

# Secretarial Notes on the Fifth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men Held at Purdue University, May 3-4-5, 1923

## FIRST SESSION

The first session of the Conference was called to order by the President, Dean Coulter, of Purdue University, at 9 a.m. in the Trustees room, Eliza Fowler Hall.

President Coulter read letters from the following named Deans expressing their regret at not being able to be present:

Dean Clarke	University of Illinois
Dean Reinow	University of Iowa
Dean Dawson	University of Nebraska
Dean Tuttle	Ohio State
Dean Hoskins	University of Tennessee
Dean Worcester	University of Colorado
Dean Armsby	Missouri School of Mines
Dean Snelling	University of Georgia
Dean Jaqua	Colorado College

Dr. Elliott, President of Purdue University, welcomed the visiting Deans in the following very interesting talk:

## OPENING ADDRESS

The commission granted me by Dean Coulter, to have and to hold your attention during the opening moments of this conference, was gladly accepted. Purdue University is deeply and permanently gratified to have the privilege of this meeting. When making our campus your sanctuary we have the conviction that we are to receive the benefactions of your friendly presence and of the accumulated humaneness of a score of other institutions. We are glad that you are here. We shall be, if you will indulge me the inconsistency, even gladder when you are gone; for then we shall be sure that we possess for our own use the largess of yourselves and your institutions.

In one essential item Purdue is like each and every institution represented here this morning. Purdue is certain as to the possession of the best Dean of Men in the country. Were they here, instead of you, this morning no doubt each of your own presidents would admit an identical superiority for his institution. And from this pleasing paradox there is great satisfaction for all of us.

The Dean of Men is an educational officer; in the present stage of colleges and universities, perhaps the *most* educational officer on the campus. With the temper of the existing academic world it becomes increasingly hazardous for any mere President to presume to discuss matters of education in the presence of educators. The wall that is said to separate the administrator and the educator is said to become higher and higher each year.

After serving on both sides, I must maintain that, all things concerned, there isn't much difference between the things that must be done on each side of the wall. The President is obliged to devote the most of himself to men who do not always realize that they are children. The Dean of Men, by the same formula, must give all of himself to children who are positive that they are men. In either case we are engaged in the double-acting business of teaching.

While it may be impertinent for me to do more than to express my sense of official and personal satisfaction for being permitted to be with you, I find it difficult to refrain from making reference to one obvious matter. The greatest practical problem throughout all of our education today is to provide treatment for each student as a separate individual who is to be taught and trained in terms of his own capacities and needs. Our institutions will be successful, not as smoothly running machines, but as constructive human agencies wherein each student is given a full chance to be what a properly educated human being ought to be—consequently, the great and increasing importance of the deanship of men, which is in reality, a professorship of human nature. May we hope that these influential professorships will aid in the great and important work of making our higher institutions, especially our state institutions, safe for brains. Intellectual ability is exposed to greater hazards today in our universities than ever before. I trust that in your discussions of ways and means for the most effective salvaging of the social and spiritual possessions of our students, you will not fail to give some recognition to the fact that even in this humanitarian world there is still a useful philosophy to be found in "To him that hath shall be given."

Dean Goodnight was called upon by President Coulter to respond to Dr. Elliott's address of welcome.

The following delegates were in attendance at the Conference:

Francis F. Bradshaw	University of North Carolina
J. A. Bursley	University of Michigan
Stanley Coulter	Purdue University
Frank H. Cowles	Wabash College
John R. Dyer	University of Kansas
Floyd Field	Georgia Tech
S. H. Goodnight	University of Wisconsin
W. G. Hormel	Ohio Wesleyan
O. W. Irvin	Toledo University
S. Arthur Johnson	Colorado Agricultural College
C. R. Melcher	University of Kentucky
Edward E. Nicholson	University of Minnesota
J. W. Putnam	Butler College
J. L. Richmond	University of Toledo
Giles E. Ripley	University of Arkansas
C. Rufus Rosen	Earlham College
H. E. Stone	University of West Virginia

The first topic on the program was presented by Dean Coulter of Purdue.

## THE PERSONAL WORK OF THE DEAN OF MEN

Since these meetings are in the nature of personal experience, it is my intention to treat the subject assigned in a very informal way.

I presume there is no academic office that has such a wide variance of duties as the office of Dean of Men. You will find no two Deans doing the same thing or working in the same way. I imagine that some of many conditions may have led to the creation of the office of Dean of Men. In some cases in the larger universities it was born out of the necessity of relieving the President of certain lesser duties of internal administration that occupied his time to the enforced neglect of the greater problems of his position.

In certain other cases the growth of the institution was so rapid and the consequent increasing complexity so great that it was necessary to introduce a new functionary to study the problem and to undertake certain specific minor duties, and in this case also the resultant was a Dean of Men. In still other cases the office seems to have been created merely to recognize years of service by a new title and Dean of Men seemed as harmless as any other. In every case within my knowledge the Dean of Men has had to discover the duties of his office and to determine largely the limits of his authority.

One thing I would like to say in opening—the great peril of the office of Dean of Men lies in the fact of a tendency which is beginning to show itself in a multiplicity of forms and cards. This increase in mechanical complexity bodes disaster since it is necessarily at the expense of the humanistic element. I may be altogether wrong but I have only one form and that one form indicates the building in which the Dean is found and the room number of his office. I have visited the offices of Deans of Men where two assistants were needed to keep track of the cards.

The Dean of Men, in my conception of his function, is not in the slightest degree an officer of discipline. I believe that just at the moment he takes upon himself the duties of discipline, when he checks on attendance, dishonesty cases, and other student offenses, he departs from the primary function of his office. He should always keep in close and effective contact with the student body and the faculty. If we are honest with ourselves, I think we will find that most of the problems arising in our universities come from the lack of this close and effective contact between students and faculty. In other words the Dean of Men if effective at all is effective because of the fact that he is able at the same moment to inspire the confidence of the student body and the confidence of the faculty. The best "Dean" I ever knew was for a number of years a janitor at Purdue University, "Pat" Tracy. He controlled the students perfectly and yet never "gave them away" to the faculty. He commanded the respect and confidence of both faculty and students. The man had personality and personality is what counts in the work of the Dean of Men.

How is the Dean of Men going to make his personality count? In the first place he will inspire confidence by being absolutely square with the students and by showing a willingness to see their side of any given case. When a new office is created it is very natural that members of the faculty should be rather jealous of their prerogatives and a little sensitive when these same prerogatives seem to be threatened. Some things necessarily pass from the hands of the professor into those of the Dean of Men. In such cases tact must be used. Occasionally the time comes when tact will not answer and then, of course, authority must be exerted, but such cases should be very rare.

I do not trouble the faculty greatly and the faculty does not trouble me very much. In the main I do the unpleasant things they want done. The faculty and I work happily together. In general, I permit the professor to do the things that put him in the limelight.

Coming to the question of personal contact with students, the Dean of Men if he is at all competent must have certain definite characteristics which should stand out clearly in all of his dealings with them. In the first place he should be finely sensitive to, and jealous of, the scholastic standards of the University. In any work with students, however casual, that ought to be well to the front. The Dean of Men has no higher function than that of making scholarship fashionable among students.

He ought also to be sensitive to student conduct for as Emerson says, "Life is three-fourths conduct." He should be equally sensitive to the outlook upon life the student takes as regards the University and community. Above all he should be sensitive as to the ideals of the students for ideals are far more determinative of life than heredity or education.

If a man has these sensitive points well developed he can do the work of a Dean of Men. Ninety-nine per cent of his effectiveness comes in those cases where the student seeks the Dean. If there was not a constant stream of students passing through my office I would feel that I was absolutely failing in my function. If they did not come to me with their little problems of fraternity and social life as well as in the graver problems of morals and conduct, I would feel that in some way I had missed the personal contact with them which would enable me to be helpful.

Even if you take as small a number of students as we have at Purdue (3000) it is manifestly impossible for the Dean of Men to come into immediate touch with each one of them. I found as I undertook the work, having a summer vacation in which to plan it, that it would be necessary for me to get into touch with the individual students by the group method. The chief function of most college organizations seemed to be to elect their successors and have their photograph in the student annual. As I thought over the various organizations, I began to wonder what definite University duties I could put upon each of them. As an illustration, we had the Student Council. The Student Council has in a way as its task to direct student sentiment and control student action. There are certain seniors elected, certain juniors and sophomores and very few freshmen.

Like other organizations the Student Council had done little for some years except pose for their picture and I felt that if I had anything to do with it I should make it functional. For years we had had student parades going over to the city after almost every game that was won. The first thing done was to place all parades in the hands of the Student Council. It was to determine the time of parades and to be responsible for their conduct. Incidentally I intimated that it was a pretty cheap thing to have a parade after every victory. The Council undertook to correct the matter and did it in such a way that we now have only one or two parades a year.

We used to be annoyed persistently by petitions for holidays. Groups of students of varying size would petition for a holiday. Almost any unusual event, however trivial, seemed enough to give birth to a petition of this sort. I called in the Student Council and asked that it control the matter of petitions for holidays. I showed them that the daily cost of the University was very great and that a vacation meant spending large sums of money without returns.

I promised that I would not present to the faculty a petition for a holiday which the Student Council had not approved. In the last three years we have had only the normal holidays. In other words we have made this organization functional. Its President comes in frequently and asks to know what further lines of work I would like the Student Council, to undertake.

From that I turned to the fraternities. I went in by way of the Pan-Hellenic Council. At first we had only ten fraternities in it but now all organized social bodies are members. This puts me in touch with groups representing eleven or twelve hundred men that I can personally reach in a very short time. I have never made a suggestion to these groups that has not met with a quick response. I give no orders, I merely give facts and occasional suggestions. The problem of getting into contact with the non-organized students takes more detail and cannot be given because of time limitation.

The student ought to be made to feel a personal responsibility for the affairs of the University, and especially should this be true of members of organized groups. Therefore, I constantly send them information which is for their good—good for their souls if not for their pride. For example, at a fixed date there comes to my desk the mid-semester report which gives a list of all students below passing grade at that time. As soon as the report comes to my desk my secretary goes over it and assigns the delinquents to the fraternities to which they may belong. The President of each chapter receives a letter reading something like this: "The following members of your fraternity were reported delinquent at the mid-semester report. This is sent for your information." No advice, no counsel, merely a statement of facts. Very often the President calls wanting to know about this or that man. I advise him as best I can but insist that it is their problem, that if the fraternity desires men of that calibre they can easily have them, but if they desire to rid themselves of them it is for them to discover the way.

Last fall the fraternities passed a rule which was a more drastic one than the faculty would perhaps have passed. This rule was that no person could be initiated unless free from all conditions. The ordinary rule of the University requires that a student must pass a certain number of hours to remain in the University. The fraternities it will be seen went far beyond this. As a result of this method we are in as fine a situation as regards the relationship between fraternities and faculty as in any University in the country. Our fraternities are a distinct asset.

