

At the beginning of the Task Force report, several definitions of a profession were given, including specified common criteria as follows:

1. standards of admission and training,
2. legal recognition,
3. a specialized body of knowledge and skills,
4. the development of a professional consciousness, and
5. a self-governing professional organization.

Apart from 5 (a self-governing professional organization) and a growing sense in some quarters of 4 (the development of a professional consciousness) none of the criteria seem to apply to advising as it is practiced today. Although advising positions require some degree of training and education, common standards for employment are not the norm. Since the educational level or degree obtained is used often as a benchmark in our society for determining professional standards, inconsistency in this area reflects an absence of these important standards.

Although the majority of respondents report that a career ladder in advising was important to them, no career path seems to exist for most of them. In spite of this, one point is clear from this survey: **many professionals are attracted to advising, have been advisers for a long time, are satisfied with their jobs, and intend to stay in the field.** This is confirmed by the fact that the turnover rate in advising positions is not high.

The many inconsistencies across the field of advising brought out in this survey forecast the difficulties associated with setting standards for professional advising. Future studies should concentrate on specific aspects of advising such as salaries and titles (with one person reporting for each institution), standards for entry-level positions, and training criteria. A separate survey of faculty advisers should be undertaken. Judgments about academic advising as a profession by professionals outside the field, such as chief administrators of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs would be instructive. More definitive and in-depth information needs to be gathered about critical areas of academic advising before the question of professionalism can be resolved. To this end, the current president of NACADA has extended the work of the Task Force on Advising as a Profession and continued work should shed more light on this complex but critical topic.

References

- Habley, W. (1986). Show us the future: The challenges facing academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 6, 5-11.
- Lieberman, M. (1956). *Education as a profession*. New York: Prentice Hall, pp. 2-6.
- Wrenn, C. & Darly, J. (1949). An appraisal of the professional status of personnel work. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), *Trends in student personnel work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Part III of an Interview with Harvey W. Wall

PERSONAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE HISTORY OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

The JOURNAL continues its series on the development of academic advising in higher education with the third installment of an interview with Dr. Harvey Wall, who began his career in clinical psychology in the early 1950s. In March 1986, Dr. Wall retired from his position as director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies (DUS), an advising unit at Penn State University that enrolls freshmen and sophomores exploring a variety of majors and advanced students seeking advising assistance with changes in their academic plans. Dr. Wall was the first director of DUS, which started in 1973 with 800 students. It now enrolls 4,000. In many ways Dr. Wall's professional experiences parallel the development of academic advising nationwide. For those new to advising, Dr. Wall's remembrances of things past, although personal and local, should provide powerful insights into the present status and procedures of advising, regardless of location or type of institution. This final interview with Dr. Wall is particularly significant, because he offers readers an extended definition of academic advising and his experienced views on how advising should look to the future.

ED: In past discussions, you've mentioned a number of people who were instrumental in shaping Penn State's current Division of Undergraduate Studies. You've indicated that these same people influenced you to the extent that they encouraged you to become involved in many activities related to advising and academic administration. What were some of these activities?

HW: First of all, my early work in DOC allowed me to become involved in several studies dealing with student uncertainties about academic program and career choice. These studies appeared to indicate that many students who experienced uncertainties as underclassmen were going through a normal developmental adjustment period. This contradicted a prevailing notion among many faculty and professional colleagues that such indecision was always symptomatic of personal or dependency problems, which had to be diagnosed and treated appropriately. (Editor's Note: see Ashby, Wall, and Osipow, "Vocational Certainty and Indecision in College Freshmen," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 44 [1966], 1037-1041.) Fortunately, I was able to put my ideas, research, and findings into practice both as an advisor and as an academic administrator.

★ HARVEY W. WALL, Ph.D., is emeritus director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies at Penn State University.

ED: What specific role did your research and experience play in the creation of DUS, the "pure advising unit" detailed in our last two sessions, and in improved advising at Penn State?

