

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
A Xerox Education Company

73-12,704

ELLIOTT, Charles Stewart, 1941-
STUDENT ORGANIZATION ADVISORS IN HIGHER
EDUCATION: CURRENT TRENDS AND PRACTICES
AT SELECTED INSTITUTIONS IN MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

STUDENT ORGANIZATION ADVISORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:
CURRENT TRENDS AND PRACTICES AT SELECTED
INSTITUTIONS IN MICHIGAN

By

Charles Stewart Elliott

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

STUDENT ORGANIZATION ADVISORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: CURRENT TRENDS AND PRACTICES AT SELECTED INSTITUTIONS IN MICHIGAN

By

Charles Stewart Elliott

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to review what various types of institutions of higher education in Michigan are doing regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. Of particular interest was whether these institutions still require student organizations to have faculty advisors. Additional areas of concern included the role of the advisor as seen from the perspective of administrators, faculty, and students and current trends and practices in various operational functions such as recruitment and selection, orientation, evaluation, and rewards for advisors.

A review of the literature revealed little more than general philosophical discussions regarding the value and role of faculty advisors to student organizations. Personal experiences and views of "experts" in the field of student activities administration in various publications provided a basis for why advisors should exist and some of their duties and functions but very little empirical research could be found dealing with faculty advisors to student organizations in higher education.

From the ninety institutions of higher education in Michigan, eight were selected as being broadly representative of the total population of institutions. Personal visitations were made to each campus. Using prepared interview guides, in-depth interviews were held with at least one activities administrator and three student organization leaders and three faculty advisors on each campus. A total of sixty-three interviews were conducted.

Responses from those interviewed were compiled and contrasted for those questions asked of each group. Detailed views of each group are presented along with composite views on the role of the advisor as seen from their three perspectives.

Major Findings

Seven of the eight institutions in the study still require student organizations to have a faculty advisor but this requirement is increasingly being reviewed, particularly by the large public universities.

Recruitment and selection of advisors is primarily left up to the student organization leaders. Only one school still retains approval of all advisor appointments.

Orientation of new advisors was found at half of the institutions but was primarily handled on an informal basis with heavy reliance on printed materials available.

Virtually no real in-service training for faculty advisors was present at any institution. Meetings of activities administrators and faculty advisors were generally held only "as needed" according to

the activities administrators.

No methods of formal evaluation of faculty advisors were found at any institution in the study. Advisors and student leaders relied on informal contacts to provide any feedback felt necessary regarding the advisor's performance.

Tangible rewards for advisors are present at only one institution in the survey. Minor rewards such as banquets, dinner meetings, letters of appreciation, complimentary copies of the yearbook, and other methods were reported at half of the institutions. Advisors reported several intangible rewards such as getting to know students better, improved classroom performance, life-long friendships, and related values.

Few changes directly affecting advisors were contemplated in the near future other than possibly dropping the institutional requirement for faculty advisors at the large institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the course of completing the doctoral program, valuable assistance was provided by several individuals. The writer wishes to extend particular appreciation to Dr. Walter F. Johnson for his advice and counsel over several years and especially during this thesis preparation. Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker and Dr. Max R. Raines also provided great assistance to program planning and thesis preparation far beyond what would normally be expected.

Special thanks are also extended to Mrs. Patricia Fultz and Mrs. Joanne Dunham for their patient and thorough help in typing this thesis.

Last, but certainly not least, the writer thanks his wife Elaine, children Marsha and Barry, and parents Rhoda and Edwin Elliott, without whose constant support and encouragement this work would probably never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Research Problem	3
	Purpose	4
	General Questions to be Considered in the Survey	4
	Overview	5
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
	General Faculty Relationships	6
	Actual Research Studies Involving Advisors	9
	Fraternity Advisor Information in Literature	10
	Role of the Advisor	11
	Summary	14
III.	DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	16
	Population and Samples	16
	Instrumentation	23
	Study Design	25
	Data Analysis	26
	Summary	26
IV.	SURVEY RESULTS	27
	Faculty Advisor Views	27
	Statements of Duties and Responsibilities	28
	Advisor Evaluation	29
	Advisor Rewards	30
	Advisor Frustrations	30
	Advice to a New Advisor	31
	Dealing with Institutional Policy Violations	32
	Their Future Plans as Advisors	32
	Student Leader Views	33
	Recruitment and Selection of Advisors	33
	Evaluating Advisors	35
	Dealing with Institutional Policy Violations	36

Chapter	Page
Activities Administrator Views	37
Institutional Policy Requiring Student Organization Advisors	37
Orientation of New Advisors	39
Advisor Development Programs	42
Advisor Rewards	43
Future Campus Changes Possibly Affecting Advisors	44
Administrator Frustrations	45
Advice to a New Institution	46
Dealing with Institutional Policy Violations	47
Views of Top Student Personnel Administrators	47
Should Faculty Advisors be Required for Student Organizations	49
Role of the Advisor	50
Summary	53
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	55
The Problem	55
Major Findings	56
Implications for Future Research	57
Discussion	58
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63
APPENDIX	
A. FACULTY ADVISORS INTERVIEW GUIDE	65
B. STUDENT LEADERS INTERVIEW GUIDE	68
C. ACTIVITIES ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW GUIDE	70
D. SAMPLE STATEMENT OF ADVISOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES AT A LARGE UNIVERSITY	72
E. SAMPLE STATEMENT OF ADVISOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES AT A MEDIUM-SIZE UNIVERSITY	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan By Type of Control and Highest Degree Offered	17
3.2 Student Leaders Interviewed by Type of Organization	22
3.3 Faculty Advisors Interviewed by Type of Organization	22
4.1 Institutions with Statements of Advisor Duties and Responsibilities	28
4.2 Student Leader Views of Sources for New Advisors	34
4.3 How the Faculty Member Became An Advisor to the Organization	35
4.4 Activities Administrators Knew of Advising <u>Monograph</u>	43
4.5 Should Institutions Require Faculty Advisors for Student Organizations?	50
4.6 Role of the Advisor	51

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Organized forms of student activities have been in existence on college and university campuses for many years. Organizations such as student government, union programming boards, fraternities and sororities, student publication staffs, and technical and professional society student chapters have existed on virtually every campus. Some of these organizations have now been in existence for over 100 years, and many are often affiliated with national organizations which maintain student chapters and groups on several different campuses, both of public and private control.¹

Originally, student groups (particularly fraternities) often existed as "sub rosa" organizations outside the control of the institution. As their influences (both "good" and "bad") on students began to be recognized, the faculty increasingly assumed control of these organizations. Indeed, in the case of departmental interest clubs and similar organizations closely related to academic studies, the faculty often provided the initial force for forming such organizations.

Most student organizations were thus formally "recognized" by the institution. This meant that formalized procedures were established by the institution which a group of students who wanted to form an organization had to follow to become "recognized." Being "recognized" usually meant that the organization was listed in official university publications such as the catalog, that they could use institution

¹Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University - A History, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, pp. 136-155.

facilities to publicize their events and hold meetings, and generally take advantage of other available university services.

Very often one of the important requirements for becoming a "recognized" student organization was that a faculty or staff member would be obtained as a faculty advisor or sponsor. Such a person or persons could be recruited by the students from volunteers or in some cases were sought out and appointed by the institutional administration.

One of their major functions in the beginning was to aid in "controlling" the organization so that it would not "embarrass" the institution or work at cross-purposes to the generally accepted goals of the institution.² While such a control function may still be desired (even demanded) by some institutions of its organization advisors, much of this has given way to more "passive" roles for advisors.³

Thus, while supervising functions were initially stressed when colleges and universities generally adhered to concepts of "in loco parentis" relationships with their students, advisors now have many other responsibilities. As outlined by Bloland,⁴ they generally include: teaching and coaching functions, consultation on programs, providing continuity, counseling individual students, interpretation of policy, supervision (although qualified as not a "major responsibility"), and meeting emergencies. He goes on to state that particular institutions may require additional responsibilities such as: financial supervision, attend social activities, attend organization meetings,

²E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961, p. 223.

³Ibid, p. 224.

⁴Paul A. Bloland, Student Group Advising in Higher Education, ACPA Monograph No. 8, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D. C., 1967, pp. 15-17.

monitor scholastic eligibility of group members, maintain organizational records, make annual reports and see that other procedures are complied with. He emphasizes the advisor's role as one of making significant educational contributions rather than as a supervisor.

The Research Problem

Advisors to student organizations exist on virtually every college campus in the United States. As noted later in this study, this is even true when they are not "required" by the institution. Yet in spite of their wide presence, they have very seldom been the subject of published research studies (see Chapter II). That little which does exist consists mainly of personal views and recollections of several long-time practitioners of the "art" of advising student groups.

Recent conversations with faculty members and administrators, particularly student activities administrators, on several campuses have resulted in some reports that advisors are no longer being "required" for recognized student organizations.

Accordingly, it would seem that a review of current trends and practices in faculty advisory situations on various types of campuses is long overdue for some exploratory research efforts. Any observable trends and future implications should be particularly timely concerns in the student activities area where considerable changes have recently occurred with widespread reports of declining interests in "traditional" activities and organizations.

With the present literature revealing very little, this project was designed to take a systematic look at what the state of the art

is in this area of higher education.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to present an in-depth analysis of current trends and practices related to student organization faculty advisors at selected colleges and universities. Particular interest is directed at whether institutions are continuing to require that organizations have a faculty advisor to be recognized. The recruitment, selection, orientation, in-service training, evaluation, and rewards for advisors are reviewed. Views of student leaders, faculty advisors, and student activities administrators on various facets of advisor operations are presented and contrasted. The role of the faculty advisor receives particular consideration.