One cannot secure very much action about scholastic standing by exhortation, but if one sends in information as to standing from time to time favorable results are certain, since no organization is willing to be constantly at the bottom of the list. The April 3rd temporary statement shows who were below passing at that time for any reason whatever. I had a check made of the men and found 1102 in fraternities and of these 1102 we had 289 delinquent. The same check showed 1112 non-organized men on the rolls which makes the two groups practically equal. Of the non-organized group 350 presented delinquencies of various sorts.

We do not urge the students to better scholarship by telling them how fine a thing it would be if they had high scholastic ambitions, we merely feed them facts. I am rather uncertain if I had made a series of talks about scholarship whether it would have had any stimulating effect, but when fraternities receive certain unpleasant facts they quickly become busy.

It was suggested at one time that house parties might be properly refused to any fraternity having a notably low standing; this year the fraternity of lowest rank, without any advice from the Committee on Social Functions, voted not to hold a house party. In giving out this information I come into a personal touch with the students that is remarkable. They come to me to talk about their own conditions and in that way I get into social and chapter house conditions, and a knowledge of these in very many cases is all that is needed to clarify the situation.

One can also get into personal contact with students very largely through their social activities. One of the burdens of the flesh and one of the penalties of the Dean of Men is to be invited to almost every social function. It breaks in on his sleep and injures his digestive powers. Nevertheless I attend as many of these as I can, simply because I want the students to feel that I am actually interested in the things that interest them. In that way through keeping in touch with all their activities I have come to know them by the scores and hundreds. Another thing that has in it an element of comedy and which may seem ludicrous in a man of my years is the fact that I am a member of a large number of honorary societies on the campus. From the standpoint of Dean of Men who is trying to get into constant contact with the student body this membership is infinitely worth while.

A very early problem confronting me was that relating to social functions. All organizations, especially after the war, were crazy about dancing. Everybody danced, at all times and in all places. The only method of regulation possible seemed to be through the students themselves. I worked on the problem seriously and thoughtfully. I called a conference of representatives from all of the social organizations in the University. I presented the problem to them, showing them that college students were being criticized because of their low scholarship, their extravagance, and the fact that they were losing their democratic spirit and that it was up to them as college students to meet the situation. I asked them to appoint a committee to work this out and bring to me the number of dances that might be given by each organization during the year. I stated that I would remember in examining the report that I was older than they and that dancing seemed more important to them than to me. The fraternities discussed the matter and brought back to me a report which, while it contained a larger number of dances than I could have wished, nevertheless was a decided reduction. I intimated that they might have made a greater reduction but told them I was a good sport and would let them try it. The majority of the fraternities did not avail themselves of the maximum number of dances permitted. The next year they voluntarily reduced the number and since that time we have had no difficulty.

I may say in this connection that the Committee on Social Functions has student as well as faculty members. In matters of discipline I desire the students to feel that we want them to work with us. Our Dishonesty Committee consists of three student and four faculty members. I realized that if I appointed the student members it would take the whole heart out of the matter. I, therefore, told the Student Council to appoint the members and that the faculty would accept the appointments. The Council has without exception appointed men upon various committees who have served effectively. They have been faithful in attending the meetings and have handled the problems presented in a way far beyond our expectations. The only thing they lack is

mercy, but after all mercy is not one of the qualities of the average undergraduate. When a student senses crookedness he is not after evidence but wants to soak the fellow.

In trying to tell you in detail what the function of the Dean of Men is, as I see it, I would say more friendly and intimate relations with students so that they will come to him with their ordinary everyday problems for advice and counsel as naturally as they would talk with their fellows. The only way to accomplish this is to study the problems of students, to place responsibility upon them and keep as constant contact with them as your strength will allow. The Harlequin Club this year gave an extremely successful performance and cleared some \$2300. The manager came to me last night after one of our meetings, for consultation and advice as to how they should distribute this balance, how much should be kept for reserve, etc. Before the office of Dean of Men was created they would have done as they pleased. They would not have consulted with anybody.

I may be wrong but I have nothing to do with discipline or dishonesty cases. If there is a case of student dishonesty the matter is referred to my desk, all papers come to me. I examine the report as carefully as I can. If I am in doubt I send for the student to talk with him. If I find him more guilty of thoughtlessness and carelessness than anything else I am apt to refer it back to the department for settlement. If, however, when I talk with the young man I find that he is guilty or shifty I tell him he can justify himself before the committee. If I find any possibility in these cases of saving the student from a public hearing I do so, since I dislike to place a mark upon any man if it can be avoided. I pursue similar methods in cases of discipline. I am neither advocate nor judge. I try to deal with all cases as if my function were to save the student from the results of his folly.

One thing further I wish to say but hesitate to do so because it may seem impractical, even idealistic, but I find in personal contact with students that one of the surest ways to reach them effectively is to make a square appeal in every case to their spiritual side. The average University student can be appealed to along these lines more than we usually realize. One thing, I think, that has fitted me for the position more than any other one thing is that every Sabbath day in every year I have been connected with the University I have held a series of morning talks with students in one of the churches. It is the one thing I do not allow myself to miss. I do not accept any invitation that takes me away from that class. We meet and talk about the real problems of student life. Last month I had an average of about two hundred. In this way I have come into a very close and intimate contact with thousands of students that would otherwise have been impossible. I believe that in our work as Dean of Men we are putting too much faith in cards and forms and other such machinery. After all the student will respond to direct appeals to his higher nature more quickly than to anything else.

Discussion which followed the presentation of this paper brought out the following interesting information illustrating the ability of students to assume responsibility and to meet it.

Smoking is not permitted on the Purdue campus and has not been for thirty years by either students or faculty. This is a matter strictly in the hands of the students, the limits and bounds within which there shall be no smoking, being fixed by them. It was intimated that should a visiting guest be seen

smoking on the campus he would be approached by students and informed as to the regulations.

Another question which brought forth considerable discussion was that of student employment and its effect on scholarship. Dean Bursley stated that many non-fraternity men were at least partially self-supporting, that data gathered so far showed that 442 who were working two to three hours a day have an average of 70.3, 94 men who are working for more than three hours have an average of 69.8, and 64 men who are playing in orchestras from two to twenty-four hours per week, have an average of 64.4.

Dean Bursley further stated that they advised students who had to work, to take a longer time for their course.

Dean Field reported that such cases were handled automatically by a Committee on Courses. Students reporting that they will have to work, without question as to whether they could carry the course in the regular four years, have a five-year course outlined for them.

Dean Goodnight, of Wisconsin, presented the second topic on the program.

### FRATERNITY DISCIPLINE

One afternoon last summer I was lounging along the shore of Lake Mendota where a pretty little spring ripples out from beneath the rocks. Five or six children, ranging in age from five to twelve, were playing in the sand with their spades and buckets. They very naturally undertook the task of damming up the stream to put it out of business. It went well for a while; then the water began to rise and to overflow here and there. With wild shouts, the children would spring to the danger spot and hastily repair the sand dike. Then it overflowed somewhere else, and finally, in spite of the valiant efforts of the little folk to prevent, the water broke through triumphantly and swept everything before it.

As I watched the scene, it flashed through my mind that there was in the situation a certain resemblance to our attempts at fraternity discipline. If you oppose objectionable initiation practices and succeed in a year's time in getting them curbed, rushing and sweat-box evils break out. Get that stopped and the gang may take to booze and poker. From this they may run to extravagance in social affairs and presently the cycle is begun over again.

Last year I reported to this Conference an effort to curb extravagance in dance orchestras at Wisconsin. We have succeeded fairly well. We have a fixed schedule of orchestra prices and all fraternities are pledged not to pay more and not to import orchestras. The Junior Prom price, too, has been reduced. But just last week we had an outbreak of public initiation stunts, the first in several years.

The figure is, of course, lame. Our efforts are not so utterly vain and futile as those of the children. A great many boys get some educative ideas and ideals in their heads during such a process, and that, surely, is worth while. But our work, like that of the children, is never done and can never be laid aside as complete.

How these disciplinary measures are to be accomplished is the big question which confronts us. Methods differ and the advice one gets when he starts to make inquiries varies enormously. Reminds me of a young man elected to the presidency of a small college. In hopeful mood he consulted President Elliott, of Harvard, as to how he should conduct things in a college. He

told him, "My dear sir, I have just one piece of advice to give you and that is to bring everything before the faculty by all means. They will discuss things with great heat. After that, do as you please. The faculty will feel that it has advised you fully in the matter." The young man bethought himself on the way West to call upon President Butler at Columbia. Butler said, "The only piece of advice I wish to give is this: in questions of policy never consult the faculty. Faculty men will invariably mess it all up for you."

One institution will tell you to make rules and plenty of them and to enforce them rigidly. Dr. Coulter, whose experiences at Purdue are certainly successful, says no rules. The two plans seem to me to represent questionable extremes. If you adopt the first, you very soon encounter the impossibility of effective enforcement. In a large institution with many fraternities a multiplicity of rules covering all sorts of abuses is simply an invitation to fraternities to see how much they can get away with. The code is soon in a position analogous to that of the 18th Amendment.

On the other hand, if there are no regulations whatsoever, deterioration sets in; a group of young men, wholly unrestrained, has the tendency to drift into bad practices. Somewhere between the two extremes lies a medium which seems to me to be the wiser one. A few enforceable regulations really enforced is a possibility. These should not be changed from year to year, but allowed to develop into traditions, that are understood and regarded as reasonable by all. A few well-seasoned regulations can be enforced and young men will recognize their usefulness and validity.

These few set rules, however, do not meet this perpetual outcrop of new things, nor should they do so. These matters should, it seems to me, be taken up with the fraternities directly and an effort should be made to gain their co-operation in curbing, for their own good, abuses which develop among them.

A short time ago, I asked for a special meeting of the representatives of the national fraternities on the campus, forty social, eleven professional, to discuss certain evils that had cropped out. I told them they were being attacked at home and abroad. I distributed copies of a typical piece of yellow journalism by a gentleman who signs himself George Frederick Gundelfinger, Ph.D. This pamphlet, "The Passing of Brother Greek," is as you know being spread broadcast and is ostensibly a review of Dean Clark's two books: *The Fraternity and the Undergraduate*, and *The Fraternity and the College*. There is, of course, no attempt at a fair review, but a venomous attack on fraternities by the easy method of quoting excerpts out of context. As his purpose, George Frederick Gundelfinger, Ph.D., states: "I am merely interpreting the book to reveal to Dean Clark and to others the strength and excellence of his case against the Greeks. He reiterates constantly that fraternities have the highest ideals of manhood existent anywhere in the country and then invariably goes on to show that they seldom live up to them, in fact violate them one and all." He devotes a section to each of the subjects: Bad Manners, Disregard of the Rights of Others, Dishonesty, Low Scholarship, Bad Influence of Upper Classmen on Freshmen, Inferiority to Independents, Poor Judgment in Selecting Members, Military Record. He summarizes with a direful prophecy: "Is not Dean Clark expressing his own opinion in camouflage when he quotes the following words of a prominent physician: 'I believe it will not be many more years until all of these college fraternities, either by the enactment of state laws

or by the regulations of college authorities, will be debarred from our educational institutions and will have to go out of business." "It is clear that the fraternity must ultimately pass out of the colleges."