HWW: I think it had a significant impact on the creation of DUS. I must re-emphasize, however, that we had strong support from sympathetic faculty and administrators. In 1970 a Faculty Senate Committee worked long, hard hours studying the possibility of a university college at Penn State, which eventually resulted in the creation of DUS. DUS was ultimately placed under an academic, rather than a student affairs, office. The Faculty Senate Committee monitored the activities of DUS in its first few years, then, in 1983, DUS was placed within the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Programs.

ED: Could the readers infer that DUS as an advising unit resulted from a compromise solution?

HWW: I prefer to view it as a cooperative effort and an evolutionary one. DUS was not the unified plan of a single visionary, and I hope I have made it clear in these sessions that academic advising, as it exists today at Penn State, resulted from a slow, steady, sometimes painful process. There can be no doubt that the advising system has been much improved and that the importance of advising is more favorably recognized, and I must stress, again, that this improved status could not have been effected without the good will of many dedicated faculty, administrators, and those directly involved with advising.

ED: You literally lived this progress or evolution at Penn State, on a local scale. With your experiences do you feel comfortable generalizing about the national scene?

HWW: I'm fairly certain that many of your readers could relate developments parallel or analogous at their own institutions. From what I see reflected by the growth and activities of NACADA, I feel comfortable enough to say that academic advising has advanced considerably in academe throughout the country—as it most certainly is light years improved at Penn State compared to my experiences in the 1950s. I think it's further safe to say that this advancement came from a cooperative effort among faculty, central administrators, and advisors. I lean heavily on the word "cooperation" and an attitude of mutual respect because, regardless of the great strides that have been made, there's still a long way to go. If the progress and evolution are to continue, cooperation, along with good will and dedication to a mutual cause, will be the key.

ED: In looking to the future, where do you see advising going, and is it going in the proper direction? More specifically, what role do you see developing for faculty advisors? Do you see an increased role for so-called professional advisors? Can you envision professional advising receiving greater acceptance within the academic community?

HWW: I'll take those questions one at a time. I think it's a fairly universal belief throughout academe in this country that faculty advisors feel most comfortable and do their best work with students interested in the faculty member's area of expertise, especially students at the junior-senior level who are enrolled in the faculty member's major. A few years ago the provost at Penn State commissioned DUS to study advising and this belief was confirmed. Conversely, these faculty indicated discomfort working with premajor students, especially those whose interests and abilities were nowhere near the faculty member's. I personally believe that it's extremely critical for students to identify with faculty, especially once the student has chosen a major. I hope that the pressures placed on faculty in the late twentieth century do not force them totally out of academic advising. As the *Involvement in Learning* report clearly pointed out, the quality of higher education suffers whenever students do not identify with faculty and faculty do not interrelate on a personal basis with their students.

ED: What about so-called professional advisors? How do you see their status within academe?

HWW: Professional advisors are here to stay. Higher education and the choices confronting students have grown so complex as to demand specialists who can help students sort out what they want to do and what they do best. The institutions need this specialized expertise and so do the faculty, whose expertise and specialization has moved them in other directions. Look at the growth of NACADA, which began ten years ago and now lists some 2,000 members. Besides a recognized organization, you have an annual national conference that attracts more than 1,000 people, successful regional conferences throughout the country, and a professional quality newsletter and journal. The phenomenon of the advising center has become so commonplace that, from my perspective, colleges and universities without some type of advising center have become a dwindling minority. If you check the *Chronicle of Higher Education* on a regular basis, you will notice ads for academic advisors, directors of advising, coordinators of advising centers, and so forth. As late as five years ago I don't remember seeing this.

ED: But does the growth of NACADA and advising centers relate directly to so-called professional advising? After all, many members of the organization and much of the staffing of advising centers come from the ranks of the faculty.

