

*File Speech
Materials*

FIRST GENERAL SESSION
Friday, December 3, 1:00 P.M.
Sheraton Blackstone Hotel

Presiding: Mrs. Milan J. Divina, Program Chairman;
Associate Dean of Students, Rockford College

"New Trends In Illinois"

Dr. Richard G. Browne, Consultant to the Junior College Board,
Former Executive Secretary to the Higher Education Board

Dr. Richard G. Browne was a member of the faculty at Illinois State University before becoming Executive Secretary of the Teachers College Board. Since his retirement he has served as Executive Secretary to the Higher Education Board, and is now acting as a part-time consultant to the Junior College Board.

Dr. Browne discussed four trends in higher education in the State of Illinois. The first was the trend for larger enrollments of students and a corresponding expansion of higher education facilities, both in quantity and in diversity. He believes that the State should have varied types of institutions to serve the needs of different students. Two-year colleges, technical colleges, four-year colleges and universities, both large and small have a real part to play in educating students in the State of Illinois.

The second trend is our tendency to enroll a "new breed of students." Students will enroll for education at all ages. There will be many more part-time students and students will come for a variety of reasons.

The third trend is that the faculties of universities will be of a different sort. Shortages are already severe and the use of women and minority groups will be increased. Nepotism regulations will be relaxed. Dr. Browne believes that we should use every qualified person.

The fourth trend is the increased involvement of the Federal Government in higher education. The National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the 1965 Higher Education Act have considerably changed higher education. Dr. Browne has said that higher education is one of America's principal "growth industries."

Dorothy Carrington
Reporter, Findings Committee

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Banquet, Friday, December 3, 8:00 P.M., Mayfair Room

Presiding: Dr. Patricia Thrash, President, IAWDC
Dean of Women and Associate Professor of
Education, Northwestern University

1965

Invocation: Miss Sarah J. Fisher, Assistant Principal and
Dean of Girls, Urbana High School, Urbana

"Tomorrow's Education: Fact and Fantasy"

Dr. K. Patricia Cross, Senior Director, College and University Program
Educational Testing Service, Princeton

I've entitled my remarks tonight "Tomorrow's Education: Fact and Fantasy," for surely it is a mixture of both. Much of the education of the future is easily predictable from the facts we have at hand today. Other aspects, which will be commonplace tomorrow, are sheer fantasy today. The changes in education, however, are occurring so rapidly that fact often intermingles with fantasy--sometimes in a dreamy way and at other times in a nightmare of confusion.

For a little while this evening, I'd like to take us away from our concerns of today and project us into the next century--to the year 2000. From that vantage point, let us look back to see how education developed in the last half of the 20th century. This is, you know, the history that we here in this room are now writing. In the year 2000, some of us will be viewing the educational scene from the comfort of medicare and age-acare, but others will still be right in there defining the role of the personnel worker. We will still be defining it, you know, for when we cease to define it in the light of the changing needs of education, the profession will be dead.

Let us begin our study of education in the late 20th century by looking back on the educational system as it emerged from World War II. The decade of the 1950's is memorable primarily as a period of extremely rapid physical expansion. The first wave to swamp the educational boat hit the colleges when thousands of servicemen returned to college on the G.I. bill. Although the G.I. bill seemed to most a patriotic gesture at the time, as we view it now, from our perspective of the year 2000, we can observe the profound effect that it had on education over the next 20 years. It was, of course, the forerunner of our present system of federally-financed education which made its big move in the irreversible direction in 1965. In that year, a \$2-1/2 billion higher education act was passed with \$70 million allotted for the nation's first government-financed college scholarships. The G.I. bill also brought a great democratization to the colleges, as men from all socio-economic levels became, in many cases, the first in their families ever to consider attending college. By the mid-1960's, colleges that had once catered to the sons of the rich were establishing special programs to attract the sons of the poor; and now, of course, we have to be reminded that going to college was once related to the family's ability to pay.

The colleges of the 1950's were so busy expanding and handling the problem of sheer numbers that we remember them more for their contribution to vast physical plants than for their progress in educational ideas. But their problems with size stagger the imagination. College enrollments doubled in the 15 years from 1950 to 1965, and they doubled again in the next 15 years. Thus, although colleges seemed to be bursting at the seams, they were adding an entire college population every 15 years. Virtually every college campus in the country had a hole in the ground for a new building and a fund drive going for the next one. In 1930, the average enrollment per college was 780; by 1960, it was 2000; and by 1970, it had jumped to 3000, but the majority of students did not attend the average size college.

It was primarily on the campuses of these large universities that it first became evident that the old ways of handling education could not be expanded indefinitely and that new approaches would have to be found.

The 1960's seemed to erupt--partly as a result of an overburdened system which could no longer meet new needs in old ways, and partly as a result of the tenor of the nation. The focus of the 1960's was on youth and on brains. The college student knew he had both, so why shouldn't he speak out? The values of those in business and in politics and in colleges and in high schools could be likened to the science which they worshipped. They were brash and sure of themselves with the emphasis on action, innovation, individualism, and daring. It was a fast age, with little patience with contemplation and philosophy. In many ways the students shocked their parents and teachers by growing old too fast. The collegiate life moved downward into the high schools with parties and drinking and steady dating and sex.