I pointed out to our boys that while we might not attach much significance to this bit of muckraking and might consider the author demented, nevertheless, the thing is being published and distributed like noxious weed seed about the country.

Not only are we subject to attack from without, but from within. We have a new journalistic enterprise upon our campus, *The Scorpion*, which contains a review of the fraternity system on the campus. "At just what point in the fraternity history the desire for exclusiveness developed into a passion for snobbishness, the aping of heraldry, and the lust for power, does not appear. It doesn't matter. Such is the situation." . . . "The great evil in the situation is that with a number of fraternities, there arises a class feeling, a community of interest among them, which, supported by the prestige of athletic heroes and the activities of the well-situated students who have much leisure time for mixing, results in an organized minority in control of press and every phase of student activities, running campus affairs from a very selfish viewpoint." Under the head of Interfraternity Council: "In contrast with Ku Klux, the Interfraternity Council, in which some fifty fraternities each have a representative, and which might be made the vehicle for much needed work, is in a state of paralysis or torpor. One campus leader criticises the Interfraternity Council affair in this fashion: 'Its personnel is below the average, being made up mostly of men from the organizations such as the stewards, or those who have nothing else to do. It is the essence and spirit of mediocrity.'"

We are, furthermore, subject to very sincere criticism from parents. We frequently receive letters from them protesting vigorously against the interference of fraternity affairs with academic work or against extravagance. A sample of such a letter, which just reached me, follows: "May I suggest to you an investigation of the initiation ceremonies of the college fraternities at Madison? It strikes me that ten days of 'razzing' day and night is entirely unnecessary and interferes more than is desirable with the regular business of the student."

Perhaps even more serious is the fact that we are also raising up enemies among the deans and professors of the faculty. Many of them are fraternity men, but they have to admit that because of objectionable practices they cannot continue to support us.

Initiations were held a short time before mid-semester this year and the results upon grades were disastrous. In the report submitted to me by the Dean of the College of Engineering, who took pains to check up on non-fraternity and fraternity men, one pledge dropped from 28 honor points to 12; another, from 31 to 17; another, from 34 to 6; another, from 41 to 20; another, from 23 to 3; one, from 19 to 0; another, from 38 to 7; and another, from 24 to 8. Of the men who were non-fraternity freshmen, 80 received a smaller number of grade points the second mid-semester than the first; 72 received a greater number of grade points than they did the first semester. That is, nearly half improved and a few more than half went down. On the fraternity side, the number of freshmen who went down in their grades was two and one half times greater than the number of freshmen whose work

improved! Many faculty members have voiced their condemnation of initiation practices which bring about such results.

This is a situation which is, I believe, a menace to all fraternities. But if you choose to close your ears and eyes to protests of the press both at home and abroad and to those of both parents and faculty members, go right ahead—and don't kick about the consequences when they come! I shall advocate no rules covering the case, for I know how easily they can be evaded.

But this "razzing period" accompanying initiations is only one of several abuses which are bringing fraternity life into disrepute at Wisconsin just now. Another is the manner in which rushing is carried on. The opening of the fall semester on our campus is little short of idiotic from the University point of view. When a freshman comes to college for the first time he is awed; he has been told by his teachers in high school that he will have to work as never before. When he arrives on the campus he finds a chaos. He is rushed and received and pulled about until he is utterly demoralized. Nobody ever says anything to him about work. He reacts very quickly to this environment, with the result that he gets a very bad start—or no start at all—in his studies. In the College of Letters and Science alone, 164 freshmen were dropped at the end of the first semester, due, as I believe, very largely to a bad start; 153 were advised to withdraw; 165 were placed on probation. Of the total freshman class at the beginning of the second semester, 23.2 per cent are now on probation.

Here is a chance for the fraternities to do a bit of good, constructive work. Institute some form of delayed rushing, *live up to it*, and you will be relieving us all of a situation which is bad for you and for the University. Furthermore, by choosing more deliberately, you will get a better class of pledges than it is possible for you to get under the present grab-bag system and you will thus benefit your fraternity directly, as well as giving the freshmen a chance for their academic lives.

The third vicious practice is the "sweat box," a device for bullying a freshman into pledging immediately, without giving him opportunity to see other groups. I am attempting to get at this evil at its source by exposing it mercilessly in a booklet which I send to all freshmen before they enter the University. I have added a new chapter to it upon this subject. (A copy of this booklet will be sent to each Dean.)

After having thus pointed out the abuses now damaging the fraternity name at Wisconsin, I conclude my talk with a constructive suggestion as to scholarship. That is the one bulwark behind which the fraternity position would be impregnable. If when people come knocking fraternities, we could reply: "But look at their scholarship, they are the best on the campus!" it would be an absolutely unanswerable argument. We are given to boasting that all the leaders in campus life are fraternity men. Then of course the fraternities ought to be leaders in scholarship and they ought to outrank the independents in grades. But unfortunately they do not. Two times out of three the independents outrank the fraternities. What defense can we possibly present against attack under these circumstances?

Fraternities are due for a fall unless fraternity men clear things up, cease objectionable practices, and do a little constructive work. It may or may not be wise to go before them and tell them so in plain terms. You have to steer a course between that of arousing resentment and antagonism, and that of putting things so gently that no effect whatever is produced. My own preference

is for plain speech backed by talks to individual groups, conferences with leaders, and so on. I am hopeful that next year will see an improvement here at Wisconsin in the evils discussed above, for our fraternity men are wide awake to their own advantage and they are willing to co-operate for their own good and for that of the University. But next year the dike will begin to leak somewhere else!

In connection with the general topic of fraternity discipline, the question arises of the handling of booze parties in fraternity houses, especially when the really guilty parties are bunches of bootlegging alumni. I shall describe briefly for your information an experiment we are trying this year which seems to be meeting with some success.

The principle is simply that of holding the organization responsible for what goes on in the house, regardless of whether the disturbers of the peace are residents of the house, visiting alumni, or guests.

During the summer session a disgraceful drunk took place in and about a centrally located fraternity house. The customary alibi was forthcoming—and in this case I believe it was true—that it was alumni and guests and that the occupants of the house were not implicated. We took the ground, however, that the occupants were responsible for maintaining order and that if they pleaded guilty to inability to do so, they thereby proclaimed themselves incompetent to run a house. Acting on that theory, we ordered the house vacated and closed.

This would have cost them a large amount of money. They complained bitterly of this cruel and unusual punishment, and eventually offered to pay a sum to be agreed upon into a student loan fund and to give guarantees for the future, if permitted to keep the house open. In view of the fact that this was the first occasion upon which the drastic penalty of closing a house had been proposed, the offer was accepted, the guarantees were given and \$150 was paid in cash into a loan fund. All fraternities were notified by letter at once of what had happened, and they were warned that future offenses would be less leniently treated.

In the fall another fraternity, or rather two active members and two or three alumni brought liquor into their house and drank during a dancing party. The two actives were sent home, the social privileges of the fraternity were cut off for the year and it was determined to publish the cancellation of the pledges of their entire pledge group, refusing ever to certify any of them for initiation. This last measure brought such a tearful protest from both actives and alumni that it was finally waived upon immediate payment of \$300 into a loan fund and the giving of guarantees. Through these two instances, the fraternities seem to have caught the idea that a booze party is too expensive a luxury to indulge in, and thus far we have had no more trouble.

This idea is not advocated as a cure-all for the ills of fraternity life. Many objections can be raised against the procedure. We have, of course, no legal right to assess a money fine upon a fraternity. That we have carefully refrained from doing. We have fixed a heavy penalty which was within our power, and permitted the fraternity to procure the withdrawal of the penalty by paying a sum agreed upon. Another danger is that some wealthy roué may desire to regard the incidents as a precedent and try likewise to purchase immunity from retribution for his moral leprosy—a plan which no one would sanction. Indeed, one witty gentleman characterizes the idea as a

“sale of indulgences,” but the parallel doesn't hold. Indulgences were procured in advance; this is comparable rather to a heavy fine for “drunk and disorderly.” However, the matter is presented merely as an interesting experiment, which thus far has resulted satisfactorily. Its adoption by others is not even suggested.

Opportunity for discussion which was given following the presentation of this paper brought out one outstanding point in particular, namely, that fraternities, professing to care for incoming freshmen and their scholarship, proceed in every way to harass them, unfitting them for their work, causing dissatisfaction and criticism by the public, parents, and faculty. The freshman arriving at college, expecting to work, meets chaos and as a result frequently falls by the wayside. At Minnesota 21.6 per cent failed of initiation this past year.

The meeting adjourned for lunch. A very delightful luncheon was served in the Home Economics building by the young ladies of that department.

## SECOND SESSION

The conference reconvened at 2:00 p.m. Dean Johnson, of Colorado State College, presented the following paper:

### LIMITATION OF EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

I shall not attempt to present a paper on this subject, but merely to make an effort to outline it so that it can be attacked from different viewpoints as desired.

The first problem to confront us is, what is the value of student activities, if any? It seems to be the consensus of opinion that those exercises participated in by students outside of the classroom are of real value as related to life's problems. In anticipation of this discussion I called into my office a young man of marked ability who was editor of the college paper last year and this year is editor of our junior publication. He says that if he could afford it he would be glad to put in an extra year in college in order that he might devote it to student activities. However, he believes that too many student activities are damaging to scholarship and that they should be distributed more generally in the student body. It is my opinion that such activities should be duly weighed and permitted to perform their function in education.

Second, do we wish to limit the activities, or participation in them? I take it from the nature of the question that we are concerned chiefly about the over-activity of a few students and the under-activity of many students. If this is the correct interpretation, our purpose will be to develop some method by which the few would not overload themselves and the many would be given an opportunity to participate more extensively. It would appear that in the student activity, the activity itself is the important thing rather than the particular end accomplished; that is, the activity is of value from the standpoint of education rather than from the standpoint of practical achievement.

The problem is, then, can students be trusted to conduct their own activities? If not, is the faculty infallible? In other words, how much value is there to the student in solving the problems of student activity just as he will have to solve the problems of the world by and by?

How much real harm do student mistakes in this particular field do? How do they damage enrolment, student morale, or morals? How much? Is there any value in permitting students to make mistakes?

