greek organizations. Little research has been conducted concerning the feasibility of housing greek organizations in the halls; this article attempts to address the issue and draws conclusions and recommendations based on information collected. It is hoped that further research on this topic will be conducted.

REFERENCES

Beach, Mark (1973). Change through student example: the case of the fraternity movement. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 14*, 111-116.

Chickering, A. W. (1967). College residences and student development. *Education Record, 48*(3), 179-186.

Decoster, D. A. & Mable, P. (1980). Residence education: purpose and process. In D. A. Decoster & P. Mable (Eds.), *Personal education and community development in college residence halls* (pp. 31-55). Cincinnati, Ohio: ACPA Media.

Kuh, G. (1982). *Enhancing the quality of greek life.* Monograph of the Center For the Study of the College Fraternity.

Owen, K. C. & Owen, S. M. (1976). Toward the year 2000: perspectives on the american fraternity movement. In Thomas C. Schreck (Eds.), *Fraternity for the year 2000-commission report* (pp. 1-23). Bloomington, Indiana: Commission on the American College Fraternity for the Year 2000.

Riker, H. C. (1983). Programming for personal development. In W. A. Bryan and R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *The eighties: challenge for fraternities and sororities* (pp. 49-72). Carbondale, Illinois: ACPA Media-Southern Illinois University Press.

Schuh, J. (1987). *Elements of Model Design.* Class Handout. Residential Life Seminar, Spring, 1987.

Sutherland, S. (1983). Issues for the eighties. In W. A. Bryan and R. A. Schwartz (Eds.), *The eighties: challenge for fraternities and sororities* (pp. 73-93). Carbondale, Illinois: ACPA Media-Southern Illinois University Press.

David J. Strauss is a 1986 graduate of Bucknell University in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, where he received a bachelor of arts degree in economics. He has served the past two years as the Interfraternity Council Advisor for Indiana University. David received an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May, 1988. This fall, David will join the Student Affairs staff at Centre College in Danville, Kentucky, as the Assistant Dean of Students responsible for Greek Affairs and Student Activities.

LEGAL ISSUES IN THE RESIDENCE HALLS

Bernadette DiMaggio

INTRODUCTION:

Today's society is becoming increasingly litigious in nature. The law in higher education has reflected this change in our society (Kaplin, 1985). Before 1960, the concept underlying many administrative decisions was *in loco parentis* (i.e. in place of parents), however *Dixon* v. *Alabama State Board of Education* (1960) ended this concept, and higher education became a right instead of a privilege. During the 70s, the consumerism movement came to higher education making it a buyer's market (Beam & Hines, 1981; Gehring & Dey, 1983). These conditions have contributed to the number of lawsuits administrators are forced to face. Residence hall administrators need to be aware of strategies by which to reduce the risk of potential lawsuits. This article will outline legal issues that affect residence hall administrators, and will describe ways in which they can reduce institutional liability.

LEGAL TERMS:

Residence hall administrators should have some knowledge of the nature of the legal issues they might encounter. Legal issues in the residence halls normally arise from two sources, contracts and torts. The relationship between the university and the student can be considered a contractual one (Van Alstyne, 1968; Laudicina & Tramutola, 1976). Lawsuits occur when a breach of contract occurs on the part of the university. A residence hall housing contract is a potential source of litigation, as is any type of contract which implies a duty to protect (Kaplin, 1980). The majority of lawsuits in the residence halls, however, arise from torts. According to Chambers (1972), when a student is injured in his person or property as a proximate result of the negligence or willful intent of an officer or employee of a college or university while engaged in his duties as an agent of the college, the civil wrong thus arising is a tort (p. 131).

This assumes that a special relationship exists between the university and the student (Millington, 1979). It also indicates that the injury to the person was foreseeable, thereby increasing the standard of care for the university.

An institution can employ three defenses in tort actions: contributory negligence, assumption of risk, and immunity. Contributory negligence implies that the student was responsible in part for the injury. Assumption of risk refers to the notion that the student understood particular risks before participating in an activity. Finally, immunity refers to protection from legal action. In the past, public schools could claim governmental immunity, while private institutions could claim charitable immunity. These claims have been abolished in most

states (Chambers, 1972; Roe, 1979). Residence hall administrators should also understand that as employers they are responsible for torts committed by their employees (Roe, 1979). University officials ranging from directors of residence life to boards of trustees are often named in lawsuits for this reason.

One difference between public and private universities is that public universities fall under constitutional restraints, and due process must be afforded to all students (Buchler, 1973). Private institutions, on the other hand, create contractual relationships, and due process may not be afforded to all students. These universities, however, do provide due process rights to students through catalogues and student handbooks. These publications can be considered implied contracts.

LEGAL ISSUES:

The following section will discuss several areas of potential legal liabilities that administrators may encounter.

Liquor law liability may be of prime importance to residence hall administrators, especially for those whose campuses allow alcohol. Under the Dram Shop Act, vendors of alcohol are responsible for torts committed (Buchanan, 1983). Universities can be held liable for torts committed by anyone who leaves their premises under the influence of alcohol purchased on that campus. In *Bradshaw* v.*Rawlings* (1979) and *Baldwin* v. *Zoradi* (1981), however, it was ruled that institutions are not the insurers of students' safety. Therefore, if drinking on campus is illegal and a related injury occurs, there is no breach of contract; thus, no liability is created on the part of the institution. In these two cases, the institutions were not vendors of alcohol. In regards to alcohol, administrators should understand the law and familiarize staff with the law and institutional policies (Janosik, 1983). In addition, residence hall administrators should institute alcohol education programs to promote responsible drinking among students.

Residence hall administrators are also responsible for informing students of potentially dangerous situations (Miller & Schuh, 1981). In *Tarasoff* v, *Regents of the University of California* (1974), a counselor failed to release information to the proper authorities regarding a client who had confided that he was going to kill a certain individual. The counselor was held liable for not revealing the information when the individual was killed. Resident assistants in particular need to provide adequate information to their supervisors about potentially dangerous situations. While conversations of this kind may breach confidentiality, the protection of all students is of prime importance. Employees, if in doubt of what course of action to pursue, should be advised to inform supervisors of these kinds of situations.