General Questions to be Considered in the Survey

The primary questions considered in this survey are as follows:

1. Are requirements that student organizations must have a faculty advisor being dropped, particularly by large institutions?
2. Are students less supportive of the need for faculty advisors than are advisors or activities administrators?
3. Do all institutions maintain stated duties and responsibilities for faculty advisors?
4. Who recruits advisors for student organizations?
5. What formal approaches to advisor evaluation are used at the institutions in the survey?
6. What forms of tangible rewards are provided for faculty advisors?

7. What is the role of the advisor?

Overview

Following this introduction, a review of the published literature directly related to the problem area is presented in Chapter II. This is followed by a complete description of the study design outlined in Chapter III and a presentation of the results of the study in Chapter IV. Whenever appropriate, the results are presented to contrast the view for each major group interviewed - student leaders, faculty advisors, and student activities administrators. The final Chapter V is devoted to summary, findings, implications for future research, and general discussion.

One of the reasons which made this study seem to be very much worth performing was the very limited amount of published research dealing with faculty advisors to student organizations. Those which were located are reviewed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Even though student organizations have existed on college campuses for many years and at least one organization claims to have had faculty advisors for over 100 years,¹ a review of the literature has resulted in very little research reported concerning faculty advisors and a limited number of general references to advisors in various publications. In this section, items located in the literature will be reviewed in the areas of general faculty relationships, actual research studies involving advisors, fraternity advisor information, and the role of the advisor.

General Faculty Relationships

The general values of having faculty members involved in student activities have been discussed by several authors of well-known texts in college student personnel work. Stroup² devotes a complete chapter of his book to faculty-student cooperation and stresses heavily that extensive involvement of faculty members will inject intellectual integrity and objectivity into organized activities and will allow the same standards as used in the classroom to be extended to extracurricular activities. He lists student inadequacies which faculty involvement can help overcome as discontinuity, incompetence, immaturity, limited amount

¹A Guide for Advisors of the Theta Xi Fraternity, Theta Xi National Fraternity, St. Louis, Missouri, 1965, p. 1.

²Herbert Stroup, Towards a Philosophy of Organized Student Activities, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1964, pp. 150-159.

of time, lack of authority, and power-mindedness. As with some other authors reviewed later, he keeps his references to faculty members very general and does not directly refer to faculty advisors for student organizations.

Williamson,³ on the other hand, uses the term "faculty adviser" on several occasions in a chapter in his book but seems to mean the professional staff employed in student activities administration. In outlining an elaborate new program directed at improved administrative services for student organizations, no mention is made of staff contact with organization advisors as a part of such a program.⁴ A form used in the program does contain space for listing of the organizations' faculty advisors but no further reference to them was made.⁵

Mueller,⁶ however, does deal directly with regular teaching faculty as advisors to student organizations. She states that the value to students of participation in activities "rises with the amount of supervision by wise faculty leaders."⁷ Written in an earlier time, she stated, "every campus activity has its adult sponsor or advisor."⁸ Particular

³E. G. Williamson, Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961, pp. 213-254.

⁴Ibid, p. 228.

⁵Ibid, p. 231.

⁶Kate H. Mueller, Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1961, pp. 214-223.

⁷Ibid, p. 275.

⁸Ibid, p. 214.

mention is made that young teachers are more active and energetic and have more time than older faculty members to devote to advising student organizations.⁹

Strang states that all school activities should have an adult sponsor who will "guide but not dominate".¹⁰ She later devotes an entire chapter to evaluation of group activities but makes no mention of faculty advisors in that regard.

Several authors have stressed the desirable use of faculty members in expanding the academic basis for operation of organized student activities. Purdy¹¹ emphasizes a need for new relationships between faculty and activities directors beyond the faculty advisor situation because "it has not necessarily provided academic recognition for work done by students outside of class, and it has further spread faculty time between research, publishing, teaching, and advising".¹²

Kamm¹³ offers an article providing a rather thorough view of faculty involvement in counseling activities with students but never once mentions faculty advisors to student organizations as a part of such a program.

⁹Ibid, p. 215.

¹⁰Ruth Strang, Group Work in Education, Harper Brothers, New York, 1958, p. 45.

¹¹Leslie Purdy, "Extracurricular Programs in Higher Education", Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 34, No. 4, Summer, 1971, pp. 164-170.

¹²Ibid, p. 166.

¹³Robert B. Kamm, "The Faculty and Guidance", Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 5, No. 4, June, 1964, pp. 220-225.

Actual Research Studies Involving Advisors

In 1962, Bloland wrote that "research evidence which bears directly upon the functions of the staff advisor to student organization is practically non-existent".¹⁴ A review of the literature since that time reveals that little has been reported to change that situation.

French refers to but does not provide a bibliographic listing for a study of one university having 175 student organizations, "each with an elected faculty advisor".¹⁵ He goes on to add "the enthusiasm, personal interest, and active influence of the faculty in that university could be felt beyond evaluation".¹⁶ He strongly supports the value of having faculty involved with student groups as advisors.

In the only study located with actual scientific research regarding faculty advisors, Muse found that "supplying supervision by an experienced, respected chapter advisor who attends chapter meetings on a regular basis" as one of the ten management practices significantly related (at the .05 level) to the degree of success (defined by six criteria measures) attained by the student organization on a college campus. He defined an "experienced" advisor as one who remains an advisor for more than one year, "interested" as attending meetings regularly (fraternities usually meet weekly), and "effective" as being respected by the group's officers. In discussing the implications of the study, he particularly

¹⁴Paul A. Bloland, "The Role of the Student Organization Advisor," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 41, September, 1962, p. 45.

¹⁵Arden O. French, "Student Activities and Faculty Relationships," NASPA Journal, Vol. 2, No. 3, January, 1965, p. 12.

¹⁶Ibid, p. 12.

stressed the value of having advisors and suggested the potential for generalizing the results to all types of student organizations and not just for fraternities.¹⁷

Fraternity Advisor Information in the Literature

National social fraternities have published some articles and information regarding advisors to their organizations. They seem to place particular stress on the importance of having effective advisors. Most of these publications, however, are intended primarily for their own internal use and are seldom available for review by outside sources. In a national fraternity magazine, Preston presents a role re-evaluation discussion for fraternity advisors. In a review of advisor "afflictions", he listed being overworked, conflicts with other advisors, pressure from school administrators over controversial group activities, and apathy towards and neglect of faculty advisors. Personal benefits of being an advisor were listed as bridging the gap between students and administrators, improvement in the advisor's personal skills of dealing with groups, national fraternity involvement, and strengthening campus activities for general student growth.¹⁸

Many national fraternities have manuals for their advisors. Two of several available were selected and reviewed for their general content. The first one generally followed a "how-to-do-it" format with listing of constitutional authority for advisors, objectives, methods suggested by

¹⁷William V. Muse, "Management Skills in Student Organizations," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 48, No. 10, June, 1970, pp. 842-847.

¹⁸Paul L. Preston, "Faculty Adviser - A Role Re-Evaluation," The ATO Palm, Alpha Tau Omega National Fraternity, Champaign, Illinois, September, 1971, pp. 38-39.

previously successful advisors, the national organization structure, and general background information.¹⁹ The second one covered advisor qualifications, duties and responsibilities, operational suggestions, and general background information.²⁰

Bryant drew on his personal experiences to present an overview of the fraternity advisor's role, duties, and responsibilities. He stressed working with individual members not just dealing with the group. Methods of effective communication and problem-solving behaviors were also outlined. The advisors own personal needs were reviewed for one of the few such occurrences found in the literature. The needs outlined included: satisfying self-expression, mutual adjustments by students as well as advisors, need for appreciation, and the need for open communication particularly involving the many frustrations inherent in being an advisor.²¹

Role of the Advisor

This is one area where the literature provides several sources for review. All were generally built around personal experience and not on research efforts, however.

¹⁹Chapter Advisor's Manual, Sigma Chi National Fraternity, Evanston, Illinois, 17 pages, no date.

²⁰Theta Xi, op. cit., 17 pages.

²¹Arthur L. Bryant, "The Fraternity Adviser", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 36, November, 1967, pp. 203-206.

The most thorough treatment of the faculty advisory area was found in Bloland's monograph published in 1967.²² In addition to outlining general responsibilities and possible advisory techniques, he discussed the advisor's role on the active-passive continuum or behavior with the group. He found it more meaningful, however, to discuss advisory functions in three general respects:

1. Maintenance or custodial functions which serve to maintain the existence of the group and keep it out of difficulty. These generally require little initiative by the advisor.
2. Group growth functions which improve the operation and effectiveness of the group and help it progress toward its goals.
3. Program content functions which can stimulate the intelligence and ability of the student participants and help them plan activities which will contribute to their own intellectual development while enriching campus life.

He saw these not in conflict with each other but more as "stages of advisory behavior that may be adopted in succession or in their entirety by an advisor depending upon his own interests, the quality of student leadership and ideation, the specificity of his institutional responsibilities, and the interests and abilities of the members of the group."²³ He did, however, stress that in the last functional area the advisor assumes a genuinely educational function.

²²Paul A. Bloland, Student Group Advising in Higher Education, ACPA Monograph No. 8, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D. C., 1967, 34 pages.

²³Ibid, pp. 12-13.