But if their morals astounded their elders, so did their seriousness of purpose and their idealistic dedication to the world. Both high school and college students spent summers and entire years in the then-developing nations which were just starting to educate their people. Students were indignant about a society that had thought that a human being's skin color carried some indication of his stature as a person. They rebelled against the machine and the anonymity that they found on college campuses which seemed more concerned with numbers than with human beings. They used any means they could find to revolt against the de-personalization which they felt. And if their mass demonstrations annoyed college administrators, it must be said that many worked quietly and tirelessly without publicity to correct the evils which they saw. Nevertheless, the words "activist" and "protestor" became somewhat synonymous in the 1960's. These students were considerably more active in protesting than they were in finding constructive solutions to the problems which beset education and the larger society.

Meanwhile, without fanfare or publicity, many thoughtful educators channeled their energies to the slow search for solutions.

Hidden under the surface of some of the more obvious educational problems was the fact that while many recognized an educated person when they worked with one, no one knew how to measure true education.

Until very recently, education was measured in units known as credit-hours or credit units. A student earned a credit hour's worth of education by attending a class for a certain number of hours a week for a given number of weeks. When he had accumulated 120 or 128 of these hours he received a bachelor's degree and was generally received into society as an educated man. In reading about this civilization, we find that even then, they knew that the credit-hours was a medium of exchange and an administrative convenience and not a true measure of education. They had adequate evidence that 120 course hours of college was not comparable across people or across colleges. It was a common occurrence to find a student graduating from high school with more advanced knowledge than the graduates of some colleges. High school and college instructors of that period faced the rather difficult task of equating their courses to this standard credit-unit system. Sometimes they had to trim the course and cut out things they considered important so that it would fit into 3 hours a week for 15 weeks. Other times, of course, they had to do quite a bit of padding and stretching to make it fit. But it was quite universally accepted that 45 hours of classroom instruction led to 3 credit hours on the educational scale regardless of the kind of instruction, outside reading, or level of difficulty of the course.

Another great problem of the credit-hour system was that because of this universally accepted measure of the educated man, students went to high school and college not with the purpose of being exposed to new ideas or broadening their appreciation and understanding of the works of man and nature, not to get an education--but to get enough grades and hours to add up to a degree. They became thoroughly trapped in the fiction that education and learning were synonymous with grades and credit. As a matter of fact, grades were so important in the 1960's that a number of practices grew up which were antithetical to good education. For example, there was great concern about student cheating. This was an arrangement whereby the cheater got credit for something that someone else learned--all of which goes to show how little the traditional measures of education really measured education, for in this instance a student who avoided learning received education credit. Another common practice was to take "gut" courses. This was a course in which you were already proficient, but you took it to get a good grade which upped your education credit while leaving unaffected your education.

In fact, by the mid-1960's, the credentials of education has almost replaced education. Many students in high school and college felt that they could take only courses that they were good in. Only in this way could they assure themselves the necessary grade point average to get to the next level of education. For instances, an engineer dared not experiment by trying a course in poetry because if he made a poor grade due to his lack of background in it, he might not be accepted into the graduate school of his choice. Likewise some very able students steered away from honors courses because they would be graded more severely, and thus their chances for the next level of education might be hurt. In other words, in education it was safer to stick to what you already knew and not fool around with trying to fill gaps in your knowledge.

It is bewildering to us now to try to figure out just why this system persisted as long as it did. I suppose that the best answer was given in the report of the Harvard Committee of 1945 which described the credit hour as the "mechanism whereby courses of every kind are legitimized, put on an equal footing, and made available for tabulation." But on the other hand, they noted that this standardization was the only alternative to complete chaos. Then as now, it was easier to specify the pathways to education than it was to define the goals.

But during the 1960's, the educational pathways became much more flexible, providing solid recognition of the fact that students differ greatly in their rates of learning. New opportunities for individual variation were introduced at an unprecedented rate. For the superior high school graduate, there was the Advanced Placement Program, the 4-year masters and the 6-year PhD. For those from educationally-deprived backgrounds, there were special pre-college sessions. Even the so-called average student had new opportunities for flexibility in his educational program. Independent study, once limited to superior upperclassmen, proved its effectiveness for average students at all levels of learning. Although the old idea persisted, the fact was that by 1965 the 4-year progression through college was already atypical rather than typical. Some students dropped out of college to work or to spend time in a foreign country; others went to college year-round to hasten their graduation. Pressures on college facilities has forced the nation out of its idea that colleges operated only 9 months per year; and by 1980, the year-round calendar which we have today was virtually established throughout the country.

The new technology provided other flexibilities in education. High school and college students as well as adults could study languages in the new language labs where they could have the "teacher" repeat the phrase as often as they needed it. Research into how people learn had resulted in programmed instruction which provided a tailor-made program for the individual, and the focus was on what one knew rather than how long it took him to learn it. The time units for learning became irrelevant anyway since by 1985 education was viewed as a life-long process rather than something one got and then had for the rest of his life. Although few were aware of the fantastic growth of adult education, the statistics of 1965 showed over 3 times as many adults engaged in some form of adult education as there were students in the colleges and universities. Not only was constant learning required to keep up with the new knowledge necessary in the occupations of all educated people, but the shorter work week and the easy availability of educational resources made continuing education a reality rather than an educational department.

