ABSTRACT
          This document presents the founding conference report
for the Society for Field Experience Education (SFEE). The report
covers the proposal to establish the SFEE and presents papers and
workshop reports. Papers and workshop reports cover the concept of
experiential learning, preparation for field experience, field
experience objectives and their evaluation, concerns and approaches
to the issue of field study follow-up, and a report on plans for a
Chicago consortium. (MJM)

FOUNDING CONFERENCE

SOCIETY FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE EDUCATION
November 10-12, 1972
Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.

REPORT

PREFACE

Finally comes the SFEE Founding Conference Feport.

Missing is a report on Workshop III, Administration and Financing.
I have written Steven Brooks, Richard Wengenroth and Evalyn Bates
for information on that session. When I receive such information
I will send it along.

The Steering Committee met again, January 4-5, at the Kellogg
Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, site of next
fall's conference. The physical facilities are excellent-large
and small conference rooms and accomodations for about 300.

The Steering Committee worked over By-Laws, approved Keith Lupton's
plans for a Newsletter and met intermittently with a conference
planning committee assembled by John Duley. Frank VanAalst (St.
Mary's College, Md.) represented the northeast; Robert Sigmon (North
Carolina Internship Office) represented the South; Roy Snyder (Chicago
Commons Assn.) represented the Midwest and William Thomas (UCLA)
represented the Far West. You may want to contact your regional
representative with ideas, expectations, needs, hopes. All are on
the mailing list I previously sent you except Robert Sigmon, whose
address would be the same as Dave Edwards'

The 1973 Conference promises to launch the Society as a real service
organization. There will be many more workshops than at Hofstra,
and they will be repeated to minimize agonizing conflicts. A greater
effort will be made to bring people with common interests together.

One purpose of having regional representatives on the planning
committee is to provide a field experience which will be useful
to the members in planning four regional conferences in 1974.
We are exploring the idea of alternating regional and national
conferences, one each year.

Finally, a word about the report. Our lead time for the 1972
conference was slim. Among other things, we did not make
adequate arrangements for documenting the proceedings. (You
will be pleased to know that Bernard Charles, Rosalind Feinstein
and Keith Lupton are working on a plan for a more vivid and
useful record of the 1973 conference.) What follows is what
I have been able to collect from Friday night's speakers, the
recorders of the four, Saturday workshops and others who kept
good records. If you would like more information on matters
discussed I suggest you contact that speaker or the leader of
that workshop.

Many of you have been gracious enough to suggest the experiential
value of the Hofstra Conference, and that it was an appropriate
beginning for a Society for Field Experience Education. I hope
the documents which follow will help you reconstruct and appraise
that experience.

<div align="right">
Howard Lord
Conference Coordinator
February 5, 1973
</div>

1972-73 STEERING COMMITTEE

President: James Feeney, Off-Campus Study Coordinator, New College
              Sarasota, Florida

Vice Prisident: Bernard Charles, Academic Dean, Livingston College
                 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Secretary/Treasurer: Donald Richards, Student, New College,
                      Sarasota, Florida

Rosalind Feinstein, Student, Empire State College, Old Westbury, N.Y.

Michael Hart, Director, Georgia Youth Affairs; Special Assistant
              to the Governor, Atlanta, Georgia

Howard Lord, Director of Encounter, New College of Hofstra University,
             Hempstead, N.Y.

Louisa Sellars, Student, Friends World College, Plover Lane,
                Huntington, N.Y.

Robert Sexton, Chairman of the Board, National Center for Public
               Service Internships; Director, Office of Academic
               Programs, Commonwealth of Kentucky, Frankfort, Kentucky

PLANNING COMMITTEE, 1973 CONFERENCE
November, 1973, Kellogg Center
Michigan State University, East Lansing Michigan

Chairman, John Duley, Director, Field Program, Justin Morrill College,
                     Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Robert Sigmon, Director, North Carolina Internship Office, 116 West
               Jones Street, Raleigh, North Carolina

Roy Snyder, Chicago Commons Association, 915 North Wolcott Avenue,
            Chicago, Illinois

William Thomas, Dean, Vocational Career Services, University of
                California, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California

Frank VanAalst, Director, Off-Campus Studies, St. Mary's College,
                St. Mary's City, Maryland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AMENDED PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH
THE SOCIETY FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE EDUCATION

NAME:

The name of this organization shall be The Society for Field
Experience Education.

PURPOSES:

1) To generally encourage the development of field experience
education in society;

2) to facilitate open sharing of ideas and activities among
persons and institutions concerned with off-campus, field
experience as a significant component in education;

3) to develop and support exploration of issues in field education
as identified by the membership;

4) to be a source of information and expertise for those seeking
assistance and counsel regarding development, management, ex-
pansion and revision of field experience programs or projects.

MEMBERSHIP:

Open to any person or institution interested in field experience
education. Membership confers voting privileges and is established
upon payment of fees:

Institutional Membership	$50.00
College Faculty or Staff	10.00
Students	2.00
Other Individuals	10.00

STRUCTURE:

The basic mechanisms for sharing of ideas and experience shall
be the Annual Conference, preferably hosted by an institution
involved in field education, and task forces growing out of the
Annual Conferences. Society business shall be transacted at a
Business Meeting held during the Annual Conference and open to
all members. A simple majority of members present and voting
shall rule on proposals not involving amendment to the by-laws.

The membership present at the Business Meeting shall elect a Steering Committee to serve until the next Annual Conference. The Committee shall be composed of nine persons, each person being chosen from one of the following three categories, each category having three representatives:

> campus-based persons - faculty or staff at educational institutions;
> field-based persons - agency or community persons;
> students - enrolled students at time of election.

ELECTION OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE:

The procedure for election of the Committee by the assembled membership is as follows:

Any member desiring to be in nomination for election to the Steering Committee shall place his or her name on the ballot list, under the appropriate category, at the Annual Conference. The times during which nominations are open and the location of the list will be announced and displayed prominently. Persons unable to attend the Annual Meeting but wishing to be on the ballot shall notify the Conference Coordinator to that effect prior to the Annual Conference. The Coordinator will then place the names on the ballot list.

Each member shall cast votes for three nominees in each category.

The three nominees in each category having the highest vote totals shall be declared elected.

The person receiving the fourth highest vote total shall be designated Alternate for that category, to serve if one of the members cannot fulfill his or her term.

All Committee members shall be members of the Society. Their professional activities (e.g., college professor, field director, student) will determine the category in which they are placed for nomination and election purposes. In the event that a person holds claim, by virtue of his or her activities, to placement in more than one category, that person shall select the category in which he or she desires to be placed.

STEERING COMMITTEE PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION:

The Committee is charged to carry out the Society's purposes as described in the proposal (and to be incorporated into the by-laws). To do this, it shall elect from its membership the following officers:

A Chairperson to provide leadership to the Committee and
Society, chair the annual conference and maintain the
Society's resource files for research and program develop-
ment use.

A Vice Chairperson to assist the Executive Secretary for
one term of service, after which he or she shall become
Chairperson for another term of service. For the initial
term of the Steering Committee's activity, and in the
event the Vice Chairperson is unable to serve, the Chair-
person shall be elected by the Committee from its member-
ship.

A Secretary-Treasurer to keep accurate records, to receive
and disburse the Society's funds, and to account for the
management of those funds.

INCORPORATION AND BY-LAWS:

By-Laws will be presented for consideration at the Field
Experience Education Conference to be held in November
1973 at Michigan State University.

The By-Laws will cover the following topics in addition to
those covered in this proposal: quorums for Business Meet-
ings and Steering Committee Meetings; provisions for amend-
ment; procedures for calling meetings and presenting pro-
posals for action to the membership.

SOME ANNOTATION ON THE PROPOSAL, being especially notes on what the
Society is NOT.

The majority of participants felt a need for a continuing forum where
they could share ideas with colleagues. A corresponding need was
for mechanisms whereby persons searching for specific information
and resources can get help. We believe the informal society we
have proposed can satisfy these needs.

We use the term "informal" because we have tried to establish
just enough structure to insure that desired interchange will
happen, but not so much structure that self-promoting elites
will be created to further validate Parkinson's Law. Thus, we
envision no paid staff positions, except perhaps for a small
number of student interns to the Steering Committee and/or
special task forces. A paid professional staff seeks to
create a dependable constituency to serve it. Expenses of
mailings, maintaining the resource files, and organizing
the annual meetings, can be covered by membership dues. We
envision a self-sustaining organization not dependent upon
special grants and therefore not beholden to the fads and
purposes which influence the foundations.

When we speak of being a source of "information..." we do not
refer to placement of specific students or professiona:.s.
Rather, we intend that the Society hold information for use
in research and program development. For example, if a school
is considering an Appalachian field program, it could learn
from the Society the names of many, if not most, of that
region's field education people and programs. It could not
learn about placement openings, per se. The Society would
provide information <u>sources</u> (along now familiar <u>Whole Earth
Catalog</u> lines, perhaps), not speak for persons and institutions.
They can speak for themselves.

In closing a note on the proposed name: Society for Field
Experience Education. "Society" because we envision a forum
of interested but not always agreeing or similarly inclined
persons, not an "association" to determine who is a "true"
field educator and who is not. "Field Experience" because we
focus on that part of education which takes place outside the
academic classroom, though not necessarily outside the frame-
work of academics. Field Experience can encompass all the
situations when the college student is involved in communities,
in cultures outside the campus, in organizations and their
purposes.

APPENDIX I - Definition of Student

The term "student" in the proposal and by-laws refers to
one who is actively registered full or part time in an educational
institution and/or field activity and is considered a student by
that institution or field host.