Williams, one of the more prolific writers in the area, has published three articles all generally dealing with advisor role and functions. His first short article, apparently addressed to new advisors, stressed the necessity for the advisor to play a "varied and complicated role." Desirable characteristics he listed for advisors included: enthusiasm; having a definite interest in students and the ability to communicate with them in a favorable way; seeing the activity as an educational experience for students; and having adequate knowledge of and interest in the purposes, goals and subjects of the particular activity.²⁴

In a similar article, drawing from the teacher-student relationship, he extends these areas to suggest to students that they choose their sponsor wisely (if allowed to do so) and make good use of their sponsors.²⁵

Another of his articles stressed that interested faculty members should provide guidance when needed but not to assume either the responsibility or authority for the organization's activities. Particular difficulties he listed for advisors to community college organizations to be aware of were:

1. Continuity due to rapid member turnover.
2. Commuting, as most students live at home.
3. Heavy tendency for students to hold at least part-time jobs.

²⁴F. Neil Williams, "Becoming a Faculty Sponsor", Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 14, Summer, 1966, pp. 204-255.

²⁵F. Neil Williams, "The Student Activity Sponsor", School Activities, Vol. 39, April, 1968, pp. 3-4 and 17.

4. High organization costs with limited student budgets.²⁶

A special role reported by Bryant for faculty members at a new community college involved helping to start student organizations in response to student concerns for the lack of organized activities on the campus.²⁷

In a study of student leaders by Ptacek, it was found that student leaders were especially reluctant to seek counseling. Due to their many time demands, these students often experienced personal difficulties. When considering ways of dealing with this problem, they found that "having faculty advisors to talk to and to refer students needing assistance" to be quite low on the suggested list of possible solutions to the problem.²⁸

Summary

The available literature regarding faculty advisors to student organizations in higher education was found to be quite limited. Especially limited were actual research studies involving faculty advisors. Most of the literature available in this area dealt with personal views and experiences from authors who have served as faculty advisors or worked closely with them. Noteworthy was the existence of some articles dealing with effective faculty-student

²⁶F. Neil Williams, "Responsibility for Activities Programs in Junior Colleges", School Activities, Vol. 38, December, 1966, pp. 2-3.

²⁷Arley Bryant, "Activities Program Beginnings in a New Junior College", School Activities, Vol. 38, December, 1966, pp. 5-7.

²⁸Paul H. Ptacek, "A University's Attempt to Counsel Student Leaders", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 28, 1957, pp. 137-143.

relationships outside of the classroom but never really considering the logical connection in this regard for student organization faculty advisors to play a significant role in doing this. Clearly, the subject of faculty advisors to student organizations in higher education is much in need of research and publication efforts.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The following aspects of the research design are presented in this section:

1. Population and Samples.
2. Instrumentation.
3. Study Design.
4. Data Analysis.

In order to find out what the current trends and practices regarding faculty advisors at the various colleges and universities are, the following descriptive research design was developed and employed for this study.

Population and Samples

According to the 1970-71 Education Directory - Higher Education,¹ there are 90 institutions of higher education in the State of Michigan. The Directory classifies them as shown in Table 3.1.

¹Education Directory - Higher Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1971, page xx.

Table 3.1

Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan

By Type of Control and Highest Degree Offered

Type of Control	Doctorate	Beyond Master's but less than Doctorate	Master's Degree	First Pro- fessional Degree	4-5 Year Baccalaureate	2 but less than 4 yrs.	Total
Public	5	2	2	0	4	29	42
Private	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>48</u>
Total	6	2	10	4	32	36	90

From the various classifications of institutions in the state, the researcher, in consultation with the Thesis Committee, drew the survey samples from four types classified by enrollment and form of control which included most of the institutions in the state.

Type I - Very large, public universities with a student enrollment of more than 35,000 students. This described three institutions in the state.

Type II - Medium-size, public universities offering work beyond the master's degree but with few doctorate programs and a student enrollment between 16,000 and 24,000 students. This described three institutions in the state.

Type III - Large, public community colleges offering two years but less than four years of study and with student enrollment of more than 5,000 students. This described nine institutions in the state.

Type IV - Private colleges offering four-year degree programs with a student enrollment of between 1,000 and 1,500 students. This described ten institutions in the state.

In further consultation with members of the Thesis Committee, pairs of institutions within each of the four types of institutions classified above were selected to be included in this study. A general description of each institution follows, with all enrollment figures being taken from the Directory.²

²Ibid, pp. 176-191.

Type I Institutions

Institution A - a large, public university offering many doctoral programs with a current enrollment of approximately 35,000 full-time students. This largely commuter-oriented institution is located in the downtown area of a very large metropolitan area in the state. It listed 205 student organizations in the spring of 1972.

Institution B - a large, public university offering many doctoral programs with a current enrollment of approximately 44,000 full-time students. This primarily residential campus is located in a relatively small city which is part of a larger metropolitan area in the state. It listed 296 "registered" student organizations for 1971-72.

Type II Institutions

Institution C - a medium-size, public university offering a few doctoral programs with a current enrollment of approximately 21,000 students. While having several residence halls, it is primarily a commuter institution and is located in part of a larger metropolitan area near the state's largest metropolitan area. It listed approximately 150 student organizations in its 1972-73 student handbook.

Institution D - a medium-size, public university offering a few doctoral programs with a current enrollment of approximately 22,000 students. It is primarily a residential campus located in a medium-size city. It reported approximately 190 student organizations for 1971-72.

Type III Institutions

Institution E - a large, public community college offering two-year programs or less with a current enrollment of approximately 8,200

students located in the second largest metropolitan area in the state. It listed approximately 45 organizations in its student handbook for 1971-72.

Institution F - a large, public community college offering two-year programs or less with a current enrollment of approximately 12,000 students located in a suburban area near a very large metropolitan area. It listed approximately 35 student organizations in its 1971-72 student handbook.

Type IV Institutions

Institution G - a small, private college offering four-year degree programs with a student enrollment of approximately 1,200 located in a small town in the central part of the state. It listed approximately 45 student organizations in 1971-72.

Institution H - a small, private college offering five-year degree programs with an on-campus enrollment of approximately 1,200 located in a large city. It listed approximately 50 student organizations in 1971-72.

Since the purpose of this study was to review existing practices at various types of institutions of higher education, it was assumed that Michigan would not differ significantly from other states, and that using the four types of institutional classifications noted above and selecting diverse pairs within each type would not result in systematically unique samples. It is recognized, however, that the procedures used may limit the ability to generalize from the results of this survey to all other institutions of higher education.

Personal experience and the literature suggested three major groups of potential interview subjects at each institution as being most likely

to provide appropriate information regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. They were:

1. The staff person most directly responsible for student organizations. This was most often the director or assistant director of student activities.
2. Three currently active faculty advisors to student organizations.
3. Three student officers from the same or similar organizations.

Contacts were made through the student activities or dean of students office at the selected institutions to arrange the interviews at mutually convenient times. The local activities administrator was requested to provide a wide range of types of organizations to include fraternities/sororities, political or social action groups, academic departmental organizations, honorary groups, and social or recreational groups. In selecting advisors and student leaders, the local contact person was also requested to include a wide range of advisor activity level so as to cover organizations both with very active and others with much less active advisors.

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 show the types of organizations involved in the interviews with student leaders and faculty advisors respectively.

Table 3.2

Student Leaders Interviewed by Type of Organization

	I (Large)	II (Medium-size)	III (Community)	IV (Private)	Total
Fraternity/ Sorority	3	0	1	2	6
Academic Club or Honorary	0	1	1	2	4
Social/Political Action Group	2	1	1	0	4
Recreational Sports Club	2	1	3	2	8
Student Government	1	2	0	0	3
Student Publications	0	1	0	0	1
	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>26</u>

Table 3.3

Faculty Advisors Interviewed by Type of Organization

	I	II	III	IV	Total
Fraternity/ Sorority	3	0	2	2	7
Academic Club or Honorary	1	3	1	2	7
Social/Political Action Group	0	1	2	0	3
Recreational Sports Club	1	2	1	1	5
Student Government	1	0	0	0	1
Student Publications	0	0	0	1	1
	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>24</u>

Instrumentation

To assess current trends and practices regarding faculty advisors to student organizations at the selected institutions in the survey, the personal interview method was chosen as offering the best potential to explore the area of concern in-depth. The major areas of interest to be pursued in the interviews were established from personal experiences, literature review, and discussions with several faculty members and activities administrators on three campuses in Michigan as follows:

1. Background information on the respondent; such as position in the organization if a student leader, number of years as advisor, and other items of factual information.
2. Presence of stated duties and responsibilities for advisors.
3. Methods utilized for recruitment, selection, and training for advisors.
4. Methods employed for evaluating the performance of advisors.
5. Amount of turnover in advisors occurring on the campus.
6. Forms of tangible or intangible rewards existing for advisors.
7. Changes in the general advisory situation contemplated for the near future.
8. The general role definitions for advisors.
9. Methods used or suggested for advisors to handle organizational violations of major institutional policies.

10. Extent of advisor involvement in aiding members with personal problems unrelated to the organization.
11. Person to whom the advisor felt most responsible.
12. General comments and suggestions from each respondent.

To facilitate the collection of information in a relatively systematic manner, interview guides were developed for use with the three groups of survey participants - activities administrators, student leaders, and faculty advisors. A separate guide was developed for each group but several overlapping questions were asked to allow for a comparison of views.

Two behavioral science professors on the faculty at a private college in Michigan who had used interviews in their doctoral thesis studies and in other research projects reviewed the overall research plan and offered several suggestions regarding interview format and the guide plans.

