DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 914 CG 004 084

By-Winter, William D.
Outreach Programs: The Changing Relationships Between Counseling and Campus.
San Jose State Coll., Calif.
Pub Date [68]
Note-8p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50
Descriptors-College Environment, Colleges, *College Students, *Counseling Centers, *Counseling Programs, Educational Therapy, *Innovation, *Interdisciplinary Approach, Student Participation, Student Personnel Work

This paper describes two innovative programs inaugurated by the counseling center at San Jose State College in response to the increased general involvement of college students over the past several years. The first program was an educational experiment which sought to make freshman psychology courses more meaningful, as well as to increase student participation in the college environment. These aims were accomplished by involving volunteer freshmen participants in peer orientation and T-groups with upper class and graduate psychology students, and by organizing a core curriculum revolving around the psychology course. The second program, involving minority groups, grew out of student violence in 1967. The counseling center undertook to bring minority problems out into the open, and to encourage small group confrontations where participants of all races might explore their racial feelings. Counselor involvement has been heavy in the cause of the minority students, perhaps to the detriment of more scholarly activities, and it is too soon to establish the boundaries of ultimate counselor concern. However, it is felt that in these stressful times, there is more danger in inertia than in experimentation. (CJ)

OUTREACH PROGRAMS: THE CHANGING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COUNSELING AND CAMPUS[1]

William D. Winter

San Jose State College, California

Traditionally, the posture taken by college counselors toward their parent college community has been has been one of passivity. Trained in a tradition of professionalism, best exemplified by the physician in private practice, we have waited quietly in our offices for our client (student, teacher, or administrator) to come to us with a problem. This has been a safe situation for the counselor, one he can control, one which brings him a meaure of respect and power. The passive orientation, however, results in our actually reaching only very few students among those who need help. Another result is that we are confined to patching over bruised egos when perhaps we could be doing something more effective to influence the educational system which is going the bruising. The increasing emphasis on community-oriented psychology, the availability of government-financed action programs, and the growing militancy of students and other minorities are all slowly forcing us to reexamine the traditional counseling model. For the past three or four years, the Counseling Center at San Jose State College has been developing outreach programs in which counselors become more actively involved with the campus community, serving as a focal point for calling attention to problems in an educationally meaningful manner. In this paper, two such programs will be described, one a joint venture with an academic department to produce a new form of educational experience, the other a program to ease inter-racial tensions. These are both experimental in nature, and although we feel they have been successful, we still have not resolved in our own minds what should be the limits set on moving our counselors into these and other new roles. Change brings uncertainty and the need for readjusted thinking.

Peer Program

Involvement is the watchword of our current generation of college students, involvement not only in the power structure of colleges and communities, but also involvement in the freedom, joy, and emotionality of life itself. The complaints of many intelligent students that they are forced into a helpless, passive conformity by the values of the faceless institutions of our society have been to well documented by the mass media covering recent campus events to need repeating here. One of the basic charges of students is that our colleges have become factories geared to the production of technicians, that they have stressed intellectualism in its narrow sense and ignored the emotional, humanistic aspects of man's personality.

---

[1]The writer is grateful to Ben Finney, John Borghi, David Stoker, and Thornton Hooper for allowing him to be a participant observer in their Peer Program. Thanks are also due to Keith Johnsgard, Wiggsy Siversten, and Ray Schumacher for furnishing information concerning the interracial groups. These are officially sponsored programs of the Counseling Center and much of the description comes from reports of the counselors listed above. The writer wishes to stress that he did not participate fully in all aspects of these programs and major credit for their development and implementation should be given to these counselors.

These charges have been echoed even by perceptive members of the faculty for over 30 generations. As Edgar Friedenberg (1965) has written, "The highest function of education, I would maintain, is to help people understand the meaning of their lives, and become more sensitive to the meaning of other peoples' lives and relate to them more fully." (pg. 221)

The Peer Project is an attempt to help freshmen break down the anonymity of a huge impersonal institution and form sub-cultures in which friendship, self-exploration, and personal growth become important values to be integrated with the intellectual knowledge in which they are immersed. This program is unusual in that it makes use of the existing course structure of the college, with no additional funding, administrative time, or special institues provided. It is also unusual because it is the joint project of an academic department and a counseling center.

