

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) 855-0212

JOURNAL STAFF

Editors	Review Board	Faculty Advisor
Diane L. Robinson Anne E. Spidler	Susan Canady Mary Beth Gasman Denise Gensor Beth Goldstein Crystal Johnson John S. Logan Cheryl Matherly Don McCarty Karen M. Ondercin John Skelton Tracy M. Tyree	George Kuh

IUSPA OFFICERS 1991

President.....Mark Hallett
Vice President.....Laurie Ellertson
Secretary.....Elisabeth Sherrill
Treasurer.....Patty Muller
Dir. of Relations..Amy Blackburn

IUSPA OFFICERS 1990

President.....Colette Chickris
Vice President.....Debbie Nelson
Secretary.....Cheryl Matherly
Treasurer.....Matt Wawrzynski
Dir. of Relations.....Sue McIntyre

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 and the Department of Residence Life. The major source of contribution is the Fund for Excellence in the School of Education. The *Journal* is produced 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

1990-1991 Edition

CONTENTS

Editors' Comments	iv
Diane L. Robinson Anne E. Spidler	
State of the Program	1
Frances Stage	
Orientation: In Aggressive Pursuit of Diversity	3
Patty Muller	
Guidelines for Anti-Harassment Policies for Public Universities	14
Cheryl Matherly	
Community Service on Campus	21
Diane L. Robinson	
Satisfaction Guaranteed: Considerations for the Job Search	28
Karen M. Ondercin Tracy M. Tyree	
The Fiduciary Relationship: Defining the Student/Institution	34
Relationship from Another Perspective Michael McCleve	

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
Dr. Frances Stage	1988-1989
Dr. Don Hossler	1989-1990
Dr. George Kuh	1990-1991

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
 Barbara Moudy, 1974
 David Stacy, 1974
 Dann Lobsinger, 1974, 1975
 Ann Deborah Alter, 1975
 Karen Farmer, 1976
 Diane Burnside, 1976
 Richard Scott, 1976
 Susan Hopp, 1977
 Frank Ardaiole, 1977
 Vince Carunchia, 1977
 Elizabeth A. Zavodny, 1978

Marc Kaplan, 1978
 Jim Scroth, 1978, 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, 1989
 Patricia Harned, 1989, 1990
 Diane L. Robinson, 1990, 1991
 Anne E. Spittler, 1991

EDITORS' COMMENTS

This year's issue of the *Journal* reflects the diversity of interests of current College Student Personnel Administration master's students. The authors examined a variety of current issues pertinent to student affairs professionals at all levels. We hope that the articles will provide you with insights and ideas you can incorporate into your work and share with other professionals at your institution.

The articles this year were written from the authors' personal and professional experiences in their work with college students as well as from topics introduced in CSPA courses. Diversity remains an ever-present topic on college and university campuses. "Orientation: In Aggressive Pursuit of Diversity" affirms the necessity of promoting appreciation of all student populations by targeting efforts toward entering students. "Guidelines for Anti-Harassment Policies for Public Universities" examines the First Amendment of the Constitution as it applies to the college student populations and policy-making on college campuses. "Community Service on Campus" describes an approach to strengthening campus community service through the development of centralized operations on individual campuses. Finally, a literature review and series of interviews provides the basis for "Satisfaction Guaranteed: Considerations for the Job Search," which outlines recommendations for student affairs professionals in their job searches. Alumnus Michael McCleve presents his perspective on the relationship between students and the institution in "The Fiduciary Relationship: Defining Student/Institution Relationship From Another Perspective."

Several people contributed to the production of this year's edition of the *Journal*. We recognize and thank the outstanding review board for their time and careful deliberation of articles submitted, the authors for their enthusiasm and willingness to revise their articles for inclusion, George Kuh for his editorial expertise and training of the *Journal* staff, Geoff McKim for preparing the layout of the *Journal*, and Becky Brock for designing the cover. Special thanks go to our alumnus author, Michael McCleve.