APPENDIX II - Institutional Membership

The Society is a membership organization dedicated to the
service of the members. To realize its service goals it must have
a fund to support the Steering Committee and Task Force activities
and to subsidize the Annual Conference. One way to obtain such a
fund is through outside sources such as government and foundations,
but outside funding almost always requires that the recipient direct
its purposes into special channels which may not always coincide with
member needs. For this reason the Society opted to secure its work-
ing capital through member dues. It is felt that institutions benefit
disproportionately from membership because they can utilize a wide
variety of the society's services and because they receive consider-
able program exposure through the Society. Further, they have greater
resources than the individual. Thus, the call for institutional
membership at a fee higher than individual memberships.

Welcoming Remarks, Dr. William McEwen, Provost, Hofstra University

It is indeed an honor and a pleasure to welcome each one of you
to the Hofstra campus. Although I sincerely mean those official
greetings as an officer of the University, I intend much more.
For I have long been a strong advocate for Field Education as an
important ingredient in the development of higher education.

The development of higher education for the past decade might be
viewed in accordance with the Hegelian dialectic. Hegel, you will
recall, interpreted human history in terms of a tension between
opposite forces. On the one hand, there is the thesis, and on the
other hand, the antithesis. Out of the tension between these
forces there emerges synthesis which combines the best of each
and adds something more: duties--rights--justice. In the development
of higher education over the past decade, traditional pedagogy
with a few student options is the thesis. Nontraditional pedagogy
with increased student options has been the antithesis. Hopefully,
out of the tension between these approaches there will emerge a
synthesis that will provide an innovative educational environment
that is conducive to the student's self-learning and self-development.

A most improtant contribution toward this synthesis was provided
from 1968 - 1970 by student dissenters. If we listened to the
students' protests there was much for us to learn. How did we
respond? May I use a parable?

> Two little six-year old girls, Maryann and Sally
> were playing with their dolls. Sally asked
> Maryann to go out in the front yard and bring in
> the doll-buggy. When Maryann returned, she said:
> "Sally, do you know what?" "What?" said Sally.
> "Well!" Maryann replied: "I just saw an intra-
> uterine device on the veranda." "Well!" said
> Sally: "But what's a veranda?"

During the periods of campus unrest many students seemed to exhibit
Sally's rare combination of being naive about the traditional and
sophisticated about the nontraditional. Students seemed to many
of us to be naive like Sally about the veranda when they rejected
the study of history and other traditional disciplines as irrelevant
rubbish, and when they condemmed the reasearch interests and the
political liberalism of many faculty as a hypocritical mask for
the establishment. But it was with greater sophistication, wisdom,
and moral commitment than possessed by most adults that these
students protested against Vietnam, against racial injustice,
against overpopulation, against environmental pollution and
against political corruption. Not only did they press us to
practice what we preached; but they made us realize that the
college campus could become a two-generation community of minds
that could exert a constructive influence on the national society.

By working together, teachers and students could cooperatively
reconstruct our cultural heritage into a more coherent and more
adequate pattern of humane values.

In addition to social reconstruction, these students pressed us
toward educational reconstruction - to recognize the necessity
for moving from an authoritarian model of a one-way teacher-student
mode of dictatorial learning toward a more autonomous model of
self-learning. This is a two-way student-teacher cooperative
process in which the student becomes actively self-engaged in
his own learning.

Now, that the pressure of student protest has subsided, will
educators relax their concern about the student's self-
learning. This would be tragic. I am confident that you who
are concerned about and are engaged in Field Education are
commited to maintaining the essential thrust of the student's
self-engagement in learning. I am equally confident that you
are fully mindful of the responsibility which your commitment
imposes.

THE CONCEPT OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Dr. Martin Kramer, Director of Higher Education Planning
Department of Health Education and Welfare

Many of you would have liked a speaker to talk about some of
the practical uncertainties of the movement toward experiential
learning. I have to say in advance that I can give little or no
help of this kind. My own thinking about the movement suggests
what are some of the problems that are really important to solve,
but not the solutions themselves.

I would like to impose a little order on my thoughts by putting
them under three headings. First is the question, why are we all
here? Why has the experiential learning movement taken off so
dramatically in the last few years? Second, I would like to take
a fairly hard look at some of the ambivalence that surrounds
such programs. It seems to me that one of the worst habits of
academia has been at work here - the habit of masking real tensions
with decorous phrases. Third, I would like to think out loud a
bit about what students really need. Whether field experience
programs succeed depends on whether those needs are met.

First, then, why has the experiential learning movement taken off
so dramatically? This topic can be broken down in turn into three
parts: constants, variables and modes of response. The constants,
it seems to me, are the perennial inputs which maturation requires.
We are talking about people age 18 to 22, a time in life when the
need to grow up is intense if it has not already been achieved.
For many young people it plainly has not been achieved. They have
observed little and participated less where adult life is concerned.
Off-campus experience will let them do both. Because educational
institutions in our society seem to have a residual responsibility
for what other institutions leave undone, the colleges have stepped
in to organize and sanction such off-campus activity.

This is really bizarre in a way. It is a little bit as though
churches set up Sunday schools in atheism, or as though a gourmet
restaurant sold books on dieting. But given that educational
institutions assume such a residual reponsibility, the phenomenon
is not so odd: they are meeting a need which someone must meet
because somehow it _must_ be met for each generation.

The variables are both social and personal. I think it is undeniable
that society has changed in two important ways. First, to borrow
from some wise observations of James Coleman, our children have become
information-rich but experience-starved. Such a change is bound to
have devastating effects on institutions which are organized for the
creation and delivery of information. They have to learn to survive
in a world in which the scarcity of their product no longer makes it
something people are willing to sacrifice for, endure boredom and
discomfort for, and postpone other things for. We are similarly
satisfied with opportunities of urban life, with a corresponding
tendency to count the cost far more than we used to.

Another extremely important social change that is pushing the field
experience movement is a second order effect of the abundant access
to education just mentioned. The extrinsic value of education is
dropping sharply. It used to be that people with college degrees had
privileged access to rewarding jobs and life-styles. The jobs they
could get in the burgeoning public and private bureaucracies were
relatively better paid, cleaner and more secure than other jobs. This
seems to be vanishing fast. As a result, students are less willing to
count on credentials themselves to assure their futures. They need
more urgently to find out what different kinds of life provide in terms
of direct satisfaction, since extrinsic rewards are much less certain.

I think, however, that students themselves are a variable here--that
the young really are different as individuals, and not just their
society. You may very well disagree with me on this, and I do not
have really convincing evidence to persuade you. But I think, for
example, that the fantasy lives of students nowadays are often
curiously impoverished. It is very uncharacteristic for them to
think about what they would do if they were this or that public
figure--Henry Kissinger say, or one of the Beatles. They rarely
seem to have fantasies about what they will do when they are over
thirty--by which point they would have had time to shape a life.

Why is this matter of fantasy so important? Because being able to
have fantasies about what you are going to do with your life has,
in fact, been a sustaining force for most people going to college
in the past. A very important reason why all of us are here is that
fantasy does not serve this function at all well now. Many young
people have to do a job in order to think about the job.

This brings me to my second topic--the tensions in the concept of
field experience. One of those tensions is that the more apparent
is the need for such programs, the harder it is to mount them success-
fully. If, for example, a student has a hard time thinking about a
career without actually engaging in it, it will also be hard for him
to get as much out of experience as for someone who fantasizes easily.
A student who did not need experience for this reason might easily
take from an experience as a hospital orderly a sense of what it would
be like to be a surgeon or a hospital administrator. But that may
be impossible for the kind of student who needs off-campus experience
most crucially.

A second tension lies between wishing to blur the distinction between
the real world and the academy and the counter wish to reaffirm it.
We want to make the campus less isolated and mix the generations. But
for various reasons, some good and some bad, we also want to say that
the two are different--as properly different as theoretical and practical
knowledge. The good reasons are all related to the Coleman point made
before: when students have righted the balance between experience and
information, they will be hungry for information again. The bad reasons
are also variants of this, but with a kind of back-lash animus: "Once
those kids find out how miserable it is to be out there in the real
world, they will be only too happy to be back on campus and settle down."

What makes all of this so difficult is our sense of bad conscience about the whole thing. It is so hard to act simply on the fact that society has changed and students have changed, and therefore we must do something different. The kids who are turned off by academic education are doing something devastating to our self-esteem. They are not excited by what we have to offer, they do not see us as role models, they think we are wasting our time and theirs. Sometimes only tenure stands between us and the feeling of worthlessness which the unemployed feel.

Such feelings make us very angry, and out of such anger can come a bad conscience. Out of a bad conscience can come a willingness to say that nothing the college does can ever be right for any student at any point in his life. Or it can result in a paternal effort to provide for the needs of students in their off-campus jobs that falls barely short of tucking them into bed every night. The first tendency undermines the role of the college, the second exerts the authority of that role in a way which makes impossible the degree of independent involvement which will foster maturation, which is the whole point.

One college president addressed a group of us in Washington and said he thought he had the answer. His college would admit students on graduating from high school as usual. But the college would find them jobs and provide a dormitory where they could live. Counselors and professors would be available from the campus by a hot-line arrangement. This is like motorizing bicycles so that people can have more opportunities for exercise.

Some of the most difficult tensions in the concept of field experience education are most apparent, naturally enough, when we turn to the problem of evaluation. One of the reasons we have launched such programs is our bad conscience about what the value of college really is. How, then, can we decide how much credit toward a college degree should be given for such experience since we don't know what a college degree should be worth, if anything?

I see this problem shaping up as a really major one in the next few years, for the reason that society at large may be very unhappy about the result. On the one hand, we have turned to such techniques as learning contracts, portfolio submission and journal keeping for evaluation mechanisms. We have rushed into such techniques because there weren't any better, and because they involved a degree of self-evaluation that found more acceptance with the students. These techniques may be working just fine, but we did not have and do not yet have a serious intellectual basis for convincing the world at large that this is so.