Residence hall administrators need to be concerned with supervision of staff, and programs and services (Miller & Schuh, 1981). *Jones* v. *Wittenberg*

(1976) held that an employer is liable for inadequate supervision of employees. It is important for administrators to provide proper training and supervision to insure the protection of all students. In *Bradshaw* v. *Rawlings* (1979), administrators were held liable for an injury which occurred at a university sponsored function. If an event is planned with university supervision, the university has a duty to protect students and anticipate foreseeable liabilities.

The largest single category of cases concerns negligence, where administrators fail to exercise reasonable care or provide a reasonably safe place to live (Gehring & Dey, 1983). These cases usually involve the use of facilities, the duty owed to those who use them, and the standard of care set for them. *Duarte* v. *State* (1979) involved the failure of a university to accurately represent the safeness of the institution. In *Duarte*, the danger was foreseeable, and consequently the university's duty was higher. A number of cases involving resident assistants relate to this issue, further emphasizing the need for resident assistant training and adequate supervision.

Proper maintenance of facilities is necessary as shown in *Shannon* v. *Washington University* (1978) in which the university was held liable for a student falling on an icy sidewalk. Other issues which relate to the use of facilities include: universities may charge a reasonable fee for special services and facilities--*Schare* v. *State University of New York at Stony Brook* (1977); housing deposits do not constitute state landlord/tenant relationships--*Houle* v. *Adams State College* (1976); *Cook* v. *University Plaza* (1981); a group cannot be excluded from the use of a public space when a forum is created--*Widmar* v. *Vincent* (1981); *American Future Systems, Inc.* v. *Pennsylvania State University* (1982) (Gehring & Dey, 1983). While these issues may not be of daily concern to residence hall administrators, it is beneficial to obtain such knowledge, which can be used to reduce the risk of lawsuits.

The last legal major issue for residence hall administrators to understand concerns proper search and seizure. The right of reasonable search and seizure is guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution as decided in *Moore* v. *Student Affairs Committee at Troy State University* (1968) (O'Hara & Hill, 1972). In this case, the court ruled that university officials may conduct searches without a warrant if they have reason to believe that the situation would interfere with the educational mission of the university, or to insure the health and safety of students. Any evidence found, however, may only be used in the university judicial process and not in a court of law, thereby ensuring students their constitutional rights. In the case of private institutions, where constitutional rights are not always protected, a statement must be included in the housing agreement or a student handbook to protect students' rights regarding reasonable search and seizure. This statement forms a contract between the student and the university and creates a special relationship between the two. A statement of this kind helps reduce institutional liability.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

Due to the many legal issues residence hall administrators must face, risk management has become an important tool. According to Kaplin (1978), there are four types of risk management. First, risk avoidance is the elimination of the entire risk which means that the university does not participate in a particular risky program or activity. Second, improving the physical environment or modifying behavior is risk control. This would be an extremely viable alternative when dealing with standard of care for facilities. Third, risk transfer is insurance, and finally risk retention is self insurance (i.e. a fund set up for potential lawsuits). Kaplin advocates not only treatment or reactive law but, preventive or proactive law which includes risk management (1985). Legal counsel should also be an integral part of a university's management team (Janosik & Andrew, 1985).

Outlined below is a decision making model which can potentially reduce risk (Janosik & Andrew, 1985). The first step in this model is to identify the source of the liability. As mentioned earlier, university liability stems from contracts or torts. It is important for residence hall administrators to seek advice from experts when starting a new program or implementing a new policy.

Next, the risk needs to be analyzed. This must be done in relation to the institution's goals and objectives. There are three different financial decisions to make when analyzing risk. First, the liability must be matched with the capability of the university to pay for the damages. Second, risk transfer should be used if it is more cost effective than assuming the risk. Finally, if a liability is small it may not be necessary to protect the university against it.

After the risk is analyzed, the likeliness of the loss should be determined. This can be based on historical evidence or an estimate. When making an estimate, an administrator should review current case law and consult experts before finalizing the estimate. A risk reducing strategy should be selected based upon the above three decisions. This strategy should take the form of one of Kaplin's methods of risk management. Finally, the potential risk should be continually monitored and evaluated.

There are three factors a residence hall administrator should remember and employ when trying to manage risk. First, whatever is written down may be considered a contract, and potential liability may arise (Beam & Hines, 1981). Second, familiarity with policies should be promoted to staff members both orally and in writing. This helps clear up gray areas for staff and promotes consistency. Finally, accurate records should be kept (Aiken, 1974). Thorough documentation is always helpful if a lawsuit is brought against a university.

CONCLUSION:

"College and university housing administrators need not be attorneys nor should they try to be. To be effective decision makers, however, they must understand the legal trends affecting their operations" (Gehring & Dey, 1983, p. 505). Residence hall administrators ought to understand their liabilities and duties to protect, warn and supervise (Roe, 1979). Legal risks, however, should not hinder programming efforts (Miller & Schuh, 1981; Roe, 1979). Administrators should not hesitate, though, to consult legal counsel when questions arise (Roe, 1979). As long as administrators act "reasonably" and "prudently" they can avoid litigation and have successful residential life programs (Miller & Schuh, 1981).

This article has outlined some issues which residence hall administrators may encounter. It is their responsibility to know and understand the liabilities that their institutions may face. By employing basic risk management techniques and acting in a reasonable manner, residence hall administrators can remain virtually "litigation free."

REFERENCES

Aiken, R. J. (1974). Tort liability of governing boards, administrators and faculty in higher education. *Journal of Law and Education, 2*, 129-141.

American Future Systems, Inc. v. *Pennsylvania State University*, 51 L.W. 2116 (3rd Cir. 1982).