Finally, we express our appreciation to the Indiana University Fund for Excellence and the Department of Residence Life, whose funding makes the publication of the *Journal* possible.

Diane L. Robinson received a B.A. in Speech Communication from Texas A&M University in 1989. She served as a leadership specialist in Briscoe Quadrangle and as a career counselor in the Career Development Center. She plans to continue her work in student affairs administration.

Anne E. Spittler received a B.S. in Human Services from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in 1989. She served as a placement counselor in the Educational Placement Office and will graduate in 1992.

AWARDS

Congratulations to these members of the Indiana University family on achieving the following distinctions.

Robert L. Ackerman	Robert H. Shaffer Award
John Bean	Coordinator, Higher Education program
Carol Cummins-Collier	ACPA Member-at-Large
Don Hossler	Chair, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Deborah E. Hunter	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Alumna Award
Patty Muller	COMU-- Outstanding Contributions to Cultural Diversity
Diane L. Robinson & Tracy M. Tyree	Winners, NASPA Region IV East Case Study Competition
Frances Stage	ASHE Promising Young Scholar Award
	IU-Bloomington Outstanding Young Faculty Member Award
	Coordinator, CSPA program
Louis C. Stamatakis	ACPA Contribution to Knowledge Award
Jamie Washington	ACPA Member-at-Large
Terry Williams	ACPA President-Elect

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Nominations of individuals for the 1992 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 master's 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." Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include; Vicki Mech-Fields, Keith Miser, Louis Stamatakis, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, and Frank Ardaiole.

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. Previous Shaffer award recipients include John Welty, David Ambler, L. "Sandy" MacLean, Thomas Hennessy, and Jimmy Lewis Ross.

Nominations for both awards will close on February 3, 1992. The awards will be presented at the 1991 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g. vita) to George Kuh, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 236, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

STATE OF THE PROGRAM

Fran Stage

Each year with the publication of the Journal of the IUSPA we make contact with the alumni of the Indiana University student affairs program. Everything is going very well, and as the new Coordinator of the Master's Program, I am pleased to have this opportunity to communicate with you.

The program faculty had a very good year and we are pleased to welcome a new Dean, Donald Warren, a scholar of the history of education from the University of Maryland. We were sorry to see Howard Mehlinger step aside, but Howard has not gone far, as he is the new director of the Center of Excellence in Education. There were changes in the department administration as well. Don Hossler was accorded an honor by his colleagues who selected him chair of the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. ELPS is the department within the School of Education that houses Higher Education and Student Affairs, Educational Administration, and History and Comparative Education. Phil Chamberlain spent his spring semester sabbatical working on a book on philanthropy. John Bean was named new chair of Higher Education and Student Affairs.

The core faculty still include John Bean, Phil Chamberlain, Don Hossler, George Kuh, Gerry Preusz, and myself. Faculty projects for the year include the completion of two books for Jossey-Bass: *The Strategic Management of College Enrollments* by Hossler and Bean and *Involving Colleges* by Kuh and others. Other books, forthcoming for the next year include a New Directions on multicultural campus environments by Fran Stage and Kathy Manning, a former doctoral student, and an ACPA Media publication on methods of conducting research on college students. On-going projects include studies of faculty socialization, institutional distinctiveness, federal financial aid programs, audits of campus life, teaching in professional schools, and learning in college classrooms.

Adjunct faculty and key administrators in Bloomington and Indianapolis continue to play an important role in the department, including: Terrill Cosgray, Tom Hennessy, Tim Langston, Don Luce, Dick McKaig, Fran Oblander, Doug Oblander, Doug Priest, Winston Shindell, Gene Temple, Bob Weith, and Doug Wilson. Congratulations go to former adjunct Barbara Varchol who was named Dean of Students at Florida State University. Additional accolades to Dick McKaig, Dean of Students at I.U. and Winston Shindell, President of ACU-I. Doctoral students who have helped with teaching responsibilities within the department include Kathy MacKay, Diana Baker, and John Downey.