On the other hand, just because not even academics are willing to say what a degree means, there is mounting pressure for criterion referenced examinations that tell the student and the public which may hire him for his services just what he can do. We have here a situation in which increasingly amorphous standards on campus may give rise to rigid ones off-campus. A college degree used to be a pretty fair proxy for intelligence and persistence and responsiveness xternally imposed standards of performance. If it ceases to be,

then our bureaucratized labor market will want something else in
addition. Narrow performance tests are just the kind of thing it
likes best, since it does not believe in versatility anyway.

All of this suggests that a "crunch" is coming for what has been
called "non-traditional study"--one of those decorous phrases I
mentioned. External degree programs are going to be caught in the
middle, and field experience programs also, though to a lesser degree.
People mounting both kinds of programs are, it seems to me, attracted
to them for opposite reasons--often, I think, the same people. On
the one hand, these programs are seen as a way to get away from ob-
jective and external standards where much that is valuable can scarcely
be measured at all. On the other hand, these programs are seen as
the way to let students show that they really can do, not just take
examinations in. We are both less serious and more serious about
measuring student achievement and this tension we must try to resolve
before others resolve it for us.

Let me here outline some principles for evaluation schemes that will
help avoid the "crunch":

    First, credit for turning the pages of the academic calendar
    will simply not be viewed as credible. A major assault is
    underway on time-in-residence as a criterion of college credit.
    Time-not-in-residence will surely fare even less well. This
    becomes a bread and butter matter for both students and in-
    stitutions, since both student aid and capitation payments by
    public authorities will surely require accountability over and
    above an accounting for days and years.

    Second, value-added measures are highly promising. If the
    student is examined on his competence, both before and after
    his field experience, and receives credit only on the basis
    of a positive difference, we will be on much stronger ground.
    The important point here is that a value-added approach will
    lend legitimacy to evaluation procedures--portfolios etc.--
    which are in a primitive stage of development and hard to make
    objective. If a journalism student, for example, writes better
    and observes more acutely after a semester working for the State
    legislature, then we can reasonably attribute at least some of
    the improvement to the field experience, even though we cannot
    measure just what he learned or know how he learned it.

    Third, jobs should be graded, and not just the students who
    work at the jobs. It is easier to learn something valuable
    from some jobs than from others. I personally think a student
    should receive more credit from learning from a lousy job
    than from an exciting one, for taking a risky job than a safe
    one and for finding his own job rather than for taking a job
    others have developed for him.

A final source of tension in the concept of field experience education is that between freedom and obligation. The popularity of the learning contract approach to evaluation is evidence of how widely this is seen to be a crucial issue, so perhaps I should be both brief and cautious in saying anything about it. The one word that needs to be said is <u>autonomy</u>, which means laying down your own rules. This is at the bottom of the contract idea, since the contract is a set of rules that the student agrees to abide by. The problem, of course, is to avoid a sort of "standard lease" form of contract. Cases differ. There is the student who, out of anxiety, deference or passive aggression, refuses to be really a party to working out a plan for himself or responsibly modifying his plans as circumstances change. Others, I suspect, seek only a license to kill time. All, I suspect, have to be cajoled into taking more or fewer risks and more or less responsibility for outcomes and adjustment to unforseen circumstances.

This last point of tension brings me to my third heading: What do students really need in their off-campus experience? They need autonomy, but they need a good many other things as well:

> First, they need to feel they are playing for keeps.
> We think of field experience education as a way of
> providing opportunities for "real life" experience
> and for autonomy, but neither of these are possible
> if it is not really <u>their</u> experience or <u>their</u>
> autonomy and sensed to be such. This sense of
> a job being real is by no means easy to foster.
> Just getting a pay check perhaps used to be enough,
> but this is surely rare nowadays. What I do is
> frequently to remind an intern that what we are
> doing is very real to <u>me</u>. I try, for example, to
> be quite candid about my own anxiety about getting
> the work done, even at real cost to all who are doing
> it. I could have put this point about playing for
> keeps under the "tensions" heading, since, of course,
> students also need the opposite: a sense that the
> commitment demanded of them is as yet only a tentative
> experimental commitment. But I think the balance
> has shifted so heavily away from playing for keeps
> in the direction of tentativeness and disengagement
> that, for now at least, our effort needs to be on
> the side of playing for keeps in almost all cases.
>
> A second need is to have sanction for seeking com-
> petence and recognition. Recognition and praise do
> little good unless it is made acceptable to want
> them and enjoy them. The anti-competitive ethic is
> very real among today's students, and it inhibits
> motivation of the most innocent kind, far removed
> from the stereotypes of ruthlessness against which
> it is explicitly aimed. It has become important to
> convey the message that a person <u>deserves</u> to feel
> good about being able to do something well.

The third need (a negative one) is the need to
need less stimulation. The demand for excitement
is not, I think, at all greater for today's
students, but it takes so much more to make them
excited, and this is a staggering handicap. I
know of no good solutions here.

What all of these problems call for is not pat solutions but
"constructive worrying". We need to:

Worry more about the changes which have made experimental
education so essential, but so difficult.

Worry more about variations in the process that gets
the student from campus into a job and the process that
brings him back again.

Worry more about the things you can't control on the job,
but can hope to change the probability of.

RESPONSE: Dr. William Petrek, Dean, Hofstra College of Liberal Arts

My field experience of attending conferences has taught me that respondents to papers do any number of things. A respondent can paraphrase and praise what the speaker has said. A respondent can nitpick, making debating points. A respondent can plead lack of time to develop his ideas, implying that if he had the time he would do a much better job than the speaker. A respondent can recount personal experiences, hoping the audience will find in them a relationship to the speaker's topic which the respondent himself is not able to articulate.

I shall try to avoid responding in any of these ways. A reading of Mr. Kramer's paper has set in motion in me some thinking about how one might go about searching for a conceptual framework for field experience education. I presume listening to Mr. Kramer's paper has had the same effect on you. So in responding, what I want to do is nourish (and hopefully not confuse) your own thinking about a conceptual underpinning for field experience education.

Four Preliminary conditions:

(1) I am doing my thinking within the context of liberal undergraduate education;

(2) A search for the conceptual framework of field experience is simply one way to clarify the conceptual framework of liberal undergraduate education;

(3) I have a fondness for praxis-thinking about which I am often fuzzy. What I am fond of is something quite a bit less than what Hegel pretended to do and quite a bit more than casual musings about my digestion.

(4) Each suggestion I will make involves (to borrow a page from the theologians, themselves notorious borrowers!) a moment of demythologisation. We need to undo certain myths, before we can take a fresh look. Or at least we need to undo certain myths before we create others. This is based on the axiom, for which there is little evidence, that the human consciousness can tolerate only so much myth and no more!

I would suggest that it might be helpful in searching for a conceptual framework for field experience education to explore conceptually five things:

(1) the notion of situation

(2) the reality of experience

(3) the act of teaching

(4) new motivational and educational relationships between
vocational, educational and disciplinary exigencies

(5) a certain kind of action as a type of reflection

The Notion of Situation

A geography, or, if you prefer, a topology (in the sense of topos,
place) of our normal, undergraduate educational behavior would
reveal that faculty and students share a common terrain and a
common set of configurations of that terrain. Campus, classroom,
library. Even the classroom itself has its own standard configuration.
The educational situation skewed by this set of topological habits
is somewhat predictable. At their worst, these habits engender
academic consumerism. At their best, they produce one kind of learning
and the most sensitive faculty participants in the situation and
students feel the stress and strain. The stress and strain has to
do with insufficient motivation, lack of experience and a kind of
unreality that no amount of fantasying can overcome.

I would suggest that if we begin with the recognition that one
learns wherever and whenever one learns and not only within
formally prescribed situations of learning, we would develop a
different geography, a different topology. Rather than destroy
our accustomed topology, the new topology would do a number of
things: (1) it would help us become more aware of the advantages
and disadvantages of our present topology (2) it would suggest a
broader and more flexible topology (3) it would very possibly
invite us to construct a situation that is a dynamic network of
educational situations. Our present topology and the situation
it nourishes tends to be static.

The Reality of Experience

Over the years I have been puzzled by certain habitual distinctions
we make in discussing higher education. For example, we are accustomed
to distinguish theory and practice, academic learning and experiential
learning, intellectual development and social-emotions development.
The distinctions have some foundation in reality, as the medieval
philosophers put it. But somehow the distinctions get in the way of
sound, operative pedagogy. Useful distinctions for certain purposes,
they harden into institutionalized myths. I would suggest that we
nuance our understanding of experience. We should view all learning
as an experience (we admit it is a process). We should treat all
learning for what it is, a personal experience. If we rightfully
interpret classroom learning as a personal experience with all the
attendant intrinsic complexity of any experiential situation, we
would find the distinction between e.g. academic learning and ex-
periential learning too rigid. We would find an experiential con-
tinuum with differences in emphasis and degree, but not in kind.
This recognition of an experiential continuum would give us a better
interfacing, a more reflected interfacing of classroom-library
ning and extra-classroom learning.

The Art of Teaching

When I try to pare the paraphernalia of higher éducation to its
essentials I find one bed-rock essential: the student-teacher
relationship. We honor the relationship in our rhetoric, in-
frequently in practice and yet secular wisdom and experience
sanction it. As an essential it is banal enough to be true.

The act of teaching receives various theoretical interpetations
and certainly a variety of practical manifestations. And yet,
given the limited topology and situation I sketched above and
given a dangerously inappropriate slighting of academic learning
as experiential, the theory and the practice of the act of teaching
come out stunted. If we would extend the notion of common in-
volvement of student and teacher in the experience of learning
to situations beyond presently sanctioned situations we would (1)
witness some refurbishing of the dialogic and intersubjective
dimensions of teaching and learning (2) recognize that many people
unpedigreed by the Academy are teachers who could teach not only
students, but also pedigreed teachers.

