

A while ago I went to a conference that addressed residential colleges and living/learning programs. One of the interesting features of such programs is their administrative sponsorship at the juncture of academic affairs and student affairs. These programs exist in college and university residences (the basis of the student affairs component) and have significant faculty involvement (the basis of the academic affairs component). Faculty involvement is most visible through courses taught in residence halls. However, an equally important feature is faculty involvement in students' lives via enriching out-of-class activities. One goal of most residentially based academic programs is to extend the concept of intellectual development through a strong emphasis on academic issues in the place where students spend most of their time. The creation of communities that value both the personal and the intellectual vectors of student development is one way to nurture student development.

Many of us in advising adopt similar views of integrating the personal and intellectual vectors of student development. This concept is central to developmental advising. Many of us in advising also have close concurrent ties to both academic affairs and student affairs, although most of us serve but one of these masters and pay tribute to the other. To those of us who work both sides of this line, several issues are clear: Communication between these realms is fuzzy; goals are frequently disparate; and few in either realm actually care about the other realm. To add to the confusion, the values and operational modes are also hard to reconcile.

In my experience faculty tend not to be rule-oriented. Research and scholarly pursuit should challenge the status quo, should test the boundaries of the known, and should see rules as impediments to progress. Administrators are the enemy; freedom is the byword.

Student affairs is a different world. Although student affairs professionals are frequently seen as "warm, fuzzy" handholders, they frequently deal with life-or-death issues in which conforming to procedure is necessary for proper job performance, especially in case of litigation. The health center, the counseling center, and the housing division daily deal with students who are bouncing off walls. Intervention has protocols that seem ungainly to faculty but are prescribed by the pro-

fessions within student affairs and by institutions.

I don't think that faculty and student affairs professionals intend to work at cross-purposes; students are the focus of all campus employees. But not knowing the aims, philosophies, and workings of other parts of campus frequently gets in the way of serving our clients . . . our students.

Back to the conference: Several faculty members from a residential college offered a panel presentation. Without intending to, they illuminated some of the above issues.

One discussed a program that was meant to illustrate their students' ability to resolve a potentially divisive problem in their community. The problem revolved around how to spend some discretionary funds for recreational board games to be used by the members of the college. Apparently, some students objected to buying a Ouija board because of its perceived satanic component. The students accomplished most of their negotiating on their e-mail newsnet. After her talk, I asked whether this was uniquely a *residential college* concern or whether this was an interaction that could occur in any residence hall. Many residence halls give students access to networked computers and newsnets, and most residence hall student groups have discretionary funds. This faculty member struggled to understand my question. Clearly, she did not know her bottom line; she did not know how student life is conducted in a regular residence hall on her campus. Because she did not know the bottom line that would exist without her presence, she was unable to measure the value added by her involvement.

One of her colleagues, a senior faculty member who lived in an apartment in the residence hall, illuminated another issue. Such programs often include faculty who live in residence halls, bringing them together with students at nontraditional times to facilitate interactions in which the formal boundaries of instruction are purposely obscured. In this particular case, the professor was British and had fond memories of Oxford tradition. In describing his experiences as a live-in member of the community, he reveled in his wide-ranging discussions with students over a glass of sherry. It sounded great, and the students who accompanied me to the conference eagerly partook in this event—one of the highlights of their conference experience.

But, given that most of his students were fresh-

men or sophomores, we can reasonably assume that the activity was illegal. Although all residence hall operations acknowledge that underage drinking occurs and most don't go looking through keyholes to root out the practice, and although many of us have fond memories of connecting with fellow students and professors over beer or wine, we do not routinely program alcohol into our interactions with our students. The lawyers say no, and the practice would put us at cross-purposes with campus colleagues, especially those in residence halls who have to enforce drinking regulations. (Ironically, at the conference we all agreed that student/faculty interaction would be facilitated if we installed pubs in our residence halls. But recognizing the boundary between wish and behavior was apparently at issue here.)

I am always amazed at the disparate views of students held by faculty and student affairs professionals—the characteristic head versus heart dichotomy. I serve on a campus committee charged with recommending changes in our advising system. One concern was how to incorporate faculty in a meaningful way. I posed the following scenario to the committee: In the midst of finals

week a distraught student comes to an advisor's office. The student has just flunked a final exam in a gateway course for her proposed career, say a first-year calculus course for entry into engineering. The gateway has apparently slammed shut. How is the advisor to react?

One faculty member offered that he would sit with the student and try to problem solve. Why had the student done so poorly? Was any remediation possible? What skills could be developed to get back on track and pass the course so that the gateway could be opened?

A counselor-type suggested that addressing the student's emotional state would be a good first step. Acknowledge that failing the exam was disheartening. Empathize and gain trust so that cognitive issues can, perhaps, be addressed later.

For each, the other's viewpoint was new! Each acknowledged the value of the other's approach.

Maybe we need more committees (ho, ho, ho) to bring people together and promote such enlightening interactions. But then again, maybe some common sense and a holistic viewpoint are all that we really need.

Howard K. Schein