Thus, the first dramatic step in improving education involved measuring what one knew rather than the pathway he had traversed in learning it. The second great breakthrough in measurement almost replaced the first, when it became apparent that what one knew was not as important as how one used knowledge. A sense of social responsibility, maturity of judgment, and flexibility of mind were also factors to be considered in the educational process.

Guidance and personnel people had long been convinced and dedicated to the idea behind the rather trite phrase of "educating the whole person." They found themselves in a difficult period, however, in the 1960's, when the rallying cry of the colleges--and the high schools--was "academic excellence." For many, however, it consisted of criteria such as high test scores for college admissions, high proportions of high school students going on to college, or high proportions of college students entering graduate school. As long as these measures served as the criteria for academic excellence, guidance workers appeared to be somewhat out of the direct educational strivings of their institutions. If the emphasis was to be the acquisition of knowledge, then the function of all other phases of college life appeared, at best, to be that of enhancing the classroom experience and, at worst, that of not interfering with it. What was left out of this whole chain, of course, was a concern with the non-intellective factors in education. The guidance worker recognized their importance, but they couldn't measure those characteristics contributing to one's success as an educated human being; therefore they were at a loss to demonstrate to their faculty or themselves whether their programs added, detracted, or left unchanged a student's sense of social responsibility, for instance.

Gradually, as research knowledge increased and the concept of academic excellence broadened to encompass educational excellence, personnel workers were returned to their rightful role as valuable members of the educational team. The extra-curricular became truly co-curricular, and faculty and personnel administrators worked closely together to provide the experiences essential for the growth of the educated person. The co-curricular programs were seen as more than playing a supporting role for the academic; they had their own positive educational functions to perform.

Research in the late 1960's showed that there was a great diversity in both students and colleges and that some students prospered in an educational environment that stifled others. The ability to measure student and college characteristics had a considerable impact on what was euphemistically known in the 1960's as the "admissions problem"--but tired guidance counselors, frustrated students, and overworked admissions officers knew it as the "admissions mess." The "admissions mess" generally was characteristic by a state of panic on the part of high school seniors, their parents, the guidance staff, and college admissions officers. It had many causes, not the least of which was the fact that the graduates of 25,000 high schools were trying desperately to squeeze into 2500 colleges. But the trouble was that so little was known about the characteristics of the colleges and the needs of individual students that everyone wanted to get accepted by a relatively few "prestige" colleges. These "select" colleges had no real recourse except to require higher and higher test scores; they were unable to define or to measure any other characteristic contributing to educational promise.

Throughout this period, guidance counselors had helped greatly to promote some understanding of the fact that there were not "top" colleges and "lesser" colleges, but rather that students had different needs in colleges. For some, the vocational track of the Junior college was the "best" college; others needed a small college with a close community atmosphere, and still others would find their greatest opportunity for development at a large university.

Thus, the problem became that of getting into the "right" college rather than the "top" college. The profit-motivated and responsible educators were equally quick to seize upon the idea of providing better descriptions of the colleges. A great variety of books giving facts about colleges came on the market in the 1960's. The College Board made available to high school counselors, a Manual of Freshman Class Profiles which described colleges in terms of the students they had accepted--their rank in high school class, their test scores, their major fields of study, etc. In the mid-1960's, the College Board pioneered a study in Indiana in which new research instruments were used to obtain objective descriptions of college and student characteristics. These self-descriptions of Indiana colleges were then published in a guide for counselors in Indiana, and they contributed greatly to guidance counselors' knowledge about the colleges in their state. The principle of computers also came to the aid of counselors and students as a variety of "college suggestor" kits became available. The student, preferably under the guidance of a counselor, listed those college characteristics related to his own abilities, interests, and needs. The selector then picked from over 2,000 colleges those which met the student's criteria, and the student was directed to a study of the catalogues of 15-20 colleges most suited to his needs.

This emphasis upon matching student needs to college environments helped, but the admissions problem was not really a single problem but rather a number of problems, and as it had multiple causes, it also had multiple solutions. One of the more obvious solutions to the administrative headaches of the high schools, colleges, and prospective students were the central records agencies which were established as competing colleges began to cooperate. While the choice was still left up to the student and to the college, centralizing the records had the advantage of making it possible to submit a single application and high school record on a common form for more equitable comparison by the colleges.

The other answer to admissions, of course, was the expansion of the college spaces available. Existing colleges doubled their size on the average, but the ever-increasing demands for educational facilities also required the establishment of 1000 new 4-year colleges and 2100 new Junior colleges in the 35 years from 1965 to the present. In the early 1960's--from 1961-1964--146 new colleges were founded. Most of these were Junior and community colleges, and this movement changed the face of higher education considerably. Although we did not quite meet Alvin Eurich's prediction of the 1960's that the freshman and sophomore years of the traditional 4-year colleges would be abolished altogether, we do know now that it is the unusual student who goes away to college after graduation from high school. Most, of course, remain in their home communities until they transfer to upperdivisions where they proceed to the master's degree. This has changed rather drastically the complexion of the student who is attending college away from home. She is no longer a 17-year old youngster, but rather a 20-year old with previous college experience and, quite frequently, married and attending college with her husband. Dramatic as other educational changes have been, the personnel programs have changed as much as any other single aspect of administration.