Interest in and applications for the master's program continues to grow. This year's 40 new students continue to be bright and eager--including many with

campuses. When minority student orientation sessions constitute the only institutional effort to incorporate diversity, it seems that minority students assume the burden of responsibility for adjusting and for learning to respect differences (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990). No change is required of the students in the mainstream of campus life, and the institution conveys the message that the majority student can comfortably maintain an ethnocentric perspective (Stage & Manning, in press).

New trends in orientation efforts attempt to change this conventional institutional message. Recent orientation efforts require the mainstream student to assume responsibility for making adjustments and learning about diversity (Collison, 1988). Majority students are given the opportunity to question their past assumptions and educate themselves about cultures different from their own. Orientation programs that incorporate diversity education for the mainstream student also help them understand that they personally can gain from learning about diversity (Collison, 1988).

Diversity programs targeted to the mainstream student are becoming a top priority for many orientation programs. In the 1990 National Orientation Directors Association [NODA] survey of member institutions, sixty-three percent of institutions with 15,000 or more students, 47 percent of institutions with 5,000 to 15,000 students, and 36 percent of institutions with less than 5,000 students indicated that they specifically addressed cultural diversity during their orientation for first-year students (NODA Data Bank, 1990-1991). Three years earlier, cultural diversity was not even mentioned as a possible topic area in the survey of member institutions (NODA Data Bank, 1986-1987).

NODA conferences are used as forums for the exchange of ideas on methods of incorporating diversity into orientation programs. The 1990 NODA Region IX Conference reflected the new emphasis in its title, "A Symposium on Diversity," devoted specifically to issues of diversity appreciation.

Theoretical and Developmental Perspective

Orientation is an important time to begin diversity education (Austin, 1990). The collegiate environment has a powerful influence on first-year students (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Often the incoming student is confronted with a variety of students on the college campus who may not have been present in their previous environment (Clay, 1989). A successful transition to this new environment can enhance the student's adjustment and promote subsequent growth and development (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Diversity education can help the first-year student understand what it means to be part of a multicultural community, and can delineate at the outset what behavior is acceptable and unacceptable (Collison, 1988). The occurrence of these interventions early in the student's collegiate experience helps establish expectations from the beginning, and eases the transition to the new environment (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

Diversity education in orientation also provides an initial challenge to new students that can enhance their growth and development (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). According to William Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development, students often enter college with a simplistic, categorical view of the world (King, 1978; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Students in this stage have an unquestioning, dualistic framework that allows them to view people, knowledge and values through absolute, concrete and discrete categories that are established by authorities (King, 1978). Diversity education during orientation may present a challenge to students' previously unquestioned attitudes towards issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Incorporating diversity during orientation conveys a message from the beginning that students must learn to accept responsibility for their thoughts and beliefs, and not rely on those imposed by parents or another authority. This challenge may help the incoming student to recognize alternative perspectives and multiple points of view, thus enhancing their appreciation of diversity (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

Diversity education during orientation can also be interpreted in terms of Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive-stage theory of moral development. Kohlberg argued that students must have experiences that test their moral judgments and provide an opportunity to reflect on their behavior if the college experience is to affect moral development (Smith, 1978; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Diversity education can challenge preconventional thinking. Incoming students at this level of development may view diversity as a means of limiting free speech and placing restrictions on behavior. These students may tolerate differences in order to avoid punishment. Diversity education can help students realize that the advantages of appreciating differences goes beyond an avoidance of punishment, and that the ultimate goal of diversity education is not to limit free speech.

Diversity programs also can challenge conventional thinking. Incoming students at Kohlberg's conventional level of development may be forced to examine their unquestioned conformity to expectations of family, group, and nation (Smith, 1978). Subsequently, students may begin to accept responsibility for their personal values (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989).

Target Groups for Diversity Education

Typically when issues of diversity are discussed in relation to orientation programs, the focus is on incoming students. A comprehensive approach, however, includes three main target groups for diversity education: incoming students, parents and student staff (Austin, 1990).

