PERSONNEL SERVICES AND THE MARRIED STUDENT
by Daniel M. Newland

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aller, Florence D., "Some Factors in Marital Adjustment and Academic Achievement of Married Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 41 (March 1963), pp. 609-611.

Dressel, Fred B., An evaluation of selected personnel services offered to married students at Indiana University. Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Indiana University, 1963.

Dressel, Fred B., "Logic, research, and the married college student," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43 (1965), pp. 920-924.

Jones, Worth R., "Affective Tolerance and Typical Problems of Married and Unmarried College Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37 (October 1958), pp. 126-128.

King, Donald N., & Fess, Frederick E., "A pilot Program for Married Students," The Journal of College Student Personnel, (1969), pp. 324-327.

Lantagne, Joseph E., "Do Married Men Succeed in College? College Marriage Inventory," The Journal of School Health, 29 (February 1959), pp. 81-91.

Marshall, H., & King, M. P., "Undergraduate student marriage: A compilation of research findings," Journal of Marriage and Family, (1966), pp. 349-359.

Morris, Elizabeth L., Married Undergraduate Couples at Indiana University 1955-1957, Master's thesis, Graduate School, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1957.

Nygreen, Glen T. Marital Adjustment in the University of Washington Married Student Community, Doctor's thesis, School of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, 1954.

Oppelt, N. T., "Characteristics and activities of married college students," Journal of College Student Personnel, (1965), 6, pp. 223-232.

Rogers, Everett M., "Effect of Campus Marriages on Participation in College Life," 33 (Winter 1958), College and University, pp. 193-199.

Thorpe, Alice C., "How Married Students Manage," Marriage and Family Living, 13 (August 1951), pp. 104-105.

THE OMBUDSMAN: WHO IS HE?
by Charlie Nelms

Monroe K. Rowland, quoted in the April 1970 issue of the NASPA Journal, views the ombudsman on the college campus as "the complaint taker who cuts red tape and hopefully gets results, or at least finds answers for unhappy citizens. His tools are prestige, publicity, persuasion and criticism in addition to his investigative powers. However. . . the very fact that the ombudsman is hired, because of problems in the system and to change the system, he is a threat." Rowland presents a relatively accurate picture of the ombudsman. There are, however, several other factors involved.

The ombudsman is sometimes expected to be too many things to too many people. He is incorrectly conceived by most people. Students see him as the administration's "spy" or "agent"; college officials who disagree with his appointment often view him as being student oriented or a "yes man" for the students; college alumni view him as one more person on the already too large college staff. In times of campus disruptions all these perceptions are common among the members of the college community.

The ombudsman in my personal view is an individual working for the benefit of the total university community even if it means taking a "student stand" at one point and the "administration's stand" at another. He is a facilitator helping students to gain the most from the university and its offerings. He aids the university by becoming aware of the students concerns and opinions in order that the services of the university can be constantly improved and updated to meet the needs and desires of an ever-changing heterogenous student population.

Communication and open-mindness are by far two of the most valuable tools for success. The ombudsman is very much like a salesman--his products are his ideas. If he cannot sell his ideas to people who are willing to develop and implement them then he fails. Since the ombudsman does not possess any "real power" and since he does not have charge of a staff whereby he can implement his own ideas, he must rely heavily upon those responsible for his appointment for support. Since rapport is important to his work a constant respect for his colleagues and the students must be maintained at all times even though ideologies may differ.

The ombudsman has to be a person who meets the approval of all segments of the college community - students, faculty and administration--because much of his effectiveness depends on how others see him. After serving as an ombudsman for a year and a half I have come to the conclusion that "valid communication" with students and with colleagues is the most effective tool for bringing about the desired change. The ombudsman must be versatile, he must be able to speak, interpret and understand the students' and administrators' language. The ombudsman cannot afford to stay glued to his desk

and wait for students to seek him out. He must show an interest in students by both his present and previous actions. Unless he shows some concern for their interests, students are likely to stereotype the ombudsman as just another person in the system.

His job is to help put back the personal touch into higher education. His actions can and will indicate to students whether the university is interested in them or not. If the ombudsman believes in the "generation gap" he is doomed to failure from the outset. He must be able to recognize the difference between "what is" and "what should be", have the ability to make constructive criticisms and make use of persausion to bring about desired change.

The criteria for selection of the ombudsman vary from one institution to the other; some universities appoint tenured faculty members; other campuses choose ministers connected with the school while still other colleges appoint young, recent alumni as the campus ombudsman. I was fortunate enough to be a member of the latter group. After serving as student body president in my senior year, I was chosen ombudsman at 21 years of age.

According to the administration I was chosen because of the rapport I had established with students, faculty and administrators and not because of my long time affiliation with the college. The ombudsman's age can aid or hinder the sensitive tasks of the office. Some people felt that I did not possess the experience nor the knowledge required for such a post. Yet students saw me as one of them, someone they could relate to, not just another part of the campus establishment. No matter who is chosen, institutions who have appointed ombudsmen must be committed in more than words.

Based on my limited experience, I believed that the idea of an ombudsman will work if given ample time and support by those who are a part of the collegiate scene. One problem, however, is likely to persist; the ombudsman is expected to be too many things, to too many people.

TWO VIEWS OF THE OPEN ADMISSIONS CONTROVERSY

by Joel M. Marlin

Does everyone who wants to go to college have the right to go, regardless of his academic record or the quality of his previous education? There are many answers, pro and con, to this question, which contribute to the current open admissions controversy. Numerous articles, which have been written on the topic, have tended to focus on viewpoints that are either for or against, while relatively few have examined the topic from all sides. In this study, the author has compiled information to present the two primary views concerning the open admissions controversy.

At the heart of the argument put forth by the opponents of an open admissions system, is the feeling that not everyone is suited for higher education, and that it is wrong to lower standards and thus, the quality of an institution, in order to make college attendance universal.[1] One of the most outspoken critics of open admissions is Vice President Spiro T. Agnew. Mr. Agnew has stated that it is a cruel waste of God-given talents to require a student of genuine ability to sit for hours in a classroom with those neither able nor prepared, and to permit him to be intellectually stalled at the level of the slowest students.[2] He goes on to suggest that rather than lowering the standards of higher education, the level of the unqualified student's preparation and achievement must be raised so that he can successfully hold his own in active, healthy competition with other students. This can be done by providing that more compensatory education, extra summer study, and special prep schools are readily available to the unqualified student as preparation for entering into college.[3] This would also be fair to the unqualified student in that it would keep him from being permanently scarred as a result of trying and failing, due to inadequate preparation, Mr. Agnew asserts.

Some others have feared that open admissions would drive away the better student who would lack a challenge in having to compete with the unprepared.[4] The able student might also choose to leave because the accommodations of those who are unqualified would produce massive enrollments and even more depersonalization than we already have on our campuses. It is also feared by the opponents that further cluttering of our universities would bring on inefficiency and unrest. As Mr. Agnew puts it, "Even now, with 8 million students on the campuses of this country, there are tens of thousands there who did not come for the learning experience and who are restless, purposeless, bored and rebellious. College, at one time considered a privilege, is today considered a right and is valued less because of that. Concentrations of disoriented students create an immense potential for disorder."[5] Some educators have pointed toward the Italian system of open admission and warned that the same pattern could result in this country. In Italy, the number of people holding diplomas has increased immensely in the past few years to the point where these are considered bargain basement diplomas and