It is somewhat ironic and perhaps prophetic for personnel work, where we still find difficulty providing for the individual that the greatest provisions for the individual, as learner, were being established during the period when everyone was concerned about the loss of the individual in the masses.

The sheer size of the educational operation has convinced many that the student must learn to adjust to being an IBM card number, and that little individualization was possible in America's system of education for the masses.

Now in the year 2000, the lock-step of education is a thing of the past. Never has there been a greater range of opportunity for meeting individual learning needs. Students of all ages focus their attention upon learning rather than upon grades and credit; there is a new spirit of cooperative learning between teacher and student. The greatest range of instructors ever presented to the American student body is available at the flick of a T.V. switch--or one may study independently at the educational resources laboratories. There is now a new and much needed emphasis on the development of the individual personality as education once again turns its attention to all of the attributes which constitute the truly educated person.

But education in the 21st century is not utopia. The academic needs of the individual and the masses have been provided for, but we are now struggling to bring back the sense of community which once existed in high schools and colleges. The campuses seem too big and too serious now to work as a community on projects where men need one another.

As one looks back over the years, we can trace the factors that contributed to our present loss of community. Although many have blamed size, this has been only one factor. More dramatic than the surge about every 10 years which means that we now have more than 1000 times as much knowledge as we had a century ago--to record, to sift, to store, to teach, to learn, and hopefully to use. Although numerous attempts have been made to combat the increasing specialization in academic, we still find that academic departments lack the ability to communicate with one another. The need for scholars exceeds the supply, and government and industry have increasingly had to depend upon the specialists from college faculties, with the result that professors spend more time off the campus than on it.

A college president of the 1960's remarked that everyone on the campus seemed to be out looking for something. Presidents were out looking for money; faculty were out seeking research funds and consulting jobs; and students were out searching for their lost identity.

The fact is, however, that the mobility of the population has certainly meant that people form tenuous loyalties to any single place or institution. Gone are the old college traditions and the fraternities and sororities which helped to maintain them. To those of us who knew the 40's and 50's, gone also is much of the spirit of fun on the campus. While education is serious, it need not be grim; and personal development, more often than we now find. But once again, educators are turning their skills to the problems, and it is to be hoped that the educators of this century are as resourceful as those of the 20th century in meeting the new needs of education.

I've talked of fact and fantasy in education, and while my fantasy predictions may not come to pass, let me assure you that my views of changes in education are undoubtedly conservative. Basically, I count myself among the educators who, as a group, are known conservatives--at least as far as their own field is concerned. The scientist's view of education in the year 2000 is much more startling. But then, they are used to scientific innovations such as television changing the habits of a nation within a single generation.

The scientists are sure that by the year 2000, voyages to the moon will be commonplace, as will be inhabited artificial satellites. The Saturday Review of February 6, 1965, reports that serious scientists predict that by the year 2000, "knowledge will be accumulated in 'electronic banks' and transmitted directly to the human nervous system by means of coded electronic messages. There will no longer be any need of reading or learning mountains of useless information; everything will be received and registered according to the needs of the moment. There will be no need of attention or effort. What is needed will pass directly from the machine to the brain without going through consciousness." Were human beings to accept such works of science without passing judgment upon their value, personnel workers would, the scientists tell us, "be able to shape and reshape at will the human emotions, desires and thoughts...."

Perhaps my earth-bound mind will not permit me to seriously entertain such a picture of the future. I am convinced, however, that the next 35 years will require undreamed-of changes of all of us, and we must be willing and ready to explore unfamiliar terrain. To the extent that we are aware of the potent forces shaping education, we may better understand our futures and use our abilities to make corrective judgments.

* * * * *

Copies of the bibliography for student personnel work in higher education are still available from Mary Harrison, University of Illinois, 130 Student Services Building, 610 East John Street, Champaign, Illinois 61822.

* * * * *

If I can stop one heart from breaking,
I shall not live in vain;
If I can ease one life the aching,
Or cool one pain,
Or help one fainting robin
Unto his nest again,
I shall not live in vain;

Emily Dickinson

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN DEANS AND COUNSELORS

CITATION OF EVA PRING

December 3, 1965

In his book, Markings, Dag Hammarskjold has written:

"Only life can satisfy the demands of life.the nature of life is such that I can realize my individuality by becoming a bridge for others, a stone in the temple of righteousness.

"Don't be afraid of yourself, live your individuality to the full--but for the good of others. Don't copy others in order to buy fellowship, or make convention your law.....

"To become free and responsible. For this alone was man created...."

Truly, Eva Pring has become a bridge for others. Don't misunderstand me--people don't walk on Eva, nor do they ride over her--but they find her a substantial help in getting where they want to go.

I like calling this Eva a bridge, because everything about her fits together--no loose ends! When I set about the business of culling opinion from her fellow-teachers and counselors, both in Oak Park and in our school, everything fell into place and fit together. Consistently mentioned was her great understanding of high school boys and girls--her objectivity in seeing their problems and those of their parents and their teachers. Because of this skill in identifying all the facets of the personality of a mother, a teacher, of a girl, people feel secure with Eva. Can we say more of a counselor?