Incoming Students

The incorporation of diversity programming for incoming students can be viewed from two perspectives. On one hand, diversity education can be viewed in terms of the benefits it provides for traditionally oppressed or underrepresented

students. Diversity programs in orientation help create a more supportive environment for women, and racially and ethnically diverse students. These students may experience a sense of relief when they realize that the burden of responsibility for ending prejudice and disputing misinformation no longer rests solely on the oppressed (Clay, 1989). This effect is even greater for lesbian, gay and bisexual students (Evans & Levine, 1990; Scott, 1988). These groups' existence often goes unacknowledged and unsupported by the institution, and society in general. Therefore, orientation programs that address homophobia create an initial feeling of visibility and institutional acceptance of lesbian, gay and bisexual students on the campus (Evans & Levine, 1990).

From a second perspective, the inclusion of diversity programming in orientation can be interpreted in terms of the benefits for the majority student. This student is asked to question past assumptions and, at the very least, to acknowledge and tolerate diversity. Shifting responsibility for adjusting to a pluralistic environment on non-oppressed students prepares them for entering an increasingly diverse workforce, and a nation in which one of every three persons will be non-white by the year 2000 (Collison, 1988; Stage & Manning, In press).

Targeting majority students for diversity education during orientation allows the college to address issues early. If the institutional mission of the college includes the pursuit of diversity, education should begin with the students' arrival on campus. Students should know from the outset of their college career that they will be living in a pluralistic environment, and they should be made aware of appropriate and inappropriate behavior (Collison, 1988).

Parents

Issues of diversity are not a top priority for majority parents attending orientation programs (Coburn & Treeger, 1988). Not many white parents ask what race their son's or daughter's roommate will be, most likely because they assume the roommate will be white (Austin, 1990). Parents do not usually ask if there are student organizations for lesbian, gay and bisexual students (Austin, 1990). And although parents may inquire about the incidents of sexual assault or sexual harassment, rarely do parents focus on the underlying issue of sexism in higher education.

Parents are affected by their son's or daughter's experiences in a pluralistic environment and the aggressive pursuit of diversity that is occurring on college campuses (Coburn & Treeger, 1988). Diversity education often requires students to question beliefs and values that their parents instilled in them. In questioning past assumptions students may change or adapt previous beliefs. Parents often must contend with their son's or daughter's new views.

Orientation professionals need to lend legitimacy to issues of diversity in relation to parents through the incorporation of this topic in parent programs and through increased literature and research in this area. Some orientation programs already have taken the initiative in addressing issues of diversity with parents. For

example, the University of New Haven offers a program for parents that includes a discussion of diversity (J. Martin, personal communication, April 27, 1990). The discussion focuses on what students will encounter and experience on the increasingly pluralistic college campus, and how their sons and daughters may return home with broader views as a result of their experiences with diversity. The inclusion of this topic in the parent program sends important positive messages about the institution's commitment to diversity.

Student Staff

The training of student orientation leaders constitutes an area where the incorporation of diversity can have a significant impact (Austin, 1990). Student staff are a central means of facilitating orientation sessions and assume great responsibility for carrying out the goals of the program (Orientation Directors Manual, 1988). If diversity education and awareness are goals of the orientation program, student staff play a vital role in the success of diversity efforts.

Recruiting a diverse staff is an important first step. However, attention to diversity does not end with the recruitment of minority student staff members. Students are not necessarily educated on diversity issues before they become orientation staff members (Bowles, 1981). During recruiting and interviewing student staff, each candidate's level of openness to diversity issues should be assessed. It is vital that the student staff training incorporates diversity education and that professional staff model appropriate language and behavior.

Student staff should be aware of the impact of subtle language and behavior (Upcraft & Pilato, 1982). The effects of language and behavior are heightened by the quantity, quality, and intensity of staff contact with incoming students (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Student staff are influential role models, and this status further increases the impact of their language and behavior on first-year students (Austin, 1990).

