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FOREWORD

According to the U.S. Office of Education, the total college enrollment more than doubled during the 1960s and is expected to increase another 50 percent during the 1970s. Whereas 3.6 million young people attended college in 1960, an estimated 11.4 million students will be seeking higher education in 1980. Contributing to this skyrocketing enrollment are the rapidly expanding community college movement and the push for educational opportunity by the disadvantaged. The recent trend toward open admissions has led to the enrollment of large numbers of students needing special help in adjusting to the collegiate environment. The resulting need for expanded and improved personnel services has placed a severe strain on traditional approaches, making it necessary to devise innovative ways of reaching and helping individual students. One of the most promising new approaches involves the employment of paraprofessionals to provide needed help in adjusting to the college community and its unique personal, social, and academic requirements.

The effectiveness of student-to-student counseling has been amply demonstrated in a variety of roles and settings. Numerous studies have reported the successful employment of student-to-student counseling strategies within residence halls, counseling centers, academic departments, and elsewhere on the college campus. The potential for using peer counselors to facilitate the work of admissions offices, financial assistance offices, student activities centers, student health centers, and other student service agencies has also been recognized. Through its Nancy C. Wimmer Award for 1967, the American Personnel and Guidance Association has recognized and approved the use of such paraprofessionals as advisors to provide "personal, social, and academic guidance within the context of a total college student personnel program."

Student-to-student counseling is a resource existing on any college campus for advising, assisting, and motivating students. As the enrollment crunch increases, junior and senior colleges are turning increasingly to such paraprofessionals for help in providing the personnel services needed by their students. Effective programs, however, will require careful planning and systematic implementation. Job descriptions must be written, requisite competencies must be delineated, and selected students must be trained and supervised. This monograph is directed primarily at personnel workers and others concerned with solving the counseling squeeze through employing peer counselors to fill designated counseling roles. The insights gained from reading it should do much to assure the development of meaningful programs for helping young people deal effectively with the personal, social, and academic problems extant to today's college campus.
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Overview of a Paraprofessional Model

There is little question that higher education currently faces multiple problems. While the sources and solutions of these difficulties are widely and often hotly debated, the basic problem is commonly acknowledged. How do we adequately educate the increasing number of persons who desire a college or university experience in light of tighter budgets and cutbacks in support for post-secondary education? For student services administrators, the problem becomes one of maintaining and expanding service in an era of standstill and decreased budgets.

Student activism in the 1960s brought to light the deficiencies of higher education in a number of painful ways. Student services in particular were forced to look at the often appalling lack of services to meet the needs of specific populations—minorities, women, failing or marginal students, older students, and those who were choosing an alternate life style or career. Even with "mainstream" students, we could hardly be termed wholly successful. The emergence of student initiated and operated crisis centers, renters’ rights organizations, birth control clinics, and legal aid groups pointed to the limited scope of both our thinking and our commitment to the real needs and concerns of students in the college environment.

At the point when perhaps our awareness is most heightened and our commitment renewed, higher education finds itself in trouble. Questions and attacks from legislatures and governing boards reflect the disenchantment of the public. Government grants seem to be drying up in many areas. Every budget is scrutinized and often either carefully or carelessly cut. Entire programs that lack some kind of power base are being eliminated (often without regard for the needs of the students they serve). Numbers of staff positions are frozen at a current or cutback level.

In the midst of these cutbacks, student service staffs continue to read journals that advocate new approaches and expanded horizons and continue to talk with students whose most pressing concerns are minimally, if at all, met by current programs. The frustration mounts. How does one move ahead in such a situation?

No one answer will solve all the difficulties; no one program becomes the panacea. The authors propose, however, utilization of student paraprofessionals as a viable partial answer to the current problem in student services.

The Paraprofessional Movement

We are living in what Riessman (1967) has termed the "nonprofessional revolution," in which over 150,000 paraprofessional positions have been established in the country as a result of anti-poverty and related legislation. This movement has developed as a response to the shortage of professionally trained personnel and a shortage of funding for such personnel, in the face of steadily growing demands for services. It has further developed as a response to demands by "client groups," such as students, for greater participation in the service function. There has also been increased questioning concerning the ability of professionals to work effectively with specific populations (McLennan et al. 1966).

Studies involving the use of paraprofessionals, which have generally had positive results, have been reported widely in the literature since the mid-sixties. Paraprofessional personnel have been found effective with chronic mental patients (Appleby 1963; Beck, Kantor & Gelineau 1963; Corkhuff & Truax 1965; ellsworth 1968), with emotionally disturbed children (Stollak 1968; Tolor 1968), in schools (Cowen, Zax & Laird 1966), and in
community and anti-poverty programs (Gartner 1969).

In one sense, we can say that the paraprofessional idea has been around for quite a while in higher education. Long-established departments, such as housing, have relied heavily on lesser trained persons, such as housemothers, to implement their programs. Students have conducted campus tours during orientation, ushered at campus events, and played similar roles for decades. These services were generally offered on a volunteer basis.

Following World War II, as specialized agencies such as counseling centers spread rapidly, little systematic provision was made for student participation. In many of these agencies undergraduate students had no place at all, in terms of either output or input. Students, often members of service or honorary groups, continued to help orient new students to campus, to usher at college events, and to provide similar services under professional direction. But the door to any meaningful participation largely remained closed.

An exception to this might be seen in housing programs, in which undergraduates were increasingly recruited and trained to perform administrative and counseling functions in residence halls. Not until the turbulent sixties, with students demanding an opportunity to participate in all aspects of university functioning, were systematic attempts made to involve students in the development and implementation of student services programs. Chapters dealing with specific services will detail how and to what extent this participation has been actualized up to the present time.

Studies have been undertaken to examine the effectiveness of student paraprofessionals in several settings. Zunker and Brown (1966) used professional and student counselors in residence halls. Both the professional counselor-led and the student counselor-led groups were successful in communicating information about effective study procedures, as measured by a comparison of test-retest differences. However, student-counseled freshmen evaluated the counseling program significantly higher, and this group also earned higher grades and had fewer residual study problems.

Wolff (1969) reported that groups led by selected residence hall personnel (student paraprofessionals) can favorably affect the interpersonal relationships of freshmen. Archer (1972) reported success in using trained undergraduate paraprofessionals as leaders of interpersonal communication skills training groups.

There are also a number of program reports currently appearing in the literature that generally applaud the use of student paraprofessionals as student services workers, although statistical evaluation is not yet available. One of these (Wrenn & Mencke 1972) described the use of undergraduates as group leaders-counselors in psychology classes. In another article, Tucker, Mengenly, and Vigil (1970) outlined their success in using students as telephone crisis center workers. Pyle and Snyder (1971) reviewed their program using students as paraprofessional counselors in junior colleges.

Students were functioning in some paraprofessional counseling-helper role in student services on 67 of 100 university campuses surveyed by Zunker and Brown (1966). Strong approval for use of paraprofessionals in counseling and related services was found by Crane and Anderson (1971) and Geer (1971). Tasks most favored by administrators for performance by paraprofessionals in both of these studies were tutoring, freshman orientation, help with study problems, testing, research aid, emergency telephone services, and counseling students with college adjustment difficulties. McCarthy (1970) proposed the use of upperclassmen in selected counseling situations on campus; Walz (1970) discussed services that can be offered by the student paraprofessional, including college readiness programs, a student ombudsman office, and a student-staffed counseling center.

**Definition**

Who or what is a paraprofessional? The term has been expanded to include everyone from the untrained student who volunteers to show new freshmen around the campus to the BA-level persons who undergo up to two years of additional training. Thus, the term is about as definitive today as is the word "professional." For purposes of our model, a paraprofessional is defined as a person without extended professional training who is specifically selected, trained, and given ongoing supervision to perform some designated portion of the tasks usually performed by the professional. This does not include offering of support services, e.g., clerical, as the major function. The paraprofessional is involved in the central activity of the agency with which he is associated, e.g., counseling, orientation, etc. He is employed to work in a specific area for which he is qualified because of his specific skills. He is generally a member of the indigenous population, or the population being served. In higher education, he is therefore a student, undergraduate or graduate.

Although a nonstudent can validly be termed paraprofessional in a higher education setting when he meets the other requirements of the definition, the fullest actualization of the paraprofessional concept requires that he be a member of the student group. This aspect will be more fully explored as the rationale is discussed. The paraprofessional generally receives some remuneration for his services.
Role Rationale

Our model defines a three-pronged role for the student paraprofessional:

1. Continued offering of service at reduced cost. The work of available professionals can be expanded by hiring paraprofessionals to take over part of the job, thereby freeing professionals for more appropriate tasks.
2. More effective offering of service through special skills and identification with peers.
3. Regular, systematic input into the system by members of the population served.

The First Role

The professional service in any agency includes elements that can be performed by persons with less training or specialized training in specific areas. The first job for an agency considering use of paraprofessionals is to decide specifically what these elements are. This can be approached in three somewhat overlapping ways:

1. Break down the job of each professional and list tasks that could be performed by someone with less training and expertise.
2. Look at the agency and list agency tasks or services that could be performed by persons with less than professional training and expertise.
3. Look at the population served by the agency and ascertain needs that are not being met. Some of these may lead to experimental or pilot projects that could rely heavily on paraprofessional personnel for implementation, at least in the early stages.

The paraprofessional is not a “cheap professional.” He cannot and should not be expected to assume all the tasks performed by the professional. Brown (1972) warns of the dangers to the whole concept of student services as a profession should this happen. Therefore, to hire a student and send him forth to “do something” about a particular situation is to almost certainly doom the project to failure. Students come to the paraprofessional position with certain specific skills or with background and readiness to learn such skills. Only if the agency recognizes this and fits person to skill can it expect the professional-paraprofessional team to jell and the program to succeed. This does not exclude the paraprofessional’s having skills superior to the professional’s in certain areas. However, the overall competence and responsibility level to be found in a professional is generally not expected in the paraprofessional.

There is both great promise and danger in using the paraprofessional to try out a new program to see if such an activity will really fly. On the one hand, this can be a good use of the additional manpower offered by the paraprofessional. However, many programs die because they are poorly conceptualized and implemented at the start, not because there is no need for such a program. A much-needed service left totally in the hands of the student paraprofessional may flounder and eventually fail. It is therefore recommended that a professional-paraprofessional team work on such a project, using the talents of each where most appropriate. Paraprofessional-initiated pilot projects may have their best chance of success in programs that serve students directly and involve other students in the offering of the service (e.g., crisis centers).

Additional Roles

The second and third statements regarding a role model for the paraprofessional draw heavily on the Office of Economic Opportunity idea of “service to indigenous people by indigenous people,” which was incorporated into anti-poverty programs. Here the concept is extended to the college or university setting where the student is the indigenous person. Students are asking—in many cases demanding—an opportunity to have some voice in the offering of services on campus. The paraprofessional program offers the chance for students to be involved in both output and input in student services.

Penny (1970) questions the paraprofessional function in a setting in which the paraprofessionals would carry out routine student personnel tasks while professionals become “student development specialists” who implement innovative programs and services. The warning should be heeded. Oetting (1969) and Hurst and Ivey (1971), among others, have spoken to the need for student services that will integrate practice with research and training in such a way that these services will create in each student an ability to productively use his college experience. In such a model, the student services function must provide for a number of roles, among them consultant, trainer, and facilitator, along with the more traditional administrative and counseling functions. Paraprofessionals must play an integral part in each of these functions in order for the role rationale to be actualized. If a cooperative model cannot be established, paraprofessionals may well fall into the trap of being “extra hands” in the office, deprived of the opportunity to offer service to their peers and to have an impact on the system in which they are employed.

The second role for the student paraprofessional, more effective offering of service through special skills and identification with peers, speaks to the output function. The student offers his particular skills and talents to develop, implement, and evaluate programs. He may be particularly useful in a number of ways in this total process. However, as a program implementor involved in the offering of service directly to other students, he has special
value. He is proof that the "system" can allow students to operate on the giving as well as receiving end of services. In addition, some studies have shown (Zunker & Brown 1966), and many of us suspect, that students can be more effective than professionals in the offering of specified services to their peers.