The next problem is, should there be faculty control, and before we discuss this we really should solve the question as to what we mean by faculty control. There are two types of faculty control, the limiting and the guiding. In the main I am convinced that the guiding plan is the wisest and most effective, but there is always a minor per cent of students who do not understand anything but the "big stick" method. We are obliged to treat with them in a language which they understand.

In the discussion which followed Dean Coulter stated that at Purdue a Faculty Committee had been appointed to study these activities. Activities had

been divided into majors and minors. No man might participate in more than one major and one minor or two minors if in no major. It was a good system worked out for limiting these activities, but was never put into operation.

Dean Johnson stated that at Colorado State College they were attempting to solve the problems by having such a number of organizations upon the campus that every man might be a member of some organization.

Dean Bradshaw stated that he disliked the Point System, that it was too mechanical, was top heavy and that it ignored differences in individuals. Activities should be educational and to be educational they ought to be done well. By encouraging large numbers to participate they raised the standards by increasing the competition.

At Minnesota there have been various modifications of the Point System, devised and passed by the students or their representatives. None have been successful, due chiefly to the amount of work involved in carrying them out. This detailed and systematic work as a rule cannot be successfully handled by students, chiefly on account of lack of time.

Dean Goodnight in answer to a question regarding limiting of number of activities a student might enter, replied "they should be prevented from entering to such an extent as they interfered with their scholastic program."

Dean Hormel then presented a paper on "Control of Accounts of Student Organizations."

### CONTROL OF ACCOUNTS OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

#### A. GENERAL STATEMENTS

The control of the accounts of student organizations involves some preliminary work which may be outlined as follows:

1. Every student organization appearing on the campus for the first time should declare its object and its membership, and should secure the consent of the faculty for its existence.
2. A list of the members and the officers of all organizations should be filed annually in some convenient office (office of the Dean of Men at Ohio Wesleyan).
3. Two classes of organizations may be distinguished: those that handle money and those that handle no money.
4. Those organizations that handle money should be required to render a financial statement at least twice a year, and their accounts should be audited at least once a year. Proper blanks should be furnished for the statements. In the case of fraternities monthly statements should be made and the audit should provide for a profit and loss statement and balance sheet statistics.
5. All organizations handling money in considerable sums should be required to work out a budget, and should have a faculty adviser.
6. Student treasurers of organizations handling money in considerable sums should be selected with great care, and should have some training for the work.
7. The whole matter of the audit of the accounts of student organizations should be in the hands of a faculty committee vested with authority to enforce rules and regulations, and furnished with sufficient clerical help.
8. It is desirable to publish an annual report of the financial transactions of all the student organizations. These reports should be summaries rather than detailed statements.



## B. HISTORY OF THE WORK OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE AT OHIO WESLEYAN

For a number of years there has been an attempt to oversee the financial transactions of the student organizations. The more important ones, such as the Athletic Associations, the Glee Club, the Transcript, the Bijou, the Historic Club, and the Christian Associations, have had faculty treasurers through whose hands all the money of these organizations has passed; and we have published in the catalogue that the Audit Committee was composed of these faculty treasurers, with the University Treasurer as chairman. We have had a rule, also, requiring not only these organizations, but all others except the fraternities, to render annual financial statements. The scheme provided further that the treasurer of the University audit all these accounts. The Audit Committee was empowered through the office of the Dean of Men to put any organization out of business which did not make an annual financial statement, and sometimes the rule was enforced. But with all of this machinery the scheme was a partial failure. The treasurer of the college was a busy man, and no real audit was made. Financial statements were rendered by many of the organizations, but nobody knew whether they were correct or not. Then, too, the fraternities were not included in the scheme, and they needed oversight more than any other group; on the average they handle more money and are attempting a more serious piece of business.

Fifteen years ago an attempt to bring the fraternities under the financial supervision of the college would have failed, but the situation has radically changed. The national organizations have brought about this change by advising and demanding a closer relationship of the local chapter with the college administration. Here is an illustration of the point in question: Twelve years ago when I began to publish the relative scholarship standings of the various college groups, the fraternities were designated as groups A, B, C, etc., simply because they would not stand for a public exposure of their scholastic ratings. Soon they came to the office to find out which letter represented their group. After a while they learned that the letters in alphabetical order represented the chapters in the chronological order of their organization; and in three years they did not object in the least to the out-and-out publication of their names.

Two years ago it became possible for us to reorganize our Audit Committee. The newly established Department of Business Administration gave us the key to the situation. The instructor who was responsible for the course in accounting was deeply interested in the financial transactions of the student organizations. This was what we had been looking for—a man who was not only deeply interested in the students, but also technically able to help put a real audit into force. An Audit Committee of three, with the Dean of Men as chairman, was appointed by the President.

This committee went to the faculty asking for some legislation to back up its work and to give it authority to enforce its demands upon the various organizations. The legislation was changed from time to time to meet the growing needs and now may be summed up in the following rule, which will be published in our *Book of Rules and Regulations*:

Each student organization must keep an exact account, with proper vouchers, of all its receipts and expenditures, and must file a report of the same, with supporting vouchers, with the Committee on Audit of Student Accounts, as of December 15, March 15, and June 15 of each college year. Failure to file these reports and supporting vouchers shall deprive the organization of the privilege of doing business and of representation in student publications. Each of the fraternities, sororities, and other fraternal groups shall pay an annual fee of \$15 for the audit, and all other student organizations shall pay one-half of one per cent on all income. Sororities shall pay student organization rates as long as they remain social

## C. MODE OF PROCEDURE

We have altogether on the campus ninety-two organizations, divided as follows:

Administrative .....	18
Athletic .....	4
Community Clubs.....	6
Interfraternities .....	4
Literary .....	19
Musical .....	4
Religious .....	4
Fraternities .....	15
Sororities (local).....	18
	—
	92

Probably ten of these do not handle any money and can therefore be required to furnish only a statement of the object of the organization and its membership. The other eighty-two groups handle, it is estimated, \$180,000. All these groups except the fifteen men's fraternities are compelled to render financial statements and submit to an audit. We took the ground that we could get along with less friction with the existing men's fraternities if we *persuaded* them into co-operation. Ten of them readily agreed, and are absolutely sold to the proposition and acknowledge that they have been greatly benefited by the audit. The other five will, I predict, be with us within a year. One of them is holding out because of its miserable financial condition—the local chapter itself being ashamed of the condition and afraid to let the committee know the facts. Some of the boys are beginning, however, to see that we can render them a real service. Then, too, there is a mix-up between the chapter, the local alumni, and the district officers, so that it is difficult for us to get organized co-operation. The other four groups have refused co-operation because of the influence of local alumni who have blocked our way. These alumni have succeeded in putting their groups in good financial condition, and I think do not want any outside agencies to interfere with what they believe to be an ideal condition. Some of these men are business men engaged in a large and lucrative business, submitting annually to an audit. Three of these four groups will be swung into line, I feel quite sure, through the influence of their national organizations. The fifth of these refractory groups is a local organization, and we shall have to use different tactics.

The eighteen women's fraternities came into existence since we began the new audit plan, and one of the conditions of their existence is that they shall co-operate in the audit—a thing which they are doing most cordially.

It has been difficult for us to secure the co-operation of two of the literary organizations which handle quite a sum of money. One of them claims that the audit is not worth the expense; the other, which by the way handed in a report just two weeks ago, and now expresses a willingness to co-operate, wanted, I suspect, to clean house before our committee got hold of their books and vouchers.

The other difficulties which we have had are more amusing than serious. I shall relate just one of a type. The Junior Class organization known as the Owl and Skull is rather a harmless group. I am sure they are not engaged in any mean politics, for they are not on the whole that sort of fellows. They were very slow at the beginning of this year in handing in the financial report and the statement as to officers and members. Then, too, the *Bijou* manager

was after them hot and heavy for the \$20 fee which had not yet been paid for last year's representation in the annual. Finally the whole matter was put into my hands for settlement. I called in this year's Owl and Skull officers, who said that the most of them had very dutifully paid, last spring, their six-dollar initiation fee, and that they had had nothing to do with the *Bijou* contract, and that besides there was no money in the treasury. I called in the officers of last year's Owl and Skull. They acknowledged the obligation, but said they had collected all but \$18 of the initiation fees; that they intended this to be used in paying the *Bijou* bill; that all the rest of the money had been spent in a feed and in a division of the surplus money among a few of the members; that in any case they were no longer members of the organization and therefore could not collect the \$18 from the present members; that they were willing to put up the other \$2; and that they did not see how they could be held. They were all very courteous, and nobody lost his temper.

To settle the matter, the seniors were told they could not enroll for the second semester until the matter was satisfactorily adjusted, including the making of a financial statement; and the current members were told that they could not have a representation in this year's *Bijou* until proper settlement was made. Then they all got busy, and before February 1, when the new semester began, the *Bijou* bill was paid and all statements were filed in my office.

There is in my office a large cabinet in which a file is devoted to each organization, and my secretary spends a great deal of time in getting the officers of the groups to report. But it is all worth while, and we hope sometime to get things to working without much friction.

Professor Hornberger, the instructor in accounting, attends to the technical part of the audit. I am sending round a set of blanks upon which reports are made.

- No. 1 is for the report on membership and officers.
- No. 2 is for the financial report of all organizations except fraternities.
- No. 3 and No. 4 are for the fraternities, and are reported monthly. They consist of a balance sheet and a profit and loss statement.
- No. 5 contains the instructions to the sororities.
- No. 6 is a blank upon which bills are rendered for services done by the committee.
- No. 7 is a blank for a report on sale of tickets.

In most cases except the fraternities and such organizations as the Athletic Association which handles about \$30,000, the audit is very simple; but it is not complete until the reports are criticised and the vouchers checked. At the beginning of the year some time is spent with the treasurers in order to explain just what is expected of them. An attempt is being made also to furnish an understudy for the treasurer in each group, especially in the fraternities, and they are finding the audit so valuable to them that they are requesting their future treasurers to take the course in accounting.

The audit in the case of the fraternities is a more extended affair, because it involves monthly reports and because the committee makes up from these reports an average balance sheet and an average profit and loss statement, copies of which are sent to each co-operating fraternity so that the treasurer may see how his group stands in relation to the average group. I have provided enough copies of the report as of April 15 so that each member of the Conference may have a copy of the average balance sheet and a copy of the average profit and loss statement.

#### D. NEED OF SUCH AN AUDIT

There are several reasons why such an audit is needed not only at Ohio Wesleyan, but I suspect at most institutions.