Three institutions of higher education in one city were used to obtain two activities administrators, two student leaders, and two faculty advisors who were used individually as pilot interview subjects to check the clarity and appropriateness of the questions in the interview guides. These institutions included a public community college, a small, public college, and a small, private college. The pilot participants were selected because of their known active involvement with student organizations on their campuses. They were interviewed under circumstances similar to those planned for the total study. Several major revisions in exact wording of the questions and the order of presentation were obtained from this pilot group. None of these pilot subjects were used in the final interviews, but two of the institutions were included. The

final forms for the interview guides were then prepared and duplicated. Sample copies of the final version of the three interview guides are attached in Appendices A, B, and C, pages 65, 68, and 70.

Study Design

The descriptive interview survey was chosen as the basic method to collect information outlining current practices and trends in faculty advisors operations on various college campuses. While basically systematic in approach, this method allowed for groupings of responses by the type of institution and/or by type of respondent. It also allowed considerable flexibility in exploring in-depth areas of particular concern which might arise in the individual interviews. One-day visits to each campus were planned to conduct individual interviews with each participant. A total of sixty-three interviews were conducted: nine with activities administrators, twenty-four with faculty advisors, twenty-six with student leaders, and four with top student personnel administrators. Individual interviews rather than group interviews were conducted, with one exception. In that case, a group interview with the three functioning area directors of particular student activities programs at a large university was held at one meeting. The overall director was interviewed separately. Considerable background information regarding requirements for student organizations, copies of relevant policies and procedures, handbooks, manuals, and other general items were also obtained from the activities administrators or student personnel deans.

Data Analysis

Responses to the survey items were tabulated by number and percentage of responses and evaluated either by comparisons of responses among the three interview groups at each campus, by comparisons of responses among the four types of institutions in the study, by comparing total responses of each of the three groups of respondents in the study, or by a combination of these comparisons. The general emphasis of the study was in finding out what various institutional practices and situations are regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. With very little research having been reported in this area, the primary analysis was directed at describing the general situations regarding faculty advisors which currently exist at a wide range of types of institutions of higher education in the State of Michigan. Descriptive comments from survey respondents are included in appropriate areas.

Summary

Starting with the selection of eight institutions in the State of Michigan considered to be broadly representative of the four selected types of institutions in the state, a descriptive survey was made of what their current practices and procedures are and any future changes they might be planning regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. By visiting each campus and interviewing activities administrators, student leaders, and faculty advisors, comparisons of views on the subject were obtained and will be presented and analyzed in the next section of this report.

CHAPTER IV

SURVEY RESULTS

This chapter is devoted to reporting the general findings regarding faculty advisors which were noted at the eight campuses visited in the study. The survey findings are reported in sections containing views of faculty advisors, student leaders, and activities administrators followed by a section containing views from top student personnel administrators.

Six major operational functions were reviewed in this survey regarding the extent to which advisors at the various campuses were involved in each area. These functions were: statements of advisor duties and responsibilities, recruitment and selection procedures, orientation of new advisors, developmental activities which might generally be considered as in-service training, evaluation, and reward systems.

The composite views of all three survey groups on the matter of whether faculty advisors should be required for student organizations are reported in another section. A section dealing with composite group views on the role of the advisor is followed by a summary of the chapter.

Faculty Advisor Views

The interview method used in this survey allowed the advisor to express himself openly on several issues and questions in the survey. The major areas reported here are statements of duties and responsibility, evaluation, rewards, some of the frustrations encountered as an advisor, advice they would give to a new advisor, the troublesome area of dealing with organization violations of institutional policy, and their future plans on continuing as advisor.

Statements of Duties and Responsibilities Since advisors are generally required for student organizations, it would seem reasonable that specific statements as to their duties and responsibilities would be formulated by the requiring agency. Four of the eight institutions in this study do have stated duties and responsibilities for faculty advisors to student organizations. As shown in Table 4.1, three of the four types of institutions have such statements with the private colleges being the only institutional type not having such statements.

Table 4.1

Institutions with Statements of Advisor Duties and Responsibilities

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
I	1	1
II	2	0
III	1	1
IV	0	2
	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>

Most interestingly, of the twelve faculty advisors interviewed on those campuses having statements of duties and responsibilities, only one of the twelve knew of the existence of the statement and where to find it (it was in that institution's faculty handbook). At one institution which maintains the most comprehensive statement of all four institutions, one of the assistant directors of student activities did not know of the existence of the statement. It should be noted, however,

that he was completing only his first year in the position and at the institution. Sample statements of advisor duties and responsibilities at two of the institutions in the survey are shown in Appendices D and E, pages 72 and 74.

A total of seven of the twenty-four advisors (29.1%) representing six of the eight campuses in the study also stated that their national organization had either complete manuals for advisors or statements of duties for advisors in other national publications. Of these seven organization advisors, four were for national social fraternities and sororities, one for a national honorary fraternity, one for a national service fraternity, and one for a national religious organization.

Three additional advisors (12.5% of the total) mentioned that brief references to advisor duties were contained in the local organizations bylaws.

All totaled then, 17 of the 24 advisors (70.8%) had some printed statement of duties or responsibilities from some authoritative source.

Advisor Evaluation No formal methods of advisor evaluation were found at any institution visited. In addition, none of the activities administrators, faculty advisors, or students indicated that the possibility had even been considered. No plans for instituting any evaluation systems were reported at any school, either through the activities administrators or individual faculty advisors.

Advisors continually commented that they depended upon formal student reactions as their major means of evaluation. Declining instances of students seeking their advice or involvement were most often mentioned as their major method of such evaluation. A common remark

made by six different advisors can be generally summarized as, "I have a good feel for how I'm doing as an advisor - the students let you know, indirectly."

Advisor Rewards Advisors mentioned many intangible rewards for their efforts as advisors. Getting to know students on a personal basis, becoming more effective as a classroom teacher, intrinsic enjoyment of the activity of the organization (such as sailing and other sports activities), and several other expressions of personal "reward" were mentioned by advisors. None of the advisors seemed to exhibit any real concern over the lack of formal reward systems for faculty advisors at their institutions.

Several minor forms of advisor rewards such as annual banquets, dinner meetings, letters of appreciation, complimentary copies of the school yearbook, and similar activities were mentioned on four of the campuses.

Advisor Frustrations The most common item mentioned by faculty advisors as their major source of frustration was lack of time to adequately perform their function as an advisor. One-third (8 of 24 advisors) mentioned this concern. Young advisors who were graduate students working on doctorates at the large institutions (two cases) presented one side of the issue as follows: "Between my thesis work, teaching a class, and looking for a job next year, I have had to reduce my very active involvement with the group"; and "My committee chairman commented last week that perhaps I was spending too much time working with our ----- organization."

Older advisors were not left out of the time problem however as three of them expressed the same concern perhaps best typified as follows: "If I ever want to be promoted to full professor, I am going to have to give up my advising the two groups and go back to publishing."

The pressures of family, especially when the advisor had small children, were also mentioned by five different advisors.

Only one advisor readily commented that he no longer supported the aims of the group and would soon "drop out" of the organization, "They (a fraternity) are anti-intellectual and only interested in a good time. It's a waste of my time and theirs to be involved."

Another frustration mentioned by two advisors was a seeming desire by the students for the advisor to be more active than the advisor felt appropriate. One summarized it as, "The students are often asking why I don't come to more meetings. They act like they want me to run the organization."

Advice to a New Advisor When asked what kind of advice they would give to a new advisor replacing them, most admitted that they had not given it much thought. Some fairly typical responses were: "wish him good luck"; "stay out of their way"; "warn them not to get too involved"; and "introduce them to the officers and split." Only five of the advisors had received any form of group introduction from the previous advisor. Three advisors were serving fixed terms of appointment as a group advisor and commented that their replacement would work at least one year with them as "assistant advisor" before taking over and this would allow adequate "breaking in" of the new advisor.

Dealing With Institutional Policy Violations When discussing this often sensitive area with each advisor, the most common response to a hypothetical situation in which the group was supposedly planning to violate a major institutional policy was, "They wouldn't do it." Only two advisors had ever had to deal with anything close to such a situation and both reported that the group had finally decided not to do it.

The most common response to the situation as an absolute last resort of advisor action was simply, "I'd have to think about it." As reported later, only four advisors saw their enforcing institutional policies as a vital part of their function as an advisor. Such enforcement, they generally felt, was a responsibility of the activities office or dean of students office. As one pointed out, "I'm an advisor, not a campus policeman or dean."

In carrying the matter further with the advisors, an overwhelming majority (22 of 24) did not feel it was appropriate to report such group plans to administrative officers until all other possible solutions had been attempted and only then in the case of grave potential for physical harm. They continued to be almost unanimous (21 of 24 advisors) that the officers would handle the situation appropriately.

Their Future Plans As Advisors Among the twenty-four advisors, fifteen (62.5%) plan to continue indefinitely as advisors, three (12.5%) have one more year in fixed terms to serve, four (16.7%) are ending their service voluntarily for personal reasons (only one due to dissatisfaction with the group), and two (8.3%) are uncertain as to their future plans. Typical reactions of the fifteen who plan to continue indefinitely as advisors were: "as long as the kids want me"; "as long as my health (not

a strenuous activity organization) holds out, I really enjoy it"; and "until I get tired of it."

Student Leader Views

As with advisors, the student leaders likewise expressed many informative views regarding the recruitment and selection of advisors, evaluation of advisors, and the proper role for the advisor in dealing with organizational violations of institutional policy.

Recruitment and Selection of Advisors Although most institutions require student organizations to have advisors, the recruitment and selection of those advisors is generally left up to the student organization members.