Baldwin v. *Zoradi*, 176 Cl. Rptrl, 809 (Cal. 1981).

Beam, S. J. & Hines, E. R. (1981). The student institutional relationship: Contract provisions and consumer expectations. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22*, 36-41.

Bradshaw v. *Rawlings*, 612 F2d 135 (Pa. 1979).

Buchanan, E. T. (1983). Alcohol on campus and possible liability. *NASPA Journal, 21*,(2), 21-25.

Buchler, J. F. (1973). Contract law and the student-university relationship. In R. A. Laudicina & J. L. Tramutola (Eds.) *A legal overview of the new student* (pp. 163-172). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Chambers, M. M. (1972). *The college and the courts: The developing law of the student and the college* (Vol. 7). Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers & Publishers.

Cook v. *University Plaza*, 427 N.E. 2d 405 (App. Ct. Ill., 2d Dist. 1981).

Dixon v. *Alabama State Board of Education*, 294 F.2d 150 (5th Cir. 1961).

Duarte v. *State*, 151 Cal. Rptr. 727 (Ct. App. 4th Dist., Div. 1 1979).

Flygare, T. J. (1976). Courts uphold university dormitory regulations. *Phi Delta Kappan, 57*, 473.

Futrell v. *Ahrens*, No. 10, 094 (N.M. 1975).

Gehring, D. D., & Dey, S. (1983). Consumerism in college housing: An empirical analysis of litigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 502-507.

Houle v. *Adams State College*, 547. P. 2d 926 (Col. 1976).

Janosik, S. M. (1983). Liquor law liability on the college campus: When are we responsible? *NASPA Journal, 21*(2), 21-25.

Janosik, S. M., & Andrew, L. D. (1985). Reducing individual and institutional liability in higher education: A decision-making model. *NASPA Journal, 22*(3), 2-9.

Jones v. *Wittenberg*, 534 F.2d. 1203 (6th Cir. 1976).

Kaplin, W. A. (1978). *The law of higher education: Legal implications of administrative decision making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplin, W. A. (1980). *The law of higher education 1980*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplin, W. A. (1985). Law on the campus 1960-1985: Years of growth and challenge. *Journal of College and University Law, 12*, 269-299.

Laudicina, R. A., & Tramutola, J. R., Jr. (1976). *A legal overview of the new student*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Miller, T. E., & Schuh, J. H. (1981). Managing the liability risks of residence hall administrators. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22*, 392-395.

Millington, W. G. (1979). *The law and the college student: Justice in evolution*. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing.

Mollere v. *Southeastern Louisiana College*, 304 F. Supp. 826 (W.D. Ark., Fayetteville, Div. 1969).

Moore v. *Student Affairs Committee of Troy State University*, 284 F. Supp. 725 (M.D. Ala. N.D. 1968).

O'Hara, W. T., & Hill, J. G., Jr. (1972). *The student/The college/The law*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Postrollo v. *University of South Dakota*, 507 F.2d 775 (8th Cir., 1974).

Roe, B. (1979). Staff liability in the residence halls. *The Journal of College and University Student Housing, 9*(2), 6-10.

Schare v. *State University of New York at Stony Brook*, 437 F. Supp. 969 (E.D. N.Y. 1977).

Shannon v. *Washington University*, 575 S.W. 2d 235 (App. Ct. Mo., St. Louis Dist., Div. 3 1978).

Tarasoff v. *Regents of the University of California*, 529 P 2d 533 (Cal. 1974).

VanAlstyne, W. W. (1968). The student as university resident. *Denver Law Journal, 45*, 582-613.

Widmar v. *Vincent*, 102 S. Ct. 269 (1981).

Bernadette DiMaggio graduated from Canisius College in 1986 with a degree in accounting. This past year, she served as the Assistant Coordinator of Teter Quadrangle. She received her M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May, 1988 and is interested in residence life and judicial affairs.

CHILD CARE NEEDS ASSESSMENT OF FEMALE SINGLE PARENT STUDENTS

Shirley F. Barrow

In 1986, 62.8% of American working women had children under 18 years of age. Within this group, the number of women with very young children is rapidly increasing. One in every five of this group is single, divorced, separated, or widowed. Nationwide, over 6.4 million women are single parents (National Commission on Working Women, 1986). According to Hooper and March (1980), these female single parents are returning to universities in increasing numbers. Swift, Mills, and Colvin (1986) cite inadequate campus child care facilities as a problem for these students. This assessment focuses on the child care needs of single female students at a large midwestern university. Results are discussed and the implications of the study are examined.

POPULATION

According to the Office of the Registrar, 53% of the students at this university are female. The population surveyed is that subgroup of female students who are single parents and have sole responsibility for the care of their children.

METHODOLOGY

Three research tools were used in this assessment:

1. A literature review which included (a) current articles, (b) literature from the local Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Association, (c) literature about current programs from the city Human Resources Department, and (d) the 1985 city child care needs survey.

2. Personal interviews with (a) administrators involved in the campus Child Care Coalition, (b) members of the Single Parent Student Support Group, (c) community members involved in the local 4-C Association, and (d) city officials from the Human Resources Department.

3. A survey. A child care questionnaire was randomly distributed among female single parent students during the week of October 26, 1987. The questionnaire asked a series of questions about the adequacy of the respondent's current child care situation and the relationship between an adequate, inexpensive, conveniently-located child care situation and respondents' ability to continue their education.

LIMITATIONS

An exploratory survey was conducted due to time constraints. The survey

data is based on 12 responses. Because of the small sample size, generalizations are not made.

FINDINGS

In this survey, 83% of the respondents are full-time students and 17% are part-time students. The majority (67%) work part-time, 25% do not work, and 8% work full-time. Finally, 58% of the respondents are undergraduate students, and 42% are graduate students.