Use of derogatory words such as fag, cripple, spic or girl may affect the new student's perception of others (Cullen, 1990; France, 1990). A student staff member who laughs at a racist, sexist, or homophobic joke rather than confronting it sends out a message that this behavior is appropriate (Cullen, 1990). A student staff member who leads a tour through the union and mentions all offices except for the Latino Student Union subtly conveys a message, even if unintended, that this cultural group is less important than other student organizations or cultural groups. An orientation staff member who asks a male student if he has a girlfriend is assuming heterosexuality and adding to the lack of recognition of lesbian, gay and bisexual students on college campuses (Evans & Levine, 1990; Scott, 1988).

The effect of diversity training for student staff on orientation programs is not easily quantified. However, the significance of the level of diversity awareness of staff cannot be minimized because of the acknowledged impact of student orientation staff on incoming students and their parents (Orientation Director's

Manual, 1988; Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). In addition, because orientation staff often are leaders in other areas of student life, the power of their diversity training extends beyond the orientation sessions (Austin, 1990).

Appropriate Timing of Diversity Education

Efforts to incorporate diversity into summer orientation programs, orientation weeks, or other orientation programs that end before classes begin must carefully consider the developmental readiness of the incoming student (Austin, 1990). For example, diversity workshops that ask new students to take a stand, require them to change or aggressively confront their beliefs and values may present a condition of intense and inappropriate challenge for a summer program (Rodgers, 1989).

Students are confronted with many new developmental tasks such as achieving competence, managing emotions, becoming autonomous, and establishing identity (Chickering, 1969). First-year students may also feel overwhelmed by the new environment, and the ecological transition can result in stress (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Often these students have relatively few established support systems in place (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). Orientation directors must find the appropriate range of support and challenge for this given context to avoid creating anxiety or disequilibrium that will overwhelm the new student (Rodgers, 1989).

Though some goals can be achieved with a summer program or orientation week, extended orientation programs represent the best forum for addressing issues of diversity (Austin, 1990; Upcraft & Gardner). When students invest quality, extensive time in a semester-long orientation course, an environment is created in which change and challenge can most effectively be addressed (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). The climate of trust and support established within these orientation courses creates a context in which optimal dissonance can be attained (Rodgers, 1989). Students can be challenged on their views of diversity within a safe environment, and change is facilitated (Austin, 1990).

Methods of Incorporating Diversity

Orientation programs vary widely in philosophy, scope, length, content and focus. Available fiscal and human resources also vary (Upcraft & Gardner, 1989). As a result of these factors institutions of higher education use several different methods to incorporate diversity into their orientation programs. These methods are broken into three general categories for the purpose of this discussion: (1) lectures, (2) role plays, simulation games and interactive methods, and (3) videos and written materials (Austin, 1990). These categories do not occur exclusively.

Lecturing students seems to be a common approach to diversity education (Austin, 1990). The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor addressed diversity through a panel of four students who talked about their experiences with racism,

sexism, and homophobia at the university (Collison, 1988). In addition, many institutions select speakers for new student convocations based on their ability to incorporate diversity into their message.

Panels and lectures are often overused in presenting information to incoming students and therefore can lose their impact and effectiveness (Austin, 1990). Lecturing students also keeps them from having to take a stand, or take risks. However, depending on the range of optimal dissonance and the availability of support, this method may be more appropriate from a developmental perspective (Rodgers, 1989). A program that does not require the incoming student to take great risks may be justified during summer orientation when they are too preoccupied with other issues, such as finding their way around campus and meeting new people. For many students, anything more than lecturing at this point could be overwhelming.

A second, more interactive method of incorporating diversity into orientation is role plays, simulation exercises, and other games (Austin, 1990). The State University of New York at Binghamton uses an interactive diversity game called "Cultural Pursuit." Eastern Michigan University also uses an interactive method in its workshop entitled "Celebrating Our Differences" (Miller, Bober, Hudson & Poli, 1990). The goal of these diversity sessions always should be to educate within a safe and supportive environment, and not to make students feel naive, ignorant or sheltered (Collison, 1988; Rodgers, 1989).