Background of the Program

A straight lecture course is all too often boring and even demoralizing to both the student and the lecturer. Sensitive faculty members get tired of lecturing, and the problem of how to make classes more interesting is a common topic in faculty cafeterias. One of us, Ben Finney, began to experiment with the format of his mental hygiene course, which was a direct forerunner of the Peer Program (Finney & Borghi, 1966). First, instead of the usual formal textbooks, he assigned more emotionally-involving materials, such as Missildine's (1963) "Your Inner Child of the Past." Second, he broke the class into small discussion groups which met regularly twice a week to investigate their own personal values and problems, as well as mental hygiene topics. Once a week, the entire class met for a more formal lecture. Third, he asked his students to write him weekly letters expressing the emotions and thoughts aroused by the course material. The instructor would read these letters, make comments on them, such as pointing out discrepancies or giving leads to explore, and then return them to the students. Finally, the course examinations were unusual in that they were essay tests graded on how well the student was able to integrate the concepts from the textbooks with the events and meaning of his own personal life, i.e., he had to illustrate and use the concepts in explaining himself as a person.

The changes instituted in this course were quite popular with instructor and students alike, and all who were involved felt that this was a maturing experience which should be continued. To this end, Ben Finney and Harold Keely expanded and restructured the teaching method into the new Peer Program. In its final form, three staff members, all with joint appointments in Psychology and Counseling, functioned as leaders. Each of these leaders ran his group in a slightly different manner, so the description below is only a general one of the 1968 program.

Structure

During the summer, entering freshmen were recruited by letter and 250 volunteered for the program. The inducements were the chance of greater interpersonal contact in college and also pre-registration into certain general education courses, some sections of which were reserved for Peers only. They were asked to pay a special fee of $25 per semester to cover the expenses of a marathon session and social activities, and also asked to purchase and read two paperbacks, Fast's "Human Sexual Response" (1966) and Brown's "Manchild in the Promised Land", (1965) before arriving at the college.

The Peer staff recruited about 40 upperclassmen who had been through similar group experiences before, either earlier Peer Tribes or in the mental hygiene class described earlier. These Experienced Members (EMS) and Great Experienced Members (GREMS), usually graduate students in psychology, became the basic encounter group

leaders and otherwise assumed responsibility for a group of about six to eight Peers. To facilitate group identity and make administration of the project possible, a hierarchical structure was set up. Each group of six to eight peers was formed into a clan, headed by an EM or a GREM. Five to seven clans were formed into four tribes, and each tribe was headed by a faculty member.

During the summer, the EMS had written the invitational letters to the prospective Peers. When the 250 Peers arrived on campus during registration week, they were given colored buttons to wear indicating their tribe, and each clan met with its EM, who took them around campus and oriented them to the college. A group of 50 Peers elected to live in the same dormitory floor. As the semester began, the Peers attended their common core classes and also special talks by faculty members on the books assigned during the summer.

Therapy

The specifically therapeutic aspect of the program was centered mainly in the group therapy sessions held by each clan twice a week, under the general supervision of the Peer faculty. What occurred in these groups depended largely on their composition, but visitors were impressed by the remarkably open manner in which the Peers dealt with very important emotional material, after the initial hesitancy had worn off. Once or twice a semester, each tribe held a weekend marathon group therapy session at a nearby college for nuns, with a beautiful mountain campus. The first evening, the entire tribe met for a long sensitivity training session, using techniques similar to those of Schutz (1967) and Bindrim (1966). That night the Peers and staff slept in the dormitory, and after breakfast on Saturday each clan began about 18 hours of continuous group therapy in separate rooms. The faculty members circulated from clan to clan helping them over occasional hang-ups. On Sunday morning, the tribe had a "reentry session," to go over what had been learned, to criticize the marathon, and to decide how to handle their new insights and anxieties. This type of session was necessary as some Peers became intoxicated with their new-found knowledge and went home to directly confront parents or friends with open hostility, and they needed help to learn to be discrete. In the opinion of the participants, these sensitivity marathons were exceedingly valuable experiences which lived up to the claims made for this type of treatment in the popular press (Howard, 1968). The mystique of Esalen is powerful in California, and apparently with good reason.