All eight institutions allow student organization members to recruit their advisors for most general organizations. Student government, student publications, and club sports advisors were often appointed by administrative authorities or served as an organization advisor by virtue of their position at the institution. How student organization leaders free to choose their own advisors would go about such recruitment is shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2

Student Leader Views of Sources for New Advisors

	Number of Responses (Type of Institution)				<u>Total</u>
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	
Recruit from Class Instructors	3	3	4	3	13
Ask Present Advisor(s)	0	1	0	0	1
Ask Activities Office for Suggestions	1	2	1	0	4
Alumni Suggestions	1	0	0	1	2
	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>20</u>

Formal approval of advisors was limited to one private institution in the study and even there the approval was primarily a procedural matter as students recruited the advisors except for a few organizations such as student government.

Students tended to rely on themselves and their fellow organization members to select advisors they felt would relate well to students. New members of the faculty, especially young members, were seen as prime resources for such recruitment by students.

An analysis of how the faculty advisors interviewed in this study first became advisors is shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

How the Faculty Member Became an Advisor to the Organization

	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Asked by Students	14	58.3
Helped Start the Organization	3	12.5
Recruited by Previous Advisor	3	12.5
Appointed by Institution As Part of Job Duties	<u>4</u>	<u>16.7</u>
Total	24	100.0

As can be seen from the table, most were recruited by students. One of the advisors was even recruited by his own daughter. Those who helped start the organization and those initially recruited by the previous advisor were actually "selected" by students in the final appointment.

Evaluating Advisors While the student leaders at five of the eight institutions in the study reported that formal procedures for evaluating the classroom teaching effectiveness of faculty members existed on their campuses, only three of the twenty-six student leaders saw much potential value in having formal methods of advisor evaluation. While none reported ever having to do so, nine student leaders (representing both male and female student leaders and all four types of institutions) stated no hesitancy to go to their faculty advisor to talk to him if he (the advisor) was doing a poor job.

Of the twenty-four students in organizations with functioning advisors, sixteen (66.7%) reported them to be of significant assistance to their organization. One even reported that without their advisor the club would have been dissolved due to a recent crisis situation which the advisor played the major part in resolving.

Some general student remarks regarding evaluating advisors were as follows: "It might be a good idea but probably too much effort for the real potential value"; "He's smart enough to know when he is doing a good job"; and "The group wouldn't be interested, it's not that important."

Dealing with Institutional Policy Violations The student side of this issue was remarkably similar to that of the faculty advisors. They too had considerable difficulty in conceiving that their organization would plan something which would be a major violation of institutional policy.

It should be noted that several institutions have recently changed their policies regarding alcoholic beverages due to the new Age of Majority Law in Michigan so that the use of such beverages at an organization function would be seen as a "major" violation at only three of the eight institutions in the survey.

The type of organizations in the survey may also have limited this area of concern as fifteen of twenty-six leaders were from academic clubs, honorary organizations, recreational sports clubs, or student government and such organizations are probably much less likely to have activities which violate major institutional policies. Some of the student leaders comments in this area were: "We just don't do anything that controversial"; "While we don't do anything like that, if we did, our advisor would never know about it"; and "Are you kidding, here at - - - college?"

Activities Administrator Views

During the course of the interviews with the activities administrators which often were two or more hours in length, several general areas of concern were discussed. The major ones can be grouped under institutional policy requiring student organization advisors, orientation of new advisors, development programs for advisors, advisor rewards, future changes possibly affecting faculty advisors, administrator frustrations, advice to a new institution, and dealing with organizational violations of institution policy.

Institutional Policy Requiring Student Organization Advisors The widespread practice among colleges and universities of requiring student organizations to have a member of the faculty or staff as their faculty advisor or sponsor is still at least official policy at seven of the eight colleges visited. The one institution which dropped their official requirement that all recognized student organizations have an advisor was one of the large public universities. Even at that institution, some categories of organizations had student-established regulations requiring organization advisors.

Procedures for enforcing this requirement through the various activities offices, however, provide several operational "loopholes". On at least two of the large public campuses, the requirement was admittedly often ignored. Not one reported instance could be found in the last two school years at any campus still requiring advisors where not having an advisor had caused withdrawal of recognition for an existing student organization or a refusal to recognize a new one.

On all campuses, but particularly at the private and community colleges, activities administrators or some of their staff members were quite willing to be listed as an advisor to virtually any type of student organization that needed an advisor to be recognized but had not been able to locate one on campus.

From discussions with activities administrators at every campus, instances were reported in which faculty members were student organization advisors in "name" only. The actual practices involved were varied but centered primarily on the following general techniques:

1. Faculty advisors who had been active and functional in their first years with the organization had since become inactive but were continuing to be listed for official purposes. At least four instances on three campuses were noted in which advisors were still listed without their knowledge (they will be removed at the end of this year).
2. Although limited in number, there was also a practice whereby a few faculty members would allow student leaders to list them as the organization's advisor so as to gain official recognition without ever intending to function as an advisor. The only actual instances definitely known to the activities administrators were limited to the two large types of institutions and involved five faculty advisors. Two activities administrators reported that they "suspected" at least four other such cases on each of their campuses.
3. While not yet wide-spread in practice, certain types of organizations such as fraternities and sororities are increasingly being allowed to have alumni members or

interested others from the local community to be listed as their official advisor rather than someone from the college faculty or staff. On the large university campuses this was particularly true, whereas the two private colleges continue to also require an advisor from the college faculty or staff.

The one institution in the study which does not require student organizations to have a faculty advisor to be a "registered" organization dropped their requirement in the fall of 1968. Of the present 296 "Registered Student Organizations" listed in their 1971-72 Directory, 119 or 40% do not have an advisor listed. This does not include social fraternities and sororities. The Panhellenic Council composed of the social sororities on that campus does require their member sororities to have advisors but they may be persons from outside the university faculty or staff.

Orientation of New Advisors When a faculty or staff member assumes the advisorship to a student organization, it is very often a new experience. This might be particularly true when considering that student leaders reported that they would seek advisors very often from new additions to the faculty and staff. Even advisors who had been organization members as college students themselves or organization advisors at other colleges where they had held previous teaching or administration positions should profit from some form of introduction to this new position they have assumed.

None of the institutions visited had a formal orientation program for new advisors. Activities administrators at six of the eight

institutions (including at least one from each of the four types of institutions) reported that they would send a wide variety of published informational materials to new advisors for orientation purposes. This strong reliance on printed materials readily available to perform most of the orientation was all that was felt necessary by four activities administrators. Another two of the eight schools would not even use that method for orientation, and only three of all eight activities administrators reported any definite commitment to meeting personally with new advisors to offer any general orientation overview of the advisor's duties and responsibilities.

Two of the eight institutions have fairly detailed manuals for advisors and one other has a comprehensive student leader's manual which would be sent to a new advisor. Manuals were only present at the two large types of institutions with none reported at the community colleges or private colleges.

There are a wide variety of reasons for this lack of orientation efforts for new advisors. Some of the major reasons reported or observed during the course of this survey were as follows:

1. The short tenure and constant turnover of activities administrators themselves who likewise reported little orientation to their own position.
2. Lack of commitment on the part of activities administrators that it was really that important when compared to all their other official duties.
3. The very low amount of turnover among faculty advisors which was constantly noted at each institution produces

few new advisors each year who would be candidates for such a formal program.

4. Lack of clear understandings in some cases of who would be responsible for such orientation. One private college did not have any staff member really functioning as an activities administrator. Responsibility for various student organizations was divided among the dean of students, dean of women, and dean of men. At every campus instances were found where other administrative officers outside the student activities or student personnel area were seen as the primary point of focus for any orientation for advisors which might occur. Academic clubs and honorary organization advisors often looked more to their academic dean, provost, or similar office than to the student activities office in terms of whom they felt responsible to or whom they would first turn to for any help in times of crisis or need. Similarly, sports club advisors often looked to the athletic director (most often their official supervisor) for any assistance needed. Student activities administrators thus often become service resources for getting things done for these organizations rather than as the primary contact point for the advisor.
5. As professional members of the academic community, advisors were often expected to need little formal orientation to such a position. As reported by three activities administrators, "It often seems that anybody can be an advisor!"

6. Students themselves were often seen by both activities administrators and faculty advisors as the best means for informal orientation for advisors. This reaction was reported by six activities administrators and nine advisors.

The orientation of new advisors was thus found to be primarily informal and generally quite limited in scope.

Advisor Development Programs The continuing in-service training and development of faculty advisors, like orientation, was found to be very limited in practice at the eight institutions visited in this study. Occasional meetings were called by activities administrators "when the need arises" but not on any regular basis at any school.

Regular meetings of fraternity and sorority advisors were reported at one institution as a normal activity as they had a formal organization of such advisors on that campus. It should be noted, however, that these latter meetings were "regular" meetings of advisor organizations and were not necessarily available for development purposes.

The availability of the monograph, Student Group Advising in Higher Education,¹ which has been referred to several times in previous chapters was another possible aid available for advisor development. Table 4.4 indicates that only three of the eight activities administrators (37.5%) knew of the existence of the monograph.

¹Bloland, op. cit., 1967.

Table 4.4

Activities Administrators Knew of Advising Monograph

	Type of Institution				<u>Total</u>
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	
Yes	1	0	1	1	3
No	1	2	1	1	5

Of the three who knew about the monograph, only two had ever used it in any formal way in working with advisors. One of the community colleges had given copies of the two chapters dealing with advisor role and advisor techniques to all its organization advisors during the 1970-71 school year and now to newly appointed advisors. One of the private colleges had reprinted parts of the monograph for their student organization advisors two years ago. It should be noted, however, that two of the five activities administrators not familiar with the monograph were just completing their first year of work in student activities.