The third method of incorporating diversity into orientation is through established materials such as videos or movies (Austin, 1990). Towson State University used the videotape Still Burning to initiate a discussion of diversity (Clay, 1989). Other institutions use videotapes such as Tale of Q, or Black by Popular Demand. Indiana University- Bloomington uses a video produced specifically for their institution entitled Racism at IU. Facilitators of the discussions that follow these videos must have a high level of comfort with diversity issues and be able to abstract relevant issues (Cullen, 1990).

Other established methods include pamphlets and written materials distributed during orientation. Currently, this method is used primarily for addressing issues of race and ethnicity, although it can be expanded to address other diversity issues. Smith College publishes a pamphlet titled Confronting Racism (Kelly, Napolitano, Sheparson, 1990). This material provides an institutional statement regarding the desirability of diversity, examples of racism, examples of constructive steps that are being taken to address discrimination and a list of resource services. Bulletin boards and posters placed in areas of high visibility also can be used, though this is a more passive approach. Timing and distribution remain important issues even with written materials.

Recommendations for Implementation

Designing a single method of implementing diversity education during orientation is difficult. Differences in institutional size and climate, student demographics, available resources, and structure of the orientation program make this task almost impossible. However, there are certain issues and general recommendations for implementation that orientation directors should consider.

Orientation directors should clearly define their goals and objectives for addressing diversity issues. Programs designed to make students aware of student conduct codes dealing with diversity should vary in format from programs that encourage majority students to take advantage of the opportunities for growth available through participation in diversity events. Likewise, programs intended to increase students' awareness of the diverse student population should vary in format from programs designed to challenge students' prevailing unquestioned beliefs and values. The establishment of clear goals and objectives is critical in justifying the inclusion of diversity workshops and for gaining administrative resources for new programs.

In addition, having clearly established goals makes the later assessment of the program's effectiveness easier, and more credible. Assessment and evaluation should include an examination of appropriate levels of challenge which diversity education provides. A program that is successful on one campus, may be inappropriate on another campus because of differences in student demographics and backgrounds. Therefore, while ideas should be exchanged among institutions of higher education, programs should not be implemented without careful consideration of characteristics specific to each campus.

Institutions also should provide a clear definition of diversity. If diversity is meant to include differences in race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, ability and age, workshops should address all of these issues. Programs with titles such as "Diversity 101" should not deal solely with racism because this gives a misconception about the meaning of diversity. Either the title should be narrowed in focus, or the workshop should be broadened in scope.

Orientation directors must also decide whether or not diversity sessions offered during orientation will be mandatory or voluntary for new students. Mandatory sessions have a greater potential for reaching those students who may benefit most from the inclusion of diversity in orientation.

Often voluntary diversity programs attract those students who already are aware of and educated on issues of diversity. Although mandatory sessions have the greatest potential for reaching students, campus politics may prevent orientation directors from requiring students to attend specific program sessions. In this case, orientation directors should devote time and energy to marketing the diversity program. Program titles, publicity, and the student staff's attitude and enthusiasm towards the program can greatly promote attendance at voluntary programs.

Conclusion

Orientation professionals will need to justify diversity education if they hope to acquire resources for new diversity programs or to avoid budget reductions in existing diversity efforts. The declining fiscal resources available for higher education increases the importance of connecting diversity education to the success of orientation programs (Schuh, 1990). Literature must articulate how diversity education contributes to and supports the philosophy and goals of orientation and the institutional mission (Schuh, 1990). Methods of assessing and evaluating diversity efforts must also be developed to ensure optimal effectiveness and accountability of programs (Kuh, 1979).

Despite the fact that institutions of higher education are increasingly incorporating diversity into their orientation programs, there is currently little published literature available on this topic. Literature on orientation and issues of diversity is needed not only for institutional support, but also to facilitate further the exchange of ideas. In addition, systematic research with a theoretical basis must be undertaken for progress to occur (Knefelkamp, Widick & Parker, 1978).