HWW: That's as it should be. I hope I have sufficiently emphasized that faculty must not be divorced from academic advising. I'm actually addressing raw numbers. If you check your membership roster and the staff of advising centers, there's no doubt in my mind that most of these could be described as professional advisors.

ED: How would you describe professional advisors?

HWW: The way I think most of us do. Simply, as persons whose contract or job description calls for them primarily to advise students, rather than to devote most of their professional energies to teaching and research. Of course, the job description need not rule out teaching and research, nor should advising centers rule out faculty members. Many, if not most, advising centers or advising systems use faculty to help and direct students, perhaps because of the make-up of the institution. Thinking optimistically, many faculty like to advise students, even premajor and undecided ones, and they do a good job at it.

ED: If professional advising, as you define it, is currently entrenched in academe, what about the future? What vision do you have regarding its further acceptance within the academic community?

HWW: As with most human events, the future is in the hands of professional advisors *and* subject to external forces. By external forces I mean the policy makers at the individual institutions. At present it seems that many administrators are favorably disposed toward effective advising systems—in widely varying degrees and depending on exigencies of location and personality. They see the need for good advising and they see the dedication of the people doing it. Advisors must keep up this good work, but they must do more. They cannot sit back and let the students come to them, and expect to be rewarded automatically. Professional advisors must, with all the energy and creativity at their disposal, stress that they are performing a function inextricably bound with the academic mission of the institution. With the creation of DUS by the Faculty Senate and its placement under a high-ranking academic office, Penn State made that statement, and I strongly believe that advising, the institution, and the students were better for it. Nevertheless, organizational structure and quality work alone were not enough and won't be enough. From DUS I can extend the idea to advising centers and advisors everywhere. I think two concepts are key to the growth and development of the profession of advising: visibility and accountability.

ED: Visibility and accountability in what sense?

HWW: I guess you might say I'm calling for creative public relations efforts. It's amazing how much good will can be gained from a short seminar or session for faculty on academic information and advising, organized by advisors or an advising center. Of course the seminar or session cannot be too condescending or overwhelming, or you miss the point. It never hurts for the advising center to invite top echelon administrators to a special program that it runs for students or faculty, or to a meeting to discuss the mission and day-to-day operation of the center. The personal touch, if done astutely, seldom fails.

I think professional advisors, wherever possible, should be involved in teaching a course or two within their area of academic expertise. They should serve on important committees, such as curricular affairs, general education, or retention to show they can provide valuable insights into improving academic quality. Also, wherever possible, advisors should engage in research

in their own disciplines or on projects related to the academic mission of the institution. However, all of this must be done carefully. That's where the creativity or artistry comes in, because there's a very fine line between gaining visibility and impressing people and appearing too aggressive and alienating them.

ED: That seems to cover visibility. What about accountability?

HWW: Bluntly stated, advising systems cost money and the higher echelons want to know that they are allocating their limited resources effectively. Internal studies that show good advising helps recruitment, retention, and student satisfaction with the institution are one obvious tactic. Remember that satisfied students who become satisfied alumni (ae) are critical to the future. Appropriate studies that show faculty are grateful for the presence and activities of an organized advising system can help, too. Faculty who perceive—even if it is not true—that an advising system works against their welfare must somehow be convinced otherwise. The advising system that cultivates the faculty as colleagues rather than as adversaries will enjoy much greater health. Here's where it helps for professional advisors to teach or conduct disciplinary research wherever possible. Visibility and accountability actually are very closely related. Advisors and advising systems must do quality work and show the whole academic community—administrators, faculty, and students—that they are doing it, and they must prove that their presence on the institution's budget ledgers is not only worth maintaining but also worth increasing.

ED: But what if none of this works? What if the institution must retrench and the administrators draw the red line through advising centers and their staffs?

HWW: Then it happens. I started out by stating that external forces have some say in the future of advising. The task for advising is to make sure that negative external forces are not turned in its direction. As a colleague at another school once told me: When it comes down to "them or us," we want to be categorized as "us." I'm trying to avoid redundancy, but advising must prove that it is bound with the academic mission of the institution. It must put itself in a position whereby, if dark days come, administrators will be as reluctant to reduce the quality of their advising system as they are to reduce the quality of their faculty.