Yes, there is more that I must mention. One is her solid integrity and her courage to stand up for her convictions no matter what the personal cost may be. And this lack of concern for personal cost leads me to the final quality of this counselor--her great devotion to the task at hand--her willingness to go the second mile--regardless of long hours and expenditure of extra energy. This we hear about from others; from Eva there is only a smile.

This talk about bridges recalls a story from the Army Engineering Corps, in which a class of trainees was assigned to make a sketch of a bridge. As the instructor walked up and down the aisles inspecting the work of his students, he stopped at one sketch in which the student had drawn in two little children on the bridge. "Take those children off that bridge!" the instructor ordered. The student got busy with his eraser. The second trip past the student's desk revealed that the two children had been moved to the grassy approach to the bridge. This really burned the instructor up. "Didn't I tell you to get rid of those children?" Again the student picked up his eraser. On his final inspection the instructor found on the river bank two little tombstones. And now, if you will forgive my mixed metaphors, I submit that our Eva Pring never abandons her charges on the near-end of the bridge. She takes them over, where their goals beckon. She takes them over, with encouragement, and with solid understanding of the terrain on the other side of the bridge.

Dorothy J. Banks
Dean of Girls, Retired
Lyons Township High School
La Grange

THIRD GENERAL SESSION
"Petite Breakfast"
Saturday, December 4, 7:45 A.M.
Mayfair Room

Presiding: Miss Peggy Lusk, Counselor, Presbyterian-
St. Luke's Hospital School of Nursing, Chicago

Invocation: Miss Jane Kotten, Counselor,
Evanston Township High School

Address: "Her Junior Year on the Moon"
Dr. Anna L. Keaton, Dean of Women,
Illinois State University, Normal

Invocation: Our Father,
We thank Thee for the freshness of this new day which can be
likened to Thy Spirit which is ever fresh--if we but use it.
As we seek for ways to guide those who pass so quickly through
our charges, so would we seek constantly for direction from Thee
for our own lives.
May we have an awareness of the privileges as well as the
responsibilities we have in working with young lives.
Open our minds to wise and intelligent thinking.
Keep our insights and sympathies ready; balance our judgment
We gratefully acknowledge now the blessings we have shared,
and we pray that as we meet together this day, our highest
purposes may be fulfilled.

Amen

Address: "Her Junior Year on the Moon"

When Mary Harrison asked me last summer to talk at this breakfast meeting, I agreed without too much hesitance, and found my head full of ideas on the topic she gave me. It is strange how, through this fall, the closer December approached, those bright thoughts have deserted me--I have been less and less willing or able to pin down what I proposed to say. So I have committed myself to writing this morning, to make sure that I do not find myself in the position of the proverbial French literary genius who at the beginning of his career overheard a greeting from friend to friend which struck fire in his artistic soul, a heart-felt greeting, "Good morning." Inspired, he developed the greeting into a clever quatrain; then he worked some weeks to develop the quatrain into a short story; that was so good that he spent some years expanding the short story into a novel, then spent decades developing the novel into an epic series of novels; then, in a mood of artistic perfectionism, he began pruning his work, reducing the epic series down to one intensely significant novel, the intense novel down to a brilliantly pithy short story, the brilliant short story down to a magnificent quatrain. By this time, his hair was gray and his career near its end, but his keen mind had developed its critical sense to such a point of perfection that he set to work again. On the day before his death, he proclaimed his final artistic triumph, the reduction of his magnificent quatrain to two terse, perfect words, "Good morning!" a greeting from the heart.

So I say to you, "Good morning," with a special bow to you new Deans and Counselors and other personnel workers who are meeting with the IAWDC for the first time this year. I am glad to have been given this assignment. It has brought to me many pleasant moments this fall contemplating the job to which I have devoted my professional career for something like 33 years, the last 29 of them in one Illinois university. I must confess that Mary did not ask me to talk on space travel or trips to the moon. But what she did suggest started me off on a search into these 33 years of being a personnel dean. Please forgive me for having used my own work with the college age as the vocabulary to express my thoughts--they could just as well have been stated in terms of your job, whatever the age of your girls or boys, and I must count on you to translate as you listen.

I have not attempted to list the qualities or resources a personnel dean must have or the rewards she may expect. I have decided to mention only the two essential pressures as a dean and counselor. They have made my work so fascinating that I have never seriously considered deserting it to go back to my first professional love, the teaching of English, of which I was once so fond that I followed it through to a Ph.D., and to which I clung for several years after I entered deaning. At the same time, it has been against these same pressures that I have at times rebelled. Back in those youthful days when I could find time to write a bit of verse, I can remember writing a few emotional lines that echo that rebellion--lines which I never shared with anyone, through some sense of embarrassed loyalty to the tribe, I suppose.

The first of those inexorable pressures has been the unending state of conflict in which the job compels you to live and work. You must be secure enough within yourself to work within the framework of a never-remitting paradox. Opposing imperatives are imposed on us in our work with people which are sometimes gently, sometimes humorously, sometimes fiercely in conflict. How well we can reconcile them determines whether we can remain happily in this work for the rest of our professional careers, or whether we ultimately must turn from it into less disturbing work.