1. The average student has an utter lack of financial responsibility.
2. The student needs a stimulus to keep the financial records in such a way that he knows all the time just where his organization stands financially, or just where it stood at any given time. This prevents large deficits and growing deficits.
3. An audit gives the treasurer a clean slate, and is the means of avoiding undue criticism as to disposition of funds.
4. It is hoped through the audit to prevent the large amount of outstanding bills which the merchants in the past have been forced to carry through the summer months. This amounted to almost \$6,000 last year in the case of the ten co-operating groups. The reports so far this year indicate that this will be very much reduced.

#### E. RESULTS OF THE AUDIT

1. Not only do we get better records now, but we get *records*, instead of no records at all. Gradually we shall get organizations with similar problems to standardize their accounts and thus work for more uniformity.
2. By this laboratory method we are teaching these treasurers, and incidentally all the members of the groups, good business principles which are of supreme importance in character-building.
3. This financial oversight gives us a new point of contact with the fraternities and sororities, and indeed with all the other organizations, which helps us to guide their activities.

#### DISCUSSION

DEAN COULTER—Graft is often found in the student organizations. Their first thought is not their duty to it, but how much is in it. The only way to correct this tendency is by careful accounting and publicity.

DEAN BURSLEY—Publications at Michigan are under one group, controlled by a board. Managing editor and business manager each get \$700, literary manager and editor each get \$600. Assistants are paid from \$100 to \$150.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Can see no difference in the amount of time put in by the editor and the player on the football teams. Salaries should be abolished. As long as they are paid in one case there will be a feeling that there should be a return in others.

DEAN DYER—The amount of grind might determine it. Football is over after a season and so is the Junior Prom, but the *Daily* staff must produce every day.

DEAN PUTNAM—No direct pay to men on paper—editor-in-chief and manager get college fee. (College fee at Georgia Tech.)

PRESIDENT ELLIOTT—I want to raise a personal doubt about it all. Certain gain comes from the independence of these student organizations. I hope we will not lose sight of the fact that we will take away the thing that makes character. I want to warn institutions of the danger of assuming, more or less unwittingly, the kind of responsibilities students should carry independently and voluntarily. In so far as possible we shall proceed on the assumption that student organizations that do not make any general appeal to the public shall be left alone to carry their financial affairs. In selling buttons, flowers,

etc., upon the campus, the name of the University is at stake, and we are perhaps justified in securing protection. I more and more come to believe that the larger degree to which we can leave students alone, the better will be the result.

The following institutions reported the use of the Warner System by at least a portion of their fraternities in the handling of their financial affairs: University of Wisconsin, University of Michigan, and University of Minnesota. Meeting adjourned.

In the evening the members of the Conference attended a reception and entertainment given by members of the faculty of the University.

### THIRD SESSION

The meeting was called to order by the President at 9.00 a.m. on Friday, May 4.

A committee consisting of Deans Goodnight, Nicholson, and Dyer, was appointed by the President to nominate officers for the coming year and to make recommendation as to place of meeting for next year.

It was suggested that before passing upon the place of meeting it would be advisable to hear the report of the committee appointed last year to consider and make report upon a division of the Conference into groups.

The committee in reporting, stressed the expense and loss in time now suffered by some of the Deans, owing to the wide area covered by the conference. It suggested that the Deans and Advisers of Men meet in alternate years in a National Conference and in other years in District Conferences. The report was received and it was voted to postpone final action until next year in order that sectional groups might first consider the matter.

The special committee on nominations and place of meeting reported, placing in nomination for President, Dean Bursley, of Michigan, and the place of meeting, Ann Arbor. The report was accepted and approved with the understanding that no precedent was to be established to the effect that the presidency and place of meeting go together.

The first topic to be presented was the following paper by Dean Field:

#### SHOULD A STUDENT CHOOSE HIS COURSE AT THE BEGINNING OR CLOSE OF THE FRESHMAN YEAR?

- I. True purpose of a course in college
  1. To develop the mind and soul of the pupil so that he will be able in new situations to think, to analyze, and to choose wisely.
  2. To present right ideals and standards which of course the average teacher of Mathematics, English, Chemistry, and Drawing does *not* do.

This teacher is causing right methods of thought along certain definite lines, but with no conception of its bearing on the whole.

3. To give right perspective

A man chooses Commerce to make money

A man chooses Ministry because his grandfather was a minister and he thinks that is the only religious profession.

- II. Some factors which make for choice

1. The personal interest of the pupil in
    - a. Machinery ME
    - b. Corn Clubs Ag
    - c. Telephones FE
    - d. Surveying CE
    - e. Drawing Arch
    - f. Country Store Commerce

NOTE.—Except in a few instances as in case of University of Oregon and University of Illinois, only recently have the schools and colleges realized that the pupil in college needs a course in Orientation for life, not just for college, and a Dean to study each individual case. Most schools now are passing the "buck" of discipline and schedule, etc., to the Dean of Men instead of leaving him free to be the friend and counselor of the student.

2. Example of some hero
    - a. Abraham Lincoln or Robert E. Lee
    - b. Gladstone or Teddy Roosevelt
    - c. Henry Grady or Michael Angelo
    - d. Red Barron or Jack Sullivan
  3. Influence of friends
    - a. Parents selecting and sending to definite work
    - b. Teacher from Tech or Auburn or Harvard
    - c. Friend who knows only geology and loves a boy is liable to make a geologist out of him
  4. Accident
    - a. Boy on campus says take F.E.
    - b. Good football team
    - c. Failure in a subject
    - d. Line of least resistance
    - e. Reputation of colleges
    - f. Surroundings—Harold and Gilbert at Emory, Dad at Tech, W. E. says Tech
    - g. Song—  
Don't send my boy to Mercer, the dying mother said;  
Don't send my boy to Georgia, I'd rather he were dead; etc.
- III. Time of choice is 16 to 20 years
1. Many Freshmen still in the "runaway" period and don't want any course, four last year, several this year. Restless, want to get out and see what they are fit for. Gresham; Harold; Earl Q.
  2. Great majority do not know what they want when entering college  
They have not thought of themselves as part of life.  
They are on the outside not yet ready for that mystic plunge.  
The sex interest is strong and disturbing.  
Others say, What are you going to do? The boy replies, I don't know, or I do know, and the first speaker never asks why or puts before him the kingdoms of the world and says choose this or that because of certain need or service.
  3. Vast numbers get to college not being properly guided lower down.  
My brother and sisters went to college because father and mother talked it and selected college students for companions in the home.  
My boys are going to college because surrounded by college ideals and standards of efficiency and service.  
My neighbor's children become drudges in farm or office because father and mother are drudges and they see nothing over the hill for their children.
  4. The farm demonstrator and Corn and Stock Clubs are sending more boys to Agricultural College than in the history of the Nation.
  5. Demonstration of courses in the College would serve to save many a misfit and salvage many a pupil who would otherwise be consigned to discouragement and the scrap pile.
- IV. Careful systematic guidance necessary. Not vocational but humanitarian. Not guidance *into* courses but direction *of* an unfolding life.  
The course is not the end—it is the daily run under the eye of the trainer and the rub down by the assistant; the try and try again at some trick play until it becomes automatic; the stimulation of quick action under

the lash, with perfect control. What for? To win in the battle of life. To hear the words of the Master *well done, faithful*, not necessarily successful.

1. The faculty must be interested in boys, not books. Who is instructing the faculty?
  2. The pupil must voluntarily face the life problems. Spread out before him his past, his community, his country, his God, the lines of service, the world ahead of him and hope and pray that he may choose aright.
  3. Face with him the underlying common principles of service.
  4. Face the outstanding facts of each course. Not just in your school but in life.  
A teacher who is a stranger in your school will have hard sledding. A narrow man cannot do it. A man who has not studied the unfolding life cannot do it.  
To succeed best one must have had experience in the fourfold life.
- V. If a course is selected without thought, every time failure stares the pupil in the face he will say
1. Am I in the wrong place?
  2. I ought to have taken the other course.  
Law: Teaching: Commerce: Not good for anything else, must be good for "A bear dog."
- VI. In conclusion, I would add that I firmly believe that in general a man should not select his life work until the end of his Freshman year and, if possible to delay it longer without disarrangement of work, even to the end of the Sophomore year.
1. This will require in a large measure all Freshman courses to be alike.
  2. General information course in which the student is confronted with general life problems.
  3. Some day this whole question will be mainly given over to the Junior College in which a broad fundamental course is given on which one can build in any direction. This with a general informational course showing the great life questions will bring such pupils to college with a definite fixed purpose for a particular line of work.

#### DISCUSSION

DEAN COULTER—We should have some method for broadening the horizon of students entering our colleges. We have methods of keeping records, instead of methods of developing life. We allow a man to come and mechanically hold him to his choice. We spend entirely too much time preparing a man for his life work. When he is fullest of daring, encouragement, and enthusiasm, we are loading him down with information, building up a magnificent machine, but not developing his life work much. There are three questions that confront every man: (1) What am I trying to do? (2) How far have I gotten? (3) When do I take hold? We have Freshmen who know neither what they are doing nor where they are going. I feel that in educational institutions we are falling down, forgetting that, after all, our systems are secondary to opportunities for broadening worth while ideas for bigger conceptions of life. Our creative power as Dean of Men is immense if we forget machinery and think of the possibilities of the student life.

DEAN IRVIN—We have 368 Freshmen. To 40 per cent of them we give a three-hour course throughout the entire year, in History of Civilization. Another three-hour course is devoted entirely to talks on how to use the library, how to study, etc. The second semester we devote to one period of instruction, another of quiz. These talks, give information as to what, for example, a civil engineer may expect, what he may look forward to. Other courses are taken up and discussed in the same way.

DEAN DYER—We have pamphlets prepared by the different departments concerning their courses. These are free to the students. The students read them and seek out the man writing them for further information.

DEAN NICHOLSON—Our Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture give so-called Orientation courses. Our College of Science, Literature, and the Arts will provide a series of lectures this coming year given for the same general purpose. These courses are good, but not broad enough. Each set is prepared largely for the instruction and help of the students who have settled upon their general life work.

The second paper on the morning's program was presented by Dean Bursley, of the University of Michigan.

#### STUDENT FORUM MOVEMENT

When I was asked to address this conference on the Student Forum Movement I found it necessary to turn to others for assistance, as we have nothing of this kind at Michigan. We do have a students' Liberal Club, but it has no connection with any outside organization.

Through the help of one of our students, Mr. G. D. Eaton, a "stormy petrel" with a brilliant mind who has bitterly attacked the administration at Michigan on account of its alleged censorship of articles written for its college publications, I obtained much of the needed information.

At Mr. Eaton's request, Miss Amy Jennings, editor of *The New Student*, sent me, together with other material on the subject, a number of copies of this magazine, which is the official publication of the National Student Forum.

I also obtained from the National Civic Federation in New York several documents published by them with the idea of arousing in the public mind some idea of the dangers which they feel lurk in the Forum Movement.