ED: If advising systems want to be "us," who are "us"? What do advisors tell administrators and the academic community that they do? In other words, how do you define academic advising?

HWW: That is the tough one. But I've spent a long time discussing it, so I guess it's only fair that I attempt to say what it is, or what I think it is.

Advising is part of the teaching mission of higher education. It helps students gain maximum benefit from the college or university they attend by teaching them to appreciate the goals of higher education and the ultimate purpose of education for its own sake and for good citizenship. Advising

teaches students the mission of their particular institution and the purpose of its general education. In the true sense of education, advising draws students out. It teaches them how to direct themselves toward a field of study, where they can best apply their abilities in the most satisfactory manner, and it shows them how best to continue these studies toward graduation and into life-long learning. It draws out of students a solid understanding of their true interests and their academic strengths and weaknesses vis-à-vis higher education, and the institution in which they are enrolled. Ultimately it helps to teach students the most effective use of their intellectual capabilities in confronting an uncertain future.

Of necessity, the academic advising function will include schedule planning, appropriate choice of major, and explanation of the curriculum requirements for that major. It will involve teaching students the proper clerical functions to effect their favorable progress through the institution. It will touch on, but not primarily or exclusively, personal adjustment and career choice issues. Finally, good academic advising will teach the student how to locate appropriate specialized services, such as financial aid, career development, and personal counseling, when these services are deemed necessary.

ED: Very interesting. Would you like this to be called the "Wall Definition or Paradigm" when someone finally writes a real history of advising?

HWW: I'd be honored, although I've never thought of myself as a spokesperson. I'm only speaking from the perspective of personal opinion and thirty-five years of my own rather localized experience. However, I really believe the time is ripe for broadly conceptualized thinking on what academic advising is and what it does.

ED: Who would do this?

HWW: Why not NACADA for starters? Not only do you have strength in numbers, but you all have a shared, mutually understood identity. If new persons show up at one of your national or regional conferences, they are immediately impressed by the fact that they meet people who speak the same language and are grappling for solutions to the same problems. Where those persons come from, the size or mission of their institution doesn't matter. You've seen that happen, I've seen that happen, and most veteran NACADA members have seen that happen for the last ten years.

ED: Who will listen to NACADA? What effect can a federated group of advisors have on top echelon administrators at a particular institution?

HWW: I can't answer that exactly, but the fact that a national statement has been made can give local advisors something with which to work, something from which to form their own local definition, a goal with which they can fashion the best advising system possible at their institution. If NACADA doesn't do it, someone else will. If administrators have nothing to work with, they will make up their own definitions and job descriptions, and, if they work in a

vacuum, they will probably end up way off base. That's why I strongly believe they have to see academic advisors as part of the teaching mission of the institution. If they see you as hand-holders, that's what you'll do. If they see you as clinical psychologists or career counselors, you will become specialists in those areas. If they see you as clerks and schedule-planners, filling out check sheets, you'll be out of jobs by the end of the next decade, because technology will replace you. Already machines are doing the bulk of registration and course enrollment at many institutions. Advising must begin to lay emphasis on itself as a teaching art, which can be improved but can never be removed from the academy that wants to see itself in the business of education.

ED: Assuming your definition of advising, what qualities would you look for in the ideal advisor? Making this more concrete, what credentials should a director of advising look for when hiring?

HWW: Interest in working with students, all types of students whether they're traditional or nontraditional, remedial students or honors students. A prospective advisor with the most impeccable, outstanding paper credentials who doesn't really want to work with students in an academic advising capacity will very quickly become dissatisfied and will end up as a drain on the rest of the advising staff.

ED: Assuming a solid degree of comfort about a potential advisor's interest, what else would you look for?