Classes

Although the Peers attended core classes, only the psychology classes were restructured specifically for this program. The Peers were asked to sign up for one year of Peer psychology, an integrated course combining General Psychology with Psychology of Adjustment. The adjustment topics were taken up first, and the letter writing and examinations continued much as in the mental hygiene course described earlier. The second semester was a more direct attempt to combine intellectual stimulation with an exploration of self and world. The text books consisted of a standard one in general psychology (Hilgard & Athinson, 1967) and several paperbacks on social problems (Malcolm X, 1965; Nowlis, 1967; Simmons & Winograd, 1966). Regular reading assignments were made and lectures given, and each clan was required to write and present a joint term paper for which they received a grade based on the evaluations of the other peers.

Evaluation of the Program

Because of the severe budgeting limitations of our state college system and the evolving nature of our program, we have not as yet been able to evaluate the efficacy of the Peer Program by means of systematic research. What follows is a purely subjective clinical evaluation bolstered by interviews with participants, letters of evaluation, and such hard data as the high percentage of students returning for the second semester of the program.

Overall, the Peer Program has been a rousing therapeutic success. Letters from Peers speak glowingly not only of the greater emotional maturity they have experienced, but also of the value of being a part of a sub-culture of interested and intimate friends. Often for the first time in their lives, the Peers have learned how to experience their own feelings openly and to communicate them, and they feel alive, creative, and "turned on", without drugs.

However, despite student endorsement there appear to be many difficulties with the program. Perhaps the one which concerns us most is that although a close emotional culture has apparently been generated, it has not been particularly intellectual in nature, and the academic performace of the Peers has not been outstanding. This can be traced to several factors. First, the heady experiences of self-exploration leaves little time for textbooks. Second, friendships interfere with studying. For example, if a Peer who is studying for an examination receives an anxiety-provoking letter from her mother, she is more likely to seek out a fellow clan member for a cathartic discussion than to return to her reading. In effect, there is a re-ordering of values involved. Hopefully, some balance and integration will take place in time.

Third, because of the sheer amount of staff time the program takes it was not possible to integrate fully the faculty members from other departments who taught the core courses. Most of them did not understand the philosophy of the Peer Program and attempted to teach their courses in the same old way, without taking into account the changed group dynamics of their classrooms. The Peers were not passive; they were noisy, questioning, anti-authoritarian, and unruly, and the instructors who were not able to adapt their teaching methods were shocked and upset. As one senior speech professor later wrote, "That experience for me was one of both agony and delight. I was, at first, discouraged and confused by my inability to cope with students who were openly expressing their feelings.... In playing the professor-student game I had unconsciously grown accustomed to receiving carefully screened feedback. The Peer Group students told me things about my course and about me that I did not want to hear at first...But, fortunately for my growth I stayed with the program. And, as we began to really know each other, I found myself understanding and caring for these undergraduate students in far more meaningful ways than I had ever experienced before....My ability to communicate with them improved immeasurably and ...My own sense of satisfaction with my teaching improved." Our belief at this point is that the intellectual performance of the Peers would be improved most effectively by our choosing the course instructors more carefully and making them a more cohesive group through training and opportunities for catharsis. However, we must be prepared for culture shock to occur when Peers attend regular courses after their freshman year.

There are other difficulties which we encountered with the program. Some Peers were too threatened and left. For others, particularly the dormitory group, the freedom of the project was too great and they spent all their time socializing and "horsing around."