The National Student Forum is a federation of liberal clubs in twenty to twenty-five colleges and is the outgrowth of the Inter-collegiate Liberal League and the National Student Committee for the Limitation of Armaments.

The only definite objective of this organization, so far as I can learn, is freedom of speech in the universities. "Freedom of speech" as they apparently interpret it is absolute license to say what they please, when they please, where they please, and how they please. Whether or not the statements are based on fact, or the subjects are appropriate for discussion in the publications in which they are printed does not seem to enter into the question.

This feeling of a desire for freedom from all restraint has almost reached the point of an obsession with some of the leaders of the movement. In their desire to secure what they call "academic freedom" they advocate "faculty and student representation on the board of trustees," and in order to fit the curriculum to "present social needs" they propose appointing student committees to revise the curriculum.

The impression one gains from all this is that in the opinion of youth, or at least of these youths, all college administrators are backward and reactionary in their ideas and policies and that the only hope for the future of our educational institutions is to turn over the control of them to these young people.

One of the most ambitious undertakings of the National Student Forum has been the bringing to the United States this year of six students who have toured through about sixty colleges, speaking of the youth movements in their countries. In the words of Miss Jennings, "these students have no desire to transplant the movements of their countries to America. They came here merely to tell us what they were doing and to exchange ideas with American students."

There is apparently much difference of opinion concerning the doctrines preached by this group of foreign students. One of the writers for the National Civic Federation, Mr. Ralph M. Fasley, calls it dangerous radicalism and in a pamphlet entitled *Youth Movement* gives in detail his reasons for this conclusion.

On the other hand, many who have heard these young men do not look upon them as dangerous radicals, whatever their real purpose in coming to this country may be.

When we attempt to judge the forum movement by the articles in *The New Student* we are faced with the necessity of determining which of these articles really expresses the ideas and beliefs back of the movement.

I cannot imagine a saner presentation of the case for and against the "thinking student" than that given in the December 20, 1922, issue of *The New Student* by Charles Denby, Princeton, '22, now at Harvard Law School, and Chairman of the National Student Forum. Neither can I see how anyone can object to the aims of the International League of Youth, an organization with headquarters in Germany, as stated by Werner Jantschge in the January 13 number of *The New Student*.

Our faith in the sanity of the movement is considerably shaken, however, by such articles as that by George Bernard Shaw in the December 2 issue and that by Amos Pinchot in the April 7 number of *The New Student*.

Mr. Shaw says:

As far as I can gather, if the students in the American universities do not organize their own education, they will not get any. The professors are overworked, and deprived of all liberty of speech and conscience. From them nothing can be expected. The governing bodies are under the thumbs of the plutocrats who pay the piper and call the tune. Secondary education as imposed by college dons will wreck civilization: in fact it has already almost done so.

From Mr. Pinchot we learn that he does not think

it is an exaggeration to say that, in universities dependent on endowments, professors do not feel sure that they could hold their chairs if they should give courses in real, instead of imaginary economics and politics.

He also says:

The American university is kind only to an inane uniformity of opinion. The man who is caught using his mind with vigorous independence is placed in an undesirable category. Nowhere in the world can we discover a more even intellectual sterility than in the American university.

The danger in the Youth Movement is not in following the ideas and ideals as expressed by Mr. Denby in his article, or by the International League of Youth in the statement of their aims, but rather in the feeling of unrest and

discontent raised in the minds of youth by such articles as those by Shaw and Pinchot.

This Youth Movement seems to have progressed much further in Germany than elsewhere, and if the article by Bruno Lasker in the December 31, 1921, *Survey* fairly describes the situation there, it certainly is not the sort of doctrine which I believe should be implanted in the minds of our youth. Its effect could be nothing less than demoralizing.

Mr. Easley, the National Civic Federation writer, says that "there is no youth movement but only individuals here and there who claim to be movements in themselves." He quotes Mr. Friedrich, one of the visiting foreign students, as having said: "It may be that this youth movement is only a fantastic dream of young people."

Perhaps this is true. Let us hope so if Mr. Lasker's description of it is correct.

If the Youth Movement and the Student Forum Movement are real, genuine attempts to arrive at the truth and to encourage freedom of thought and expression, there can be no legitimate objection to them. But unfortunately this does not always seem to be the case.

As an instance of an apparently deliberate misstatement of facts might be mentioned an article called "The Brass Check at Michigan," by John Rothschild, Executive Secretary of the National Student Forum. This was published in the March 7 number of *The New Republic* shortly after young Mr. Rothschild had been in Ann Arbor for two or three days with several of the foreign students whom he was personally conducting on a tour of some of the American colleges.

Just prior to their visit the Board in Control of Student Publications at Michigan had been accused of exerting a strict censorship over campus publications and of attempting to stifle all expressions of opinion that were not entirely conventional and acceptable to the University authorities. Rothschild was much interested in the situation and, at his request, I went over the matter very carefully with him, telling him all the facts. However, "facts" were not what he wanted, for a story based on them would not have been sensational enough.

It is in this evident desire for sensationalism, and unwillingness to be guided by actual facts or truth, if the truth in any way interferes with their obtaining what they are after, that the main objection to these Youth Movements lies. We at Michigan do not feel that student publications must necessarily be censored, nor do we object to students freely presenting their views on any problem or any subject they desire. We do believe, however, that their statements should be based on facts and that there is a proper time and place for the presentation of certain subjects. We object to scurrilous personal attacks, to obscenity, and to deliberate misstatement of facts. Outside of this there is absolute freedom of expression.

The National Student Forum has possibilities of exercising a tremendously good influence and possibilities of exercising a tremendously bad influence over our student body. I think there is no doubt but that at the present time the leaders are largely socialists and radicals with the idealistic, and in many cases, fantastic, dreams of youth.

It seemed to be the common experience that the approach, in the introduction of this movement, was made through the Cosmopolitan Clubs. In some instances the appearance and talks of the group of visitors who traveled over

the country this last spring were spoken of very favorably, in others there had not been full approval.

President Elliott thought the matter should be left alone, trusting to the good sense of the bulk of the students to take care of it. "It will die out when the leaders see the lack of interest in it. The majority of our students are here for business and will not allow their work to be interfered with."

Copies of papers gotten out at Wisconsin and Michigan were passed around. These papers were gotten out by so-called leaders of the new student movement. At Wisconsin they have no University recognition, therefore have no privileges on the campus and do not use the University name. At Michigan they have no official recognition.

The next topic on the program, "The Anti-Fraternity Campaign," was presented by Dean Melcher, of the University of Kentucky.

### THE ANTI-FRATERNITY CAMPAIGN

I have not prepared a paper on the Anti-Fraternity Campaign nor am I able to add much new after the instructive presentation by Dean Goodnight of the subject, "Fraternity Discipline," and the discussion which followed and included a very general survey of the government and status of our college fraternities.

I may say for my own state, Kentucky, there is no anti-fraternity spirit or agitation at the University, nor has there been within the sixteen years I have known the institution. Of the other six colleges that belong to the Kentucky Association of Colleges, three (Centre College, Transylvania College, and the University of Louisville) have fraternities; and three others (Berea College, Georgetown College, and Wesleyan College) have no fraternities. Berea and Wesleyan have never had fraternities and Georgetown abolished them about two years ago. There were but two fraternities at that institution, which had a student body of about three hundred, and the attitude of the college authorities was that, as there were only two fraternities, the tendency was toward an exclusive and undemocratic spirit. There should either be more fraternities in the institution or none to preserve the democracy of the institution and the shortest road to this desired consummation was to abolish the existing fraternities, which they did.

Of course the fraternities have their faults and often grievous ones. To some, fraternity membership is the greatest thing in college life; the fraternity badge is more eagerly desired than the diploma. There are numerous other faults known to all faculty members, but, taken all in all, I agree with Dean Coulter that fraternities are a distinct asset.

In matters of discipline I have found it easier to get results with national fraternities than with local groups and organizations. We can reach them through their province and national officers, and my experience with these officers has been very satisfactory.

The opposition to fraternities waged in the various states has been discussed at the Interfraternity Conference, held annually at New York City. From the minutes of this Conference (if not from being present) you all know this opposition centers principally in South Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Texas. Whether this opposition and the anti-fraternity legislation, both state and local, in those and other states is all justifiable I am not prepared to say, but there is also another side to the question which we are bound to consider in a discussion of this question and I do not think I can present it in a better

manner than by the following taken from a letter from Mr. Don R. Almy, Chairman of the Committee on Extension of the Inter-Fraternity Conference, in answer to an inquiry for information on this subject:

The American College Fraternity system is 176 years old; has initiated 700,000 members, of whom half a million still survive. The system is divided into approximately 200 societies with 4,500 chapters located in 660 colleges. Of these, approximately 1,000 chapters belong to the honorary or semi-honorary societies that make little or no effort to maintain homes, rooms, or houses. Of the 3,500 chapters affiliated with the remaining 150 fraternities approximately 2,600 occupy college homes. Approximately 1,100 of these are owned by their occupants and cost about \$21,000,000. The furnishings of the homes that are leased have cost approximately \$3,000,000 more. Nearly 60,000 college men and women are housed under their own roofs and their number is constantly increasing. About 40,000 are initiated each year and about one third are inducted into honorary societies as a mark of approbation for work well done in the class rooms. The majority of these are already members of other fraternities of a social or professional character.

The American College Fraternity was founded when America was a wilderness, has kept pace with the economic and spiritual growth of our people and has furnished them with examples and advice at every step of the way.

Its alumni are leaders of thought and expression in almost every field of activity, particularly in education, government, religion, and the professions. These men have been influenced by the wealth of comradeship they received from their educated leaders whose characters have been molded in an atmosphere of human love and friendship.

The college fraternity has its human ends and purposes. It has come to stay, to progress, to improve with the coming years. As an institution it is human. It has had and still has its faults, but these have been more of methods of application than in its underlying principles. In instances connected with college life it has responded to generous and constructive criticism more quickly and better than the college fraternity system. It still seeks to be never above criticism that is wholesome and constructive. It promises to profit by its errors, to seek to avoid further repetition, and at the same time to serve its members in the colleges with which they are affiliated and their own kind in a wholesome and honorable way.

#### DISCUSSION

It was the general opinion that fraternities had improved greatly during the last four or five years, under the stimulus of the threat of anti-fraternity legislation.

Dean Johnson asked each member of the Conference to give approximately the proportion of fraternity men and sorority women. The following estimate was given:

	Per Cent Men	Per Cent Women
Dean Johnson .....	50	..
Dean Nicholson .....	25	20
Dean Bursley .....	30	20
Dean Ripley .....	25	18
Dean Dyer .....	45	..
Dean Bradshaw .....	45	..
Dean Goodnight .....	30	25-30
Dean Field .....	37	..
Dean Coulter .....	30	40
Dean Melcher .....	26	35
Dean Rosen .....	45	..