HWW: Demonstrated experience within the context of interest, and an education at least at the master's level. The latter would show me that a candidate has a stronger-than-average commitment to higher education and a perspective that you normally cannot receive as an undergraduate. Besides, across campus the academic departments require at least the master's level for their faculty, and this requirement will go a long way in helping the advising center's image as being "one of us." The prospective advisor should have minimal credentials equivalent to those expected from the rest of the academic community.

ED: Why not the doctorate? That seems to be a virtual necessity for faculty rank in the last two decades and a staff of "doctors" would certainly satisfy *la bella figura*.

HWW: The doctoral credential does not hold for all fields in all places. If you can staff an advising center with people holding doctorates—great! First, that's probably not feasible from a supply, demand, resources position. Second, by including only doctoral-level people in your initial screening, you might be eliminating automatically some very good people. I'm not saying that a person with a bachelor's degree could not be an outstanding advisor. There are sufficient examples of people without any degree at all holding senior professorial positions. I'm only saying that you can staff an advising center with persons at the master's level, which says something about that person and which helps the image of advising around campus.

ED: On the subject of degree as credential, what *type* of degree did you have in mind?

HWW: Generally, it doesn't matter. There's no such thing as an advanced degree in academic advising, and advanced courses in advising are embryonic at this stage. Frankly, I don't think academic advising should attach itself to any one discipline. In the Division of Intermediate Registration and the Division of Counseling, for example, we were all counseling psychologists, but that did not make us good academic advisors, and many of our counselors had no interest—there's that important word—in academic advising. Some of the skill gained in counseling and psychology programs with interviewing and relating to students one-on-one *can* be very valuable. An advising center, however, benefits from a staff with a wide range of academic backgrounds, because most centers deal with students with a wide range of interests. If an advisor runs into a subtle or fine-tuning situation outside of his/her area of expertise, it's extremely helpful to have a colleague to turn to who might have personal knowledge in that discipline.

ED: Would you require advisors to have courses in such subjects as interviewing?

HWW: That would not be a bad idea, but again I don't think formal courses in counseling skills are necessary. There are many ways of gaining and proving this experience other than credits on an academic transcript, and I'm sure that your readers can come up with as many instances as I can.

ED: What if NACADA were to draw up minimal credentials or expectations for advisors, and individual institutions do not pay attention?

HWW: Then they don't. But they would be aware that they do not even meet the minimal criteria for advisors requested by a consensus of national experts in the field. Realistically, NACADA or any group speaking for advising cannot dictate to an institution that has its particular needs and constraints. Nevertheless, NACADA—or whoever—can set up the target at which the institution can aim. Frankly, I think most institutions would be grateful for guidelines in hiring advisors.

ED: Getting back to the credentials themselves, you have been clear on the need for interest in advising and education at the master's level. What else would you like to see in a candidate for an advising position?

HWW: Good communication skills in speaking and writing, and good interpersonal skills in dealing with students and colleagues in the academic community. A candidate may have had specific courses in one or all of these. If not, just like determining interest, there are other ways to determine a person's experience and competency in these areas, imperfect though they may be.

ED: What about a knowledge of statistics and testing?

HWW: Very helpful, if for no other reason than to be able to avoid bad conclusions through improper use of statistics and testing evaluation. Again, courses taken and listed on the resumé would be ideal. However, I don't think this is entirely necessary. For example, a faculty member from an English department

who is advising freshmen may not have had statistics and testing evaluation as part of his or her formal background. But this person certainly knows the value and limitations of any test and can learn very quickly how to interpret properly any objective test or statistical norms that the institution might use in advising students.

ED: So, you would lean on the old military method of OJT (on-the-job-training)?