The third role, that of giving regular, systematic input into the system, is usually the last to develop in a system. That is, agencies often move to a paraprofessional program because it appears to be an inexpensive and effective way to extend services. However, as student paraprofessionals interact with professionals, with other students, with the agency, and with the institution in general, they begin to have some definite input about what is happening. Their input is often offered first at the level of the program in which they are involved. They begin to raise questions about organization, about the delivery system, and so forth. Later, they raise questions about the service itself. Why isn't the agency doing anything about such-and-such a problem? Why are staff meetings conducted in such-and-such a manner? And so on. They also give input about who students think professionals are, about the impact our services are having on students, and about how our agency is evaluated on the campus. Professionals can, of course, shut all this off and insist that paraprofessionals concentrate on output. However, when this is done, a valuable force for systematic and productive change is lost. Professionals bewail the irresponsibility of students who criticize but have nothing to suggest short of revolution. Paraprofessionals, working within the system, are involved in trying to offer viable programs to meet the needs of their peers. They can be very effective change agents in student services systems if professionals will listen to their input and give their ideas a chance.

A word of warning is in order here, however. It is suggested that the output and input roles be mutually compatible and that they are best used in tandem. It has sometimes been the policy of administrators to use students for input only, in the sense of providing information about radical activity or other student "happenings" about which the administrator wishes to be informed. The student in this case rarely has the identification with the service and the involvement with programs that allow him to evaluate the input and make decisions about how it should be used. Also, he can nullify the entire model by being seen as an administrative "tool."

Additionally, if the input is to be comprehensive, the student paraprofessionals should be drawn from diverse backgrounds and life styles. This is often very difficult to accomplish but can be a goal to be worked toward if the input function is truly valued. If only Anglo, middle-class males ranging in age from 19 to 21 are hired, it should be no surprise that their input does not reflect the concerns of minorities, women, or other populations on campus.

Thus, it is suggested that the most propitious structure provides as diverse a paraprofessional group as feasible and that these students (a) be involved in the output function in order to offer service and to better understand the actual working and problems of student services and (b) be involved in the input function in order to collaborate with professionals on the goal of bringing about productive change in student services on the college campus.

The Graduate Assistant

In some ways, the role of the graduate assistant in student services and that of the paraprofessional may overlap. However, there are definite points of separation. The graduate student is involved in a specific agency or service for a designated amount of time in order, primarily, to facilitate his own learning. He may possibly fulfill all three aspects of the paraprofessional role function during this time, though it is more likely that he will fill the first two roles at best.

Some graduate students in a student personnel curriculum have become paraprofessionals. This generally involves their having short-term experiences in various agencies while they function concurrently as paraprofessionals in one area on an ongoing basis.

Benefits to the Paraprofessional

The student paraprofessional's contribution to student personnel services has previously been delineated. One of the major arguments in favor of such a program is the positive effects it has on the paraprofessionals themselves. These experiences allow a number of students a unique opportunity to better realize in their own lives the goals that higher education holds out to students.

A number of benefits have been reported by students as a result of their participation in a paraprofessional program. These will be discussed specifically in chapters dealing with the individual services and in the chapter reporting the experiences of the authors at Colorado State University. Generally, one or more of the following benefits has accrued to student paraprofessionals and can be seen as goals for programs:

1. Satisfaction in feeling that students have an opportunity to get involved and make changes in the system.
2. Increased feeling of self-worth and confidence, which can lead to greater interpersonal and skill competence and satisfaction.
3. Increased competence in specific skill areas.
4. Increased interest and participation in classes, often resulting in higher GPAs.
5. Increased contact with key persons in the college community, which often leads to other opportunities.
6. Work experience providing exploration of alternate vocational/educational goals that can result in change of major field of study or increased commitment to present field.
7. Skills and references that have greatly facilitated admittance to graduate school.
8. Skills and references that have allowed some paraprofessionals to move into career positions with BA degrees.

**Finances**

Just as the professional demands some tangible reward for his services, so should the paraprofessional. If the student is to be considered an integral part of an agency and if he is to contribute his services on a regular basis, it seems appropriate that he be paid for his work. This is important from the point of view of both the student and the agency. First, many students must provide some part of their own support. It would be difficult, to say the least, for a student to contribute his time in student services and also try to study and work in another job. If payment is eliminated, the pool of potential paraprofessionals is limited to those who can afford to volunteer time.

Some consider the giving of academic credit a viable form of remuneration. This appears more acceptable in terms of training, however. Offering academic credit for the training portion of the program is recommended when feasible and when the quality and quantity of training merits the credit.

It seems that the best use of student paraprofessionals requires that they be able to work in the agency a reasonable number of hours per week (5 to 20) and that they hopefully remain in the position for at least one academic year. This requires, in most cases, that they be paid for their services. It is sometimes possible to devise alternate, long-term forms of remuneration. Provision of room and board to paraprofessionals or use of tuition waivers are two fairly common methods.

**The Definition and the Model**

We have discussed the use of students in student services in broad terms but have used a very explicit definition of the paraprofessional. We have said that he should be selected, trained, evaluated, and given supervision, that he should perform specified central student services functions that are generally part of the work of the professional, that he should be a student, and that he should be paid for his work.

We have eliminated from our definition the nonstudent, the untrained student who contributes occasional work, the student involved in a support service such as typing or keypunching, and the student volunteer in the crisis center or other student-operated service. Each of these persons can and does make valuable contributions. They can be included, in a broad way, as some part of the paraprofessional movement. However, we are committed to the model outlined here, with three essential and interlocking roles for the paraprofessional in higher education. All these roles appear necessary if the paraprofessional movement is to realize its potential as a positive force in solving the problems confronting student services. It seems that only those who merit the term paraprofessional, as we have defined it, will be able to perform the functions needed to maintain the best of what has been developed in student services and to move in the new directions that challenge us today.

**Potential: A Look Ahead**

Higher education has barely begun to tap the potential of students as an implementation and change force. Experimentation with use of students as co-workers in the student personnel services area is widespread and appears to be growing. Where we currently are, however, seems far from where we might better be in order to realize the full power of this resource.

There are probably many programs and services in which a student may appropriately never encounter a professional, but could interact solely with paraprofessional staff. There are undoubtedly innovative areas of service on almost every campus that paraprofessionals could be the main force in establishing and that could be implemented by student volunteers or students doing field work. There are decisions made and policies enacted in which paraprofessionals could have valuable and needed input.

In the chapters dealing with specific services, we will attempt to be more concrete and to offer suggestions as to how the paraprofessional resource could, and hopefully will, be more creatively and productively used in that service.

We must heed the warnings of Penny (1970) and Brown (1972), however, and not attempt to fit the paraprofessional into a stereotyped role from which he cannot escape. The paraprofessional will inevitably be confined to a stereotyped role if the professional is similarly trapped. Brown (1972) discussed possible roles for the student personnel worker and described essential elements of an ideal role model. He would have student personnel workers give up
their claim to being the only ones concerned about total student development, become less paternalistic, develop direct ties with the academic area, and adopt a role as behavioral scientists. He further advocates some type of direct contact with every student.

If we can begin to unlock traditional professional roles in order to better facilitate the student's development, we can hopefully also develop meaningful roles for paraprofessionals. The danger is there. The paraprofessional movement on campus can founder in locked-in, traditional, nonrelevent jobs that are seen by students as further extensions of a paternalistic and dehumanizing establishment. The alternative involves changes in and restructuring of the professional role and the inclusion of the student paraprofessional as an involved and valued co-worker.
Selection: The Position and the Paraprofessional

Selection is a key variable for achieving success in a paraprofessional program. It is the foundation on which the components of training, performance, and evaluation are built. Selection is a two-stage process that involves (a) choice of positions that are clearly paraprofessional in nature and (b) choice of persons who can optimally fulfill the requirements of these positions and of the total program.

A number of paraprofessional programs have failed because little or no consideration was given to the tasks or functions of the position. Until this is clearly delineated, it is impossible either to determine skills needed by the paraprofessional or to evaluate effectiveness.

Stage I: The Position

The process of selecting positions may originate within an agency that wishes to use one or more paraprofessionals for various positions or to employ a number of persons in one type of position (e.g., student assistants in residence halls). The position selection process may also be initiated by a central authority such as an administrator or specific committee. Such a committee might consist of a coordinator, professionals, and paraprofessionals and might be charged with the responsibility of setting up and coordinating the paraprofessional program on campus. The various agencies would be requested to submit applications for paraprofessional positions to the committee, which would then decide which positions merit implementation.

The following guidelines are appropriate in either situation.

1. A systematic procedure for selection of positions should be established. A judgment must be made about the suitability of the position for paraprofessional staffing. If funding is limited, only a few potentially viable positions can be chosen. Even when funding is not a problem, no position should be accepted without careful review. Not all agencies are ready to effectively use paraprofessionals; not all positions are well thought out and ready for implementation. Therefore, in order to maximize the success potential of the paraprofessional resource, it is important to have procedures and guidelines for reviewing positions to determine their suitability.

   It is recommended that the selection process include input from a variety of professionals and paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals need to be included in all stages of the program development. Since paraprofessionals work directly in the program area, they can often be more accurate than professionals in judging the feasibility of a proposal. If the program is new and has not been staffed by paraprofessionals, inclusion of interested student volunteers in the review process is suggested.

2. The position described should involve the paraprofessional as an integral part of the major or central function of the agency. This function, in student services, would mean some role in the development, implementation, and evaluation of programs offered to students on campus. Hopefully, the paraprofessional could be involved in all three of these areas with one program. Although the implementation role is vital and probably the one with which the paraprofessional spends the most time, he should also be allowed input into further program development and evaluation.

3. A specific, clear job description should be written. Before a paraprofessional is employed, it is important for everyone concerned to know what this person is going to be doing. This helps to ease any staff anxieties concerning threats to professional competence and to traditional role definitions. More importantly, it gives both professionals and paraprofessionals a basis for negotiating their relationship and mutual tasks and responsibilities. This
description will change over time, as the paraprofessional becomes more skilled and the program develops and changes. Such change is often fairly rapid, especially in cases in which paraprofessionals are used to initiate new services.

If the job description is sufficiently specific and clear, paraprofessionals can begin to work on the easiest or lowest-level tasks immediately. Students are generally quite anxious and insecure at the beginning of their paraprofessional experience. Having certain definite tasks to perform helps them to become more at ease in the situation and to become quickly acquainted with the agency and its services. It also helps to more clearly define the service role of the paraprofessional.

4. Qualities and skills necessary for the position should be specified. Specific positions require specific skills. It is important that these be determined and clearly specified. It often helps to list all the qualities and skills that would be relevant and desirable in a paraprofessional who is hoping to fill a particular position. These skills and qualities can then be rank-ordered in terms of necessity and desirability, since no one applicant is likely to possess every desirable quality. It may also be helpful to determine which skills are needed at the time of selection and which can be taught to the paraprofessional during preservice and inservice training.

5. Arrangements regarding training, supervision, and evaluation must be specified. If the selection program is administered by a committee, training, supervision, and evaluation elements may already have been worked out and simply need to be understood and agreed to by the agency or person submitting the request for a position. If not, these arrangements should be spelled out in the position request. It is especially important to have a specific individual named as supervisor for the paraprofessional and at least minimum supervision contacts indicated in order to provide ongoing support and consultation.

Stage II: The Paraprofessional

Once a position has been clearly defined and instituted, the next step is to find the most appropriate person to fill the position. A number of issues need to be considered in this process. It is important that selection be an open process; students with diverse interests and background should have a chance to compete for positions. Qualifications should be clearly spelled out; selection procedures should include a variety of methods by which the applicant can demonstrate his skills; and placement within the program needs to be sensitively implemented.

Active Recruitment

How does the potential paraprofessional find out that such an opportunity exists? While capable persons may be found using word of mouth to an "in" group, the types of paraprofessionals included are thus limited and the range of input needlessly reduced. Agencies also leave themselves open to criticism that they have created another closed system.

Every effort should be made to advertise the program and specific positions as widely as possible on campus. One method is to make periodic presentations, well advertised in advance, to interested students. At such meetings, students can also be given information about programs and activities on campus in which they could participate in order to develop the skills that would enable them to apply later for a paraprofessional position. Additional methods include classified advertisements in the campus paper, posters, and notification of faculty in key departments.

One technique that has been successful, however the program is organized, is to designate one or more persons whom students could contact for information or applications. A central file of completed applications can then be kept on hand in order to assure a ready supply of personnel for positions to be filled.