According to the 1985 city survey and student affairs administrators involved in family housing, there is a need for infant/toddler (birth-24 months) child care. The 1985 city survey and this questionnaire indicated that there is a need for flex-time child care. Flex-time care is defined as time when care is needed outside normal hours of operation (6am-6pm, Monday-Friday) of most providers. The 1985 city survey identified the need for before/after school care. However, the local school corporation's Extended Day Program and the Family Student Council's Schools Out Program seem to be relieving the "latchkey" child problem. About 9% of the time children spend alone occurs in the evening hours (Rodman & Pratto, 1980, in Cole & Rodman, 1987). This study identified isolated cases when young school age children were left alone for short periods of time. Respondents indicated they need evening, night, and weekend child care. Odd work schedules and the need for study time away from their children are reasons that respondents indicated care of sick children is needed. Current services do not provide care for sick children.

Respondents are concerned about the cost of child care. Respondents with preschool children (ages 2-5) spend an average of $40 per child weekly. Good child care is expensive and many respondents must rely heavily on financial aid. They are worried about entering the job market, at traditionally lower salaries, with a large educational debt. Second, when asked if their current provider was conveniently-located, some respondents indicated a recent move to be closer to their providers. In some cases, respondents indicated that it became necessary to purchase an automobile. Finally, all respondents strongly indicated that the availability of child care was important to their ability to continue their education.

IMPLICATIONS

The implication of this study for student affairs administrators is that there is a growing population of students who need adequate on-campus child care. Administrators should come to a decision as to whether or not the role of the university in the student's life is also to include assisting the student both in finding and providing adequate child care. With this limited sample, the need for child care cannot be fully documented. What is needed is an in-depth detailed study. Although limited, this study implies a connection between inadequate child care services and student enrollment and retention. Further research needs to be done to examine the relationship between an adequate, inexpensive, conveniently-located child care situation and students' ability to continue their education.

REFERENCES

Cole, C., & Rodman, H. (1987). When school-age children care for themselves: Issues for family life educators and parents. *Family Relations, 36*(1), 92-96.

Hooper, O., & March, G. B. (1980). The female single parent in the university. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 21*, 141-146.

National Commission on Working Women. (1986). *Child care fact sheet: Working mothers and children.* Washington, DC.

Swift, J. S., Jr., Mills. D., & Colvin, C. (1986). Special programming for displaced homemakers. *Journal of NAWDAC, 50*(1), 3-7.

Shirley F. Barrow received a B.S. in history from Indiana University in May, 1984. She is currently working toward the M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. Her interests lie in international services and university development. This summer she will establish a data bank of international alumni for the Indiana University Office of International Services.

THE REALITY OF BEING A FIRST YEAR PROFESSIONAL

Susan Campbell
Susan Mehlinger

The purpose of this article is to inform graduate students in student affairs of the circumstances surrounding the adjustment to the first professional position. The authors' goal is to promote awareness, rather than prescribe a course of action.

The transition from graduate school to the first student affairs position involves more than physical relocation. Social and institutional factors also play a prominent role in this transition. The first job provides an opportunity to apply the theories learned and practiced in the student affairs graduate program. However, the first year professional may find this knowledge is less important than management, interpersonal, and budgeting skills (Spencer & Carlson, 1987).

Preparation programs stress one or more of three areas: student development, administration, and counseling (Saddlemire, 1987). For example, the CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Service/Development Programs (1986) advocates that a curriculum with a student development emphasis include coursework in Organizational Behavior, American College Student and Environment, Helping Relationships, and Career Development. Some graduates discover that in their new positions few colleagues are familiar with student development theories and, therefore, they often are not incorporated into departmental goals (Julian, 1987).

The political environment of a university may affect the use of student development theory (Julian, 1987). Webster defines politics as "the total complex of relations between people and society." Another definition is offered by Ambrose Bierce: "the conduct of public affairs for private advantage" (Julian, 1987). For example, chief administrators establish goals for the institution but, the motive behind these goals and the manner in which they will be operationalized may not be clear. In addition, goals differ throughout units of the organization. The use of student development theory in student affairs units may not be effective if the institution is not committed to the welfare of the student.

Graduate students often fail to realize the importance of politics in an organization when entering the first position because they lack training in how to be effective managers. As new professionals, an awareness of the elements of an organization is essential. The political environment of an organization influences the institution's receptiveness to one's ideas. For instance, both formal and informal organizational charts exist (Kuh, 1983). The formal, written charts, however, may not resemble the unspoken chain of command of the informal charts. The new professional should be aware of the existence of both charts since they can affect program implementation. Also, the recent graduate should know the history of both the university and the department because this can affect the success of programs. If an idea has been tried before and has failed, the acceptance of that idea may be faced with hesitancy unless the first year professional proposing the idea can devise a new and better strategy.

Some student affairs professionals enter the field because they enjoy the student lifestyle (Spencer & Carlson, 1987). The practical experiences acquired during graduate school do little to dissuade this feeling of eternal "studenthood." However, university administration has norms that are different than those of students. Time constraints and work ethics for professionals differ from those of graduate students. In addition, one is no longer a paraprofessional and thus relationships with students change. With good interpersonal skills, one is able to gain the respect of students and administrators while encouraging the development of the mentor-protege relationship.

This issue of respect continues to the work setting. The first year professional may find him/herself in a position of supervising an office staff that may not be receptive to the ideas and orders of someone new, especially if age and experience are factors. For example, a secretary may have twenty years of experience in the department and have worked with only one supervisor in that time. The individual entering this situation needs to be aware of the existing norms and attempt to operate within them. Overwhelming the staff with new ideas and rules will not aid implementation. The respect of the staff is the key to cooperation. Success will occur through effective interpersonal skills such as decision making, leadership, and mediating skills (Spencer & Carlson, 1987). The new professional may spend more time mediating staff conflicts than s/he ever imagined (Julian, 1987).

Finally, knowledge of the budgeting process is important for recent graduates. Through assistantships and internships in graduate school, students have little, if any, responsibilities in budgeting. This lack of experience may result in little knowledge of how to manage resources. When entering a job, it is likely that the budget will already be in place for the fiscal year. Also, the new professional should know who the caretaker of the budget is. Furthermore, the first year professional needs to identify the flexibility of the budget when planning a program.