HWW: Yes, because that's happening now, and for those interested in advising and willing to learn, it seems to be working quite well. The *ideal* candidate for an advising job would 1) demonstrate interest and prior experience in the field, or related fields, 2) have at least one advanced degree, 3) have proven skills in speaking and writing, 4) have proven interpersonal skills, 5) have a basic understanding of testing evaluation, and 6) have a general knowledge of the history and philosophy of higher education in the United States. However, very seldom in my 35 years with advising can I remember anyone who perfectly fit this description. They may have come close, but usually some type of specific, localized training was necessary.

ED: What if your above six criteria were somehow established and local institutions wanted to set up routine training programs to reach that ideal?

HWW: That would be *the ideal* and I can see from reading this *Journal* that a variety of training models exist at institutions. Why, therefore, could there not be a general, national model for training advisors that could be adapted at local levels?

ED: What elements do you see as critical to an advisor orientation or training program?

HWW: I think any model should include some discussion on the history and philosophy of higher education in this country and advising's relationship thereto. It should discuss the history, educational mission, and general education philosophy of the particular institution. Following that, it must necessarily cover curricula, overall requirements, and nuts-and-bolts procedural and scheduling issues. Then the session or sessions could move into practical or hands-on application of statistics and testing evaluation as used locally. The trainee should have the opportunity to meet and interact with concerned, veteran faculty advisors and key colleagues in such offices as admissions, financial aid, the career and personal counseling centers—if these people will not be part of the trainee's day-to-day activities. As we all know, we learn best by doing, so the next step would be on-the-job training supervised by a senior staff member. After that, you might even require a probationary period of three to six months.

ED: Who should develop such a model?

HWW: Any number of organizations related to higher education could, and with some amount of determination NACADA has as much expertise as any group could have. Nevertheless, somebody should do this for the sake of giving advising the appearance of a national, unified position. I've made the points

that advisors know what they do and should come up with a consensus definition, and should make a statement about minimal credentials. The next logical step seems to be a flexible, sensible, national model that can be adapted locally for training advisors. With this much unity or apparently clear focus, advising can make a much better case for recognized status within academe. It's a maxim in psychology/sociology circles that appropriate and expected behavior most often receives appropriate and expected treatment. To draw some practical analogies, look at what medicine and law have done for themselves in the last century, and my original profession, psychology, was in its infancy 100 years ago. Now these professions have high visibility and command a good degree of respect.

ED: Isn't it extreme to compare advising to well-established professions like law, medicine, and psychology?

HWW: Perhaps financially speaking, but not if you think the issue through to where these professions stood in the United States in the 1880s. Once again, compare the current status of advising to where it stood twenty years ago, and you might see my logic that there is some cause for optimism. However, for the optimism to become reality, there has to be vision, dedication, and hard work.

ED: Besides this consensus definition of advising, advising credentials, and a training model, what else do you incorporate in this vision?

HWW: A broad research base. For example, Sam Osipow's work on student uncertainties about major and career choice can apply to advising all types of students at all types of institutions as does William Perry's and his students' work on cognitive development and student behavior. I'd like to see more studies on academic advising's connection to general education or advising's importance to imparting the role of higher education. Much more work can be done on how students approach the decision-making process. In other words, I'd like to see advising research that goes beyond particular procedures or the efficacies of a specific program or advising strategy at a particular institution. There are any number of examples I could give, but the important point is for advising to engage in more universalized or broad philosophical thinking.

Because advisors come from so many different backgrounds, the research can be richly interdisciplinary. I said it before and I'll say it again. Professional advising deals with the entire sweep of curricula within institutions and it should not attach itself to any one discipline. The variety, the richness, the simultaneous breadth and depth we presently find in advisors could be lost if that would happen.

ED: Who has the time, energy, and resources for such activity?