New Relationships Between the Vocational, Educational and Disciplinary Exigencies of Higher Education

Certainly the establishment of such new relationships is what educa-
tional innovation in higher education, and per force, field experience
education, has been wrestling with. If we accept an equation of
freeing with educating, then the question is what frees. The
discipline? Certain types of knowledge we traditionally label as
liberal arts? Certainly each has its liberating function. It is
freeing to enjoy epistemological sophistication. A poem can transmit
a nourishing humaneness. However, have we perhaps slighted the
vocational interest and involvement as a liberating force. So often
we find ourselves in the posture of trying to be sure we educate
(free) along with preparing someone for this or that vocation, job.
In its most ridiculous form we think we educate when our pre-med
student has successfully made his way through a set of general
graduation requirements that include the social sciences and the
humanities.

We could, of course, perpetuate the myth that the manual arts are
not liberalizing. Or, we can limit our recognition of liberation
through vocational involvement to the artist and the college teacher.
Let's admit it, here we have to do battle with a societal situation
in which not all jobs (vocations) are equally liberalizing, a societal
situation which resists a liberalizing, a freeing interpretation of
the exercise of a vocation.

Neverthless, the vocational interest of the student (or at least
her or his quest for determination of vocational interest) is a
strong force that needs to be reckoned with educationally and not

simply technically. Such reckoning would, I suggest, lead us
to some conceptual readjustment which would require us not only
to be more nuanced in our judgment of what frees man, but also
more refined in recognizing the interplay of disciplinary, "ex-
periential" and vocational requirements and dynamisms.

A Certain Kind of Action as a Type of Reflection

Heretical, I am willing to be, but I do wish to say that as thin
as the line between action and reflection (between speaking and
acting) can be at times, it still is a line. However, what I do
want to suggest by saying that certain kinds of actions can con-
stitute a type of reflection is that we need to recognize the
fleshed character of our thinking, of reflection, of our theoretical
activity. It is not an easy matter to sort out clearly what dis-
tinguishes work, say, from play, play from thinking, thinking from
dreaming, work from action, action from reflection (since we can
accept reflection as an act and as some kind of action).

Further, when we examine the conditions for reflection we find the
roots of reflection sunk deeply into action, we find a dialectical
relationship. What I am suggesting goes a bit beyond either of
these realities. In the largest sense there is a manual character
to so much of our reflection. We betray the narrowness of our
perspective on this with images of the arm-chair scholar or of
Rodin's "Thinker". When we examine the larger segments of our
reflective activity we wonder where non-reflective experience ends
and reflective experience begins, we discover not only books, paper,
typewriters, computers, but people and situations which normally
we classify as tools and occasions but which we might also interpret
as fleshed reflection.

I do not want to suggest that just any kind of action, spontaneous
or habitual, qualifies as fleshed reflection. That strikes me as
absurd. But just as we construct situations that induce reflection
and constitute reflective acts in the regular collegial environment,
so we need to recognize that not only can we induce reflection and
constitute reflective acts in a non-collegial environment but we can
accept that certain types of action, reflectively prepared, are
really ways for the student to extend reflection on epistemological,
technical, value-centered, disciplinary questions. In many instances,
to distinguish the reflective moment from the action to which it
corresponds is as difficult and probably as meaningless as distin-
guishing kiss and lips.

RESPONSE: David N. Edwards, Associate Director,
           North Carolina Internship Office

Realizing the theoretical impossibility of responding fully to
an entire speech in less time than the original speech takes
for delivery, I wish to limit my comments to a few key remarks
by Mr. Kramer and so, keep my role in proper perspective. In
this approach and in certain subject matter Dr. Petrek and I
travel some similar oratorical routes.

First, I think the most perceptive and useful content of the
keynote address lies in those sections that describe the tensions,
the dynamics, of the educational context. It may now be trite
for me to say we are in a period of change in the whole society,
and, of course, in higher education. But it is vital to re-
iterate for emphasis, as Mr. Kramer does, that this change means
that adaptability and inventiveness are now necessities not
options in the renewal of higher education.

During this period of renewal Mr. Kramer says there is a tension
between the degree of need for programs such as field experience
and the degree of likelihood that such programs will succeed. He
characterizes this tension as an inverse proportion: the stronger
a student needs field experience, the weaker the educational value
for him through that field experience. While I have some doubts
about that, I wish to add that if the statement is true, it is
the price we have paid for too long accepting in pure form the
prevailing learning mode--lecture and library. The closed system
of the classroom has conditioned students to measure carefully
the length of their intellectual chains. When the leash is un-
snapped a profound disorientation can take place. This is not,
however, justification for shielding students from the exigencies
of experiential or affective learning. My own experience as
administrator of a field experience program taught me to resist
preliminary cries of anguish from uninitiated students. The
plummet from the nest does not have to end disastrously, but
more important, the height disparity or tension between campus
and general society need not have existed to begin with.

The leash can be played out (better yet, it need not ever have
been used), and the nest can have been lowered by increments, or
even built on firm earth.

Here Mr. Kramer and I may disagree. There are recurring points
in his remarks which reflect the assumption that there is
necessarily some basic difference in collegiate existence and
"real world" existence. For instance, early in his comments
Mr. Kramer says:

> "Because educational institutions in our society
> seem to have a residual responsibility for what
> other institutions leave undone, the colleges have
> stepped in to organize and sanction such off-campus
> activity."

Mr. Kramer then compares the role assumed by colleges to the
improbability of a Sunday School, for lack of a better advocate,
teaching atheism or a gourmet restaurant selling books on dieting.
While I could defend both such examples of seeming irony, I
had rather assume that the examples are valid paradoxes and
simply ask, Why should the academic curriculum be so unlikely
a primary source of off-campus (i.e., experiential) learning?
A glance at history would suggest that distortion of, rather
than adherence to, higher educational tradition has made ex-
periential learning seem less "academic" than more cognitive
modes.

Consider the word "academic." The term itself provides a
clear signal of this perhaps unsuspected history. Webster's
tells us that an "academy" is an institution in which knowledge
or skills are taught. And the practical theme of skills has
its roots far back in the chronicles, for the Academy, or
Akademeia, was the name of the gymnasium in which Plato taught.
Imagine that, Plato teaching in a gymnasium! Not so difficult
to imagine if one recalls the Greek "whole man" concept and its
evidence within the curriculum of the gymnasium.

So now, what is truly academic--the musty odor of the library
or the more acrid odor of the locker room? Historical answer:
both.

Consider this further bit of etymology. The conceptual basis
of the "college" lies in the medieval professional guilds,
themselves a revival of Roman custom, wherein men of like
skills gathered for mutual benefit. Collegium and universitas
denoted the organization of any craftsmen, but history has
preserved these words to signify a special association of
practitioners--the constituents of an academic community. Thus,
both "college" and "university" historically derive from an
association with common professional purpose but not necessarily
common methods or styles of teaching and learning.

How appropriate then that colleges are recommencing the truly
traditional academic function--producing the whole man partly
by placing him in the world of affairs. Such a development
within higher education relieves the second tension of which
Mr. Kramer speaks: that tension which "lies between wishing
to blur the distinction between the real world and the academy
and the counter wish to reaffirm it." One releases that tension
by literally defining it away on historical grounds.

Though originally ignorant of the historical judtification, the
North Carolina Internship Office, of which I am a part, has for
four years now accepted by experience and reason the fact that a
practical context can provide a valid academic learning experience.
It has further postulated that especially any public agency can
maximize its value by accepting a service-learning intern: one
who has a welldefined public-need-based task and who has articulated
conscious learning objectives for himself and to his educational
institution. Ideally he is supported by a work supervisor, a
faculty liasion, and his own peers. I am sure this conference
will provide at other times the opportunity for you individually
to view material we at the North Carolina Internship Office have
developed to support the service-learning concept. I do wish to
add specifically that our experiential concept emphasizes careful
planning, continuous academic support, and concrete evaluation of
the given internship.

Raising the issue of evaluation carries me to the other major
point of Mr. Kramer's address that I wish to discuss. He makes
a timely observation in noting the increased pressure but, more
important, need, for those of us in experiential learning to
develop meaningful evaluation procedures. I say "meaningful"
rather than "academically respectable" because accreditation
under a cognitively oriented accreditation system, such as we
now have, would seem frequently incompatible with the learning
data input. Put simply, a grading system and a grader accustomed
to measure recall, organization, and manipulation of information
becomes inadequate to measure the progress of a student with
those skills in a big-and-complex-as-life situation.

The most sophisticated study of learning in experiential settings
that I know of is a treatise by David Kiel called "Student Learning
Through Community Involvement." It is available in limited quantities
through our office.

As for the evaluative mechanisms of learning contracts, portfolios,
and journals to which Mr. Kramer alludes with reservation, there
is some perhaps useful comment in our publication "A Notebook on
Service-Learning." I cite these documents not necessarily out of
pride but in hopes that you will reciprocate with resource leads
when our paths cross this weekend.

COMMENTS DURING RESPONSE AND DISCUSSION

1. Phrase "flesh reflection" of Dr. Petrek has a particular
    appeal for me; something like H.G. Wells comment about the
    "primary learning experience" (ultimate, visceral learning)--
    that "some people fudge and sidestep their way through life
    so that their first encounter with a primary learning ex-
    perience is in the sweat of their own deathbed."

2. My basic formula for a field experience:

   Overt performance + substantial degree in newness of
           environment = field experience

   This could include structured on-campus environments, attending
   other schools and travels as well as the more obvious intern-
   ships and field term.

WORKSHOP I: PREPARATION FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Leader: Dr. John Duley

Recorder: Loren Kramer

The seating arrangement set the stage for exploring the
preparation needed for a cross-cultural experience.