The issues of management, interpersonal and budgeting skills can contribute to a student affairs professional's decision to leave the field. Holmes, Verrier and Chisholm (1983) reported an attrition rate of 60 percent by the sixth year for student personnel workers. Another factor is the limited advancement possibilities for professionals holding only a master's degree. One should

remember that in order to achieve the ranks of higher administration, the doctoral degree is mandatory (Saddlemire, 1987). Therefore, those who are seeking quick advancement opportunities tend to find positions outside student affairs.

This article is not meant to discourage graduate students in hopes of acquiring a position in student affairs. Rather, the goal of the authors is to convey some of the realities of the university work setting. Graduate students should take advantage of courses outside of their programmed curriculum to develop skills in management, budgeting, and interpersonal relationships. Although these courses will provide a foundation, adjusting to the job may depend more upon the new professional's adaptability to a university work setting.

REFERENCES

Brown, R. D. (October, 1987). A matter of style: How you learn what you learn. *Campus Activities Programming*, *20*(4), 54-59.

Connelly, M. M. (September , 1987). Getting on the right track. *The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International*, *55*(5), 4-7.

Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs. (1986). *CAS Standards and Guidelines for Student Services/Development Programs*, p 111.

Julian, F. H. (October, 1987). Reality 101: Lessons for new professionals. *Campus Activities Programming*, *20*(4), 61-66.

Saddlemire, G. L. (October, 1987). To what degree are you willing to go. *Campus Activities Programming*, *20*(4), 43-47.

Spencer, M. G. & Carlson, J. M. (September, 1987). The first year: Establishing your professionalism. *The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International*, *55*(5), 8-11.

Susan Campbell received her bachelor of science degree in psychology from Louisiana State University. She received an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May, 1988. Currently, she is a placement counselor in the Education Placement Office and hopes to pursue a career in career planning and placement or student activities.

Susan Mehlinger earned a bachelor's degree in business from the Indiana University School of Business in May, 1985. In May, 1988, she received an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. She plans to enter the field of student affairs in either athletics academic advising, orientation and/or career counseling.

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. FRAN STAGE

J. J. Thorp

Dr. Fran Stage is in her second year on the faculty at Indiana University. She has a B.S. in Mathematics from the University of Miami (1972), an M.S. in Mathematics from Drexel University (1973), and an Ed.D. in Higher Education Student Affairs from Arizona State University (1986).

You had an interesting history, kind of an atypical background. How did you get into the student affairs field?

I began by teaching math in college. I did that for seven or eight years. As I was teaching math, I became more and more fascinated with certain aspects of education. How do students learn and why do they drop out? I taught at a community college and at Arizona State University. In both cases I had students who would be doing fine, then they would disappear. After a number of years, I became interested in some of the things that didn't have to do with math equations. These things prompted me to go back to school and get a degree in higher education.

As I studied what helps students learn and why they succeed, I began to formulate my own hypotheses. I would read research and think of different approaches. I became interested in doing studies myself. In my first year, several professors asked me to work with them on an article tracking grade inflation to test for a cohort effect. Were the incoming classes indeed brighter than the previous students or was there grade inflation? Working on that paper was fun and interesting; more fun and interesting than classes. My career path began to turn in that direction as I got positive feedback. Toward the end of my studies, I looked for faculty positions. I looked at Indiana and Ohio State among others, and here I am.

What do you think of Indiana University so far?

I like I.U. One of the positive aspects is how supportive the faculty members are. I've always felt people value what I'm doing, and people always consult one another before they make decisions. They do all those important things that organizations should be doing, but don't always do. My work in the Academic Affairs office at A.S.U. gave me knowledge and experience with bad situations, so I appreciate this department. Nothing like a few bad experiences to help you appreciate the good ones.

Are you happy with the curricular change that have been made?

Yes, I am. Before the changes, we had a lock step curriculum. Everyone went through almost exactly the same courses. I think the new curriculum is a step in the direction of recognizing that student affairs is a broad field and there are a wide range of interests among the students in the program. Although it may be easier to lock them all into the same program, we should allow some flexibility.

Do you see more changes in the near future?

Yes. Given Don's (Hossler) and my philosophy about this, I can't imagine us being locked in. I can see us making adjustments as we go, a flexible curriculum. It would be negative if we just locked into something and maintained it for 10 years because it was a lot of work to change. So as the years go by, the curriculum will evolve. As issues change, the special topics or one credit courses will change. Right now those issues seem to me to be fairly basic: the law, administrative practices, the multicultural campus.

Do you see any similarities in the students that come through the program at Indiana?

When I came to Indiana I wasn't sure what a large student affairs class would be like. I quickly decided one of the positive aspects of the program was the wide range of students. They run from one extreme to the other. Overall, I would say the students are professional and demanding, in a positive way, about their academics. Students are enthusiastic and positive. All those things fit together to make this a very exciting job. Students push me to do a better job. Being here at Indiana also pushes me to do a good job. There is a reputation here that I have to maintain. I have to maintain it in my research and in the students that we graduate from the program. We have many good students and that is real exciting.

What are your plans and goals for the future? The next 10 or 15 years?

If someone asked me what job I would have if I could have any job in the world, I would say a college professor. Here I am. In the next seven years I hope I'm still here. It would mean I have been successful in many ways; helping students move through the program, meeting their short term professional goals, helping people learn more about college students and their experiences on the college campus, and providing support and services to higher educational institutions in general. My long term goals follow from this. I see myself being a program head, but my medium range goals are what I'm focusing on.

Do you see any significant changes in the student affairs realm in the coming years?