HWW: That's the key problem that advising struggles with at the moment. Advisors are given X number of students, always too many, "other duties as assigned," and are expected to go from there, with no stipulation made for growth and

development, or advancement. Your past and current presidents have addressed these issues in the *Journal*, and I've noticed a few articles on the so-called burnout topic. I think there should be more studies on just how much an advisor can take, or how sabbaticals and larger advising staffs are in the best fiscal and educational interests of the institution. That's why I said earlier that somehow released-time should be found for advisors to serve on meaningful committees and to teach in their academic areas. I can extend this to finding time for research or writing research grants. I know I'm stressing the "what" and not the "how," but I strongly believe that most advisors day after day, year after year, can't sit at their desks and deal with students who come to them. It's not good for most advisors, and neither is it good for advising, because this focused activity keeps advising isolated from the academic community.

ED: This touches on issues of standards. If advising nationally and institutions locally can have expectations of advising candidates, should not candidates have some guarantee of their working conditions?

HWW: Although the guidelines would need to be very flexible, I don't think it hurts advising here and now to begin considering general norms such as minimal advising loads for certain situations, suggested clerical support, working conditions and work space, job security, and even such benefits as sabbaticals, released time, and pay scales. It presently happens in academic areas like engineering, education, psychology, journalism, and social work; so advising, if it wants to be a recognized part of the academic community, can certainly start thinking along these lines. On its own, or jointly with appropriate agencies, it could come up with certain minimal standards for advising necessary for departmental or institutional accreditation.

ED: Another ideal for future consideration?

HWW: No. An ideal for consideration now, not in the distant future, which fits in with my belief that advising must develop a broad vision and work toward its fulfillment.

ED: You've expressed an optimistic sentiment more than once. Should our readers assume that your vision sees a favorable future?

HWW: Why not? For three sessions I've detailed my personal experience with the development of academic advising and have given my views on its growth and status nationwide. I hope I have not bored too many readers with my emphasis on how far advising has come. I'll repeat what I said earlier in this session. Advising can influence its own future. However, to do this, advisors cannot sit back passively, go about doing good work, and expect automatic rewards. They have to make their case actively—and carefully. From the relatively safe position of retirement I can offer suggestions based on 20/20 hindsight and uncounted mistakes. But, like Wes Habley in Chicago, I can

urge your readers to "seize the day," because I am confident that what academic advising should be and where it wants to go both depend on the actions of the advisors themselves.

ED: Which is a simultaneously frightening and hopeful challenge. If your reminiscences, opinions, and suggestions have bored the readers or raised controversy, you can be assured that you will hear about it. In the meantime, accept sincere thanks for your time spent and your wisdom imparted.

Carol Ryan

EDUCATING FOR CITIZENSHIP THROUGH EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

The Advisor's Role

The author states that most advisors do not have enough information about experiential learning opportunities in their communities to encourage their universities to become involved in offering these opportunities to their students. In this article, the author identifies some successful experiential learning programs, discusses possible learning outcomes of such programs, and explains the advisor's role in such an activity.

INTRODUCTION

Academic advisors spend much of their time helping students choose appropriate courses to meet their educational goals and the university's distribution requirements. Little attention is paid to the inclusion of experiential learning into an advisee's degree program despite the fact that most people learn best by doing and by integrating concrete experience and theoretical knowledge (Kolb, 1984). While many colleges and universities do offer experiential learning opportunities and internship programs, generally academic advisors have not been as knowledgeable about these options as they are about course descriptions and major requirements.

Educating for Citizenship

Most educators discuss the value of experiential learning for students in terms of career exploration, acquisition of personal and job skills and beginning knowledge of the workplace. However, another aim of experiential programs is to educate for citizenship. Universities have long neglected this traditional goal (Newman, 1987). It is true that in recent years students have retreated from their involvement in community issues and, in an uncertain economic climate, have concentrated on educational programs which emphasize career preparation. Nevertheless, our country needs citizens who understand the political, social, and economic realities we confront and who are willing to work toward change. Universities have an obligation to provide the kinds of education which will prepare students to serve in volunteer roles ranging from ad-

★ CAROL RYAN, Ph.D., is an advising faculty member of Metropolitan State University in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota. She serves as the project coordinator for the FIPSE-funded Community Service Internship Program at her institution.