Other problems center on the difficulty of finding proper peer staff, and the tremendous drain on the time and energy of the faculty members. The administrative and emotional responsibilities are exceedingly heavy, and at times they all longed to return to the shelter of their previous state of distance from students. At

times, the personal problems of the staff even interfered with the cohesion and productivity of the Peer Groups. Although no major students crises have occurred during the program, Peers would quite often come into the Counseling Center for emergency consultations, as anxiety was stirred up. However, because the Peers had friends, and a therapy group, these consultations were generally brief and relatively productive. Finally, we received no extra funds, and hindsight shows us that the demands of this program are too great to be borne by the tribe leaders without released time or other extra compensation. This type of experimental program runs counter to the narrow pseudo-intellectual bias of many of the general faculty and of the community. It has proven difficult to sell the general faculty on this program, and their conservatism is matched by the shocked comments from a few parents and our local unenlightened press.

Despite these difficulties, we believe the program has been a success and that it points the way toward a more meaningful education for our "now" generation.

Minority Group Program

The Peer Program is structured and has been in existence for several years; therfore, it is easier to describe in detail than our groping efforts to involve the Counseling Center in a program concerned with the interracial problems on campus. In addition, these efforts are so intertwined with exceedingly complex historical events and personalities as to make a coherant short description difficult.

Background

Although many of us had been intensely concerned with the progress of the civil rights movement, we reacted with personal shock and fear when the threat of racial violence faced us at the opening of the 1967-1968 school year. We were caught flatfooted, with no adequate means even to try to be of help in the situation. Consequently, except for minor informal consultations with our staff, the administration had to develop its own plans. Fortunately, some of the concessions made, such as cancelling the opening football game, placing fraternities and sororities on probation, and appointing a college Ombudsman brought us a temporary reprieve. The counseling services immediately held a staff meeting to which we invited the Ombudsman, minority group spokesmen, and interested faculty, to answer the naive question of what we would do to be helpful in this period of crisis. Out of this meeting grew two concrete programs which are easy to describe and an atmosphere which is more difficult to communicate.

Concrete Programs

Before the crystallizing efforts of Harry Edwards, most members of the campus community had been largely unaware of the problems of minority group students on campus. We felt ours was an integrated campus and the complaints of the Blacks seemed almost hysterical. As we gathered more information on the true state of affairs, we soon concluded that we, as well as other faculty, administrators, and students needed to be educated as to what the experiences and feelings of our minority students were. We therefore produced a videotaped series of interviews with Black and Mexican-American students in which they discussed their college experiences of discrimination. This film, "Day of Concern", produced by John Borghi and Bruce Ogilvie, was very effective, and was shown at an open meeting in the college auditorium and discussed by a panel of students and faculty. Although attendance was not large, the program did serve its purpose by focussing attention

on the College's problem and also bringing out several valuable suggestions for faction programs. Although TV interview programs on racial issues are now commonplace, it was a new experience for us. Despite many heartaches in bringing the project to a successful conclusion, there were several useful byproducts. One was the increased comraderie of an inter-disciplinary faculty group[1] working together voluntarily on a social problem. Another was that we learned the ropes of coordinating public relations, television, class schedules, etc., which helped us in later projects. Finally, the "Day of Concern" program brought us in contact with a less vocal minority group, the Mexican-Americans, who, at one point lodged the first official complaint of prejudice received by the new Ombudsman, which complaint was directed at --our Counseling Center! Settling their grievance over alleged underrepresentation in the film was useful both to us and to them.