There was general milling around before the sessions formally
began, people in and out, people standing not sitting. After
a while, the leader asked everyone to find a seat and asked
for response to the arrangement and feeling it produced:
    disorientation
    had different expectations of the workshop than fit the
       arrangement
    that confrontation was expected
    that we were all expected to get involved but we didn't
       know in what way it would break down the cohesiveness
       of the group
    feeling a bit uneasy
    feelings of hostility and anxiety
    (quite a few people came into the room for the sake of
       the workshop but left. Most returned later on.)

In this manner individual's reactions to disorientation were
drawn out.

New arrangement of chairs: horseshoe formation with 15 chairs
in the curve plus one chair facing the horseshoe situated at
the open end of the formation. (The rest of the workshop
participants sat around the outside of the formation.) Enter
a male and two females clothed only in cloth wrappings and
beads, take position at the single chair at the open end of
the formation, and proceed to role play-simulate a greeting
communication with the 15 "visitors" to their "culture
Their "culture" was represented not only by the clothing but
also a different language, form of greeting, sharing of drink,
and choice of their favorite from amongst the "visitors."
The three of the "albatrosian" culture presented a consistent
atmosphere of "strange culture", which stimulated mixed responses
and reactions. The remainder of the workshop was a seminar in
the pros and cons of this exercise in preparing people for a
cross-cultural experience, and some criteria for effective
eparation.

Pros and cons of this role playing exercise

The role playing did provide a participating medium (for the 15 only).

The question of artificiality vs. reality was discussed at length. Some felt it turned them off because it was obviously a representation of a culture by people not of that culture. The majority felt that it was done well enough to achieve effective participation which stimulated real emotions--anxiety fear, friendship, warmth, superiority, withdrawl, etc.-- the purpose of the exercise.

Question: Could the exercise be real if these three, obvious Americans (who are notorious for being manipulative and controlling), weren't of the culture being represented?

Rationalization: It isn't important as long as it brings out real emotions like those felt in actual cross-cultural experience.

Question: Could the exercise be at all real when there was a question of whether "we" were visiting "them" or "they" were visiting "us"?

Rationalization: Again, the emotions and resulting interaction are the test--in general, it worked.

For some the exercise brought out negative reactions due to the prospects of being manipulated by these three.

Question: Is role playing a valid exercise for effective preparation for involvement since it reinforces a we-they relationship?

Rationalization: Role playing is like "starting fresh"; like a child, knowing nothing initially. Also the essential value of role playing is in the discussions following it.

In one of the discussion groups considerable discussion centered on the question of whether there, in fact, is a need for preparation: the question of whether the whole purpose in field experience is experiencing (thus no need for preparation) or a form of "structured" learning (thus a definite need for preparation).

Criteria for Preparation

Determine where the group is at, what tools are needed and their sequence. Provide opportunities for:

1) skill development, such as observation
2) participation
3) emotional responses
4) developing emotional muscle (controlling and directing one's emotions)
5) making choices
6) clarifying values
7) understanding of group dynamics

The role playing-simulation exercise and subsequent seminar was led by Anne Janeway, Mary Burdick, and Les Long, of the School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont.

Recommendations

Gather and provide model of preparational and orientation procedures, present and past, and evaluative responses to these styles and procedures.

In future conferences, provide more demonstration/involvement sessions and fewer lectures.

WORKSHOP II: FIELD EXPERIENCE OBJECTIVES AND THEIR EVALUATIONS

Royce. S. Pitkin

Respondents: Bernard Charles
Philip Singer

Recorder: Donald Richards

Dr. Pitkin opened the workshop by attempting to define field
education. He began with John Dewey's concept of experience.
Experience seeks change. Experience is separated from activity
by feedback, "the return wave of consequences flowing from it
(experience)." Experience must include learning something.

Field experience was defined as experience away from the college
in the wider society. The challenge for educational institutions
is to enable teacher-advisors to create environments where the
student may have a wealth of experiences in the sense defined
above.

Six criteria for evaluating the desirability of a field experience
from the student point of view were suggested.

1) The opportunity for new experience; the opportunity to
   test thought by action.
2) Stimulate thinking.
3) Add to one's knowledge. Here special emphasis was placed
   on knowledge of other peoples and cultures.
4) Add to one's own sense of dignity and self-worth by
   providing the student with a placement that has social
   significance.
5) Provide the student with opportunities to test and develop
   his abilities as a decision-maker and problem solver.
6) Aid in the development of a life-style.

Finally it was noted that field experience education also
provided the student with the opportunity to explore vocational
possibilities.

In the area of evaluation, as in other areas, it was stressed
that our difficulties were the difficulties of the educational
world at large. No one knows very much about how the on-campus
experience can be justly evaluated. Dr. Pitkin stressed the
personal nature of the evaluation, stating that he sought to
rely as much as possible on what the student had to say about
his experience. He did suggest four questions which student
and advisor should both consider in the process of evaluations:

1) Has the experience added meaning to one's life? How?

2) Has knowledge been acquired. Knowledge here is applied
   knowledge within the subject area of the field experience
   in contrast to personal insights which may also be derived
   from the experience.
3) Does the student's report indicate evidence of growth.
4) Has there been a general appraisal.

Dr. Pitkin devoted the remainder of his presentation to concrete
experience as an advisor to students in off-campus projects.
We shall not attempt to recount every experience here. The
problems raised were familiar ones to the audience, consisting
primarily of college field advisors. For the record, there was
some impatience with this portion of Dr. Pitkin's talk.

Dr. Singer's response may be constructed around two themes;
experiential education is a response to the discontinuity of
American education; and the fact that we are now beginning the
routinization and bureaucratization of experiential education.

Dr. Singer argued in favor of evaluation by solely external
standards. This necessitates a clear understanding of just what
the students are doing. If the students are doing participant-
observation, then we can build from existing criteria. Anthropology
and the Health field provide models. Here is our starting point.

The discontinuity of American education brings students and
faculty together in pursuit of an alternative. The student
seeks a meaningful education for an adult life. The educator,
in his effort to provide service, is part of a developing new
profession made up of people whose primary responsibility is
to field education. We are at this conference because of the
need and because, given its growth, the process of providing
opportunities is becoming more structured. This, we must accept
and understand rather than rise up in arms over this development.

Our second respondent, Dr. Bernard Charles, opened by stressing
his institution's orientation. Livingston College is an urban
institution serving an urban student body that is less affluent
than most. Black and Latin students account for over half of the
school's student body. Dr. Charles added another criteria to
those of Dr. Pitkin; Has the field experience been of value to
the community or agency involved? There was an immediate and
very positive reponse on the part of the audience to the introduction
of this new criteria. Evidently this has been the concern of
many in the audience but hasn't yet been properly aired.

Dr. Charles also stressed the fact that many of his students needed
stipends in order to make experiential education feasible. At the
same time, he made note of the fact that it is quite discriminatory
to place students only in the agencies that pay the most. These
agencies may need students less than smaller low-budget community
organizations. Livingston's solution is to have all the agencies
using students pool the money they pay students and Livingston
College then determines how these funds will be disbursed.

A final issue involves the problem of assessing placement sites.
Many urban students have been in a position where they have been
ripped-off by the very agencies or agencies similar to those which
now seek their services. Obviously students are reluctant to
invest their skills in the work of such agencies. If academia
is at all effective, it is putting some muscle behind the projects
it supports. Clearly we must accept this fact and by thinking
clearly and thoroughly, accept more willingly responsibility for
the social implications of what we do.

Audience response was varied and stuck pretty closely to the
points made by the speakers. Several significant conclusions
may be drawn. The idea that a new profession was developing
received a great deal of support. Concern with the student's
benefit to the community was also apparent. But the sentiment
most in evidence was that agencies and colleges had to close
the gap between their respective expectations of the student's
role in the field. Finally, workshop participants frequently
expressed the need to get together with people in similar roles
elsewhere.

A few editorial comments; The workshop generated some significant
general concerns but several needs became apparent. Primarily
there was a need to break down into groups. We need to take our
general ideas and develop hypotheses that will be tested. This
will necessitate more follow up. Some interchange of ideas and
results between conferences seems essential. Some form of written
communication like a news letter would be valuable.

Communication from Dr. Philip Singer,
Chairman, Allport College, Oakland University

I would like to take this opportunity to tell you some of
my impressions of the conference and the panels in which
I participated.

Unlike previous conference involved with "inner colleges"
or experimental colleges" this particular conference seemed
to be dominated by the managerial class rather than students.
Indeed, when Dr. Pitkin made his address and was interrupted
by a member of the audience who said that he felt that the
participants had not come to hear him discourse at length,
the audience indicated that they wanted to hear Dr. Pitkin
and did not want to break down into the "group" sessions which
have been so typical of these types of conferences. This
response indicated to me the growing maturity or institution-
building process in connection with field experience education.

It seems to me, and I am not being facetious here, that a
very good Masters or Doctorate dissertation could now be
written on the "The Co-optation, Routinization and
Bureaucratization into the University Establishment of
the Field Work Experience." I believe the movement is
sufficiently recent (5-7 years) for a genuine piece of
research to be done here.

I was particularly struck by the number and range of disciplines
represented by this new managerial class of university educator.
Apparently we are now seeing the on-the-job professionalization of
educators who realize that the field experience is going to be
with us for the foreseeable future.

It may be a mistake to continue to demand and look for a
generalized evaluation for all such experiences. I am
reminded of the fact that each of us in our own disciplines,
anthropology, political science, sociology, etc., evaluate
students within our own frame of reference and this will vary
from instructor to instructor without reference to any
common departmental baseline, except in the case of large
introductory courses which are graded on a curve. What the
conference seemed to be doing was trying to establish a
baseline of "normality", "conformity" which would be set by
the Society and against which we would then go back to our
universities and colleges and then set our own individual
evaluations. There is a real danger that in institutionalizing
ourselves, we will set artificial evaluation baselines which
will renew the tension between the anarchy/desire of the
student who must, in the end, put it together himself and,
the acceptable, sanctioned institutional reference of the
college.