The session adjourned for lunch.

## FOURTH SESSION

The afternoon session convened at 1:30, when Dean Bradshaw, University of North Carolina, presented a paper on

### THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE CONTROL OF THE MORAL AND SOCIAL LIFE OF THE STUDENTS

I want to repeat to the group what I said to the President of this Conference when he asked me to read a paper on this subject. I cannot settle the questions raised by the title but there are many who can settle them. However, I doubt if there is anyone that can raise more questions that he cannot settle than I can.

I have tried many ways of getting a running start on this question. I went to the library to see if anyone had written anything that might furnish me a text and an authority. The only thing that I found was a statement by President Gilman, of Johns Hopkins, that the University, as such, was made to deal with mature men and had no responsibility save for their classroom instruction. However, he recognized that the undergraduate college did have such responsibility in the fact that it received immature material. He regarded the combination College and University which we have in America as inferior to the European plan of having the University separate. Johns Hopkins followed this ideal for some time and then expanded its undergraduate department, moved it out of the city, and embarked on all the many enterprises of campus life that it had previously condemned. Why? I have not yet found the answer.

I went back to the starting point and tried for another take off. I talked to some of the members of our own faculty. To tell a long experience briefly, I found three groups or types of opinion. One had no views. One doubted the ability of students to get along without constant supervision in all phases of their life and was sure that the University could not commend itself to the state if it permitted students to have their own free will. The third group was interested in the cafeteria plan of education, said it was the duty of the faculty to be there with the mental nutriment laid out where it could be got. The pearls of academic lore were to be cast forth and the swine could do as they darn please about picking them up. I am not quite fair to this last class. Many really good men in our faculty believe that the University is concerned with the intellect only and that it weakens its position and multiplies its burden when it undertakes to minister to any other side of student life.

Well, it is needless to say that I went back to the starting point once more for another take off. This time instead of asking students I looked back over my own students' reactions and I think that I was fairly typical of my own institution. We talk much about the motive for going to college. I can really give the impulse which sent me to my own University. It so happened that my father was a minister and that one of his churches had given me some scholarships at a denominational college. It also happened that the traveling representative of that college came to talk to me. He told me of its Christian

character, of the wide territory that its students were drawn from, of the high average of character and culture in its student body, and of the intimate relationship that existed between its teachers and students. All of these things made some impression. It also happened that there was a boy in my town that was a student at the University. He pitted his persuasive powers against those of the denominational college representative. He said many things. He told of athletic victories. He showed the size of the catalogue and argued from that to greatness. He said that the student-body was not selected, but like the world outside was made up of all sorts of individuals. But the one thing that has remained vivid in my mind, to this day was his statement that what you did at the University was up to you, that no one was going to nurse you but you would be treated as a man until you showed otherwise and that it was sink or swim. That statement reached down into my eighteen-year old heart and aroused something that was just beginning to stir and that was seeking some place beside the ancestral hearth in which to fight its maiden tourney and achieve its own confidence. I honestly believe that it was this thing and nothing else that carried me to the University and when I got there I found things as I had expected them and liked it.

If you think that I have taken my final position in this matter you are mistaken. This was the position I was in as long as I was a student and I resented any faculty interference. However, after graduation I went back as Y secretary for two years and I discovered that there were numbers of students who had not come to the University on any such divine mission as I had, but had drifted there and were drifting through and would for many years at least be almost entirely dependent on leadership, in the absence of good influence accepting bad. And these men come in hordes to institutions that are not built for them. You gentlemen know better than I the extent to which supervision has been carried in the mid-west, and I am fairly sure that this section excels all others in that respect. Perhaps I can give some new information about the opposite extreme in the South, and I am sure we have come more nearly the *laissez faire* than others. I know a University where there is absolutely no regulation governing fraternities. When I say none I mean exactly that. In that same institution drinking has always been ignored. The 18th Amendment has made no alteration in that policy. The morning after the Easter dances the student, who has danced until he was ready to stop, until dawn if necessary, must go to class, but it is matter of indifference as to whether he goes sober or drunk. That, I suppose, is the limit of non-responsibility for the control of moral and social life. Just think of the wastage of this policy.

That brings me to the effect on my thinking that my present work has had. I see so much of the permanently damaging effects of bad student choices and discover so much inefficiency in student leadership because of its lack of experience and perspective that I find myself constantly tempted to install supervisory systems. Sometimes I have yielded to that temptation. I am learning to go slow.

Well, I still have not answered the question raised. However, we have drawn some circles around it. Now there are some unclassified aspects to the question that I would like to mention. In the first place I am sure that the idea of education as purely intellectual was wrong. Unfortunately the boy is unable to send his mind to college and leave the rest of him at home and as long as he brings his body and soul and character along these are just as

definitely shaped during these formative years as is his mind. No parent or state would absolve the institution of all responsibility for the direction of this other sort of influence. This was recognized in the establishment of our University in 1795 off in the woods so that the students should be free from the distracting influences of the metropolis of 2,000 that was then the state capital, and when a little later, long before anyone dreamed of prohibition, all grog-shops, as they were then called, were forbidden for a radius of five miles about the young University. I am certain that this was a sound principle.

I am certain that the moral and social and political life of the students have, then, an educational value, just as we recognized in the case of the activities. I believe that it is part of the Universities' responsibility to provide a good moral and social environment for the students and when there is a moral leper among the students themselves, to remove him. On the other hand, we must remember that these folks we are training will find no such supervision when they leave the walls of the University. They must, as leaders, construct the environment of their own state, must many times have a higher standard than their community and know how to withstand all sorts of pressure to surrender it. Such knowledge does not come from a hot-house system. That is one more point that I am sure of.

I think that the whole matter comes back to the definition of education. Some recent writer has traced what he calls the dialectic movement in education from the emphasis on the individual and his stimulation to the formal and disciplinary organization of subjects and disciplines. There is certainly some ground for believing that this movement takes place. If the critics of American life and American collegiate education at present are to be believed, we have been in an era of standardization and discipline and must come again to regard the individual as the educational unit in place of the curriculum or subject or standard that we now use to measure educational achievement. If this is true, and I think it is, then our control to be effective must be not only environmental but individual. But that is just the very hardest kind to apply without destroying all initiative. You can manipulate the press, the curriculum, the movies, the saloon without the individual being aware that he is being governed in terms of the matter that goes to make up his motives and attitudes. But these are all standardized processes and they might be perfectly co-ordinated to produce a thousand men a year who all had the same standards of action. But none of these folk would be equipped for leadership. That is one more thing that I am certain of.

One of the members of this group said to me yesterday: "It is often more difficult to get students to do things of their own accord than it is to go ahead and make them do it willy nilly." I think that is undoubtedly true. I think that is one reason we do not try that method more often, and sometimes the only reason. One more point of certainty. If you will permit a stranger to make a criticism, I would like to venture this opinion. The western institutions do not seem to be as confident of the value of student government or the validity of student honor as some of the rest of us. They complain of the lack of student initiative. We have recently had an illustration of student government that will illustrate my criticism. We had much trouble with drinking at dances just after the war. There was much criticism of the dances and of student standards. Some advocated the abolition of the dances, some, more drastic regulation. My predecessor (who held the job one year only), instead of yielding to this pressure, had the faculty committee on dances abolished.



talked the matter over with the students and turned their dances over to them for their own supervision. There was no startling result, although things were much improved.

Gradually student sentiment became aroused on the subject and the German Club, which sponsors all dances, passed a resolution that no student should be admitted to the dances without first signing a pledge on his honor that he would not touch an intoxicant during or for six hours before a dance. This was done in spite of some opposition on the part of the Dean of Students, who foresaw somewhat of a double standard creeping in. However, it absolutely abolished the taint of liquor from our organized social life. I am sure that no faculty action could have been half so effective. But we had to give the boys a little time in which to become worked up to action. Inability to legislate in advance of an abuse is not a special student fault. But a University administration that is determined that nothing shall ever be done by a student which shall reflect discredit on the institution can never afford to wait for this arousal of student sentiment, and any University regulation which antedates this sentiment is definitely bad pedagogy. I am certain of that. It is a question as to whether University Presidents are to be apostles of financial and political safety first. For the Dean of Men cannot withstand pressure from the President, no matter how much he may desire to wait for campus reaction. And many members of the faculty will demand that "something be done." They are not much worried as to whether it be the right thing. They want a show of repressive activity, which in my humble opinion is futile and positively wicked, unless absolutely necessary.

The human race is a curious commodity. The up-to-date trainers of wild animals argue for gentleness. The best-trained horses are probably those turned out by the cavalry and artillery of the United States Army, where no one is allowed to strike an animal and a horse is never "broken." The criminologists of the world are advocating the honor system in our penitentiaries. Yet many of us are unwilling to trust students. Some day we shall work ourselves up to the point of trying, like a science professor at our place who adopted a plan of having the men in a large section report attendance by hanging rings on pegs. He appealed to their honor to be fair and then hid behind the door to watch and see the result. Of course they found out his duplicity and repaid it in kind. Maybe there would have been some cheating for a while. But if it had been allowed to go on a revulsion of feeling would have swept the practice away and honesty would have been an established tradition. I am certain of that because I have seen it happen.

We once had as Dean a man named Marvin Hendrix Stacy who was reported by the students to have said, "I would rather have it said that Marvin Hendrix Stacy did what he said he would do than to be the Governor of North Carolina." I am not sure Mr. Stacy said this. However, I am certain that the characteristic here portrayed represents one of the cornerstones of society, one that we feel the great need of today in many places. I do not think that such individual self-starting integrity is to be produced by training men to do things because they are told to do so or because it is what everybody else is doing. It will come only as the result of the emphasis over a period of years of individual responsibility, self-respect, and self-control. In some ways respect for authority and self-respect are antagonistic. I am certain of that.

I hope out of these many isolated fragments of my own convictions we can find material for a discussion. It may be that we shall be able to arrive

at a well-rounded conclusion. The best I can do is to say that I do think that the University has a responsibility to give its students moral and social education, that that education is to be achieved in part by control, but that such control must, as far as possible, be through motives rather than forces, and through appeal to individual conscience rather than community standards. I am not an advocate of the sink or swim method of dealing with undergraduates, neither do I believe in trying to make it impossible for a man in a University to go to the dogs. I am trying to make it unnecessary for him to have a wreck, and easily possible for him to find someone interested and about to advise, and improbable that he will fail to avail himself of such advice. We still hold that it is good educational policy to allow a man his inalienable right to make an ass of himself, but we constantly exhort him not to exercise it.

#### DISCUSSION

DEAN DYER—Stated that he found that students would not get acquainted with the faculty because they were afraid it would be thought that they were trying to win favor.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Said that he favored free speech for students as the University would not suffer from what the students published.