In some cases, it would be worthwhile to aim publicity at and seek paraprofessionals from the specific groups who would be served by a program. Minority students and older students may be two such groups.

General Qualifications

Beyond skills that are needed for specific positions, it is important to define some general qualifications or characteristics that all paraprofessionals should possess. Many times, professionals' ideas of such qualifications seem to be operating in the way they select students for paraprofessional positions, but these criteria are rarely made explicit. Perhaps one problem here is that many of these qualifications are difficult to define and specify and thus more difficult to determine than are the specific skills.

As an attempt to better define qualifications, the following are suggested as some qualities or characteristics that might be considered appropriate for all student paraprofessionals. These are not hard and fast rules, but merely characteristics that have been found useful and appear to be worth presenting.

1. The student should have sufficient experience with the institution, so that he can help others to find their place or make changes. This usually implies that the student be a junior or senior in a four-year school or a sophomore in a two-year institution. In all but the most exceptional cases it takes several years to develop both the maturity and specific skills needed to perform adequately all parts of the paraprofessional function.

An exception to this may be the older student who
has gained wider experience outside the college environment. Graduate students may make excellent paraprofessionals, but their input function may be limited unless they have some identification with concerns of undergraduate students or their position allows them to offer service to graduate students. Students who are doing graduate work at the same institution in which they were also undergraduates may be able to provide this input. However, this could be another case of "inbreeding." The student with undergraduate experience at another institution can bring a new perspective to the program. In any case, we recommend that the majority of paraprofessionals be undergraduates in order to maximize the potential for peer identification in the offering of service and for more relevant input regarding student concerns and needs.

2. The student should possess an amount of interpersonal competence and communication skill that allows him to deal effectively with a variety of individuals and groups. This qualification can be restated in a number of ways. What is being presented is the ability to come across to some variety of persons and to be able to do so on a one-to-one basis or in a group.

Assessment on a Carrhuff-type communication scale should give an accurate picture of the applicant's ability to deal empathically and respectfully with others and to help them in self-exploration, understanding, and movement toward problem solution (Carrhuff 1969). Other techniques, such as microcounseling (Ivey 1971), can help determine the student's ability to attend and listen to others. Group simulations can be used to assess the applicant's skills in working effectively with a number of other students at one time.

3. The student should be minimally able to cope with ambiguity and stress. These variables appear to be inherent in the paraprofessional position, especially at the beginning. Riessman (1967) has defined the paraprofessional as "the marginal man." It seems apparent that the paraprofessional moving into his new role will have to deal with the ambiguity and stress of his position, which is somewhere between the world of the student and that of the professional.

This skill can be assessed through a review of previous situations in which the applicant has dealt with ambiguity and stress. A simulated group experience with these factors built in can indicate which applicants are able to move on with the task and which are immobilized or show inappropriate behaviors under conditions of stress and uncertainty.

4. The student must be minimally able to organize his daily life. Even the most skilled person will not fully succeed in the paraprofessional position unless he can satisfactorily balance his classes, his paraprofessional job, and his social life. The student who cannot remember appointments, is consistently late for work, or leaves work half-done will do the agency and the paraprofessional function more harm than good—even if he does occasionally do a brilliant job. The "over-committed" student who is involved in everything on campus will most probably have problems in functioning effectively as a paraprofessional when his tasks and obligations begin to pile up.

5. Finally, the student must understand and be able to work within the philosophy of student services that is held in his college or university, as well as the philosophy of his specific agency. This does not mean he must blindly accept the whole philosophy nor that he will not work for changes in the system. One goal of the model presented is systems change through paraprofessional input. But a student who is totally alienated from the systems, goals, and philosophy will be at best only able to fight with professionals. General agreement of direction and purpose between professional and paraprofessionals thus appears necessary if productive service is to be achieved.

Selection Procedures

Valid selection procedures necessitate job descriptions that are clear and precise. It is necessary not just to select, but to select for a particular position.

A selection process based on general characteristics may be set up. With this procedure, subsequent selection for a specific position might more properly be termed placement. In other situations, applicants apply for a specific position and are evaluated both on general characteristics and specific job skills.

There are advantages and disadvantages in each method; either could be workable. It is recommended that paraprofessionals or other students have an integral part in both a general and specific selection process. It also seems essential that the professional who will supervise the student have a good amount of input, perhaps the final decision, regarding who will work with him.

To accurately evaluate applicants in terms of both general and specific criteria, one would probably need to go beyond the standard one-to-one interview. The New Careers Movement, a major development in the use of paraprofessional personnel (Pearl & Riessman 1965), has developed some strategies that can be implemented on campus. New Careers offers employment and concurrent education as a way out of poverty. The program developers clearly articulate the necessity for a close tie between selection procedures and the job to be done. Training is mainly of the inservice type (as it is in many paraprofessional programs), so that New
Careerists begin to function on the job with little preservice training. It is, therefore, important to select those who possess at least the minimum skills needed for the position.

Among the techniques developed in New Careers has been an extensive use of roleplaying in a close-to-real situation. In some cases, actual recipients of the agency's service are hired to take part in simulation and interview experiences and then give feedback to the agency regarding the performance of the applicant. Either paraprofessionals or selected students could serve as the "client" in a campus situation. The roleplay situations can be devised to evaluate interpersonal skills and ability to deal with stress, as well as specific skills. Such a technique emphasizes the abilities of the person who is better at "doing" than talking about how to do it.

Riessman (1967) also advocates a group interview procedure in which one or more interviewers meet with several applicants for paraprofessional positions. This is a way of observing how potential paraprofessionals interact with peers rather than just with agency representatives.

In one New Careers program (Willcox 1970), persons were hired for a short period of time to complete a needed survey. Those who were most highly evaluated in this short-term job were hired as permanent members of the paraprofessional staff. A variation of this in the college setting is the use of evaluations from an applicant's volunteer experience on campus. One problem here is that it is difficult to compare effectiveness in a wide variety of experiences. Requiring a uniform, brief, volunteer experience of each applicant would generate data on how each applicant performed and also how his work compared to that of other applicants. In some programs, applicants for a paraprofessional position are required to have been a volunteer worker in the same or a similar program.

Another promising development for evaluation of interpersonal effectiveness is found in the work of Carkhuff (1969). He has defined as a selection principle the idea that the best index of whether a person will be helpful to another is his current functioning as a helping person. He uses scales of discrimination and communication in selecting those who will receive further training. The scales are based on his research with the facilitative and action-oriented dimensions relevant in the helping process. These include such areas as empathy, respect, and confrontation. Carkhuff advocates the selection of those who are currently rated as "most helpful" on the scales, since these persons have the most potential for development. He points out the importance, however, of having trainers who are functioning at higher levels than are the trainees.

Each of Carkhuff's scales consists of the same 16 helpee excerpts, that is, brief statements made by persons seeking aid. They deal with a variety of content and feeling areas. On the communication index, the helper formulates his own response to the excerpt. On the discrimination index, four possible responses are given and the applicant is asked to rate each on a scale from one to five. The applicant is thus attempting to discriminate between good and poor responses.

Some work has been done with use of personality inventories as a selection instrument. Such instruments, if used at all, would perhaps serve best to screen out the more unsuitable candidates.

### Placement

If selection has been implemented for a specific position, then placement is synonymous with that task. In situations in which a fairly large number of students are chosen for a position (e.g., orientation counselor), some attention must be given to placement. The abilities and interests of each paraprofessional need to be further evaluated. This process should include input from the professional staff as well as from the paraprofessionals involved. Some programs leave the entire decision up to paraprofessionals, who then work with the position options as a group. This can be very satisfactory as long as the professional staff is willing to live with the decisions made.

### Selection of Trainers and Supervisors

Carkhuff (1969) has articulated the principle that only those trainers who communicate at higher levels than their trainees will be able to effect growth and learning in the trainees. These ideas can be applied beyond work with Carkhuff's core dimensions. If paraprofessionals with interpersonal skills, ability to deal with stress, and specific skills are selected, then what kind of professionals are needed? The following qualifications are suggested for those who would work as trainers and supervisors of student paraprofessionals.

1. The professional needs to be interested in the program and open to working with students as co-helpers in his program. Imposition of a paraprofessional on a professional who does not believe that the position or program can be viable will greatly hinder success.

2. The trainer-supervisor should be open, flexible, and able to listen to the paraprofessional. Changes in whatever system is initially set up are inevitable. It is important that the professional be able to move and switch directions when this seems appropriate. Though the need for new directions may be articulated by the paraprofessional, it is also desirable for the professional to be able to sense what is happening and propose an alternate direction when appropriate.
3. The trainer-supervisor should be able to organize his own work and lay down an organizational framework within which the paraprofessional can function. This is especially vital to the paraprofessional during training and during the first weeks on the job. The paraprofessional needs to relate to a model, someone who can meet job and time commitments, in order to develop these skills himself.

4. The trainer-supervisor should be more skilled than the paraprofessional in any skill he attempts to teach. If this is not true, the paraprofessional will not develop maximum skill. Supervisors and trainers can hopefully acknowledge their own limitations and allow their paraprofessionals to learn certain skills from other persons. The competent trainer-supervisor does not have to be all things to his paraprofessional.

Basic Principles

Basic selection remains the foundation on which a viable program is built. Principles of effective selection can be reviewed:

1. Select only positions whose descriptions involve the paraprofessional in the central functions of the agency and are specific and clear regarding his responsibilities.

2. Set up both general and job-specific qualifications for paraprofessional positions.

3. Include both professionals and paraprofessionals in the selection process.

4. Utilize selection procedures that allow the applicant to demonstrate what he can do, not just what he can talk about.

5. Select trainer-supervisors who can serve as appropriate models.
CHAPTER 3

Training:
The Potential Actualized

Relevant training goes hand in hand with appropriate selection in the development of effective paraprofessionals. Careful selection usually makes the training task more fruitful and more easily accomplished, but even ideal selection conditions do not eliminate the need for training.

Overview and Goals

Training is an ongoing process that seeks to build the competence and confidence necessary for successful job performance. Paraprofessional training programs range from very limited to very elaborate ones and use a wide variety of methods and techniques.

Riessman and Carkhuff have emphasized the importance of training in paraprofessional programs, both to eliminate negative habits and to teach positive, helping responses. Riessman (1967) notes that while trainees bring many positive skills and values to human services positions, these persons may well possess characteristics that would prevent them from becoming effective helpers and facilitators. He sees training as having the vital role of eliminating or controlling these negative characteristics in prospective paraprofessionals. Carkhuff (1971) says that "without the systematic selection and training of the participants, effective programs cannot be developed and implemented [p. 148]." He has reported a number of studies demonstrating marked improvement of paraprofessionals in the core dimensions of the helping relationship as a result of his training methods.

The New Careers movement has developed a basic rationale and methodology for the training of indigenous paraprofessionals. Much of this work is easily transferable to the college campus by substituting students for indigenous paraprofessionals in the New Careers model. Therefore, many of the training concepts discussed in this chapter are based on New Careers publications, offered through the New Careers Training Laboratory (1968, 1969, 1971a, 1971b).

Training Components

Training programs for paraprofessionals should include two primary components. Generalist or core training is the first component. This area involves those knowledges and skills that are essential for all members of the paraprofessional group, including "community building," organizational-administrative topics, policies and procedures, ethical issues, and interpersonal relationship skills.

Community building attempts to develop a sense of "group" among the paraprofessionals. This will allow them to use each other as consultants and to see the entire group as a support system as they move out into their specific job placements.

Ethical issues, such as confidentiality, must be covered before the paraprofessional works in a student services agency. The use of information about other students is a critical area in which the paraprofessional must accept and act in accordance with professional standards.

Job-specific skills are the second training component. These are the skills and knowledge that each paraprofessional needs in order to function in his individual position. Interviewing skills and behavior modification techniques are included here. Information concerning the development of the current position and operating practices will also help each trainee to understand where he fits in the program and to avoid mistakes that may have been made by his predecessors.
The Training Process

Each required skill needs to be carefully taught to trainees. The following steps are used in the teaching of these skills and can be adapted to various training methodologies.