Advisor Rewards Only one school (a community college) visited during the study had a formal reward system for advisors. There the reward is a modest \$55 per semester for organization advisors certified as active by the activities office. The practice was not a new one as it has been in effect for at least five years. The amount was increased \$5 per semester last year. It should also be noted that the faculty and some staff personnel (counselors) at this college are represented by a collective bargaining organization. The monetary reward system, however, is not

included in the master contract. The faculty member who serves also as the advisor to the student newspaper has had his \$1,500 annual stipend included in his individual contract. This procedure of monetary payments to advisors preceded the formation of the collective bargaining agency on this campus.

The other community college in the study also had its faculty (and counselors) covered by a collective bargaining agreement but compensation for advisors had not yet become an issue there. They do have a somewhat unusual arrangement whereby faculty members receive annual monetary payments (\$200 to \$300 per year in most cases) for serving in various capacities sometimes performed by faculty advisors on other campuses. These activities included: chaperoning dances and popular entertainment events, supervising cheerleader squads, and related activities. Additional pressures to include advisor compensation into future contract negotiations were considered possible but not likely at this time by college officials.

At one of the large, established universities in the study, the faculty had also just elected a collective bargaining agency to serve them on campus. One student personnel administrator was concerned that student organization advisor rewards might eventually become a bargaining issue but did not expect this during the first year or two of collective bargaining operations.

Future Campus Changes Possibly Affecting Advisors None of the institutions visited had made or were contemplating making any changes for the next school year which would affect organization advisors.

The three remaining large universities in the study which still require advisors for recognized student organizations all reported

that they were "considering" dropping this requirement. Only one of the three was reported by its activities administrator to be seriously considering adopting this change within the next year. They were also involved in extensive review of their entire operations and procedures for student organizations. Student government would be involved in adopting any policy change removing the requirement for advisors at each institution, and this was reported to be likely to slow such adoption at all three of the schools.

At the two medium-sized universities visited, the activities administrators were currently involved in updating the advisor manual for improved operations. Such revisions had not been made at either institution for at least "two or three" years.

The activities administrators at every school visited reported major changes taking place within their student organizations on the campus. Many traditionally popular organizations such as fraternities and sororities were declining in student participation while others, such as sports clubs and student political organizations, were growing in popularity and participation. The involvement of advisors in dealing with any of these challenges was not mentioned as a likely occurrence.

Administrator Frustrations The activities administrators also talked of some of their frustrations regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. Activities administrators at six of the eight schools visited expressed major interest in the study being conducted and mentioned the lack of research known to them in the area. The four administrators at the large and medium-size institutions all mentioned the large number of student organizations on their campus and the resulting difficulty of

keeping track of them. Two comments were particularly enlightening:

"We can't even keep an up-to-date list of what organizations we have, much less the names of their officers and advisors"; and "While I agree that we need all these things (orientation program, evaluation, and rewards), tell me how in the world I can do all that for 190 organizations in the time available to do it."

The turnover in the positions of activities administrators was also mentioned as a source of major frustration at three of the four larger institutions. All four institutions have a director of student activities (or similar title) and three to five assistants. Two of the four directors were in only their first year at the position and another was completing his second year. Each institution has assistants completing only their first or second year at the school. As one director at a medium-size school commented, "We have all organizations pretty much divided up among the four of us. The only problem is we change people so often we lose track sometimes of who is responsible for which ones." Another assistant director remarked, "We have trouble enough orienting our new activities people much less worrying about new faculty advisor orientation. Our director spends much of his time recruiting for our staff vacancies each year and that limits our ability to have a great deal of concern with advisors."

Advice to a New Institution

In response to the survey question, "What recommendations would you make to a new school regarding faculty advisors?", the following general statements were made. Only two of the eight administrators would suggest "requiring" advisors for student organizations. Three others would "strongly encourage but not require" and three would leave "completely voluntary."

One director at a medium-size institution suggested, "Create a climate for faculty to want to join rather than require it." He further added, "help create organizations to complement academic departments" and "attempt as much personal contact with advisors as possible."

Noteworthy, at the one large institution no longer requiring advisors, the three assistant activities directors interviewed all suggested requiring advisors at first until the institution and its organizations are "adequately established."

Dealing with Institutional Policy Violations The activities administrators tended to agree with student leaders and faculty advisors that advisors were not primarily enforcers of institutional policy. Only two of the eight administrators felt that such was a major responsibility of the advisor. Typical of the administrator views against such a role was this comment from one of the medium-size schools, "The minute they have to do that, they are no longer advisors." The other view was perhaps more pragmatically expressed by one of the private school administrators as, "If it was bad enough to possibly get fired over, naturally the advisor would have to do something about it."

At each school the matter was left rather vague and no clear statements of policy on the issue had been issued by any school in the survey.

Views of Top Student Personnel Administrators

Although not included as a part of the personnel being interviewed on each campus in the survey, the top student personnel administrator (vice president for student affairs, dean of students, and similar titles) was visited wherever possible for additional background information and for their views of the faculty advisory situation on their

campus. Perhaps it is noteworthy that two positions were essentially "vacant" (one filled by an acting academic administrator and another due to the dean of students being the acting president), one was on an extended medical disability leave, and one was on an extended vacation.

One top administrator at each of the four types of institutions in the survey was contacted however. One dean of students at a private college would be leaving in a few weeks to assume a new position at a different institution.

All four top administrators contacted were strongly supportive of the values inherent in having "good" advisors for student organizations. Only one (at one of the large institutions) saw it likely that this requirement for faculty advisors might be dropped within the next year or two. As he said, "I'd hate to see it happen because I've known many good things from them, but we're just too big to continue pretending that they are all really active any more."

The dean at the private college saw no real problems with their decentralized operation having faculty advisors being the concern of several administrative officers. He expressed hope that their small size and "mutual interest of students and faculty in being close to each other" would continue to be one of their institutional strengths.

The one community college dean expressed the desire to have the student activities office become much more active with their faculty advisors. In giving advice to a new school, she remarked, "Wait and see what student interests really develop in the area."

A very interesting comment from one dean at one of the medium-size institutions was his strong feeling that advisors would continue to be required "for quite some time" at that institution while the student activities administrator had earlier commented that he thought it might soon be dropped!

Like their activities administrators who were interviewed privately before this contact with them, the four top administrators reported many more pressing campus issues needing their attention than the area of faculty advisors to student organizations.

Should Faculty Advisors be Required for Student Organizations

In this time of increasing demands by students for more freedom in conducting their own affairs, views were obtained during the interviews from student leaders, faculty advisors, and activities administrators as to whether faculty advisors for student organizations should continue to be required by institutional policy.

At those institutions still requiring advisors as a condition of recognizing a student organization, it was anticipated that students would not generally approve of such a practice. This generalization was not supported based on interviews held with 21 students at the seven different institutions requiring advisors. Students were only slightly less supportive of the requirement than were advisors themselves (81% to 90% respectively) and three of the four students who opposed the requirement attributed their opposition primarily to how little their advisors actually did rather than to any opposition to being required to have an advisor.

The researcher had not anticipated that less than half of the activities administrators would think that advisors should be "required" (see Table 4.5 below).

Table 4.5

Should Institutions Require Faculty Advisors for Student Organizations?

		Type of Institution				No.	%
		I (Large)	II (Medium)	III (Community)	IV (Private)		
Student Leaders	Yes	2	5	6	4	17	81
	No	1	1	0	2	4	19
Faculty Advisors	Yes	2	6	6	5	19	90
	No	0	0	0	1	1	5
	Not Sure	1	0	0	0	1	5
Activities Administra- tors	Yes	0	0	1	2	3	43
	No	1	2	1	0	4	57

Role of the Advisor

Several questions probing the role of the advisor were asked during the interviews. Each person interviewed during the survey was asked to define the role of the student organization advisor as they felt it should be. Using the three role functions outlined by Bloland² and various combinations thereof, the open-ended responses of the three categories of interviews are shown in Table 4.6.

²Bloland, op. cit., p. 12.

Table 4.6
Role of the Advisor

<u>Role Functions</u>	<u>Activities Administrator</u>	<u>Faculty Advisor</u>	<u>Student Leaders</u>	<u>Total</u>
Maintenance	3	11	20	34
Group Growth	0	2	1	3
Program Content	0	0	0	0
Maintenance and Growth	3	10	5	18
Maintenance and Program	1	0	0	1
Growth and Program	1	0	0	1
All Three	0	1	0	1
	<u>8</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>58</u>

As can be seen from this table, activities administrators and faculty advisors in this survey rather evenly define the general advisor role as that of maintenance functions or a combination of maintenance and group growth functions with 37.5% in each area among the administrators and 45.8% and 41.7% respectively in each area among faculty advisors. Students likewise rated those two functions above all others but saw the advisor's role as much more of maintenance functions (76.9%) than the combination of maintenance and group growth (19.2%). Advisors often tended to stress continuity (a maintenance function) and helping the group toward reaching its stated goals (a group growth function) while students stressed expertise (maintenance) as the dominate description of the advisor's role.

Advisors were also asked if any influences outside of the local organization or activities office significantly affected their role as

an advisor. A total of twelve of the twenty-four (50%) responded positively. Nine (37.5%) listed national organizations the group was affiliated with, one listed student government, one listed his academic department, and one listed a yacht club to which his sailing club belonged and used for sailing as outside influences on their role as advisors.