References

- Austin, D. (1990, May). Orientation and the issues of diversity: What's happening and what works. Presentation conducted at the National Orientation Directors Association Region IX Regional Conference, Portland, ME.
- Bowles, J.K. (1981). Dealing with homosexuality: a survey of staff training needs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22(3), 276-277.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*.
- Chickering, A.W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clay, C.A. (1989). Video inspires discussion of bias: Introducing freshmen to diversity. *Safehouse*, 2-3.
- Coburn, K.L., & Treeger, M.L. (1988). *Letting go: A parents' guide to today's college experience*. Maryland: Adler & Adler.
- Collison, M.N. (1987). Racial incidents worry campus officials, University of Massachusetts Study. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33(27), 1, 41.
- Collison, M.N. (1988). For many freshmen, orientation now includes efforts to promote racial understanding. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 35(2), 29.
- Crosson, P.H. (1988). Four-year college and university environments for minority degree achievement. *Review of Higher Education*, 11(4), 365-82.
- Cullen, M. (1990, October). A world of difference. Presentation conducted at the National Orientation Directors Association Conference, Hartford, CT.
- Evans, N., & Levine, H. (1990). Perspectives on sexual orientation. In L.V. Moore (Ed.), *Evolving theoretical perspectives on students*, *New Directions*

- for Student Services, No. 51 (pp. 49-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- France, S. (1990). Hate goes to college. ABA Journal, July 1990, pp.44-49.
- Kelly, G., Napolitano, R., & Sheparson, J.A. (1990, May). Diversity on a "homogeneous" campus. Presentation conducted at the National Orientation Directors Association Region IX Regional Conference, Portland, ME.
- King, P.M. (1978). William Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C.A. Parker (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings, New Directions for Student Services, No.4 (pp.35-51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knefelkamp, L., Widick, C., & Parker, C.A. (1978). Editor's notes: Why bother with theory. Applying new developmental findings, New Directions for Student Services, No.4 (pp.vii-xvi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D. (1979). Evaluation: The state of the art in student affairs. In G.D. Kuh (Ed.), Evaluation in student affairs (pp. 1-11). Cincinnati: ACPA.
- Miller, G.F., Bober, M., Hudson, D., & Poli, M. (1990, October). Dealing with difficult developmental issues at freshman orientation. Presentation conducted at the National Orientation Director's Association Conference, Hartford, CT.
- National Orientation Directors Association Data Bank. (1986 -1987).
- National Orientation Directors Association Data Bank. (1990- 1991).
- Orientation Director's Manual. (1988). National Orientation Directors Association.
- Rainsford, G.N. (1990). The demographic imperative: Changing to serve America's expanding minority population. In P. Steeples (Ed.), Managing change in higher education, New Directions for Higher Education, No.71 (pp. 91-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rodgers, R.F. (1989). Theories underlying student development. In Kuh, Bean, Hossler & Stage (Eds.) ASHE Reader on the College Student. Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.
- Schuh, J.H. (1990). Financial management for student affairs administrators. Alexandria, VA: ACPA.
- Scott, D. (1988). Working with gay and lesbian students. ACU-I Bulletin, 22-25.
- Smith, A.F. (1978). Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory of the development of moral judgment. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C.A. Parker (Eds.), Applying new developmental findings, New Directions for Student Services, No.4 (pp.53-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stage, F., & Manning, K. (In press). New Directions for Student Services: Framework for Creating a Multicultural Campus Environment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Upcraft, L.M., & Gardner, J.N. (1989). The freshman year experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, L.M., & Pilatro, G.T. (1982). Residence hall assistants in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patty Muller is a first-year master's student in College Student Personnel Administration. She received a B.S. from SUNY-Binghamton in Applied Social Sciences. She is currently working as an Assistant Coordinator in Briscoe Residence Center and will continue to work there next year.