Pitkin spoke of his criteria for evaluation and mentioned the
following: - meaning, knowledge, change-growth and self-appraisal.
These are criteria for successful psychoanalysis therapy. I
say this because Pitkin emphasized these criteria in connection
with an internal evaluation by the student. However, I feel that
field experience should not be internal therapy and that our
criteria must be external. Therfore I believe that every field
experience should consist of two parts: (1) a description as
accurate as possible of what went on in the field experience,
and (2) a description of that experience within the context of
the relevant literature. Grading, of course, will be done by
the individual professor. If we do not adopt this external
approach then field experience will be inventing the emotional
wheel all over again for every individual.

I had the feeling that many of us were about to develop a
new sturm und drang adolescent discontinuous stage in human
growth and involvement with our concern for evaluation and
emotional growth. This phase was once considered to be from
puberty to about eighteen years. We are now extending this
from eighteen to about twenty-five years. This seems fairly
typical of American educational characteristics in the social
sciences and humanities, where on the one hand we wish to
encourage emotional growth and development, but on the other
hand we are not prepared to "let go" and apply external,
adult sanctions and evaluation procedures.

As the discussions developed in the large session and in the
smaller groups, I had the feeling that America at large is
now becoming a vast anthropological field station. In that
connection I feel there will be increasing negative reactions
just as the American Indians have finally revolted against an
anthropologist in every teepee and as foreign countries have
now set up barriers to field experience.

It is clear, to me at least, that we will be increasingly
facing programs of ethical behavior for ourselves and our
students in field situations. It may be wise for the Society
to consider drafting a code of field experience education
ethics using the model of the American Anthropologists and
the Society for Applied Anthropology.

Finally, you suggested in the plenary session that one purpose of
the field experience education is to motivate students who
are not motivated and that the field experience opportunity
may result in making non-students with hidden agendas into
students. I do not think that this should be the purpose of
the Society. Nor do I think that field experience is
necessarily the way to inspire the teen-ager to thirst after
knowledge. Many students will be good students without such
an experience.

WORKSHOP IV: POST FIELD FOLLOW-UP

Chaired by Nick Royal
Recorder: Paul Conner

In their opening remarks, the panelists made the following
observation:

Nick Royal, Coordinator of Field Programs at Merrill College of
the University of California at Santa Cruz, emphasized the use-
fulness of student returnees as resource persons, with their
contributions being closely tied in with the institution's
academic programs.   To facilitate this, Merrill College rotates
all its faculty into terms of service on the campus committee
that oversees field programs. (see attached paper.)

Edward Davidson, Director of the Office of Academic Studies at
the Smithsonian Institution, recommended that faculty keep in
close touch with students while they are in the field, to prepare
the way efficiently for the student's post-field contributions.
On return, students should especially be used to educate the
faculty.   To insure a post-return contribution, students should
be prepared from the outset of their field work to prepare for
the possibility of failure.   An alert faculty can help students
realize that "failure" can be educational.

Nat Schwartz, Student, New College, Sarasota, Florida, pointed
out that faculty members usually have little understanding or
appreciation of what the students experienced in the field and
have little interest in learning afterward about the students'
experiences.   This can be counterbalanced if the institution
makes definite plans on how to use he student after his field
work is completed.

Frank Dobyns, until recently the Training Director for the
Community Development Foundation, agreed that student returnees
were often ignored and went on to observe that it is difficult
to "marry" an orthodox institution, a field agency, and a student.
Part of the solution is to ask the questions, "What's in it for
the professor?", and "How can the field agency benefit?"

Paul Conner, President of InterFuture, indicated that students
should have a range of post-return possibilities from which to
choose, but that this choice should be made before the field work
even begins.   For example, those InterFuture students who return
to direct undergraduate seminars on their respective campuses,
start planning their seminars before embarking on their cross-
cultural experiences, so that, while in the field, they can
gather appropriate materials for written, oral, and audio-visual
presentation.

After the panelists had spoken, the workshop divided itself
into small groups for more intimate discussion of these issues.
Some of the highlights of their conversations may be summarized
as follows:

1. <u>Plans for the follow-up should be developed in cooperation
with the field agency which is supervising the student's work.</u>

Professors are generally uninterested in what the student
has done in the field, whereas the field project itself may
suggest particularly useful types of community-action or
campus-project follow-up which faculty and field agency
personnel could cooperate to facilitate.

The faculty nose should be rubbed in the dirt of field ex-
posure; he should go into the field to observe his students
at work and talk to the agency personnel. If meetings are
held of academic and professional staff for liaison, they
should be held in the field as often as on campus. Perhaps
SFEE can learn more from academics in professional schools,
who have more experience in on-the job- training programs
for their advisees in the field and have little interest in
being bothered by the student when he returns. Coordinated
planning toward a follow-up goal (like a seminar, action
project, or publication) could overcome this apathy and waste.

2. <u>Follow-up contains at least two valuable elements -- evaluation
and sharing.</u>

Academic and field staffs should confer after each field
experience to evaluate it. Often, word does not get back
to a school of the exceptionally useful or miserable job a
student has made. Students, too, should have the chance to
evaluate the program in debriefing sessions, possibly with
other students who have had similar exposure. Some campuses
have had seminars composed of returnees, who devote an extended
period to comparing and analyzing their respective field
experiences.

Opportunity should be given returnees to tell the campus
community about their experiences, in a formal, pre-planned
setting -- like a seminar, symposium, or visits to relevant
classes to make presentations. The student needs to feel
there are persons sufficiently interested in his work that
he will be given a forum of his own afterward from which he
can educate administrators, teachers, and other students.

3. <u>Follow-up must be adequately financed.</u>

If there are to be post-return seminars, evaluations, and
community action projects, they will probably cost money.
This can be obtained, even in this time of tight budgets,
with the help of ingenuity and salesmanship.

One must first discover what it is that impresses each of
the administrators or trustees who has a say in budgeting.
If some are impressed by quantitative evaluations, "before
and after" attitudinal tests might be administered to students
verifying whether their experiences have made them more aware,
knowledgeable, humane, internationalist, and tolerant. These
are used, for example, at Johnston College, Redlands University,
Redlands, California.

If the institution is highly oriented toward faculty research
it might be possible to interest some faculty in involving stu-
dents in projects that would advance the faculty members' schol-
larly purposes. An adroit coordinator of field studies might pull
a fait accompli, launching his project and looking for money
afterwards, pointing to constructive field activity in progress
as an argument for funding.

Above all, the student returnees are the best salesmen and should
be invited to use those talents on return. The campus coordina-
tor can arrange lunchneons teas, and other devices through which
top administrators are given personal exposure to articulate re-
turnees. At one InterFuture college, the returned participant
annually makes a presentation to the board of trustees.

With an adequate budget comes increasing respect on campus for
the field studies coordinator and his program. Fund-raising for
future field work, therefore, can be an important by-product of
sharing the students' experiences with the campus.

4. Recommendations to SFEE for future conferences.

    (a) Include more representatives of field agencies.
    (b) Include more representatives from professional schools.

SOME CONCERNS ON AND APPROACHES TO THE ISSUE

OF FIELD STUDY FOLLOW-UP

The topic of Field Study Follow-Up is one that has special
interest for the Merrill Field Study Program, since the Field
Committee, the governing body for the Merrill Field Program
has begun to give real thought to this area of our field
program during this past school year.

The concerns outlined below in one sense are very personally
related to the Merrill Field Program, but it is hoped that the
reader will be able to relate to the issues, problems, and
questions raised and find something here that will have some
value for the program with which he or she is affiliated.

A. SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT THE MERRILL FIELD PROGRAM

Merrill College is one of now eight colleges at the newest
University of California campus, the University of California
at Santa Cruz. Each College has a theme or emphasis which
receives varying amounts of attention by faculty and students
depending upon each individual college.

Merrill College opened up in the Fall of 1968 with a focus
on social change in the world today and relationships between
the developed and developing areas in the world. Tied in with
this focus was the idea that field work was to play a, inportant
role in the education of students who attend Merrill College.
Below are excerpts from the 1968 University catalogue describing
Merrill College and its emphasis.

> Change is an essential feature of the world that
> concerns the College.
>
> If that concern is to be intelligent, and lead
> to useful action, it will call for disciplined study
> study of the liberal arts and sciences.
>
> If problems of change and intelligent action
> are to be understood, it will be useful to
> experience them.
>
> The poverty of two-thirds of the world's people will
> be a primary concern of Merrill College. We shall be
> interested in understaning technology and its
> effects on growth, as well as in what comprises an
> equitable distribution of the world's product. We
> will be equally concerned with related problems our
> society shares with the world: prejudice, alienation,
> and mismanagement of power, environment, and human
> rights. The College intends for students to learn
> in the classroom about such problems. It also
> intends that they be capable of responding to them
> with constructive action.

It is expected that most students in the College will
devote a substaintial period, sometime following the
freshman year, to full-time work and study in the
field. For some this might mean six months with
migrant workers in California, for others a year in
a community development project in Peru or a primary
school in Upper Volta. It will be a function of the
College to attempt to prepare students for such work,
including preparation in relevant foreign languages.

That Fall of '68 the College started as the "Third World"
College and with the idea, on the part of the in-coming student
body, that there would be a variety of Field Study possibilities
from the moment the students enrolled that Fall Quarter. As it
was to become evident, the theme of the College was to cause a
lot of soul-searching and the Field Program initially was
non-existent. One of the unique things about the College
though, was its focus and the tying in of field study to that
focus. When I started working with Merrill students during the
Fall of 1969, there had been some part-time field work developed
and a few students had been out on full-time field work.