As discussed earlier, advisors were very seldom seen by activities administrators, student leaders, or themselves as enforcers of institutional regulations. Only two of the eight (25%) administrators, four of the twenty-four (16.7%) advisors, and three of the twenty-six (11.5%) student leaders saw this as an important part of their role as faculty advisor. Particular stress by both students and advisors was placed on the advisor working out any such difficulties within the organization by dealing directly with the student leaders and members themselves. Only two of the twenty-four advisors (8.3%) indicated that they would give prompt consideration to reporting group violations of institutional policy to appropriate administrative authorities. Only in the cases of grave physical harm and as a last resort did students or advisors see such reporting as a desirable practice.

Regarding the matter of advisors dealing with personal problems of student organization members totally unrelated to the organization, all three groups represented in the survey generally thought such activities to be a viable part of the advisor's role. However, seven of the twenty-six students (26.9%) would not feel free to go to their present organization advisor for help while only one advisor definitely stated his refusal to deal with such problems. When asked the extent

of their involvement in dealing with such problems, three advisors (12.5%) reported heavy involvement, ten (41.6%) reported moderate involvement and ten (41.6%) reported only limited involvement.

Summary

The major findings in this study can be summarized as follows:

1. Most institutions in the study still "require" faculty advisors for recognized student organizations. Although still requiring faculty advisors, several practices are currently employed to work "around" the strictness of such a policy.
2. Student leaders primarily recruit their own organization advisors and administration approval of advisor appointments is very limited. When recruiting their advisors, student leaders look for young and often new faculty members who they feel will relate well to student members in the organization.
3. Very little is presently being done in the area of evaluation, orientation, training, and formal rewards for advisors. In most cases, any rewards received by advisors for their efforts can generally be considered as intangible, personal values rather than tangible in nature.
4. Few institutions presently place a high enough priority on advisor relations to be contemplating any significant changes affecting them other than the possibility of eliminating the requirement for organizations to have advisors at the large institutions.

5. Faculty advisors and activities administrators generally tend to define the faculty advisor's role primarily in terms of maintenance or custodial and group growth functions, while student leaders more strongly define it as primarily one of maintenance or custodial functions.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This final chapter contains a summary of the study, major findings, and implications for future research regarding faculty advisors to student organizations.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to review what various types of institutions of higher education in Michigan are doing regarding faculty advisors to student organizations. Of particular interest was whether these institutions still require student organizations to have faculty advisors. Additional areas of concern included the role of the advisor as seen from the perspective of administrators, faculty, and students and current trends and practices in various operational functions such as recruitment and selection, orientation, evaluation, and rewards for advisors.

A review of the literature revealed little more than general philosophical discussions regarding the value and role of faculty advisors to student organizations. Personal experiences and views of "experts" in the field of student activities administration in various publications provided a basis for why advisors should exist and some of their duties and functions but very little empirical research could be found dealing with faculty advisors to student organizations in higher education.

From the ninety institutions of higher education in Michigan, eight were selected as being broadly representative of the total population of

institutions. Personal visitations were made to each campus. Using prepared interview guides, in-depth interviews were held with at least one activities administrator and three student organization leaders and three faculty advisors on each campus. A total of sixty-three interviews were conducted.

Responses from those interviewed were compiled and contrasted for those questions asked of each group. Detailed views of each group are presented along with composite views on the role of the advisor as seen from their three perspectives.

Major Findings

Seven of the eight institutions in the study still require student organizations to have a faculty advisor but this requirement is increasingly being reviewed, particularly by the large public universities.

Recruitment and selection of advisors is primarily left up to the student organization leaders. Only one school still retains approval of all advisor appointments.

Orientation of new advisors was found at half of the institutions but was primarily handled on an informal basis with heavy reliance on printed materials available.

Virtually no real in-service training for faculty advisors was present at any institution. Meetings of activities administrators and faculty advisors were generally held only "as needed" according to the activities administrators.

No methods of formal evaluation of faculty advisors were found at any institution in the study. Advisors and student leaders relied on informal contacts to provide any feedback felt necessary regarding the advisor's performance.

Tangible rewards for advisors are present at only one institution in the survey. Minor rewards such as banquets, dinner meetings, letters of appreciation, complimentary copies of the yearbook, and other methods were reported at half of the institutions. Advisors reported several intangible rewards such as getting to know students better, improved classroom performance, life-long friendships, and related values.

Few changes directly affecting advisors were contemplated in the near future other than possibly dropping the institutional requirement for faculty advisors at the large institutions.

Implications for Future Research

Even though the subject of faculty advisors to student organizations is seldom on a high priority basis at many colleges and universities, their wide existence and usage even when not officially required by the institution should merit further study. The present lack of reported studies involving empirical research on faculty advisors should not be continued in spite of the difficulties involved in formulating appropriate methods for research about such a general area.

Specific areas for research suggested during this study include:

1. More empirical determinations of faculty advisor role definitions as seen by institutional administrators, faculty advisors and student organization members.
2. More in-depth consideration of the motivations as to why faculty members volunteer to become organization advisors.
3. Experimental programs for advisor orientation, in-service training, and evaluation should be conducted with their effectiveness appropriately evaluated.

4. A large scale survey of academic administrators should be made to assess the value (if any) placed by them on faculty advisory duties. Particular interest should be directed towards assessment of the inclusion of student organization advisor services in any salary increases or promotion possibilities for the faculty member involved.
5. More studies should be made to assess realistically and objectively the value of faculty advisors to student organizations.

Faculty advisors for student organizations have existed for many years on college campuses and they will no doubt continue to exist even if not required by institutional policy. The very limited amount of research conducted about them to date should be corrected as soon as practically possible.

Discussion

In preparing for this study, it was felt that the type of institution would be one of the most important variables affecting faculty advisors to student organizations. While large size often did reduce the amount of contact reported between activities administrators and individual faculty advisors and student leaders, the type of student organization more consistently seemed to affect the faculty advisor. Academic clubs and interest groups reported very similar forms of operation regarding the advisor regardless of the type of institution. The same seemed to hold true for fraternities, sororities, and political action groups.

An indirect outgrowth of this survey was the composite suggestions received which could be used as a basis for a more unified total

activities program involving faculty advisors. Assuming that the activities administrator would have primary responsibility for this, major elements of such a program might include:

1. Aid in recruiting new group advisors by encouraging faculty member participation in group activities to increase mutual knowledge between students and faculty members. Means of especially involving faculty members new to the institution should be particularly developed.
2. Activities administrators should seek to have lists of names of interested faculty members available to suggest to student organization leaders. These lists could be developed from informal contacts, surveys, or suggestions from other faculty or staff members.
3. Unless the advisor has a major responsibility to the institution, such as in student government or publications, the selection of advisors should be a mutual decision involving only the student group and the faculty member concerned.
4. Each institution should develop a reasonably clear and concise statement of the advisor's duties and responsibilities, such as shown in Appendices D and E, pages 72 and 74. It would aid in recruitment of new advisors if at least some general understanding were available of the amount of time involved in being an "active" advisor.
5. A definite orientation "program" should be available for new advisors. This need not be just formalized meetings

unless many advisors are new at one time but should include:

- a. Presentation to the advisor of all available printed materials which could concern him as an advisor, such as student handbook, advisor's handbook, institutional policies and procedures, and similar materials.
 - b. Sufficient meetings between the activities administrator (and their staff members - including secretaries) and the advisor to get acquainted, discuss the major issues involved, and establish reasonably effective channels of communication and cooperation.
 - c. Prompt follow-up soon after the above, to answer any questions the advisor might have. They can quickly "drop out" once the initial group interest in them wears off, as it inevitably appears to do.
6. The possibilities of valuable in-service training for advisors are almost unlimited. Through meetings, field trips, seminars, and workshops, advisors could be exposed to up-to-date information on institutional policy changes; student attitudes, values and interests (particularly their recent changes); new services available at the institution; and related matters. Films, speakers, and other forms of presentations on group dynamics, leadership methods, and organizational development could be helpful. Advisors should be kept informed of the latest research articles dealing with student organizations and anything closely related to the advisor and his functions at the institution. Regular meetings for idea exchanges

should be held with advisors as they quickly can become the "forgotten" man (or woman). It would probably be best to start in-service training by assessing the needs expressed by present advisors through personal contacts or a questionnaire.

7. For the modest cost involved (\$2.00 each), each advisor could be given a copy of Paul Bloland's monograph, Student Group Advising in Higher Education.
8. Evaluation of advisor effectiveness should be made. Initial efforts might be relatively informal ones such as asking students to provide anonymous comments to the advisor at the end of the year. Formal instruments could be rather easily developed. Since advisors will probably be very sensitive to their work generally performed as a "volunteer," they should be involved in the very beginning of any evaluation programs.
9. The potential for rewards should be carefully assessed on each individual campus. Group advising efforts should be included in annual appraisals of faculty members along with other forms of university service. Sometimes released time or credit towards their teaching load might be appropriate.
10. The continued involvement of faculty advisors in every conceivable phase of student activities should be stressed. They must feel needed or important to continue performing these often thankless jobs. Some form of annual appreciation for good performance should be devised at each institution.