I think the changes are going to be changes in approaches to issues rather than in the issues themselves. The issues are clear and I think we will spend the next ten years learning to deal with things differently. One of the biggest issues is the problem of the student who is not of the mainstream on the college campus. Not only minorities, the obvious minorities, but also the less visible minorities, the first generation college student, the learning disabled student, the gay or lesbian student, or the student who was abused as a child. It is becoming clear that we have not been very successful in our efforts to help the minority students get along. Those students still leave at very high rates. I hope in the next 10 to 15 years there will be a change of attitude. We will stop noticing that student are black, or Hispanic. They will just be students and we will talk to them as individuals with an individual set of problems that could be just like the next person's. In order to do that, we have to do more listening and less reading about generalizations. The generalizations seem to have done more harm than good. We should help them as individuals.

Do you have any research that you're working on right now?

One of the most interesting things about my job is reading and generating ideas. I'm interested in student development theory and the trouble practitioners have using it. Students in my classes want to know how to connect theory and practice. The connection is always problematic. It's problematic in counseling, psychology, business, or in any field. It's easy to study business theory but, when you're managing a store, how do you apply Maslow's hierarchy of needs? Lately, I've become interested in that connection. Students in my classes will hear me talking about process models.

One of the gaps in student development theory literature is the lack of theory on minority students. It will be an area of focus for me in the next couple of years. Most of the theory has been developed based on mainstream people. The Perry theory is developed using males at Harvard. It will be interesting to see, and maybe be a part of, the expansion of those theories and their application.

There are a lot of highly quantitative studies about why students leave cóllege, why students change majors and how we predict satisfaction or G.P.A. Separate from that literature are studies about who students are and how they develop. People who study outcomes don't pay much attention to who students are and how they develop. People who study who students are and how they develop don't pay much attention to the supposed positive outcomes we all want to help students attain. I'm interested in filling that gap with my research.

J.J. Thorp received a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Vermont in 1987. This past year, he served as the Assistant Coordinator of Read Center. He hopes to pursue a position in residence life upon receipt of a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May, 1989.

ALCOHOL - THE PERENNIAL TOPIC
One Dean's View

James W. Lyons

The subject of alcohol use and abuse is a topic that is almost always discussed when student affairs deans gather. A quick perusal of NASPA national and regional meetings over the past four decades will convince one that alcohol or related topics are a constant part of our professional dialogue. For many deans, a substantial amount of time is spent on alcohol issues on their respective campuses; crafting and enforcing policies and rules; and designing treatment and educational programs. During the past three decades, however, the topic has broadened. We now talk about substance abuse; alcohol is but one of many substances that are abused.

Are these matters that are often given short shift in professional training programs? It may be so, and if it is, it may be because, as a profession, we have always been a bit reluctant to fess up to our "control" functions. We talk more about our educational roles, and about individual development. Shaping and especially enforcing campus policies doesn't have nearly the same glamour. But like it or not, these roles are part of the work of our profession. If we approach them with skill, there can be strong connections made with our educational roles.

SOME COMMON "SLIPS" WHEN DISCUSSING SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Talking about substance use and abuse can be tricky because the language is imprecise. Words and phrases often mean different things to different people.

When we refer to drug abuse, do we mean the simple use of illegal drugs? Is just using marijuana wrong? Or is it wrong only when someone uses too much of it? Or in the wrong place at the wrong time? How about "crack" and other forms of cocaine?

Where does alcohol fit in discussions about substance abuse? Are alcoholics drug abusers? Are people who are under 21 and drink too much abusers? Any more or less so than those over 21? Are under age drinkers who drink in moderation drug abusers?

In short, "drug or substance abuse" sometimes means unlawful drug use, or unhealthy drug use, or drug related activities that imperil others such as drunk driving. Sometimes it refers to unfair drug use (like gaining a competitive advantage over others in sports and exams).

As is so often the case when crafting or discussing policies, it is often wise to spend some time with the question, "What's the problem?" Clarify things before getting very far into a discussion, especially before reaching to solutions.

Against this background I would like to offer my personal view of the state of "substance abuse" these days, and some of the new and interesting policy implications we face. Then I want then to turn to some of the collegiate responses that are being made to substance abuse. While I will offer no programs I would like to offer seven assumptions, that if used, will almost surely guarantee flawed programs or policies.

CAN RATIONAL THOUGHT PENETRATE OUR NATIONAL HYSTERIA?

Our national mood these days is being shaped by vigorous reactions to real and perceived increases in drug abuse. That mood is fueled by political posturing, a near hysteria over cocaine, a genuine public concern that illegal drugs are too prevalent, and public debate about how best to curb drug abuse. That debate reaches clearly to our foreign policy when we see the Secretary of Education call for the use of the military to intervene in countries that manufacture drugs and export them to the United States, and to our national security policies that often call for our country to overlook drug production and trafficking by Latin American and Asian countries in the interest of "national security."

We need not look much beyond our own campuses to see evidence of the hysteria. Solutions and programs are often quickly designed and hastily put in place. Only later do the troublesome consequences that could have been seen earlier show up to plague our institutions. Students have already been affected by recent waves of public and institutional interventions, and there's more to come. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has crafted and implemented policies mandating drug testing of athletes that have affected hundreds of students across the country. Some schools have implemented their own drug testing programs that are quite separate from the NCAA program, and which reach to even more athletes. Students are required (some say coerced) to sign statements agreeing to be tested by the NCAA should they or their teams enter post-season competition. If they do not agree, they are denied the chance to be on varsity teams.

These programs have been implemented despite an embarrassing lack of information about the effects that some drugs have on athletic performance, about the efficacy of the tests themselves, and the theories that were used to build the list. Why, for example, are street drugs on the list if they have little or nothing to do with enhancing performance? Are they there to avoid embarrassing coaches, teams, or schools? What drugs might product false positives? For example, will drinking a cup of tea fifteen minutes prior to a test cause the outcome to be positive? Are educators really comfortable with knowing that the best tests give false negative results about 5% of the time? While these and other questions were not a part of campus discussions, they are now, as the

implications of drug testing begin to sink in.