I have already mentioned two of these paradoxes as I have experienced them. First, it is true that I have been so fascinated with this dean's work with the college age, rewarded by it in so many ways, that I have never seriously considered leaving the work once I became a part of it, and 33 years in the field is a pretty good testimony for the job's ability to hold me. And yet, it took me years to reconcile my rebellious, star-spangled ego to accept the stifling experience of being seen by others, by students and colleagues, not as a person at all, but as an office, a title, a preconceived authority symbol, a delegated voice and hand of the administration. Perhaps you can escape this stereotype, but I do not believe you can, and I am not sure that it is wholly desirable that you should--you really are a symbol, a delegated voice, an official identity, when you become a dean or counselor. You must solve the paradoxical conflict in the very nature of the job by accepting the necessary shell of official identity, without losing your own flavor, your own self, and without losing your confidence and your peace of mind.

Second, whatever your field of academic proficiency, it is desirable both professionally and personally to teach in the classroom, so that your academic respectability can be verified to both students and faculty members, and so that you will not become isolated in the ivory tower of office appointments and lose your contacts with the student mind and behavior in the classroom setting; and yet, no professional job was ever more jealous, whatever your personnel title,

of time stolen from your appointment calendar and from precious time for research and evaluation of your work. The more successful you are in getting through to your students and your classroom faculty, the more hours you will use for individual appointments; the more hours you need for appointments, the less time you will have for your classroom teaching; the more successful you are in classroom teaching, the more time you will need for keeping up with new publications for your class and the more you will need contacts with your classroom students and for preparation of materials for them--hence the less time for office appointments as a dean. Round and round it goes, the battle, until if you are like me, you will have to cut it short one way or the other. For me, the appointment calendar drove out my classroom teaching years ago. I could not bear the conflict between the two, and made my choice.

Everywhere you turn there are contradictory demands upon you. How many times have you agonized over trying to be a counselor who can free the student from his fear of authority, and at the same time be the voice and the hand of authority, trying to clarify, encourage, and enforce the standards of behavior which express with the philosophy of your school? We are not willing, you and I, to delegate the entire counseling role to a clinical center (who wants to be reduced to an Emily Post social instructor, or--dreadful thought--the total disciplinarian, with the proverbial red carpet for any who venture into the office?); nor do we wish to turn over our leadership in clarifying and evaluating standards in the school to any agency separated from us (reducing us to administrative routines without contacts with student and faculty thought in the evaluating processes), or relinquish our role in enforcing standards--discipline--to the city courts (who are too impersonal), or the school security officer (who does not have the training or the philosophy we have), or to the principal or president (who, poor soul, already has too many demands on his time and attention). We never free ourselves from our concern with all three roles in student behavior--counseling, evaluation, clarification, and communication of standards, and imaginative, understanding creative enforcement of standards. And there the conflict remains.

Or consider our role as official administrators, obligated by our job to be loyal to the policies and the professional persons of our superiors, loyal to the professional dignity and authority of our faculty colleagues, and to our teaching staff, and loyal at the same time to our students, respecting and listening to their fears and their complaints and their dreams and their inspirations--all without loss of professional and personal integrity. Believe me, when you add another factor sometimes, when you know you would not have made the same policy decision and yet you must remain loyal to the decision made above you, you will feel this conflict sharply, and you must find a way to live with it professionally and personally.

We organize our time and energy so carefully and efficiently that we can keep our in-basket persistently empty, and our out-basket always full, our calendar scheduled full with well-planned-for appointments; and yet we are repeatedly interrupted to answer an important long distance call, or forced to clear the crowded calendar for an emergency, or squeezed into a 9th or 10th hour in the 8-hour day so as to be available to the freshman who came in tears, or to a visiting colleague from another town who just dropped in, or to a worried professor who, thank fortune, has at long last remembered our offer to help him understand why Susan X is Susan X and not Susanne Q. We must concentrate to the exclusion of everything else, like Einstein himself, and yet at the drop of a hat, felt or feathered, we must interrupt concentration and respond cheerfully and attentively to whatever is next approaching us! It is not easy always to remain our own sweet selves!

Day in and day out we must consider students one by one as individual persons, keeping always within reach as they need us; and at the same time we must see them as only part of a whole, part of trends and problems and special interests, identify them and organize them into research evaluations and records to show us where we all are going, and why.

We must concern ourselves with every student, regardless of his rapport with us--the clinging vine whose need for attention smothers us, the rebel whose revolt bruises our self-confidence, the indifferent one who barely tolerates us--we must accept them all without losing our zest for understanding them. We must not cling ourselves to them with sentimental or professional possessiveness, or withdraw into a hurt personal limbo when their interests and their decisions do not coincide with our secret or not-so-secret hopes for them.

We must be absorbed in the concerns of our work, busy beyond the capacity of every day, and yet we dare not become so fascinated with busy-ness that our goals are turned to stone on our hands, our bodies denied the necessities of rest and daily care, our minds neglected and starved in a steady diet of shop-talk. If there is any universal hazard in our job, I believe it is in this paradox, for if we really are successful and in love with what we are doing, then we ourselves multiply the demands we make upon ourselves at the expense of the personal attention we must pay ourselves if we are to remain physically and emotionally well.