A final comment about faculty advisors must be made. The present lack of research about them and very limited forms of orientation, in-service training, evaluation, and rewards noted at the institutions in this survey cannot have occurred by accident. If advisors do truly have a viable educational potential for contribution to student organizations, activities administrators must approach them with considerably more interest and enthusiasm. If left on just an informal basis and primarily to their own devices, faculty advisors are not likely to progress beyond the present situation and state generally described in this report.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bloland, Paul A., "The Role of the Student Organization Advisor", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 41, September, 1962, p. 45.
- Bloland, Paul A., Student Group Advising in Higher Education, ACPA Monograph No. 8, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D. C., 1967.
- Bryant, Arley, "Activities Program Beginnings in a New Junior College", School Activities, Vol. 38, December, 1966, pp. 5-7.
- Bryant, Arthur L., "The Fraternity Adviser", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 36, November, 1967, pp. 203-206.
- Chapter Advisor's Manual, Sigma Chi National Fraternity, Evanston, Illinois, no date.
- Education Directory-Higher Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971.
- French, Arden O., "Student Activities and Faculty Relationships", NASPA Journal, Vol. 2., No. 3, January, 1965, p. 12.
- A Guide for Advisors of the Theta Xi Fraternity, Theta Xi National Fraternity, St. Louis, Missouri, 1965.
- Kamm, Robert B., "The Faculty and Guidance", Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 5, No. 4, June, 1964, pp. 220-225.
- Mueller, Kate H., Student Personnel Work in Higher Education, Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1961.
- Muse, William V., "Management Skills in Student Organizations", Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 48, No. 10, June, 1970, pp. 842-847.
- Preston, Paul L., "Faculty Adviser - A Role Re-Evaluation", The ATO Palm, Alpha Tau Omega National Fraternity, Champaign, Illinois, September, 1971, pp. 38-39.
- Ptacek, Paul H., "A University's Attempt to Counsel Student Leaders", Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 28, 1957, pp. 137-143.
- Purdy, Leslie, "Extracurricular Programs in Higher Education", Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 34, No. 4, Summer, 1971, pp. 164-170.

- Rudolph, Frederick, The American College and University - A History, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962.
- Strang, Ruth, Group Work in Education, Harper Brothers, New York, 1958.
- Stroup, Herbert, Toward A Philosophy of Organized Student Activities, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1964.
- Williams, F. Neil, "Becoming a Faculty Sponsor", Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 14, Summer, 1966, pp. 204-255.
- Williams, F. Neil, "The Student Activity Sponsor", School Activities, Vol. 39, April, 1968, pp. 3-4 and 17.
- Williams, F. Neil, "Responsibility for Activities Programs in Junior Colleges", School Activities, Vol. 38, December, 1966, pp. 2-3.
- Williamson, E. G., Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FACULTY ADVISORS INTERVIEW GUIDE

School _____

Date _____

Explain the purpose of the study.
Stress confidentiality.
Express appreciation.

FACULTY ADVISOR INTERVIEW

How long have you been at the college?

What subject areas do you teach in?

What organization(s) do you serve as advisor for?

How long have you served as an advisor for this organization(s)?

What do you feel your primary role to be as an advisor?

Have you been provided with a statement of your duties and/or responsibilities as an advisor? If so, by whom? (constitution, Dean's office, etc.)

How do you feel about the college's requirement that organizations have advisors?

How were you selected as an advisor?

Faculty Advisor Interview - 2

Do you serve alone or with other advisors to this organization?

When you were first appointed as advisor, what kind of orientation were you provided?

Is there much turnover among advisors at this college?

Do you meet regularly with anyone from the activities office?

To whom do you feel responsible as an advisor?

Do you see the college making any significant changes in the future roles of advisors in the near future?

What kind of evaluation process do you use to evaluate your effectiveness as an advisor?

Do you or would you help the student members of your organization with personal matters unrelated to the organization?

Faculty Advisor Interview - 3

Are there outside influences on your role as an advisor (such as national organizations, etc.)?

How would you handle major violations of institutional policy by the organization?

What forms of rewards are available here to you as an advisor?

Tangible?

Intangible?

How much longer do you anticipate continuing as an advisor to this organization?

Would you aid in recruiting a new advisor if you need to cease functioning as the organization's advisor?

What recommendations would you make to a new person starting as a faculty advisor to your organization?

Any general comments?

Thank you very much for your help.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT LEADERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

School _____

Date _____

Explain the purpose of the study.

Stress confidentiality.

Express appreciation.

STUDENT LEADER INTERVIEW

Name of organization.

What is your position in the organization and how long have you held it?

How long have you been a member of the organization?

What is your general definition of the role of an advisor?

How do you feel about the college's requirement that organizations have advisors?

Does your advisor have stated duties or responsibilities?

What kind of process is used to evaluate your advisors?

How would you obtain an additional or different advisor?

Student Leader Interview - 2

Is the institution or your organization planning any significant changes possibly affecting advisors?

What kinds of rewards are available to advisors (tangible and intangible)?

Are there any outside influences on your advisor (such as a national organization)?

Does your advisor provide significant assistance to your organization?

Is your advisor available for help with personal problems not related to the organization?

How should an advisor deal with major violations of institutional policy?

Any general comments you might have.

Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX C

ACTIVITIES ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

School _____

Date _____

Explain the purpose of the study.

Stress confidentiality.

Express appreciation.

ACTIVITIES DIRECTOR INTERVIEW

Are advisors required, recommended, or whatever for student organizations?

How are advisors selected (appointed, approved, etc.)?

What is their general role as defined by the institution?

Does this role vary for the type of organization?

Do you have stated duties and responsibilities for advisors?

How much turnover is there in advisors?

What kinds of orientation is provided for new advisors?

Activities Director Interview - 2

What "developmental" programs are carried out by your office for advisors? (regular meetings, etc.)

Are advisors evaluated? If so, how, when, etc.?

Are advisors expected to give students help with personal problems unrelated to the organization?

Do you expect them to report violations of institutional policies?

What forms of rewards are available to advisors?

Tangible

Intangible

What recommendations would you make to a new school regarding faculty advisors?

What (if any) changes are expected here in the near future regarding advisor requirements, etc.?

General comments:

Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE STATEMENT OF ADVISOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES AT A LARGE UNIVERSITY

ADVISORS OR COUNSELORS OF ORGANIZATIONS

Definition and Function

An advisor or counselor is a full-time member of the university faculty or staff who, on the invitation of a university group, agrees to be its official advisor. In some cases, a group may wish to have more than one faculty member participate in its activities.

The primary function of the counselor is that of an educational advisor. This does not imply that his help is necessarily of an academic nature or given in a pedagogical manner, but rather as a friend with more experience and vision. His work with the group is an extension of his general teaching and counseling activities and is not a disciplinary function.

To be asked by a student group to be its advisor is obviously an honor. It likewise presents a genuine opportunity to make further valuable contributions to the education and social growth of members of the group through association with them in the informal settings of group activities. In many respects, the educational impact may be of more enduring character than that received in the classroom. Not a responsibility to be taken lightly, the compensations are of a high order. Organization counselors are encouraged to consult members of the Student Activities staff on organizational problems and to use their services in any way which may be helpful.

Responsibility of the Advisor or Counselor

1. To the University

- a. The counselor of any university organization should be concerned with the coordination of the activities of the group with the purposes, ideals, and standards of the university, and with the stated aims of the constitution of the organization.
- b. Signatures of counselors are required for requisitions against organizational accounts using university financial facilities and on other official forms required of organizations such as booking cards, organizational membership forms, and the like. The counselor should not affix his signature without taking reasonable care to ascertain accuracy and purpose. One purpose of the above requirement is to enable the counselor to keep himself more fully informed of the group's plans and activities and to provide an additional opportunity for advising with the group.
- c. The counselor's signature on financial reports and on requisition forms in no way implies personal responsibility on the part of the counselor.

2. To the Group

- a. The counselor should be concerned with the coordination of the activities of the group with the purposes, ideals, and standards of the university, and with the stated aims of the constitution of the organization. The counselor should hold periodic consultations with officers of the organization on the program, plans, and problems of the group.
- b. Regular attendance of the counselor at the meetings of the organization is highly desirable.
- c. In order to function effectively, the counselor should be well informed regarding all plans and activities of the group.

3. To Himself

- a. The professional activities of the counselor, such as teaching, research, writing, administrative duties, service on professional committees, may expand to the point where his extra-curricular activities such as his work with student organizations must necessarily be curtailed. In such a case, the counselor should, in fairness to himself as a professional person and to the student organization to which he is counselor, readjust the extent of his activities with the group. If necessary, additional faculty counselors should be considered. In extreme cases, it may be necessary for the counselor to withdraw as advisor to the group.

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE STATEMENT OF ADVISOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES AT A MEDIUM-SIZE UNIVERSITY

INFORMATION FOR GROUP ADVISORS

The student groups of the campus are important socializing and educational agencies. Faculty members who serve efficiently as advisors to them can be of great service in aiding young people to learn to lead, to follow, and to assume the various obligations of organizational membership. The advisor's duties may be listed as follows:

- (1) Help each officer of the organization to understand his duties.
- (2) Aid groups and officers in planning programs and projects.
- (3) See that the continuity of the organization is preserved through constitution, minutes and traditions and that its past activities are adequately comprehended by succeeding officers and members.
- (4) Encourage the use of parliamentary procedures.
- (5) Aid officers and members of the organization in establishing standards to guide in the selection of new members.
- (6) Give particular attention to the financial activities of the group in order to prevent the leaving of organizational debts for succeeding members to pay.
- (7) Guide officers in administering the programs, policies and plans of the group.
- (8) Encourage high academic and social standards.
- (9) Help students to understand and apply democratic principles within their own organizations and in relation to other groups.
- (10) Attend all organization meetings or arrange for a substitute to be present.
- (11) Counsel students in the organization who are on social or academic probation.
- (12) Cooperate with the Office of Student Activities, who is supervisor of student groups, in the development of organizational activities.