Other students, however, are not free from the drug testing craze. Nearly a third of the firms that recruit at universities these days require drug tests as a condition of employment. Many students seeking government jobs (and internships?) will face drug testing requirements. Students in ROTC will be required to undergo testing for the presence of the AIDS virus antibodies. The same is true for other students seeking careers in the military. Drug testing is also a part of the repertoire of the military and intelligence services.

The federal government funds much of the research in both colleges and universities. How soon will it be before universities encounter strings attached to their research contracts that seek to ensure that the research team must be drug free? Colleges are already being asked to certify that they have comprehensive drug education programs as a condition for their students to receive financial aid. Such testing and enforcement practices inevitably generate concerns about erosion of civil liberties, especially the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure and the right to due process. Some see troublesome relationships between drug testing and AIDS testing. Others fear the zeal of the federal ideologues who seek to impose their "solutions" on to higher education community.

What is interesting is that the recent federal programs to foster a "Drug Free America" barely mention alcohol as an abused drug. It is downplayed as a matter of policy. Why?

ALCOHOL IS, BY FAR, THE MOST ABUSED DRUG

The substance that is most often abused on campuses (as in society generally) is alcohol. The abuse is a widespread problem. Too many students are using too much alcohol too frequently. Few campuses can claim that they have no alcoholics on their faculty, in their administration, or among their staff.

Student affairs deans regularly report that most conduct problems are related to drinking. Each incoming class will include a few students who are alcoholics: they are dependent on alcohol, cannot control their use of it, and organize their lives around its use. All deans have seen cases where a student has become socially and intellectually deficient because of alcohol use. Each year college health services and nearby hospital emergency rooms treat cases of drug overdose. A few students die; more almost die. Alcohol is far and away the drug most overdosed. Two of my professional and personal friends, both graduate school classmates, died of complications arising out of their dependence on alcohol.

As is the case with most of society, there is little relationship between drinking laws and drinking behavior. Consequently, enforcement agencies find it difficult, if not impossible to enforce the laws. In any event, enforcement is minimal and spotty. It should not be surprising that many public officials and law enforcement agencies want (and even expect) universities to enforce the public law, even though that's not our job.

Alcohol USE, on the other hand, is firmly embedded in the culture of most campuses; it is a part of the social and ceremonial rituals on most campuses; the tailgaiters, the "sherry hour," cocktails before dinner, the keg parties, wine tasting events, and toasting a celebrant. Some athletic departments even join with brewers to advertise (and thus culturally connect) sports and beer. Distillers and brewers spend much money advertising in campus newspapers and some alumni magazines. Official university events are often incomplete without wine or some alcoholic beverage. Kegs are often the hearthstone of student parties. So use is, or at least seems to be, accepted. Alcohol ABUSE, however is not an acceptable part of the campus culture. Yet, it is with us and it seems more pronounced than in earlier years. Even though alcohol abuse is not accepted, it does not generate the concern it deserves, especially in relationship to illicit drugs. Consequently elsewhere, it is one of the most difficult problems to address effectively.

So alcohol continues to be a fixture on our campuses, just as it is in American society. Many people use it reasonably, as an occasional beverage with a meal or in some recreational or social situations. Some people, however, have trouble with alcohol. They use it to excess, which in turn diminishes the quality of their lives and the lives of those around them. Therefore, I believe that the aim of our collegiate educational and medical programs and policies should be to have those who choose to use alcohol avoid becoming abusers. Except for the very rare campus, it is futile to pretend that college students can be denied the choice about whether or not to use alcohol. When will we ever learn that prohibition won't work?

CRAFTING GOOD POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Just because drug and alcohol abuse problems have been with us for many generations does not mean that they will not yield to effective policies and programs. As we look ahead, we need to keep two thoughts in mind. Like so many problems of humankind, alcohol abuse will never go away; we'll not fix it once and for all. So get ready for the long haul and recognize that we can bring about some changes, and that even small changes can improve the quality of life and lives on our campuses. Secondly, we should recognize that many swell looking and glamorous programs have not worked. Yet their glamour tempts us to try versions of them again and again - never recognizing that some of the premises on which they rest are seriously flawed. Before we break even more of our picks, let's examine some of those flawed assumptions. I offer a few of the more common.

1) The use and abuse of illicit drugs are more of a problem than alcohol abuse on our campuses.

Study after study shows us that this is not so. Sure, illicit drugs are a problem on nearly all campuses. But, the incidence of use and problematic consequences pale by comparison with alcohol abuse and its consequences. Yet, we test athletes for møst drugs other than alcohol. Recruiting employers show little interest in alcohol use by potential employees, yet they experience significant employee absenteeism and performance problems due to alcohol abuse.

Somehow, our campuses do not focus as much on alcohol abuse as we do on the abuse of other drugs. Yet, we decry the role that alcohol abuse plays in overdose emergencies, in hazing, in academic deficiencies, in death and injury, in violent behavior, in date rape, and in shaping qualities of our environment that detract from good learning and scholarship.

2) Knowledge determines behavior; "if they only knew they wouldn't!"

How many of our respective drug and alcohol education programs rest on the assumption that the provision of information about drugs (usually information about associated dangers) will deter the use of those drugs? Too many. Our literature is full of studies that show that those who are most informed about drugs are those who use them the most.

Student affairs deans and their colleagues base many of their programs and services on the premise that feelings affect thinking, learning, and behavior. While their intellect is celebrated, students are whole persons who are also developing their psychological, social, sexual, ethical, physical and spiritual selves. It seems to me that these are the contexts that are most often associated with drug abuse. If so, these are powerful enough to override the intellect when it comes to deciding about situations involving the use (and perhaps abuse) of drugs and alcohol. Why cannot more of our collegiate programs take the more complicated road and approach substance abuse with the sure knowledge that students feel as well as think and that their feelings can and do significantly affect their behavior?

3) Behavior can be significantly shaped by regulation.