Many of us find ourselves battling a conflict between our feeling of being needed, being indispensably and peculiarly distinctive in our success--powerful, if you wish--a feeling which being an authority symbol tends to force upon us; and our urgent belief that we must welcome mature self-determination and self-action among those with whom we work, both our colleagues and our students. This is a battle we fight over and over again, for just as we become sure of our own success, daring or articulate ones break through our illusion of indispensability, and we must turn to new ideas we did not create, but they did.

Knowing we must respond to all people, we must nevertheless recognize that they do not respond alike to us, nor are we always impartial in our response to them. We must learn to recognize and make allowance for our own prejudices and preconceptions as we do for the prejudices and preconceptions of others. Anxious to be always adequate, we must learn to refer to a more appropriately oriented colleague or other available agency, and be able to recognize such referral is not a defeat. We will not succeed every time, frustrating as that truth is. In fact, we often cannot even know whether we succeed or not.

You must be confident and self-assured--and must be humbly aware that you can very well be wrong. You must involve yourself deeply in students' problems--and you must forget them. You must seek collaboration with your colleagues--and you must preserve confidentiality. You must encourage self-revelation so that you can understand--and you must warn your counselee of your obligations as an administrative officer.

If this prospect of unremitting conflicts appalls you, think it over seriously. This vocation may not be for you. If, on the other hand, it thrills you to the core, the prospect of demands that will never let you settle down to comfortable boredom, then hold tight and stay with it--this is your job for sure. You will never want to leave it, can never leave it, for any other kind of work. It will not let you go!

The second paradox may not impress you for a little while now that you are new in the game, but it will grow upon you until one day it seems to you the most characteristic and the most difficult of all. And I might say, it is the most exciting, perhaps the most rewarding, for all the headaches it may bring.

You will discover, if you have not done so already, that the most carefully planned professional curriculum cannot have prepared you for the unexpected, the desperate, the shocking reality of the emergencies that you must meet in your job, or the delicate complications they can involve. However confident you were when you first started work, you are likely to find confidence-shaking occasions when you look around and say, "Who, me?" If you don't have your confidence shaken now and then by the responsibility you must carry, then I really wonder if you have full insight into your work. You really ought to have capacity for growing with experience, you ought to know better what directions to turn after you have cut your professional teeth on the job. You will find yourself developing a technique of your own, a depth of understanding, an ability to anticipate, an increasingly dependable know-how through the years.

Then one day, presto! or should I say, whammo! Some one of the most trusted persons with whom you are working will shock you with an assumption that you feel is false. When you challenge it or inquire into it, he or she will candidly make it clear that you are the one out of line, dated, not with it, old hat, a square from Squaresville, if you think your assumption is true any longer. That day you will have begun to recognize the inexorable pressure of change, the painful reality of change. We deans and counselors must develop a security within ourselves, based upon a conscientious, intelligent search for fundamental truths on which we can base our philosophy of life and work. We spend years of our professional lives and our personal lives trying to identify these truths and to relate them to our work. What happens when the landmarks on which we based our essential thinking become themselves ill-defined or lost as the world turns? What if the sociological patterns in our society themselves shift so fundamentally that our very words for talking about them do not speak the same meaning to those we are counseling? When this happens--and I assure you that the world will no more remain static for you who are new here today that it has remained static for us who came into the work thirty years ago--then you will know the pressure upon deans because of change. Changed backgrounds, changed experiences, changed assumptions, changed customs force painful reevaluations and renewed searching into eternal verities, a rethinking of hard-won concepts of truth. Your hair may have turned gray by then and you may have added a few pounds, but if your job has the fascinating, absorbing reality to you I hope it does and will, you will never grow old--you will remain flexible in simple necessity. You will never be free from the pains of growth.

When I entered this work in 1933, the League of Nations was dying, the mental health field was still concerned with the wave of adult suicides of 1929 and 1930, and the fear engendered by an economic quagmire. College graduates were filling menial jobs, bread and soup lines were common, banks were untrustworthy, men and women hesitated to risk marriage, and philosophers arose to declare that there were no worlds left to conquer. The status quo was wonderful, precious, because it was dangerous to risk the unknown. Frankly, I was dubious about accepting an appointment as Dean of Women and teacher of English in a small college in South Dakota, but felt myself lucky to have its security. The November after I arrived, we experienced the first of the terrifying dust storms that plagued the plains in the 30's. Students paid their tuition with their parents' remaining cattle, with credit orders on their father's merchandise stores, with tax anticipation warrants with which their teacher-parents had been paid by bankrupt school boards.

In the residence hall in which I lived as Dean of Women, women's hours were 7:30 p.m. except for Friday and Saturday, when they were 10:00 p.m. An 11:00 p.m. lights-out policy prevailed. Self-government for student women was through elected officers who gingerly watched the Dean of Women for approval as they acted in matters of noise and hours and social plans. It was the unspoken understanding that behavior or cultural programs or policy evaluation of any kind was administrative. On moving to Illinois in 1937, I found better developed concepts of student participation in policy decisions, but within a clean-cut structure of close administrative control, centered in a strong president. Students used the voice they were granted power to use, but within very clear limits. It was a fairly comfortable arrangement, in which we all could know each other well and could "feel" each other's moods. A kind of paternalistic family feeling held us all together.