Probably two key aspects of the Merrill Field Program
which developed my first year at Merrill were the Field
Committee hammering out policy on credit and philosophy and
the development of petitioning guidelines. The Field Committee
is formally made up of four students (each of whom have usually
done full-time field work); four faculty members; the provost;
and the Field Program staff (myself and the assistant). There
is a problem when one's committee changes each year, with
continuity, but also there is a strength in that sooner or
later all Merrill faculty will have served on the Field
Committee and will have become "educated" to the concerns of
the Field Program. (Part of the "education," for example, is
in the need for faculty members to become aware of the problems
that students face when they return to Merrill and USCS after
intense field study experiences, and the need to help students
integrate their field work with their academic work after they
have returned.)

The petitioning process was also refined from the first
year of the College's operation. The present petition,
developed that year, asks not only what the student plans to
do, but how he or she is going to work out preparation and how
the project fits into the student's academic life at USCS. The
latter aspect deals with how the student plans to integrate
his or her field work into the work that he or she will be doing
on return to Santa Cruz. However, at the same time, for several
years at least, we seemed so busy approving field study petitions
and working out our general philosophy, we did not take time to
give much thought to the subject of various forms of post field
work meetings and seminars.

At the end of last year the need for more systematic
follow-up was felt. The following comment by Professor
Terry Burke, last year's Chairman of the Field Committee,
alludes to this. In a closing Chirman's memo to me he
wrote:

> <u>Post field work follow through</u>: This is an area
> where we still have not developed anything like
> an adequate response to the felt needs of many
> students. Students return frem a full-time field
> project burning with the desire to communicate
> to others what it had they had seen and experienced.
> More often than not, they end up frustrated in
> this endeavor. I would strongly encourage continu-
> ation of the experiental program we began in
> the Spring ('72) of presentations by students who
> have returned from long-term projects.

B. THE FIELD PROGRAM ADDRESSES ITSELF TO THE QUESTION OF FOLLOW-UP

As I look back on my three years with the Merrill Field
Program, it does not seem until last year, Winter and Spring
Quarters of 1972, that the Field Committee really began to
think about the issue of follow-up for students who had
returned from full time domestic and foreign field study
placements. Below is a memo which Frank Smith, then Field
Program Assistant, sent our to the Field Committee members in
February 1972 entitled, "The Establishment of Priorities":

> I propose that the Merrill Field Committee set up
> a concrete list of priorities in order that we can,
> both as a committee and as personnel in the Field
> Office (Nick and Myself) determine where we want
> to go and whether we are getting there.
>
> A concrete list of priorities implies that we
> can; 1) exert energy on a point or issues, and
> that we can 2) measure and evaluate our progress.
> Some ideas I have as to priorities are:
>   1. the newsletter--how to improve it--how to
>   enlist the help of students;
>   2. the reorientation seminars for returned
>   students;
>   3. the development of new projects that are
>   in response to the "social crisis" Mike
>   refers to;
>   4. spreading the word about the program
>   through special evening gatherings and
>   meetings;
>   5. the creation of a resource center for the
>   generation of skill workshops;
>   6. the writing of a more expressive and
>   acceptable statement of philosophy.

In one sense it represents the endless debates and discussions
the Merrill Field Committee has regarding the goals of the Field
Program and how best to carry out these goals. Item number 2,
the reorientation seminars, was beginning to receive more attention
in our thinking about the total Field Program. Throughout the
year a number of reasons were given for why follow-up of some sort
is important, and in particular, what reorientation seminars
might accomplish. Below are some of the reasons mentioned
throughout our meetings for why formal and informal follow-up
for returnees would be worthwhile:

- A student who has returned from field work is a potential
    resource to the Merrill College community. I.e.; that
    student may be very willing to come into classes where
    the field work relates and talk with the class, or he or
    she may be willing to have an informal "rap" session with
    a group of students in one of the living units of the
    dorm. The returnee may be helpful in helping another
    student plan out a similar field study project. Finally,
    some students who have returned from an extremely valuable
    experience may want to teach a "Student Directed Seminar"
    which would mean putting together an academic course and
    making it available to other Merrill students.
  Field study involves real and unique learning that traditionally
    has not been give much recognition in the classroom.
- Students should be given the opportunity to come to grips
    with what their field work has meant now that they are
    back on campus. This would involve either informal
    "rap" sessions or a specific course analyzing the field
    experience which allows students to reflect with other
    students and faculty members on the nature of their field
    experiences in a variety of terms. (For example: personal,
    academic, political, etc.)

In a paper, by Allan O. Pfnister*, dealing with an analysis
of a Study-Service term for a mid-western college in Costa
Rica, the author cites the problem students have returning
to their campuses after having participated in a program
away from their colleges, and their problems in relating
that learning to what happens back at their schools:

---

* "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Progams: Two Case Studies
(Central America and Spain)" by Allan Pfnister, Occasional
Papers in Higher Education, No. 1, (Feb. 1972), School of
Education, University of Denver, p. 12.

One of the complaints of students who have
participated in the junior year abroad or some
other experience is that although they return
to the campus excited about the experiences they
have had, they find it almost impossible to
communicate these experiences to students on
campus who have not shared similar experiences.
Indeed they find a certain resistance from their
fellow students and faculty, to their recounting
their overseas experiences. After several rebuffs
they cease trying to communicate to others, and in
time the experience itself fades into the background
as a pleasant memory.

Although it was hard to determine the extent to which our
students who returned from field study found themselves
isolated and unable to find people interested in hearing
what they had to say, there certainly is some truth in the
description of problems for returning students described
by Allan Pfnister. It was felt by members on the Field
Committee that encouraging students to share their ex-
periences with interested persons, groups, or classes,
and structuring sessions that would specifically require
students to look at their field experiences, were both
concerns that the Field Program should focus on.

- Students who have done full time field study in a very real
    sense have done something special and are unique resources
    for the College and thus should be recognized in some way
    or a series of ways. In the past this has taken the form
    of an annual dinner at the Provost's house for students
    who have done full-time field work that year and "College
    Honors" for some graduating students who have made excellent
    use of their field experiences. Again, the idea here is
    that doing field work has a special quality to it, and
    that we should recognize those students who have taken
    part in it.

C. MODELS FOR STRUCTURING FOLLOW-UP IN A FIELD PROGRAM

At this point something should be said about models for
structuring follow-up in a field program. As pointed out in
this paper, we have arrived at the need for follow-up and
approaches to it over a period of several years. Our approach
is a multifaceted one and one that has grown out of the
development of our Field Program as it grows with our new
College.

One model, with certain advantages, is described in a
handbook for the Field Study Program of Justin Morrill
College.* From what I gather by reading the handbook,
everyone at Justin Morrill is required to do one term
of field work before they graduate. (At Merrill College,
the Field Committee does not require everyone to do Merrill
Field Study, although the College assumes that many
students will do some sort of field work before they
graduate.)

The field term at Justin Morrill is preceded by a
Preparation Seminar and followed by a Return Seminar,
both consisting of weekly meetings of around six weeks
in duration. Both of these seminars have fairly specific
goals, and the goals for the Return Seminar are stated
below:

> During the Return Seminar the staff:
>   Helps the students relate their intuitive responses to
>   the Field study to an intellectual understanding of it.
>   Helps the students use the experience as a source of
>   knowledge about themselves and other cultures.

Although the Merrill Field Program does not follow the model
above, I find this one to be a very useful one and one in
which follow-up is structured into the total field experience.
The handbook points out to the reader that credit is not
completed until the student has taken the Return Seminar and
followed through on the requirement of that seminar.

The Merrill Field Program is at the point now where the
Committee members feel that follow-up is very important.
Although we do not require all students returning from field
work to take a post-field work seminar such as is done at
Justin Morrill, we are trying to see that students are not
just thrown back into the academic and social life of Merrill
College and the University without being able to draw upon
their field experiences. Instead we try to provide a variety
of alternatives for the interested student.

Below are a number of organized and not-so-organized activities
which are aimed both at involving the returning student in the
life of the College as a resource and at helping that student
deal with the meaning of his field work when back as Merrill:

- A student can do an evening presentation related to his or
    her field study project. This can be used as a means
    both of recruiting interested students and allowing the
    returning student to talk about his experiences.

---

* The "Justin Morrill College Field Study" handbook was put
together by Director John Duley, and his staff for their Field
Study Program. Justin Morrill College is one of several
experimental colleges at Michigan State University.

- Students who are interested can speak to classes which are
  dealing with topics which relate to their field work. One
  class where this is especially useful is the Merrill
  course, "Social Change in the Third World" which is taken
  by most frreshmen. Because mnay of the full-time field
  work projects are in Third World areas, students who
  have returned from field work are excellent resources.
  At the beginning of each school year I prepare a list for
  the Merrill faculty of students who have done full-time
  field study, and who are thus potential resources for
  classes.
- The student can incorporate his or her findings from the
  field study in a senior thesis or senior project. Although
  not many student do this, students who have created an
  independent major with field study as an intergral part
  of that major will often do their field work through the
  Merrill Field Program and then incorporate research from
  their field work in their senior thesis or project.
- A course or a series of courses related fairly closely to a
  field project can be taken. Some of the courses which
  come immediately to my mind, are: "Urbanization Politics,"
  "Poverty and the Law," and a seminar on the Philippines.
- Involvement with the Merrill 120 course, "Preparation for
  Cross-Cultural Experience" (which is required of students
  planning to go on full time field study through the Merrill
  Field Program) can mean either being a resource person for
  a particular discussion session or becoming a student
  Teaching Assistant for the course.
- The student who would like to analyze his or her field ex-
  perience in a class setting can take Merrill 121, "Analysis
  of Field Experience." This year Merrill College has added
  this new course, and a similar course is available through
  the Community Studies Department at UCSC. The "Community
  Studies" major at UCSC has a post-field work analysis
  class which combines reading, discussion, and the writing
  of papers.*
- The description for the Merrill course reads as follows:

  This course is aimed at providing students
  who have done full time field work in a
  community wither in the U.S. or abroad,
  through the Merrill Field Program, the
  opportunity to analyze in an intellectual
  framework the nature, goals, and processes
  of field study.