Basic Steps

1. Break the skill down into small, sequential steps.
2. Explain the goals and method of training the skill. Tell the trainees what will be taught and why.
3. Describe the first step in learning the skill.
4. Demonstrate the first step.
5. Give trainees a chance to try the step, either through roleplaying or an experience with a "real" situation.
6. Give specific feedback to trainees regarding their progress (from trainer or other trainees).
7. Repeat Step 5; another chance to try the first step.
8. Give feedback.
9. Repeat process until trainees have minimum ability to perform first step.
10. Discuss process so far with trainees.
11. Continue, using the same practice-feedback process with remaining steps in the skill.

Breaking the skill down is often the most difficult part of applying this general model. When done well, however, it can be equally effective with mechanical and interpersonal skills.

Example of the Basic Steps

An example of this process, using teaching of the feedback model, might be as follows:

1. The skill of using constructive feedback can be broken down into these steps:
   a. Person giving feedback states his point, making sure it is specific, deals with his own feelings, and is directed toward a changeable behavior.
   b. Person receiving feedback tells sender what he has heard. Sender agrees and they proceed, or disagrees and Step "a" is repeated until the message as sent is the message as received.
   c. Receiver tells sender how he feels about the feedback, how he reacts to it.

At this point, additional feedback can be given by the sender, or feedback given by receiver, or the two persons go on to deal with issues raised by the feedback.

2. The purpose of using the feedback model, specifically in the supervisor-supervisee relationship, is discussed with the trainees. The requirements for constructive feedback are outlined and examples are given.

3. The first step, giving an item of feedback, is discussed in more detail. It is emphasized that feedback should (a) be specific; (b) deal with feelings of the sender (that is, how he is affected by the action of the receiver); and (c) be directed toward a changeable behavior in the receiver.

Trainees are told they will work in groups of three and that each person in the triad will have the opportunity to send feedback, to receive feedback, and to play the role of consultant. The consultant will make sure that sender and receiver are following the model. Trainees will give real feedback to each other.

4. At this point, the group is asked to break up into sets of three and decide who will play each of the designated roles in the first round. The trainer will then take the sender role and demonstrate one or more examples of constructive feedback (e.g., "Polly, I feel very shut out when you lie down on the floor and close your eyes during our discussions").

5. Trainees try to give constructive feedback. The consultant in each triad verifies whether the feedback meets the criteria.

6. Consultant in each group tells sender how his feedback came across.

7. The sender tries again, with the same or another feedback item.

8. Consultant tells sender how he did this time.

9. Generally, for this step, two attempts are enough for most senders to give a reasonably constructive feedback message.

10. Trainer will take several minutes to see how triad members feel about process so far.

11. Step "b," or re-stating by the receiver, is presented and practiced. Steps 1 through 10 are used again for this procedure.

Methodologies and Techniques

A variety of training systems incorporate all or part of the basic steps. Following are some of the methods and techniques most widely used and advocated with paraprofessionals.

Core conditions. Carkhuff (1969, 1971) advocates the training of paraprofessional helpers in dimensions related to constructive gain or change of the person being helped. He has developed counselor-responsive (empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness) and counselor-initiated (self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy) dimensions.

His training procedures consist primarily of teaching trainees to communicate at high levels of these dimensions. This is intended to initiate helper self-exploration and self-experiencing of relevant problems and lead to constructive action by the person being helped. Carkhuff’s approach has been effectively applied in a wide variety of situations using paraprofessional personnel (Carkhuff 1969).

Instrumented training. This method, developed at the New Careers Training Laboratory (1969), uses specially prepared materials that pose problems for paraprofessional trainees. The materials or
instruments usually take the form of open-ended questions which the trainees solve by working together in small groups. The trainer remains out of the group while the problem is worked on. Generally, a consensus solution is required of each group.

The method is especially advocated for use in joint training of professionals and paraprofessionals, since one of its chief goals is team building.

Microcounseling. This term refers to one variant of microtraining techniques. It is a structural or methodological approach to interviewing training in which interviewing methods are broken down into component specific skills that can be taught to trainees with the aid of videotaping and feedback. The model is a close variation of the basic steps discussed earlier.

According to Ivey (1971), the structure of microcounseling is designed to give the trainee a conceptual framework for a behavioral skill, shorten interview length, and provide practice until a satisfactory skill level is attained. A number of skills essential to an effective counseling interview can be learned through this process.

Roleplaying and simulated training. Roleplaying is a technique in which the trainees act out or “do” the kinds of problems and situations they expect to encounter on the job. Simulation often takes the process one step further, perhaps using an actual student as the “client” or recipient of service. Sometimes the terms are used interchangeably. They have in common the idea of getting the trainee to do things rather than talk about what he might do.

A New Careers publication (1968) outlines guidelines for roleplaying. It recommends that the situation played out be a common one, that is, one with which all the trainees can easily identify. The situation chosen generally should be short in duration.

Written materials. Manuals or handbooks can profitably accompany most training situations. They can serve as reminders of important information and procedures. They often save time and trainer effort by communicating ideas or information that is conveyed as appropriately in written as in spoken form. Manuals can also serve to expand the trainee’s understanding by giving more examples of how a skill might be used in the work situation.

Group discussion. This technique appears to play some role in virtually all training programs. It can be used to evaluate the training process, to build group cohesion among the trainees, to talk about ideas presented in training, or to solve a specific problem.

Lecture. Some ideas may still be best presented by this method; however, it does not actively involve the trainee. It is recommended that some follow-up be planned to ensure that the trainees understand and can apply the message given by the lecturer.

Meaning and others (1971), in their evaluation of a paraprofessional training program, found that lectures and other didactic presentations were seen by trainees as highly valuable.

Audiovisual media. Films, audiotapes, and videotapes all have their place in a training program. It is possible to present simulations or brief vignettes to a large group by use of videotape. Feedback on trainee progress is greatly facilitated by use of audio- and videotapes.

Field observation. Many times, paraprofessionals remain relatively unacquainted with the larger milieu in which they work. Their own agency or residence hall, the library, a classroom or two, and the student center may form the limits of their on-campus world. Visits to various living units, student-operated services, other agencies, and the dean’s office may aid the student paraprofessional in making more appropriate referrals and in feeling more comfortable within the whole student services area.

Workshops. Workshops, ranging from several hours to several days and designed to teach a specific skill, can be used very effectively in the ongoing training function. They can be limited to those paraprofessionals with an interest or skill deficit in a particular area. Trainers may be outside consultants, trainers in the program, or the paraprofessionals themselves. Popular topics include such areas as building motivation in groups, consulting with faculty or students, and designing evaluation programs.

Subgroup consultation. Two (dyad) or three (triad) person consultation groups that meet weekly to talk about job difficulties and brainstorm solutions are helpful in building an ongoing support system for paraprofessionals. Membership of the subgroups can be shifted periodically (perhaps each quarter) to give each paraprofessional the opportunity to consult with a number of his peers. After the paraprofessional is acquainted with his job, he often finds it helpful to set specific behavior change goals on which he can work with the help of his subgroup.

Training Phases

Although training must be seen as a continuous process, two phases can be delineated. These are: (a) preservice training, which covers the ideas and skills the paraprofessional must have before he begins his work and (b) inservice or on-the-job training, which deals with skill upgrading and teaching new skills.

Riessman (1967), among others, recommends that preservice training be short (perhaps a few days) in order not to raise too much anxiety in the paraprofessionals. Some methods, such as that of
Carkhuff, will necessitate a relatively long preservice period unless this training can be continued while the paraprofessional is on the job. A good rule for preservice training might be to teach only those skills that the trainee must have to begin functioning in his job and save the others for inservice training.

Inservice training is concurrent with service on the job and is generally designed to teach the job-specific skills that only one or a small group of the paraprofessionals need. Training programs can also be designed for the entire group, either to teach concepts and skills or to extend the sense of community among the paraprofessionals. Riessman (1967) asserts that the chief value of ongoing training is the opportunity it gives the paraprofessional to develop his role identity in a group situation with fellow paraprofessionals. Inservice training can also be used to build stronger bonds and work out differences between professionals and paraprofessionals. This can take the form of a problem solving session to deal with a controversial issue, or paraprofessionals and professionals can participate together in a learning experience that both groups see as valuable.

Trainers and Supervisors

High skill levels of trainers and supervisors are essential for success in the training process. Carkhuff (1971) asserts that "the key to all programs is the level of functioning of the trainer. Without trainers functioning at the highest level all results are modified or neutralized [p. 148]." McLennan and others (1966) state that "it is probable that the personalities and character of the staff are as important as their knowledge and skill [p. 141]." These authors make the point that the trainer must be trained for that particular responsibility, but that he must also know the work situation from some actual experience with it. It is easy to overestimate the training and supervisory skills of otherwise competent professionals. They, like their trainees, have to learn.

The Role

Four qualities necessary for the trainer/supervisor of paraprofessionals can be identified: (a) high interpersonal functioning, (b) appropriate personality, (c) skill and experience in the work situation, and (d) training as a trainer.

The first dimension deals with high functioning on Carkhuff's core dimensions or on an alternate scale of interpersonal skills. The trainer must be well able to demonstrate, in his own work and life, the relationships skills that he is attempting to teach.

"Appropriate personality" is a nebulous appellation that nevertheless seems to play a definite part in the success of a trainer or supervisor. It certainly would overlap with the area of high interpersonal functioning but also speaks to an element of open communication. The trainer/supervisor should be open to a student or trainee point of view and able to be flexible and open in the training process. That is, the trainer/supervisor should have “face validity” to the trainee; he should be credible in the role he has assumed.

Possession of specific skills is a necessary requisite for those who will supervise the paraprofessional directly or who will teach these skills. It is necessary also to have some experience in the general field in which the paraprofessional will work, though experience in the exact position is not always feasible.

Training for the trainer/supervisor role can be given to those who possess the other characteristics. It would be ideal to be able to use only staff who possess all of the relevant characteristics, but it is usually more feasible to assign separate training functions in a manner that maximizes the skills and abilities of each person. For example, a trainer in the area of interpersonal functioning may be able to function well even if he has little or no experience in the specific position in which paraprofessionals will work. However, he would probably be able to use more relevant examples and simulations if he did have such experience.

Often, organization of training and staff assignment will depend mainly on how many persons and what type of persons are available to work in this area. Each person may assume the role of both trainer and supervisor in very broad areas, or the roles may be broken down to fit individual skills, as suggested above.

The following are recommended as guidelines for the trainer/supervisor role, whether fulfilled by one or two persons or a group:

1. Trainers should only train in areas in which they have demonstrated a high degree of competence and skill.
2. Individual supervisors should be highly familiar with the position and necessary skills for that job.
3. Trainers and supervisors should be able to communicate effectively with each other and with paraprofessionals.
4. Trainers and supervisors should understand and promote the goals and philosophy of the paraprofessional program and design training/supervisory sessions with these in mind.
5. Trainers and supervisors should undergo some defined training in areas appropriate to their function in the program.
6. Ongoing consultation should be available to trainers and supervisors.
Training for Trainers and Supervisors

It is important that trainers know not only what they want to teach but how to go about teaching it. A workshop often serves well as a training mechanism. The following areas provide a minimum curriculum for such an experience:

1. Team building—coordination
2. Setting of overall goals and objectives of training of trainees
3. Setting of specific behavioral goals for trainees (How exactly will the trainees behave differently when training is completed?)
4. Design of methodology and techniques to be used (the delivery system)
5. Evaluation of the learning by trainees and effectiveness of trainers
6. Practice and instruction in the delivery system, using the basic training steps to be used with trainees

Often such a workshop will concentrate on the preservice stage of training. The same model can be used in planning inservice experiences, although the same team may not be involved.

Persons who will be responsible for ongoing supervision of paraprofessionals should have specific training in that area. Minimum preparation for this position would include a working knowledge of using mutual feedback with paraprofessionals, some skill in helping the paraprofessional learn specific tasks, and an ability to think through and organize expectations for the paraprofessional so that the job becomes neither too demanding nor completely loose.

The Paraprofessional as Trainer

It is important to invite paraprofessionals to become involved in the training function as their experience and skill make such involvement feasible. Preservice training will generally be more trainer-directed as a result of the relative inexperience of the paraprofessional trainees. However, paraprofessionals can be expected to take a major role in developing inservice programs. At a basic level, they can indicate their needs as specifically as possible to trainers, who can then provide the appropriate training experiences. At a more advanced level, they can use their individual abilities and skills to help develop and implement training programs for their paraprofessional colleagues. Learning the trainer role is often a new challenge to the experienced paraprofessional and can give an added dimension to the learning of the paraprofessional trainees.