There is some truth in this assumption, but not enough to rest comfortably with a policy or program that leans heavily on it. Regulation or passing laws work best when there is a clear consensus about the "common good," and when a law relates clearly to that common good. But we have a long history of unenforced rules, and rules that were effectively discarded long before someone got around to legislating them away.

The second best example of this is to be found in the annuals of the Prohibition Era - the grand legislative assault that didn't work. The best example, however, remains the common public law that forbids drinking by citizens under 19 or 21. Has that law significantly shaped the drinking behavior of the under-aged? Of course not.

4) Colleges should enforce public laws.

Wrong! Colleges should abide by laws. And they should help their members do the same be setting expectations of lawfulness and by informing members of the collegiate community of relevant laws. But where is it written that colleges and their officers are law enforcers or enforcement agencies? Our role is that of educators. That role would be severely crippled and compromised were we also to serve as enforcers of the public law.

5) Colleges are, can, or should be sanctuaries from the enforcement of public laws.

There was a time in American higher education when this was a true and common assumption. It was a companion piece to "en loco parentis" which anchored, among other things, the assumption that schools should assume parent-like relationships to their students. In many ways, the family home still is something of a sanctuary for minors. If a minor gets in trouble police still call the family - the implication being that the parents should take responsibility and intervene and "handle" the matter. That was the common approach for college students in earlier days. A student who got into trouble (say, drunk in public) would not be put in the drunk tank along with grown-up drunks. Rather, the police would call the dean to come and retrieve the student and "take care" of him or her. And that is what happened. Colleges assumed that the student was their responsibility. So did the police and local judges.

But students are no longer minors; the age of majority moved from 21 to 18 during the 1960's. Students have no fewer nor more rights than other citizens. And colleges are not inclined to "take care of their own" when it comes to enforcing public laws. The days when the campus was a sanctuary are long past. Those times will not return, even though there are currently some pressures for colleges to return to some of those earlier practices; pressures from enforcement agencies and occasionally from parents who would just as soon have their son or daughter protected from the harshness of real live law enforcement.

6) College rules should mimic public laws.

Wrong again! It is generally accepted that college policies exist for educational reasons. Those educational reasons are likely to result in college laws that protect and enhance an academic community. More often than not, they differ from the public law. The most obvious reason is that the school need not mimic the public law. It is already on the books and should be subject to enforcement neither more nor less than anywhere else. The campus isn't a sanctuary; public laws apply there.

The less obvious reasons for differing policies are associated with the special characteristics of an academic community. Take intellectual dishonesty, for example. That is hardly a serious issue in the public sector. We have all learned to hold advertising suspect. We ask, "Can this or that claim be believed?" We really do not hold our public officials to stern tests of truthfulness. Rather, we

have come to accept a stance of disbelief; we not only question the judgements of public officials but we also question the veracity of the information they claim to have used to support the judgements. We even see public officials lauded because their public dishonesty and deceit was honorably motivated - as in the case of the Iran/Contra scandal. Honesty in the academy, however, is taken much more seriously. That's understandable because scholarship and research depend on the integrity of the preceding work of others, and the special relationship between teacher and student must be marked by trust. If that trust is betrayed by an act of academic dishonesty, the relationship is virtually destroyed. Hence, colleges regard dishonesty much more seriously than most other social institutions. They don't give medals for lying, cheating, and plagarizing. They don't look the other way. They give walking papers and suspensions. It is also often the case that educational institutions will give different weight to transgressions than would the public judicial systems

Policies regarding alcohol and drug use can also be different from the public laws. For example, under-age drinking is not really an issue with many institutions. Alcohol abuse is. Why should educators by any less concerned about a 25-year old student alcoholic than a 19-year old student alcoholic? Neither can function as well as they should. So most college policies (or practices) ignore the 21-year old drinking age. That is in the public law. But if, by policy, there are interventions in cases of drug and alcohol abuse, most of those interventions take little account of the student's age.

Colleges, then, need not simply replicate public laws. When they do, it should be for purely educational reasons.

7) Colleges should be neutral on matters of drug abuse.

There are those who hold that drug abuse is private behavior and, as such, is not the proper business of the college or university. Others manage somehow to misapply notions of academic freedom. Just as students must be free to savor the free market place of ideas, so too, should they be free to experiment with chemical alteration of their moods.

Educational institutions should not be neutral about such matters. We do care, and for good reason. The recreational abuse, and sometimes the simple use of psychoactive drugs is antithetical to education. Taking drugs to take one's mind out of circulation is stupid behavior. So is using street drugs of unknown dosage and purity. There are many public laws that prohibit such use and students are subject to those laws like everyone else. Why take the unnecessary risks of arrest and public judicial hassles that will surely have an adverse affect on one's ability to be a productive student?

Finally, we know that virtually all students have the choice to use and abuse drugs. Why pretend that students don't have those choices when we know that they do? Isn't it better to gear our approaches to helping students make good choices? And doesn't that happen better when colleges are clear about why they are concerned about the abuse of drugs? If so, that suggests something quite different from a neutral stance on such matters.

FOR FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

Student affairs professionals need to root out some of the weak premises on which so many apparently good, but unsuccessful programs and policies have been based. Can better assumptions be advanced? In doing so, can we approach these tasks as educators and not legislators or public law enforcers? Can we create a campus climate marked by support and caring for the welfare of individuals in the academic community? Can we keep the educational purposes of our institutions in better view? Can we apply what is known about the factors that are most significant in shaping and altering behavior? Can we avoid phony neutrality and create "climates of disapproval" of personal and educationally destructive behaviors? When students leave our institutions, will we have helped them make good choices about the use of one of society's oldest drugs - alcohol?

James Lyons is Dean of Student Affairs at Stanford University. He did his undergraduate studies at Allegheny College and his graduate studies at the Indiana University School of Education where he received his M.S. in 1956 and Ed.D in 1963. In 1985, he received the Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumus Award from the Department of College Student Personnel.

IUSPA
Education 236
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 2
Bloomington, Ind.
47405