---

* One of the interesting aspects of the course is that students are
required to write three assigned papers and one free choice paper.
The required topics include: an organizational analysis of the
community or agency with which the student worked; an empathy study
of one person in the community the student got to know well; a
discussion of the role of the outsider (the student) in entering and
adjusting to the community; and a description and analysis of a
itical incident/crisis situation that occured during the period
field study.

Along with having students evaluate their individual
field study experiences, the course looks towsrd the
preparation course, Merrill 120, and how that course
can be strengthened and made more relevant. (A copy
of the "Tentative Syllabus for Merrill 121" is
available with this position paper.
- A related approach to the Merrill 121 course, for the
students who have returned from the Israel Kibbutz
Program is a series of informal seminars (five of
them through the Fall Quarter) which are required of
students who are back at UCSC from that field study.
These discussion sessions allow for both general
"rapping" and focusing in on particular topics. Since
some of the students from this group will help with the
preparation for the next Israel program, it also gives
us a chance to think about suggestions and preparation
for next year's group going to live in Israel.

How have students who have completed full-time field study
seen the aspect of follow-up and reentry into the academic
life of the College? Students who responded to a questionnaire
I sent out had a variety of comments to make:

Although I am not an enrolled student this quarter,
I am involved in a seminar with Karlene Faith ("analysis
of Field Experience"). Some of the positive aspects
of this class are, being able to relate your field
experience with other returning people; the unanimous
feeling that most people going on field study are not
properly equipped; the desire to examine the validity
of the Field Program in terms of the political
implications of involving students in the social/
cultural lives of Third World peoples; and lastly,
the prospects of putting together a manual which
hopefully will answer or at least pose these questions
and more to students planning on a field experience.

I am extremely pleased with how I have managed to
integrate last year's field experience with my course
work this quarter. Involvement in Karlene's class
(Merrill 121) is a much needed experience as it is
helping me to evaluate and reevaluate my personal
experiences as well as the whole concept of field
work in general. It's good to be in a group of
people who have shared similar experiences and compare
impressions, reactions, etc. I'm quite surprised at
how diverse reactions are!

I am also taking Professor David Sweet's Introduction
to Latin American History course--I am finding it
extremely enjoyable and meaningful as my travels
have given me a good feeling for many of the places
we are studying. Also, the course is adding new
dimensions to my understanding of Latin America and
specifically the area in which I lived.

Working with Professor Tony Fink on an independent
study on the basic concepts of nutrition (from a
biochemical viewpoint) is also directly applicable
to my experiences in Cuzo.

All in all, last year's experiences are making my
courses this year seem very relevant. Field work
has also helped me to better define my future plans.

***

I was on the Israel field program, Summer and Fall
1970. I can't really say that I have integrated
what I did on my field study to my other studies at
UCSC; however, my field experience has certainly
affected my life in Santa Cruz as far as the people
whom I associate with, and, to a certain extent, the
activities in which I take part. I think that one
reason for this "lack of integration" is that I never
really viewed my "Israeli Experience" as an academic
experience, but more as an interim period between
studies--a time to get away and just try to experience
a different kind of life. I have taken part in a few
orientation programs for people thinking about going
on the program, and have certainly talked individually
with people going to Israel.

I am not disappointed in what happened after coming
back to Santa Cruz. I cannot speak for other full
time field study programs, but I feel that it was
inherent in the Israel group (certainly in our
particular group), that we ourselves kept together,
talked about the program, evaluated it etc. I also
think there was enough coordination between those
students who have been on the program and the Field

Study Office in efforts to try to make the field experience an even more valuable one.

***

I also felt it important that those who had participated in the program, and gotten so much out of the whole Merrill Field Program, give something back in return. For this reason I became involved with recruiting more students for the following two groups. Last Winter Quarter I was the T.A. for a class in preparation that the students had to participate in in order to go to Israel. It was really interesting to me, because my experience in Israel generated a lot of interest in books and reading about Israel, that I never had before I spent time there. I feel that every student should have as a part of his involvement in field study a commitment to the program upon return.

***

My interests changed and I've taken no related courses.

***

I am taking a course in "Urbanization and Politics" which my field study did not deal with directly but gives me a new perspective on migration from rural to urban areas which I would not have had if I had not gone to Crystal City. I am majoring in Community Studies and will be doing another field study but without credit. I feel that Crystal City gave me a new insight into this kind of work and where I would be best suited to work in the future.

***

Upon return to UCSC I gave a lecture (slides) to interested people. Over the summer I took "African Philosophy" from Abdu Kasozi and found I could add a lot to the class after my trip. Also was motivated to take "Anthro. 1" and do serious sketching work with an eye to getting a job in the field, returning to Africa. Currently I am assembling slides and a small paper for the Third World Teaching Resource Center.

Basically I feel the field study definitely deepened
and changed my orientation to school. I feel it was
more meaningful than a great deal else I did in
school, and will continue to be on a long term
basis. Since then much of my effort in school has
been directly concerned with developing the possibility
of returning to Africa or traveling elsewhere,
especially in an area not completely Westernized.
It also developed in me an interest in languages
hard to satisfy for west Africa, as languages are
so localized. Ideally I would like to take a
Yoruba course, and may eventually do so in UCLA.

I would be happy to be used as a resource although
my time is limited and I couldn't commit myself to a
lot of work. In general I feel the field program
has been supportive since I returned. It seems
especially necessary to release the ideas and
emotions which build up during a field experience,
especially with people who have also done something
similar. I found this more rewarding just with one
or two people so tended to shy away from large meetings.

D. SOME QUESTIONS WHICH CONCERN THE MERRILL FIELD PROGRAM

1. Should some sort of post field study class or seminar be
   required of every student who has done full-time field
   work? Should everyone be asked to take the same seminar,
   or should a variety of options be Offereed? In what ways
   can post field study follow-up be structured so that
   students take part in it?

2. How can the field program and college help the student in
   his or her own assessment of the experience?

3. What changes does field work trigger in the individual--
   intellectually, morally, politically? What support can
   be given to returning students in these deeply personal
   commitments?

4. How can the student's experiential learning be shared with
   the rest of the college? (In trying to set this up, how
   structured should this be? I.e., "rap" sessions; speaking
   to classes; student-directed seminar, etc.)

5. What is the faculty's role in follow-up? Ideally they
   could be very helpful (and might learn from students who
   have returned from field work), but the problems related
   to getting faculty to take an active role in supervising
   students while on field work, point to the fact that it
   may be difficult to get much support from faculty on
   follow-up.

6. Is there a body of literature, books, articles, films, etc., that might be very helpful for follow-up? There are really two categories of materials here: one relating to the general topic of follow-up, and the second category relating to materials that would be useful to use with students in a seminar-type setting.

The stated purpose of the seminar is to "analyze in an intellectual framework the nature, goals, and processes of field study." The Following questions will be considered:

- What were the motives behind my decision to do field study?
- What did I hope to accomplish?
- How were my expectations/hopes failed or fulfilled?
- What are the justifications for doing field study?
- What are the negative implications of field study activity?
- How have my own cultural conditionings affected my field experience?
- What are the political implications of involving American students in the social/cultural lives of Third World peoples?
- What is the relationship between my field study experience and U.S. imperialism?
- How was I significantly prepared for effective work in the field?
- In what areas was my preparation lacking?

2. Required Readings:

Cowan, Paul, The Making of an Un-American
Field Study Reports
CRV (Committee of Returned Volunteers) Newsletter

3. A solid attempt will be made to define those areas which all field experiences have in common, regardless of the region in which field study was conducted or the nature of the project engaged in. What are the universal problems of field study? How can these problems be alleviated through preparation?

4. Seminar projects:

- participation in Core Course sections
- evening presentations of field experience for Merrill community
- collect ideas for future field projects, i.e., regions and specific projects
- advise prospective field study applicants
- prepare a "Preparation and Analyis of Field Study" manual
- plan Merrill 120, "Preparation for Field Work" to be offered Winter Quarter

5. Collectively we will attempt to define those ways by which our theory and praxis, i.e., classroom and field experience, can be most effectively integrated.

6. The collective responsibility for the siminar will be facilitated to the extent that we know and understand the nature and effects of our individual field experiences. Descriptions and evaluations of field study projects will be xeroxed and distributed among ourselves. A more general analysis statement will be written collectively. The preparation manual will contain individual reports, the analysis statement, information for specific regions and projects, and a comprehensive bibliography.

REPORT ON PLANS FOR A CHICAGO CONSORTIUM

PROBLEM

Service agencies are increasingly bombarded with requests for field
experience education opportunities form colleges throughout the
nation. At the same time, institutions engaged in field experience
education (or seeking to become so involved) are finding increasing
difficulty in identifying appropriate service/learning opportunities
and administering widespread programs.

We believe that Chicago offers a unique opportunity for the ex-
ploration of alternative approaches to experiential learning and
productive collaboration between and among agencies and institutions.

PURPOSE

To facilitate the establishment of institutional relationships
between educational organizations (local and out-of-town) and
service agencies (public and private) for the purpose of im-
proving and expanding field experience education in the Chicago
area.

FIRST STAGE

To explore the current status of field experience education in
metropolitan settings and consider alternative approaches to the
expansion and upgrading of such opportunities in the Chicago area.

SECOND STAGE

To arrive at a range of potential key issues and methodologies,
which may include:

1. Student housing
2. Orientation of the city/region (for resident and
   non-resident students)
3. Field placement opportunity bank
4. Academic/practitioner exchanges
5. Objective evaluation/reporting mechanisms
6. Cooperative Administration/supervision
7. Certification of field experience
8. Development of interdisciplinary (problem oriented)
   service/learning teams
9. Joint supportive academic activities
10. Cooperative project development and funding