A valuable role for the paraprofessional is that of a trainer of student volunteers in various programs. This allows a considerable saving of professional time and provides another aspect to the “service to students by students” rationale of the proposed model discussed in Chapter 1.

A well-articulated training program which defines itself as an ongoing process provides for the needs of paraprofessionals as they progress in their service. Such a program consistently upgrades skills of supervisors as well, thus allowing professionals to be effective trainers and models for the students who work with them.
CHAPTER 4

Sources of Funding

The costs involved in initiating and maintaining a paraprofessional program are diverse. Salaries must be provided along with facilities and materials for use by the paraprofessionals. In addition, planning for the costs of proper selection, training, and supervision are essential for the success of the program. Operating expenses for a paraprofessional program will include the following:

1. Salaries for the paraprofessionals and operating costs necessary to maintain a payroll system
2. Professional work hours allotted from employees' time for recruitment, selection, training, supervision, and evaluation of paraprofessionals
3. Facilities to be used by paraprofessional staff, including equipment to run programs facilitated by paraprofessionals
4. Additional office space and equipment necessitated by the addition of paraprofessionals to the staff, including desks, mailboxes, paraprofessional offices, and meeting rooms
5. Training materials

The administrator in charge of hiring paraprofessionals must resolve a number of details concerning a payroll system. First, a federal and state minimum wage must be adhered to. Second, wage levels over and above the minimum scale should be established for more specialized positions. Salaries for paraprofessionals should not stagnate, so merit increases will be in order for longevity and above-average job performance. This provides the paraprofessional with an increased motivation factor.

The salary rate for each job should reflect both the nature of the position and the qualifications and experience of the paraprofessional hired to fill the job.

Time sheets or other record-keeping systems should be used to determine work output, as well as to compute the salary for each pay period. Ideally, paraprofessionals should be paid for every hour they work; however, many committed individuals will work above the amount of hours they get paid for, whether it is permitted or not. At any rate, an attempt should be made to comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act. No paraprofessional, accordingly, should feel coerced or obligated in any way to work more than the prescribed number of hours for which he will be paid.

The agency hiring paraprofessionals is expected to absorb the loss of professional man-hours of work. Specific training and supervision of paraprofessionals may take a few hours per week; however, these hours will be repaid when the work output from the paraprofessional begins to show its effects.

Monetary savings can be accrued while initiating a paraprofessional program through the use of available materials and funds. Office space, equipment, and other materials may be procured from existing stock. This will limit the amount of purchasing that becomes necessary by adding paraprofessional staff. In addition, money for salaries may be available from existing agency budgets or budget surplus.

Funding from within the Institution

The college or university budget offers numerous potential sources of revenue that may be tapped in order to meet the expenses of hiring paraprofessionals. Accordingly, two possible funding sources, central or departmental, can be used.

The central funding model consists of an agency through which all paraprofessional positions are budgeted (see Chapter 11 for a discussion of the Colorado State University model). After the central committee has ranked position requests in terms of priorities, funding is approved. Salaries for the approved positions are then paid through one budget.
An additional funding scheme shows each position being funded by the particular agency or office in which the paraprofessional works. For example, the university housing office might pay the salary for the paraprofessional who works with off-campus housing, or the student relations office might pay the salary for the paraprofessional counseling withdrawing students.

The second funding model shows more potential for effectiveness with programs that have been proven successful. After the central committee or agency funds a position and the paraprofessional has made significant contributions to the program, the agency that has benefited can be requested to fund part or all of the paraprofessional’s salary for the following year.

As more positions that have worked well become independently funded, new positions may be funded for the first time. In other words, the centralized program funds do not stagnate by funding the same positions and programs year after year. The second funding scheme becomes essential where there is no centralized program coordinating the disposition of paraprofessional staff.

**Additional Sources of Funding**

The two funding models delineated assume that the operating funds will come from the student services administration budget allocated from the institution’s general funds. In addition, savings can be accrued by searching for additional sources of funding. Potential alternate sources of funding are described below.

Salaries for paraprofessionals who demonstrate unmet financial need can be funded through federal or state work-study monies. Student eligibility criteria for federal work-study programs can be found in the *College Work-Study Program Manual* (1971). The manual states that

... under the law, a student may be selected for employment under the College Work-Study Program if he meets all of the requirements listed below:

He must be:

1. In need of earnings from such employment in order to pursue a course of study at the institution;
2. Capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study while employed under the program;
3. Accepted for enrollment as a full time student at the institution, or in full-time attendance there as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student; and
4. A national of the United States, or in the United States for a period of time other than a temporary purpose with the intention of becoming a permanent resident thereof, or be a permanent resident of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [p. 3-1]."

Generally, the student wishing to qualify for federal work-study should demonstrate unmet financial need. The amount of unmet need exhibited by the student will be determined by the institution’s financial aid officer.

In addition to federal work-study, some states have their own funds for work-study programs. It is suggested that the campus office of financial aid be contacted concerning the availability of state work-study and guidelines for eligibility. In addition, state work-study funds can be made available to deserving parties on a non-need program. This will be contingent on the skills the paraprofessional brings to the job.

At larger institutions, the financial aid officer will designate a work-study coordinator to whom all inquiries can be addressed. The manuals containing guidelines for federal and local programs should also be available through this person.

Auxiliary enterprises that show a profit (e.g., housing, food service, health service, and student center budgets) can be requested to fund part or all of the salaries for paraprofessionals working within their operations. In addition, where auxiliary enterprise profits feed into the general student services budget, allotments can be requested through the office of the dean of students.

Student services staff can also seek to engage in cooperative funding with the campus student government. For the more activist-type positions, like a paraprofessional working with off-campus housing, student government can be asked to house the paraprofessional and provide the program with an operating budget. In return, the student services office can provide a salary and supply training and supervision. This assists the development of cooperative efforts in student services and ensures that student personnel services and student government do not work at cross purposes.

Additional sources of funding can be researched by the alert paraprofessional coordinator. Among the less frequently used sources are funding through faculty (resident instruction) budgets or funding through the assessment of special student fees.

**Funding from Outside Sources**

A number of potential sources of funds are available through government, private, and community sources for those willing to take the time and effort to pursue them. Some of these sources are described below.

One potential source of funding would be through a federal or state government research or training grant. This entails writing the grant proposal, corresponding with potential funding agencies, and work through institutional channels to obtain approval. One source to consult for available government programs is the *Annual Register of Grant Support* (Renetzky 1971). The Register is a guide to grant support programs of government agencies,
foundations, and business and professional organizations. The descriptions provide information concerning the type, purpose, eligibility, financial data, application deadline, and address of the foundation or agency. Programs listed by the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Mental Health may be pertinent to paraprofessionals in the higher education setting. The author of the grant proposal will have to determine which funding agencies may be interested in the project.

Grants for studies in education, psychology, and mental health (which may apply to usage of paraprofessionals) can be solicited from private foundations as well. The Ford Foundation is a well-known source of funds in this regard. In addition, state foundations like the Hogg Foundation in Texas can be solicited for evaluation funds. Brown and Zunker (1966a, 1966b), who conducted evaluation studies of the student-counselor program at Southwest Texas State College, obtained funds through the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health. A useful source of potential funds is The Foundation Directory (Lewis 1967), which should be available through most campus libraries.

Some general guidelines concerning procurement of foundation support are found in Pollard’s Fund Raising for Higher Education (1958). Pollard suggests that the institution “study the whole field of philanthropic foundations carefully, and only thereafter submit projects [pp. 162–163].” He goes on to suggest that “colleges and universities will do best to exploit foundation sources which are located, so to speak, in their own backyards [p. 168].” In addition, four types of foundation grants are delineated: (a) gifts to operating budgets; (b) scholarships and fellowships; (c) gifts to strengthen the institution; and (d) gifts for experimentation, research, or demonstration (Pollard 1958).

Grant research proposals should be channeled through the research dean in each college of the university. Where no research dean is available, the contracts and grants administrator should be consulted. Prospective grant authors will profit from assistance in writing the proposal in order to match the project with the interests or mission of the foundation or agency that is being petitioned for financial assistance. In addition, the research dean may be able to assist with the location of potential sources of funding, as well as making the proposal draft stronger, thus increasing the chances that the proposal will be funded.

Local community action programs concerned with mental health and other community outreach programs should be investigated. Community agencies can be requested to pay a portion of the salary for a paraprofessional. For example, a paraprofessional for drug education could be funded by a community agency. In return, the paraprofessional can allot a direct proportion of time on the job to working with the surrounding community agencies.

An additional method of funding is for the community or city agency to fund the salaries for paraprofessionals they hire themselves. In return for services rendered to the university community, institutional staff and resources can be allotted to training the community’s paraprofessionals. Here again, a cooperative effort aimed toward alleviation of overlap between campus and community programs and insurance against the two working at cross purposes is facilitated. An example would be for the university crisis center to be partially funded from community mental health agencies. In return for the community’s contribution, the hotlines staffed by paraprofessionals and volunteers should remain at the disposal of any member of the local community and not be exclusively for students.

In addition to what has been discussed, possibilities for funding peculiar to the locality of the institution may be available. The operating costs involved with paraprofessional programs are diverse. They can be met if the administrators involved will use some initiative and imagination in attempting to procure program funds to meet the costs.
A well-defined system of evaluation must be built into the paraprofessional program. Evaluation should be viewed as an ongoing process, not merely added as an afterthought once the program has been initiated. As with the areas of selection and training, a model that identifies the variables within the program that lead to its successes and failures must be developed.

Prior analysis of the quantity and quality of evaluative research performed in the student services area would be of help in understanding the basic content of this chapter. Unfortunately, there does not exist a great "body of knowledge" on which to build the case for paraprofessional employment in higher education. In reality, there appears to be only a smattering of trial and error procedures that seem to leave more questions unanswered than answered. This does not mean, however, that the given parameters of the paraprofessional program are beyond empirical evaluation. The continued avoidance of evaluation in the student services area has caused staff to hesitate in the crucial areas of innovation and experimentation. Traditional methods of developing programs within the student services areas consequently are more appealing because less risk is involved. Administrators must begin to view the evaluation process as a means of improving procedures rather than as a personal affront to pet programs.

Goals of Evaluation

Evaluation should be perceived in terms of both its long-range and immediate benefits. In other words, once the evaluative data is collected and analyzed, what direct or indirect benefits are in evidence? The purpose of this process can best be summarized through analysis of four main goals: (a) increase credibility within the academic community, (b) provide feedback to staff on performance, (c) determine if specific goals were obtained, and (d) decide which programs merit continued support.

One major benefit of evaluation focuses on the often overlooked area of public relations. Working within a milieu (higher education) where people demand proof of worth is frustrating for those unfamiliar with the principles of experimental design. However, the rewards of systematic evaluation, although at times subtle, are extremely important. These rewards usually come in the form of funds, a re-allocation of staff time, or manpower assistance from other departments.

A second benefit of evaluation concerns the use of observational feedback models. Conscientiously undertaken, this procedure can provide both the supervisor and supervisee necessary performance data critical to program effectiveness. This measurement of individual contribution helps redefine roles in addition to eliminating or retraining the nonproductive worker.

Evaluation should also be helpful in determining specific goals. This area probably reflects the major contribution of the evaluative process, for it tends to both precede and complement the other three points presented. Here we are asking the question, "Did we accomplish what we had set out to do?"

Throughout this monograph, the term "behavioral objectives" has been used in terms of defining an end product. Through the employment of research and evaluation techniques a hypothetical position is transformed into objective data that should relate directly to the measurement of these behavioral objectives. Providing additional data such as this has obvious benefits. Maximum funding has traditionally gone to experimental proposals that rely heavily on the measurement of objective input and output.

Finally, systematic evaluation data helps chart the direction and credibility of programs. The measurement of success and failure assists in rank ordering priorities, thus promoting more efficient use of funds and staff time. The student services area traditionally has supported plans year after year that
have not proven effective in obtaining specific behavioral or program objectives. Consequently, this goal is achieved by sampling observable data such as university support and staff performance ratings.