Now it is 1965. A sputnik shot into orbit has shaken our world, and we are talking about landing on the moon. For the old cliches of "in loco parentis" and "social responsibility" and "conduct becoming the standards of this university" we now have new cliches: "Civil rights," "due process," and "Civil disobedience," and sit-ins and lie-ins and teach-ins; instead of the "socially oriented" we now speak of the conformist as the organization man and the man in the gray flannel suit, and the non-conformist as the creative personality who does not act effectively within the standard pattern.

In the world affairs we have had a second world war, a Korean war, a long-drawn cold war, and now a Vietnamese war, to say nothing of the little brush fires like the Congo and Cyprus and Santo Domingo, and the like. Compulsory military training for our young men, with all varieties of reaction to it and to war itself, is an everyday fact of life. Military women are now common, and in Vietnam they serve in combat.

The Ku Klux Klan and McCarthyism and other isms with dictatorial or conspiratorial or terroristic philosophies have risen and fallen and risen again.

The old age Social Security plan has become a commonplace, and Medicare has come into being, while meantime the elderly are being forced to retire by practically universal retirement systems, and geriatrics is the new medical specialty. Parallel with this loss of the ascendancy of age and experience has come a rise to power for youth and innovation. The changed structure of the family, the rise of a new scientific aristocracy composed of the very young, the practical impossibility of changing job assignment once one is fossilized by seniority--all of these and other factors make old solutions for new problems suspect.

International relations have been precipitated into a new age by thermonuclear physics, and economic principles have been exploded by computerized management and cybernation. A new United Nations has been born, which this fall celebrated its twentieth year, still struggling for its identity, with new nations carving their way out of old colonies and races and ideologies glaring at each other across new borders.

Mental health specialists are centering their concern on the 50 per cent of our hospital beds now being occupied by the mentally ill, and the shocking realization that 50 per cent of the suicides in our country are college students.

Far from a good-natured deference to authority and regulations on any college campus, we now have an outspoken demand for the reasons for old standards of behavior. Basic concepts, basic assumptions are being questioned nationwide. Father no longer is believed to know best.

Is truth in itself desirable? the new generation asks. Is it only a variable? What is so wrong about lying if you can see you will gain from the lie?

Is personal integrity really required of a creative individual?

Can an experimental experience with a hallucinatory drug duplicate a religious experience. Then what is religion?

What is all this talk about responsibility? Responsibility to whom? Why should the individual subordinate his personal wishes to the welfare of a society whose opinion is of no interest to him? Why should he be concerned about his unknown--or his known--neighbor?

Why is shoplifting, disregard for property, so bad? If society does not make it possible for an individual to have what he wants, why does society deny him the right to take it when he can find it?

If everyone else in a class cheats, why isn't it justifiable to cheat a little yourself, to protect yourself from the irrational bell curve?

What is so bad about drinking? About getting a little drunk? Why all this todo about alcoholism? Who's an alcoholic?

Sex standards which once were at least common knowledge though not uniformly adhered to now are themselves in serious flux. Remembering Dr. Lloyd-Jones's report on the conflicting systems of sex morality these days, we are beginning to hear in addition a militant demand for privacy in personal affairs, inviolate from institutional or other intrusion--why should anyone inquire into behavior between two private individuals? Whose business is it but theirs?

With the rise of youthful confidence and outspoken challenge to the right of age to regulate youth, colleges on all sides are hastening, sometimes belatedly, to re-examine their regulations and to utilize this serious-minded intelligence among students in decisions about regulations. In contrast with South Dakota's 1933 women's hours of 7:30 and 10:00, we in Illinois are hearing on all sides student rumors about the liberalism of all other colleges and universities in women's regulations and murmurs of discontent are rising about all regulations. The days of the silent, passive teenager are gone, and so are the peaceful days on university campuses. A new day has brought indignant, loud, impatient, not-too-respectful "creative thinkers," with the association of truth with the new rather than with the old and traditional.

The 1965 dean must think fast and flexibly in her role of interpreter, catalyst, guide, listener, counselor, administrator. Her functions shift with new concepts, her tools must be made from both old and radically new materials. It is a time of excitement and challenge, of extraordinary ferment. The world will continue to change, and ideologies will continue to arise in conflict, and youth will continue to challenge the concepts of the previous generation. One of these days you who are now new will stand in my old timer's shoes. To your surprise

you will be the older generation. When that day comes, and a pretty young thing comes in to tell you about that out-of-date family of hers, you will listen with calm understanding when you hear that they have the fuddy-duddy notion of sending her to the moon for her junior year. You will not be surprised that she favors going instead with her latest boyfriend on his two-year rocket tour of the nearby planets, or accepting Professor Nemo's scholarship for a year in the undersea University of the Pacific. And you will use the newest techniques developed by your committee on computer decision-making, or will help her reach one of the half-dozen admissions advisers for the Year-on-the-Moon Project through her hand-made communicator set, or what is more likely, will fall back on the good old 1965 device of non-directive counseling and let her fight it out herself!

For all the conflicts you will have endured by then, and all the changes you will have faced, you deans of the future will still be in the game, because there is no other job in the world like it for you!

Jane Kotten
Reporter, Findings Committee

* * * * *

If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away.

Henry David Thoreau

Mingle a little folly with your wisdom; a little nonsense now and then is pleasant.

Carmina Horace