The second program we introduced was one of interracial encounter groups. We ran seven regular groups during the year. A group was typically composed of approximately four Blacks, two Mexican-Americans, six WASPS, and two faculty members, all of whom volunteered for the groups. At first volunteers were solicited by notices sent to classes and to newspapers, but wer were more successful when we opened a recruitment booth in the center of campus. At the start, these groups concentrated on Black-White-Brown problems, raising questions such as whether the Black students were actually planning to burn down fraternity row, and expressing stereotyped mutual hatred. Gradually, after the ventilation of hostility more personal topics were developed and discussed therapeutically. These of course varied with the composition of the groups. Middle-class Blacks might, for example, be concerned with parental pressures toward achievement, while lower-class Blacks might be torn up over their fear of feeling and expressing tender emotions towards any whites, and all might discuss the anxiety that comes with the conflict between militancy and Uncle Tomism. Although therapy and catharsis helped the minority group members, it is our opinion that the overall benefit for the white members was even greater. Although these encounter groups were but a small step, they seem to have been successful and may be integrated into the College's new educational opportunity program for disadvantaged youth.

Atmosphere

When the academic year began, be had no program or role to play in dealing with problems of campus unrest. By the end of the year, we were intimately involved in these problems, to such an extent that our purely academic activities suffered. Many of us had had minority members as clients or students, and we had worked actively in a consulting role with several departments which became key areas of tension. For example, Keith Johnsgard, Bruce Ogilvie, and Thomas Tutko had been working for years with the physical education department doing research on athletic motivation. The impression grew, among minority group students, that our counselors were concerned, competent, and could be trusted (as much as any white faculty member could be). They began to drop in to chat about personal problems, and the occurrence of such incidents as our devoting several hours to helping hospitalize a Negro student without traumatizing him excessively helped build this trust. Another incident which helped our image occurred during a riot when the Counseling Center kept its doors open and offered first aid to tear gas victims. Minority students began to bring organizational problems to us, for example, asking us to be faculty advisors for minority student clubs. The administration also turned to us for advice and

---

[1] Some of the active members of this committee were Robert Martin, Ruth Rehbock, Lowell Walter, Robert Reynolds, Bruce Ogilvie, and the author.

for help in arranging easier communication with students on tense issues. We began to work closely with the Ombudsman, referring students to each other and sharing joint projects. In a manner of speaking, we have become the middle men, the experts on communication who are trusted by all sides and who attempt to help clarify issues and channel rage into rational demands. The enormity of the problem faced by minority groups and our own ineffectiveness to make any basic changes which really matter have been humbling, even frightening experiences.

These, then, have been some of the ways in which our Counseling Center has moved out into the campus community. In general, this move has been a good thing for us, despite our anxiety and the decline of our scholarly activity. However, the consequences of this change are not yet clear, and many of our doubts remain as to the optimum limits of our involvement. For example, for several years we have consulted with departments having faculty problems and have even run encounter groups in one department. Again, one of our counselors was asked to give the impassioned speech which broke up our major student riot. Also, our advice on handling demonstrations is sought by the police. And our efforts to encourage nonviolent demonstrations rather than violent ones sometimes lead to accusations that we are wholly identified with the establishment. Each of these activities presents a danger to our integrity as a counseling service. But in these stressful times we feel that more danger lies in inertia than in experimentation.

References

Bindrim, P. Peak-oriented psychotherapy - paper presented at the American Assocn. for Humanistic Psychology, September 1966.

Borghi, J.H. & Finney, B.C. Increasing self-awareness - paper presented at the California State Psychological Association Convention, January 1966.

Brown, C. Manchild in the promised land. New York: Signet, 1965.

Fast, J. What you should know about the human sexual response. New York: Berkeley Pub., 1966.

Finney, Ben C. History of the peer group - unpublished manuscript.

Friedenberg, E.Z. Coming of age in america. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Hilgard, E.R. & Athinson, R.C. Introduction to psychology. New York: Harcourt, 1967.

Howard, J. Inhibitions thrown to the gentle winds. Life, 1968, 65, 48-65.

Missildine, H.W. Your inner child of the past. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1963.

Nowlis, H. Drugs on the college campus/ Detroit: NASPA, 1967.

Schutz, W. Joy. New York: Grove, 1967.

Simmons, J. & Winograd, B. It's happening. Santa Barbara: Marc-Laird, 1966.

X, Malcolm. The autobiography of Malcolm X. New York: Grove, 1965.