Areas to Evaluate

Within the paraprofessional program there exist two basic components of operation. They are the total system and the individualized program. The system refers to the total paraprofessional program, i.e., the model as presented in Chapter 1. Variables subject to analysis within this aspect of the program include general readiness level of the campus to support such a program, general goals and objectives of the total program, selection procedures, general training, system coordinators' role and function, administrative efficiency, and the ongoing community perceptions. The evaluation of the above areas reflects on the need to comprehensively review the program in a general fashion. Results of this analysis are of benefit to the system coordinator or coordination group in their attempts to shape the program and its effects on the student services area.

The specific program delineation refers to any one of many individual programs under the auspices of the "paraprofessional program." For example, it might refer to the paraprofessionals hired as staff in residence halls or those serving tutorial functions in academic advising offices. Generally, an evaluation of these areas is somewhat more complete, because the variables lend themselves to necessary manipulation by the evaluator. Three obvious specific components which need to be periodically reviewed are the program (services offered), the paraprofessional, and the supervisor. Obviously, system evaluation and specific program evaluation overlap somewhat. In the training processes, for example, the overlap is understandable because similar content variables are examined, while methodology and specificity variables may be entirely different. Training is typically viewed as a coordinated function of both the system coordinator and individual supervisor. Content and presentation generally differ to satisfy the paraprofessional's needs at various stages of employment. However, common training goals should be in evidence.

As a cautioning aside, one should make every effort to differentiate between personnel and program evaluation. Many a program has been forfeited or has undergone major revamping simply because the personnel was inadequate. The converse of this is true as well.

In summation, it is important to note that the two areas of evaluation must be given equal priority. To demand evaluation data on specific areas without comprehensively reviewing total program efforts is naive and likely to produce erroneous assumptions.

System Evaluation

Let us now turn to a more in-depth review of the previously outlined system criteria in an effort to determine just what should be evaluated under each area.

General readiness level of campus to support such a program. Traditionally, student services programs have developed on many campuses without due consideration of need or purpose. Furthermore, even less attention has been given to discussing common concerns across the division such as allocation of staff time, use of funds, or implementation of programs. As a result of this lack of communication, efficiency and output are minimized. Consequently, the first step in developing a paraprofessional program on any campus is to evaluate the current scene. Are programs effectively meeting the perceived needs of the academic community? Can student feedback be used to an administrative advantage in making decisions? Is staff wasting time on noncontributing functions such as clerical work? Are areas within the division willing to relinquish certain functions to trained undergraduates in order to provide more time for acknowledged professional priorities? These are but some of the questions that come under the auspices of assessing institutional need. Campus readiness thus becomes a very practical rather than philosophical concern.

General goals and objectives of the total program. Obviously, this area is subject to exhaustive and ongoing evaluation. One must determine if the paraprofessional program has set goals compatible with the student services area and even with the institution itself. If one of the goals of the program is to manipulate or redirect objectives within the student services division, then this should be made clear from the outset.

Behavioralizing program objectives is essential when attempting to define objectives and goals. It is even more critical to the evaluation process. Without a contrived plan to achieve desired individual and/or group behavior changes, evaluation serves only to proclaim supposition and not fact. Examples of how behavioralizing objectives can enhance programs are found throughout the paraprofessional model. The involvement of paraprofessionals is typically based on the presumption that their input will not only change attitudes but also have an effect on behavior patterns. Whether behavior is reinforced or changed is determined by the end goals desired.

Selection procedures. If the paraprofessional system is designed to screen candidates prior to any review by individual supervisors, then the process must be analyzed in terms of its effects on the total system. Is the program publicized sufficiently to maximize the
number of student applications? Are the criteria for positions compatible with general proficiency levels of undergraduates? Are the general screening criteria (e.g., grades, class, rank, etc.) fair and supported by rationale? Does the program lend itself to minority recruitment? Are individual differences something to be valued or ignored?

A common error when evaluating the selection process is to limit our thinking to selection of personnel. Not as obvious, but just as essential, is the selection of the positions themselves. Basic points one might want to consider would be: Are the expressed needs for positions well documented? Is the position description legitimate in terms of the requesting office's function and philosophy of operation? Will the position promote innovation or merely carry forth tradition?

General training. As with the process of selection, there are training criteria that should be subjected to evaluation. A few to consider might include: Can general training be geared to provide every paraprofessional with a core of essential basic skills? Does general training actually complement specific training efforts by each supervisor? Can experienced paraprofessionals be used successfully as leaders in core training? What methods of training are most effective in transferring information and/or teaching new skills?

System coordinator's role and function. The leadership provided the total program from its initial inception to fulfillment of planned objectives is critical. Consequently, it is important to analyze the system coordinator's role. As discussed in Chapter 2, this person's initiative and perseverance are factors that correlate positively to the overall effectiveness of the program.

Criteria to evaluate with respect to this position should include the following: Assessment of the working (line/staff) relationship between system coordinator and individual paraprofessional supervisors is critical. Is there a leadership style dominant in development of successful programs (autonomous/flexible versus rigid/authoritarian)? How does the coordinator's role facilitate the areas of selection and training? Can the system coordinator's time commitment to the paraprofessional program be effectively balanced against other administrative/teaching responsibilities?

Administrative efficiency. Our current era in higher education seems to reflect our increased interest in accountability at all levels. Efficiency studies in the student services area as well as throughout faculty programs are a direct result of this concern. New ideas such as the paraprofessional program will undergo this scrutiny as well. In evaluating the efficiency of such a program, the following criteria should be considered: Do the paraprofessionals actually provide a service that frees the professional for other duties? Is work output compensated for in a fair and equitable manner? Are the necessities of selection, training, and evaluation handled without overloading work schedules or duplicating efforts? Are standard methods of procedure flexible enough to allow for individualized efficiency programs in the variety of offices that might employ paraprofessionals?

Ongoing community perceptions. Often the area of community relations is overlooked or egotistically avoided. This is a dangerous pattern to fall into, for generally speaking the paraprofessional program is at the mercy of the total academic community for funding and other means of support. The academic community is taken collectively to include faculty, administration, and students.

These perceptions consequently become criteria highlights for purposes of evaluation. Is the paraprofessional program an assumed function or do the merits of such a venture need to be debated year after year? Do members of the academic community appreciate this program even though direct contact is minimal? Should more attention be given to the public relations aspect of the paraprofessional's role? Is it possible to increase the visibility of the entire paraprofessional program?

We have attempted to identify some of the more obvious and prominent variables within the paraprofessional system that should be subject to evaluation procedures. The next area of discussion will investigate the process or methodology of such evaluation.

Methodology

Identification of criteria (unanswered questions) within a system is merely the initial step in the evaluation process. How one interprets, compares, and challenges this data is equally critical. Designing good, reliable methods of evaluation has constantly been a problem to the student services administrator. What little time has been spent on the evaluative process has been concentrated on asking rather than answering questions.

Prior to discussing potential methods of analyzing the paraprofessional system, let us review a few basic assumptions:

1. Evaluation represents an effort to determine whether basic objectives of the paraprofessional program are being achieved.
2. A variety of evaluation methods usually exists in respect to any single program criteria.
3. The evaluator must explore a number of these alternatives in order to determine the best method for his particular purpose.
4. The total paraprofessional system will benefit from the knowledge obtained from such a process.

Over ten years ago, E. G. Williamson wrote about the field of student personnel work and the necessity of ongoing evaluations:
Such evaluation may take the form of informal spot checking; it may involve systematic collection of opinions and reactions of student clients; or it may take the form of objective and controlled experimentation, using quantified criteria of changes in the behavior or self-perception of the individual student. No program can continue to develop in step with increases in related knowledge without such evaluation. It is a mark of an effective program and of effective staff work when personnel workers are interested in constant evaluations of their efforts. It should be noted, however, that systematic experimentation in many areas is not presently possible because of our present lack of effective methodology. Nevertheless, it is an important administrative function to encourage every staff member to think critically of the need and the desirability of evaluation [1961, p. 131].

Obviously, his insights have relevance for today's programs. Our analysis of the paraprofessional system uses Williamson's perceptions on evaluation methodology as a guideline.

The method of informal spot checking is typically too often used by administrators as a supplement rather than a complement to other evaluation techniques. Within the paraprofessional program it can be an effective means of determining effectiveness and availability of staff. Spot checking also serves to give the evaluator ongoing contact with different services. Such visibility is often interpreted by the paraprofessional as a positive support function.

System spot checking is usually a function of the system coordinator. Although the method is informal, it usually is predetermined and consciously undertaken. It may take the form of visiting an individual paraprofessional service in operation or having coffee with a supervisor. However undertaken, this process of direct observation should definitely be a part of system evaluation.

Systematic collection of opinions can be an effective evaluative method if for no other reason than because people generally like to ask about and give opinions. This process does not approach objective scientific data collection in terms of reliability and validity measures, but it is generally more acceptable than the previous discussion on spot checking.

In this situation we are talking about establishing regular feedback models. Not only are student (client) perceptions and attitudes studied, but time and energy also are spent surveying faculty and other administrative agencies on campus. Student feedback can be gained through the post-interview or post-inventory methods. Faculty and administrators sitting on advisory groups to the paraprofessional program typically feel at ease in giving feedback through this medium.

Written progress reports, accompanied by a documented list of activities, can provide feedback mechanisms for both paraprofessionals and supervisors. Typically, increased system efficiency is the major objective of such a program.

Objective and controlled experimentation is another evaluation technique that could be employed. As Williamson (1961) stated, student services workers can find a multitude of excuses for not pursuing this method of evaluation. The authors feel, however, that the paraprofessional program must undergo such scrutiny before it is accepted in total by the academic community of which it is a part. The system coordinator should feel obliged to have available to the program research personnel with such expertise.

Earlier in this discussion we mentioned the value of designing behavioral objectives for the program. Especially important is the precise measurement of the degree of success regarding the attainment of specified program goals. For example, as we discussed in Chapter 3, there are definite correlations between training and job performance. The evaluation process in this circumstance dictates the use of objective research methods. Experimental design, control groups, and statistical analysis are characteristics of this methodology. In summation, it is interesting to review the ideas of Paul Dressel as he interprets the value of such investigations:

Evaluation in its basic meaning of making judgments about the worth of an act or experience is inevitably involved in every phase of the operation of an institution of higher education, for every decision or resource allocation involves—wittingly or unwittingly—some choice among values. Evaluation in this decision-making interpretation is not only essential and inevitable in all phases of the operation of the university, but it is also evident that an institution of higher education which exists primarily to inculcate in its students competency in making wise judgments should itself evidence this behavior. Thus evaluation in its broadest sense is coextensive with the operations and goals of the university [1970, p. 54].

Specific Program Evaluation

As the basic model describes, the paraprofessional system functions as a unifying force for the individual services participating in the program. To this point we have outlined some basic concerns regarding system evaluation. Let us now turn our attention to the individual services or specific program areas in an attempt to better understand the goals and purposes of follow-up evaluation at this level.

Three obvious components influence success or failure at this level: the paraprofessional, the supervisor, and the attempted program. Each component will be analyzed and described in terms of criteria and methodology.

The key figure in any service development is usually the implementor—the paraprofessional. Whether the service offered is viewed as preventative, remedial, or developmental, direct implementation is critical. The criteria are motivation and interest in position, development of specific, necessary skills, accomplishment of predeterined goals, and ability to follow through on projects and use resources effectively. The methodologies employed are direct supervisor assessment, self-assessment,
client ratings, and group discussions with other paraprofessionals.

Supervisory responsibility and influence should not be overlooked or viewed as having minimum significance to end goals. Without such involvement by concerned professionals, the paraprofessional program would not exist. The criteria for supervisors are dedication and commitment to the program, supervisory skills, development and follow through on training programs, and ability to differentiate and set priorities. The methodologies employed are system coordinator assessment (if practical), paraprofessional feedback, group discussions with the supervisors, and self-assessment.

Our final consideration lies with the potential service offered. The given medium or situation in which the professional and paraprofessional work to develop new services or share existing responsibilities is critical to specific program building. When a program is implemented, many factors should be analyzed. The criteria are numbers served, quality of product, changes in attitudes or behavior, and time commitment and money expended. The methodologies are logging contracts, use of feedback models, attitude questionnaires, time/efficiency studies, direct observation, and statistical analysis of behavioral objectives.