DEAN COULTER—Thought it would affect the University, since it was his belief that the public held the University responsible for the utterances of students.

Dean Nicholson spoke on "The Rooming House Problem at Minnesota."

#### THE ROOMING HOUSE PROBLEM AT MINNESOTA

Situated as the University of Minnesota is, in a large city, I believe our rooming house problem is materially different from that of other institutions represented here. At only one time—just after the war—have we had real difficulty in housing our students. Students are scattered over an area extending from Lake Minnetonka to St. Paul, a distance of twenty-five miles.

We have few regulations. First, regarding women—no woman may live in a house not approved by the Dean of Women. No men students or any other man are allowed to room in a house where women students room. These regulations have been in effect for some years.

During the past year we have gone further and have established a Housing Bureau whose first responsibility is the inspection of houses as to their sanitary conditions and as to any other conditions they may think advisable. So far as the women are concerned, it is absolutely necessary for the house they live in to be approved by the Housing Bureau. This last is not true in the case of men. A list of approved houses is kept on file and if the men desire to avail themselves of this list they may do so.

A year ago the Board of Regents adopted a regulation to the effect that a student taking a room takes it for a quarter and may not leave without obtaining the approval of the University authorities. There were two chief reasons for this action, (1) the student when registering must give both his home and city addresses. Shifting from one room to another made the addresses on file useless, and (2) there are always numerous disputes between landlady and student with each side appealing to the University to adjust the difficulty.

A student must then remain one quarter in the room he takes at the beginning of that quarter unless he can show that conditions are such that he cannot

do proper work. If he changes his room for any other than an approved reason, he is held for the rent for the balance of the quarter. If a landlady insisted on putting a student out of a room without a satisfactory reason, her name would be removed from our approved list.

Women students must abide by house regulations governing the reception of company, hours, and evenings out. So far there are no defined house rules governing the men other than that they are to conduct themselves as gentlemen.

One new development with us which may interest you is the beginning this year, for men, of the dormitory system. The woman's dormitory houses a hundred women. Developing from that has come the co-operative cottage plan. The woman in charge of the Housing Bureau asked permission to equip four cottages this past year, for men, on the same basis as the woman's co-operative cottages. Each of these houses takes care of ten men, with one central table for the group. I have called at these cottages several times and have found a good spirit among the men. They have the advantages of the fraternity house. Everything is kept in good order—clean, pleasant rooms, piano, and card tables. They get their room and board for less than they can get it outside. Both average about forty dollars a month. The houses pay all expenses, paying first a sinking fund, interest, and reserve. With all these advantages, however, there has not been a time when there has not been a room begging for a tenant. Just why this is true we have been unable to determine.

#### DISCUSSION

DEAN BURSLEY—Showed a form used at Michigan which the landlady may use, stating that the student is to remain in the house a semester. Landladies are advised to use it as it removes misunderstandings. They desire contracts covering a year, but the University feels that students should not be bound for periods longer than a semester.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Also showed a form in use at Wisconsin, distributed to those wishing to rent rooms. It is used by about 25 to 35 per cent of the landladies. If a student pays by the week, he cannot be held for more than a week's rent.

The meeting was adjourned to reconvene Saturday morning.

After the close of the session President Elliott and members of the faculty took the members of the Conference for a drive about the city.

In the evening Dean and Mrs. Coulter entertained the members at dinner at their home. This was the most enjoyable session of the Conference—more topics were discussed and more enthusiasm shown in the discussion than in all of the other sessions combined.

## FIFTH SESSION

The final session of the Conference convened Saturday morning, May 5, at 9:00 a.m.

Dean Stone, University of West Virginia, presented the following paper:

### GUIDANCE ACTIVITIES IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Should the vocations which are open to graduates of a University be studied by University men before graduation? Should the kinds of training needed by those who desire to enter these vocations be analyzed? How many occupations should be investigated by a college man before he chooses the subject in which he will major? How much should the vocational aim, or the life career motive, influence the choice of major studies? These are questions both pertinent and practical in these times of increasing educational costs. They also have a bearing upon the conservation of human resources. They are deserving of special consideration in State Universities which are a part of our great public educational system and are therefore maintained largely by public taxation.

Is it advisable to disseminate among students the facts necessary to make an intelligent choice of a vocation? Should students be assisted in arranging courses of study preparatory to entering the specific vocations chosen? Do they receive that help in sufficient amount now?

That American Universities are awake to the problem is evidenced by their activities in this field. A Committee on Vocational Guidance at Leland Stanford Junior University in 1919 utilized the resources of that great institution for the analysis of nearly two hundred occupations in Commerce, Agriculture, Engineering, Art, Social Service, Journalism, Home Economics, and other fields. These occupations were analyzed from the following points of view: (1) Personal qualifications required, (2) Financial considerations, (3) Attractions of the occupation, (4) Preparation required, (5) Nature of the work, (6) Opportunities for employment, (7) Entering the vocation, etc.

The University of Kansas has issued and distributed to students mimeographed booklets concerning the opportunities and requirements in Advertising, Accounting, Banking, Investments, Metallurgy, Medicine, Municipal Administration, Pharmacy, etc. It has also distributed bulletins on *The Relation of English to the Vocations*, *The Vocational Value of Spanish*, *Vocational Opportunities in the Field of Zoology*, etc.

Oberlin College prepared a booklet giving *Vocational Information for Students*. This booklet, however, dealt largely with literary, professional, and the so-called social service occupations.

Dartmouth College has a Vocational Counselor who works in co-operation with the Associate Dean of the College. A library on occupations is maintained for the use of students. Very complete undergraduate personnel records are maintained.

Northwestern University employs a Director of Personnel in whose office are kept very complete personnel records, including student rating scales, records of personal interviews, vocational inclinations, and personal guidance to students.

Helpful pamphlets for educational activities relating to occupations and giving educational guidance have gone forth from the Graduate School of the State University of Iowa and from the National Research Council in Washington.

Brown University has been a leader in the guidance of undergraduates through orientation lectures. The subjects include: How To Use the Library, Causes of Success and Failure in College, Methods of Study, A College Man's Religion, Engineering, Science, Economics, and Art and Literature.

For several years the University of Montana at Missoula has given Freshmen a course of lectures called, "College Education." These lectures have been given largely by the President and the Dean of Men. They have dealt with: Choosing a Vocation, Choosing Courses, Personal and Mental Efficiency, Loyalty, and How To Study. Other types of educational and vocational guidance at Montana are handled through the Deans of Men and Women with the committee of advisers which is under the chairmanship of the Dean of Men. A student handbook dealing with student conduct and educational guidance is issued.

The University of Washington has a Vocational Secretary with headquarters in Administration Hall. The scope of service includes the collection of data of value in advising undergraduates as to the course they should pursue. It also includes placement service particularly for the members of graduating classes. Four full-time assistants, one outside agent, and special extra help is employed in this work. Last year two thousand people were placed at a total salary of about a million dollars.

Vale University now maintains "a single Freshman class," undifferentiated as to the future intentions of the students. This class has its own separate Dean and faculty. No Freshman classes contain more than twenty-five students. A valuable asset of the Freshman year is the counselor system maintained. The chief job of counselors is "to be at the disposal of youths ready for college life, for counsel and that sort of assistance which the mature can properly render to the immature in their work and their problems of personal development."

An annual conference on vocational information is held at the University of Wisconsin. Literature on vocational opportunities is assembled.

At Ohio State University a Student Committee on Vocational Guidance exists for the dissemination of occupations open to women. This committee makes it a point to keep in the library, and advertise on the library bulletin board, books relating to vocations for women.

Distinctive work has been done at Carnegie Institute of Technology in connection with the examination of students who are looking forward to engineering careers. Tests have been given by which the likelihood of a boy's success in an engineering school has been found in advance, and with a fair degree of reliability. Much work of value has also been done by the Life Insurance Sales Research Bureau, by the Research Bureau for Retail Training, and by the Bureau of Personnel Research. These three bureaus comprise what is known as the Division of Co-operative Research of Carnegie Institute of Technology.

The School of Commerce and Administration of the University of Chicago offers an "individualized curriculum" to each student. The courses vary according to the "past training, present capacities, and contemplated occupation of the student." In order to carry out this plan accurate knowledge concerning each student is obtained, personal qualities rated, and personal records kept as to business and professional experience, reading, occupational preferences, and other relevant facts. While no attempt is made to determine the likelihood of the success of students in various commercial occupations, facts about opportunities are placed before students and help is given to students in the estimating of their own qualities. The University also provides fragmentary units of testing, rating, and follow up. As in other large universities, an appointment bureau for teachers is maintained. Nothing, however, that approaches a complete personnel service is maintained.

Practically all State Universities and many privately endowed colleges have Deans of Men and Deans of Women. West Virginia University in a bulletin just issued says: "The Dean of Men is the contact officer between the administration and the men students of the University. He exercises a friendly supervision over the moral, social, and intellectual life of undergraduates." In the exercise of this friendly supervision personnel record blanks have been prepared and used in the educational, personal, and vocational guidance of students. A beginning has been made looking toward the accumulation of a working library on vocations. Intelligence tests have been given to all Freshmen under the direction of the Department of Education. Articles designed to help students in the difficult task of self-analysis have been printed in the University paper, and in other ways the existing class officer system of guidance has been supplemented and stimulated.

No discussion of collegiate efforts in the field of guidance would be complete without at least mention of the service rendered by the Bureau of Vocational Guidance of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University, the guidance courses offered in Teachers College of Columbia, and the courses recently inaugurated in the University of Chicago. Although the ostensible purpose of these courses has been primarily training of counselors for public schools, many have gained from their research and teaching a basis for success in extending vocational guidance to Colleges and Universities.

No attempt is made in this brief article to review the guidance activities of all higher institutions in this country. An effort has been made to point out types of the varied service that is being rendered. Neither would the writer minimize the splendid personal service of individual instructors in all colleges. Thousands upon thousands of students have been assisted in planning their work and in outlining their courses of study to best advantage. Other thousands have been helped by intelligent service of Heads of Departments, Deans of Colleges, and University Presidents themselves, in the difficult task of getting established in their chosen vocations.

What the writer has sought to do is to present the situation as it is in the hope that all who are interested in the development of Vocational Guidance in American Universities may gain some new ideas, or sources of new ideas. It is also the writer's hope that this brief review may stimulate others to review more completely and more scientifically the guidance activities of the Colleges and Universities of the United States.

At the close of a brief general discussion the Conference by a unanimous vote expressed its appreciation of the kindness and efficiency of Miss Holston, Dean Coulter's secretary, who had acted as secretary during the Conference. Also a rising vote of thanks to Dean and Mrs. Coulter and others who had helped to make the Conference a success.

The Conference adjourned to meet again the following year at the University of Michigan at the invitation of Dean Bursley.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD E. NICHOLSON,  
Secretary