One final cautionary note: If, in the student services area, evaluation techniques were poorly planned and implemented prior to the advent of paraprofessional personnel, then the difficulty of evaluating this new program is compounded.

Many other aspects of the program should be researched and evaluated. Two basic questions are interrelated. Are we sacrificing quality by substituting some aspects of the professional role through use of paraprofessionals? What kind of impact is made on students (clients) by paraprofessional effectiveness? More studies like the Brown and Zunker (1966a, 1966b) efforts discussed in Chapter 6 need to be developed to further articulate and document client feedback.

Another concern stems from the fact that on many projects the professional and paraprofessional work as a team. The question arises: Is there a differentiated impact through a cooperative effort?

A thorough test of our original "paraprofessional hypotheses" is needed. That is to say, how valid is our assumption that the paraprofessional is relieving the professional of some of his functions, providing direct services to students, or giving regular input to the system? The evaluation in this case would demand the use of all methods previously discussed.

Finally, it is important to consider the following points when developing the paraprofessional program: (a) frequency of evaluations, (b) personnel responsible for evaluations, (c) reporting findings/using data, and (d) rewarding evaluations.

The paraprofessional program can benefit from a combination of both continuous self-evaluations and periodic program assessments. As discussed, regular (weekly) opportunities for evaluation between supervisor and paraprofessional are essential. Likewise, a planned progressional evaluation of specific programs should be conducted at least quarterly. An annual review of the paraprofessional system should be complementary to both continuous and periodic evaluations and, of necessity, comprehensive in scope.

No one connected with the paraprofessional program can avoid playing a role in the evaluation process. Each person, professional or paraprofessional, has, through the nature of his responsibilities, a unique way of viewing the program. This diversity enhances both the reliability and validity of such investigations.

Conducting research is one thing; using the results is equally important. The authors would like to stress that the time and personnel involved in evaluating the paraprofessional program is substantial. If the results and data are not used to revise and enhance the program, then the process has not fulfilled its purpose.

The system coordinator should be cognizant of which programs and staff make a concerted effort to conduct and effectively use evaluations. Such documentation can be rewarded through increased funding, the allocation of more personnel, or other less visible means of support.

Some mention should be made regarding the evaluation process employed prior to the initiation of any paraprofessional program, that is, some form of pre-evaluation assessing both campus need and readiness levels. The following questions illustrate the point. Are professional student services staff limited in their functions by lack of time or funds? Is program outreach limited because of staff size? Is the current system providing students the opportunity to give regular input? Do administrators and faculty support the principle of students serving students? Are staff willing to evaluate their own roles and share some of their current tasks? Could student services workers effectively make use of more free time? Are the objectives expressed by the paraprofessional compatible with institutional goals? Answering these questions as a part of the early evaluation process is critical. Obviously, without such data institutions would have a difficult time implementing the paraprofessional program.

This chapter has tried to approach the concept of evaluation in a very practical way. It is important to understand what inconsistencies exist in higher education that directly affect the paraprofessional program, and it is critical that an evaluation procedure be established based on available resources. Evaluation should be perceived as a valuable tool to be used by all segments of the program.
The Paraprofessional in Student Orientation

Paraprofessionals have been used widely as counselors in orientation programs (Brown & Zunker 1966b). Students have also been instrumental in formulating and implementing college orientation programs through committee participation and their role as advisers to new students. Some delineation of the types of orientation programs and their purposes will aid in understanding the role of the paraprofessional in such activities.

Orientation programs have traditionally been developed for the purpose of easing the entering freshman’s transition from high school to college. The term “orientation,” when applied to the college setting, usually refers to a short period of mass meetings where college authorities and selected members of the student body impart rules, regulations, and general information to the new student (Snider 1970). The majority of stated purposes fall into two general categories: first, to inform students of their immediate relationship to the resources of the institution and, second, to aid in their adaptation to the collegiate community (Pappas 1967).

Freshman orientation programs have been criticized for a number of reasons. Traditional orientation programs devote little time to the new student as an individual (Snider 1970). The growth of student bodies has forced larger institutions to devise more elaborate, more extensive, and more costly programs. Registration officials can no longer expect to handle the increased number of new freshmen unless these incoming students have been prepared for the procedures beforehand. The increased number of incoming students has caused the individual student to become lost in the crowd. As a result, mass meetings have been used more often.

Along with the increased size of orientation programs, there has developed considerable variation among the types of programs. Some institutions offer a preregistration session lasting one day. Others offer freshman weeks, welcome weekends, freshman camps, and other programs that last for greater periods of time.

Orientation programs have shown a trend toward diversification. Three major types of orientation programs are currently in use: (a) precollege freshman day or freshman week programs designed to be informational in nature; (b) freshman camps designed to be social experiences, usually occurring before classes begin; and (c) freshman orientation courses designed to aid the freshman’s adjustment by focusing on his ongoing concerns throughout the first part of the academic year. The lengthy routines of testing, registration, and enrollment have often taken large portions of the precollege orientation program. This condition has generally led to an extension of the orientation process throughout the first part of the academic year. Some institutions offer courses in orientation with academic credit granted on a variable basis.

Certain similarities exist among orientation practices as well. Kronovet (1969) found that over 90 percent of the institutions replying to her study have orientation programs at which attendance is required. Franks (1967) reported that seven of the eight institutions included in his study showed some common procedures, including (a) an orientation committee composed of administrators, faculty, and students; (b) a fall orientation program held prior to registration, with attendance required; (c) an orientation course required as part of the freshman curriculum; and (d) use of upperclass aides in the programs during active periods.

Precocllage orientation weeks, freshman camps, and orientation courses all lend themselves to the involvement of selected, trained, and supervised upperclassmen (paraprofessionals). Students have served on orientation steering committees and as aides in the programs they have helped to develop. Few institutions use graduate students during
orientation; however, undergraduate students are used extensively (Kronovet 1969). Upperclass students have been hired and trained to fulfill a number of roles during orientation. The remainder of this chapter will discuss the use of paraprofessionals in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the variety of programs that have been described.

Rationale

A number of reasons may be proposed for the use of upperclass advisers in orientation. College Management ("Utah’s Orientation," September 1967) described a program at the University of Utah where freshman students who were too timid to participate in regular orientation activities were provided with upperclass guides. Upperclassmen have been used to facilitate a small group approach to orientation. This approach has stemmed from the realization that mass meetings tend to depersonalize incoming freshmen. Upperclass guides serve as information resources for new students. Small reference groups, as described by Foxley (1969a), are designed to make the orientation experience more personal in helping students obtain information about university life. This plan also facilitates the making of new friends and increasing one’s self-understanding and self-reliance.

Although the faculty role often predominates in orientation, these programs have much to gain from student help during freshman week. Mueller (1961) argues that of all students, sophomores make the best assistants. They are close to their own experiences as freshmen, their sophistication in campus affairs is fresh and stimulating, and they will be eager listeners at briefing sessions. Other upperclassmen may possess these qualities as well.

Functions and Roles

The major functions or roles fulfilled by student orientation advisers can be delineated into three general categories: campus resource, group facilitation, and public relations.

The Paraprofessional as Campus Resource Person

Upperclass orientation advisers have accumulated personal experience in dealing with the campus, which the freshmen are viewing for the first time. Through mass meetings or small group sessions, upperclassmen can contribute toward meeting the informational needs of the incoming student. Information concerning campus activities, clubs, organizations, entertainment, courses, teachers, and social life may be communicated either by pres-
discussions. This ensures that the locus of orientation remains on the incoming student.

**General Guidelines**

The three roles can be used in all programs employing upperclassmen: on-campus preregistration programs, freshman camps, and orientation courses. Freshman orientation courses, however, provide the least stress on the public relations function and more on the use of group-facilitation skills. Some freshman orientation courses provide for separate class meetings and discussion sections. The main purpose in using the upperclass discussion leader is for him to become intimately involved with channeling his class discussion and moderating his group's thinking (Ehrlich 1967).

The discussion leader's role can be described in terms of a number of functions, including: (a) supporting certain views expressed by the professional counselor—such views have greater impact when set forth by another student; (b) keeping students up to date on college activities; (c) providing factual information about the institution; and (d) taking attendance and scheduling appointments for individual conferences between the professional counselor and the student.

Kronovet (1963) described a freshman reaction to the successful use of upperclass discussion leaders:

> Of special significance are the reactions of the freshmen to the discussion leader who perceive the assistant as a contemporary with whom they can further discuss issues that were raised in the orientation class or even personal matters. When the assistant has been carefully selected and placed, he apparently becomes a respected group member. As such, the freshmen are influenced by his comments and values just as they are influenced by those of the orientation counselors. For the student who tends to be timid, the assistant may serve as a bridge for further contact with the counselor [p. 46].

**Selection**

Selection of upperclass orientation advisers necessitates the development of both criteria and methods. Snider (1970) has summarized a general guideline to be used when selecting advisers. He comments that "the upperclassman can definitely be an asset if he recognizes his worth as an experienced person at the college, or he can be a hindrance if he joins the orientation team for the prestige it gives [p. 139]." Those who seek to apply for the job for prestige or to recruit members for their organizations are therefore to be eliminated, if detected.

Criteria for selection can be classified into the following general categories:

1. An assessment of the student's leadership experience based on past activities and potential
2. Determination of the applicant's knowledge of the institution and willingness to acquire information
3. Demonstration of interpersonal skills, especially the ability to relate to individuals and groups of differing ages (includes faculty, administration, and parents)
4. Scholarship ability, which can be determined by grade point average and recommendations by academic faculty

The applicant's interpersonal skills are a key requisite in the group facilitation function. Knowledge of the institution and personal experience in dealing with it will help the paraprofessional fulfill the roles of campus resource person and public relations officer. Interpersonal and verbal skills are important when holding committee membership with faculty and student personnel administrators, as well as when speaking to parent and student groups. It is suggested that scholarship (i.e., a minimal grade point average) be used only as a preliminary factor of elimination where the number of applicants prohibits the interviewing of every individual. In addition, sex, ethnic group, and major should be taken into account to provide for diversity among the student staff.

Methodology must be considered along with criteria when discussing selection of student orientation counselors. The selection process should include the following elements:

1. A completed application can be used to provide self-reported data.
2. A selection committee should be established to screen applicants. The committee should include student membership, comprised of past orientation counselors.
3. An interview should be administered by the selection committee. Individual or group interview situations can be constructed. This facilitates assessment of the interpersonal qualities possessed by each applicant.

The question of whether to use individual or group interview situations has been a recurring issue among orientation directors. The results of many studies comparing the efficacy of the two methods have shown that they are equally valid (Banta 1969). The use of the leaderless group discussion or group interview technique, however, does offer some practical advantages. First, the time spent reviewing applicants is reduced. Second, the group discussion setting involves the applicants in an actual situation in dealing with people and would seem to be a valid predictor of future performance during group orientation sessions. Banta (1969) also found that group discussions are more likely to retain the attention and interest of the raters and express more aspects of the candidate's personality. A group situ-
ation also allows the student to demonstrate his interpersonal skills in front of the selection committee.

Training

The process of training for orientation paraprofessionals has been debated at length. A minimum has been written on the training of freshman advisers (Patty 1966). What has been cited is barely definitive enough to give an indication of what has not worked. Foxley (1969b) cautioned that a “fun and games” type of orientation does not meet the academic and intellectual expectations of the incoming freshmen. Training, therefore, should stress more than merely skills needed to orient new students to campus social life.

Training for orientation paraprofessionals should stress the development of the following: (a) the paraprofessional’s knowledge of the institution and its resources; (b) interpersonal and group skills; and (c) specific skills (depending on the type of program involved).

In order to facilitate development of the paraprofessional’s knowledge of the institution’s resources, preservice training is necessary. This training should include briefings by representatives from various academic and student service offices along with a thorough review of official publications.

Many orientation programs are now placing emphasis on the interpersonal and small group aspects of the orientation adviser’s job. The development of interpersonal skills enhances performance of the group facilitator function. Required readings in group dynamics and human relations are suggested for the preservice portion of training. Inservice training, especially for orientation group discussion leaders, should be geared toward the mastery of group skills. Consultation and seminars with professional staff may prove helpful. The training program described by Kronovet (1963) provides a good example of inservice training for group facilitators. Orientation paraprofessionals enrolled for two hours’ credit in the honors seminar in small group behavior. The course was conducted by the dean and his assistants (paraprofessionals). Those who enrolled in the course were responsible for readings, discussions, and individual research concerning group behavior as part of their inservice training.

Training can also be applied to specific skills called for by different programs. In order to facilitate the public relations function, for example, paraprofessionals may have to develop public speaking skills. Specialists from the speech department can be used as resource persons during the preservice training period. Paraprofessionals should be able to discuss their specific skills and concerns with orientation staff throughout the program as part of inservice training. This can take the form of weekly seminars or staff meetings, with the paraprofessionals, the professional staff, and the director in attendance.

Generally, preservice training should take place during the entire academic quarter or semester preceding the program. Inservice training, however, should last through the duration of the program. Some needs of paraprofessionals may not surface until after the program has begun. Frequently, continuous training provides opportunities to develop additional necessary skills in paraprofessionals.

Funding

Funding for salaries for orientation paraprofessionals should come from the student orientation budget as part of the student affairs or admissions operation on campus. Few upperclassmen now receive compensation for the preservice training period. Advisers are usually paid an hourly or daily wage for their participation while the program is being conducted.

Other forms of compensation can be used in lieu of, or in addition to, monetary rewards. Room and board can be provided for the time the paraprofessional spends living on campus during orientation. Academic credit can be offered for upperclassmen serving as discussion section leaders for orientation courses. Where special inservice training courses are available, academic credit can be earned.

Evaluation

Orientation advisers should be evaluated to determine their impact on the incoming freshman’s perception of the college environment. The use of before-after inventories is one common method of measurement. Such inventories may include measurement along the following variables:

1. Surveying parent and freshman attitudes toward the university and its agencies before and after attendance at orientation to detect any changes. Cole and Ivey (1967) used a similar technique, measuring the differences between attenders and non-attenders of orientation.

2. Survey parent and student perceptions of the institutional environment before and after orientation. Hurst and Smith (1970) have used such a study, assessing differences in parent-student perceptions before and after attendance at orientation.

3. Assessing different impacts of different programs by alternating use of student and faculty
advisers during the program. Academic achievement, attrition, knowledge, and use of campus resources can be measured for students who attended orientation programs where the advising was done by students. The content of the orientation program can be changed at one interval to include use of faculty advisers—the faculty-counseled group can serve as a control. The length of the summer program allows for a change of content for evaluation purposes.

In addition to before-after inventories, the program should be evaluated in its entirety. Orientation advisers are best evaluated by the students they serve, the faculty they work with, and themselves. In addition, more balanced opinions are derived from greater participation in the evaluation process. This can be done through using the following techniques:

1. Use incoming freshman participants to evaluate their orientation experience. Students should be provided an open-ended questionnaire asking their opinion on the efficacy of the program, which portions they benefited from, and which portions should be deleted. Ivey (1963) collected similar data over a three-year period.

2. Faculty orientation counselors should be surveyed to assess their response to the use of student advisers. Orientation course instructors can be questioned concerning the effectiveness of the paraprofessional discussion leaders as well.

3. The student advisers should be surveyed to assess personal gains derived from their role in orientation. Personal growth, acquired skills, and changes in attitude should be assessed. The acquisition of leadership skills, a sense of personal worth in group leadership, and the efficacy of the orientation program in its entirety should be discussed directly with the director or student personnel professional. In addition, a self-report, open-ended inventory should be administered to allow for elaboration on each point.

The director of orientation should provide discussion meetings where the paraprofessionals are permitted to react to their participation. This ensures a direct flow of feedback into the system that will determine the structure of the orientation program for the following year.

Toward the Future

If current trends in enrollment and diversity of orientation programs continue, the use of student paraprofessionals should increase. The preregistration segment of orientation programs is in no danger of being phased out on larger campuses because of its importance in preventing confusion when registration day arrives.

With more specialized training, fewer areas will fall under the classification of "beyond the student's competence." McCann (1967) proposed that future programs should not stress social events. She commented that

... the composition of today's entering student body is different from that of a few years ago. This group and their typical classmates will be better prepared academically and more serious about curricular responsibilities and the achievement of good grades and less concerned with traditional co-curricular activities than their counterparts of the last decade [p. 86].

Her predictions should hold true for the students attending higher education institutions during the 1970s as well.

In order to meet the needs of incoming students who possess a predominately academic orientation toward college, programs will have to gear themselves more toward academic advising and less toward introductions to campus social life. Upperclassmen can be trained in the academic advising areas. An alternative is to draw paraprofessionals directly from the campus Office of Academic Advising. They can work directly within the orientation program, as is done at Colorado State University. This shift of emphasis from social to academic advising will expand the role of "campus resource person" and diminish the public relations aspect of the paraprofessional's orientation role. The role of group facilitator should remain central, as the tendency toward the small group approach continues and the addition of discussion courses expands the orientation curriculum.

In addition, more specific orientation programs geared toward residence hall life have become necessary as more residence halls have been built. Residence hall assistants (also paraprofessionals) trained in orientation procedures or orientation advisers trained by residence hall staff can be used as the trend toward longer programs that include overnight visits increases. At Temple University, for example, carefully selected and trained upperclass student leaders have lived with freshmen in the residence halls during their three-day stay since 1966 (Scheurer 1967). Academic advising and residence hall life are areas into which the expertise of the orientation paraprofessional can expand.

The expansion of the paraprofessional role into the areas of academic advising and residence hall counseling suggests the necessity for more specialization in training procedures. Areas that provide information about residence hall life and academic advising must become a part of the training process. This will call for a greater amount of expertise among the upperclassmen applying for the position. Given such a trend, student participation in the formulation, execution, and evaluation of orientation programs should continue to increase in terms of both their numbers and their degree of
influence. Hopefully, the trend will ensure that freshman orientation remains focused on the actual needs of the incoming student.

The diversity among the types of orientation programs and entering student bodies should continue to increase for the foreseeable future. This will necessitate greater flexibility on the part of student orientation paraprofessionals. Proper selection, training, and supervision will be key elements in helping student paraprofessionals to meet the informational, social, and academic needs of the incoming students.
CHAPTER 7

The Paraprofessional in the Counseling Center

The widespread support for use of paraprofessional personnel in counseling centers noted in Chapter 1 (Crane & Anderson 1971; Geer 1971) can be understood partly in terms of the manpower crisis being experienced by many of these centers. Gallagher and Demos (1970) assert that "an increased counseling load has been reported by most college counseling centers, but the increase has been limited by staffing [p. 9]."

Recent studies (Albert 1968; Nugent & Pareis 1968; Oetting, Ivey & Weigel 1970) indicate that approximately two-thirds of U.S. colleges offering a baccalaureate degree have established some kind of counseling service on campus. Many additional colleges are currently in the process of setting up such services.

Although there has been a rapid increase in the number of counseling centers, there has been only a moderate increase in numbers of staff in established centers. At the same time there has been an increased demand for service by students, faculty, and administrators. Center directors have responded with measures such as setting up waiting lists, limiting the number of sessions of individual counseling that each student can receive, assessing fees, or experimenting with shortened times per session. None of these appear to have significantly alleviated the staffing problem.

At the same time that counseling center directors are coming to realize that student needs cannot be met with current staffing patterns, some leaders in the field are expanding the role of the counseling service into preventive and developmental areas. Although individual counseling remains the primary service of the counseling center, Oetting (1967) proposed that "we can no longer sit back and wait for students to line up for therapy or guidance; we must develop a concern for all of the students on the campus and the part that the college experience plays in their lives [p. 384]." Oetting, Ivey, and Weigel (1970) suggest a new kind of counseling program with the following goals: (a) to increase effectiveness of staff by teaching them to analyze and deal with problems in a shorter amount of time; (b) to extend into the campus community, identifying and using its mental health resources; and (c) to establish concern with prevention and personal growth as well as with remediation.

Morrill, Ivey, and Oetting (1968) have spoken to these general goals in the development of outreach programs that would offer services to students in settings outside the counseling center and would deal with prevention and growth as well as remediation. The focus of the outreach-development thrust is on "creating within the individual the ability to profit from the total college experience [Oetting, Ivey & Weigel 1970, p. 45]."

The three factors of manpower crisis, increasing numbers of centers, and an expanding role for the counseling staff are factors in the increasing readiness of directors to look toward paraprofessionals as part of the solution. Oetting, Ivey, and Weigel (1970) see students as one of the major mental health resources and assert that "any program that does not include active involvement of students would be only a partial and incomplete approach to campus mental health intervention [p. 48]." The value of the peer identification of the paraprofessional is being taken seriously as a unique component in counseling center programs.

The idea of using paraprofessionals in mental health is not new; in fact, mental health facilities have traditionally been the largest users of nonprofessionally trained personnel. Numerous pro-
grams have been undertaken, with research generally indicating effectiveness equaling or sometimes exceeding that of professionals (Beck, Kantor & Gelineau 1963; Carkhuff & Truax 1965; Ellsworth 1968; Magoon & Golann 1966; Truax & Lister 1970).

While programs using paraprofessionals have been developed and implemented on campus, few have been thoroughly evaluated. Zunker and Brown (1966) conducted a significant study using student counselors in a college study skills program. The study compared the effectiveness of professional counselors and trained students. Both groups were successful in communicating information about effective study procedures. However, student-counseled freshmen evaluated the counseling program significantly higher than did professionally counseled freshmen. Also, analysis of earned grades and residual study problems led to the conclusion that freshmen counseled by student counselors made greater use of the information received during counseling.

Although this study used students in the counseling role, it was not a counseling center program. Indeed, much of the service using student counselors appears to have been done in student services areas other than counseling centers. The specific function of the student as counselor in orientation, residence halls, and academic advising is covered in other chapters.

In a survey of 100 universities, Zunker and Brown (1966) found that students played a counselor-helper role on 67 percent of the campuses. These findings are similar to those of Powell (1959) where 147 of 181 campuses surveyed involved students in the counseling role. It appears in both instances that most of these functions took place outside the counseling center administrative structure.

Recent reports (Pyle & Snyder 1971) show increased paraprofessional involvement in central counseling center functions. This movement has been applauded by the task force on paraprofessionals established at the counseling center directors' conference in Kentucky (Task Force on Paraprofessionals 1970). The task force supported identification, training, and consultation with persons who have not necessarily had prior professional training in counseling.

Both the American Personnel and Guidance Association policy statement (1967) and the report of the 1965–66 Education and Training Committee, Division of Counseling Psychology, American Psychological Association (1966) support the use of paraprofessionals in counseling. The APA group urged professional psychologists to become involved in the training and supervision of paraprofessionals, as well as development of appropriate roles for them.

Function of the Student Paraprofessional

Studies of Function

A survey of 121 college counseling directors by Crane and Anderson (1971) indicated wide support for use of paraprofessionals to perform certain tasks in the center. While 64 percent reported using paraprofessionals, over 75 percent of the directors were in favor of using paraprofessional personnel. They felt that paraprofessionals were appropriate for the following roles: tutoring, working as a big brother to disadvantaged students, aiding in freshman orientation, assisting in research, providing guidance on study problems, administering vocational interest tests, manning emergency telephone service, and counseling students with adjustment to college difficulties. Strong disapproval was registered for use of paraprofessionals in counseling students with sexual or emotional problems, marriage difficulties, or symptoms of pathology or for administering individual intelligence or projective tests.

In a survey of 218 counseling centers, Geer (1971) found that paraprofessionals were employed in 47 percent of these centers. Eighty-seven percent of the centers using paraprofessionals used them in such tasks as testing, research, clinical work, and tutoring. Fifty-two percent of the centers using paraprofessionals used them for screening, academic advising, and interviewing students withdrawing from the university. Thirty-six percent of the paraprofessionals employed in these centers already had a BA degree. A number were graduate students working on practicums or internships. Therefore, the list of tasks performed does not necessarily represent those that would be assigned to the undergraduate paraprofessional.

Beal (1969) reports a survey of 126 junior college counselors and 104 counselor educators that attempted to identify appropriate duties for counselor aides in the community junior college. Most duties considered appropriate by both professional groups were those that helped counselees indirectly. Some of these involved minimal person-to-person contact. In direct contacts with students, paraprofessional activities were to be generally restricted to the dissemination of factual information. Most of the respondents thought that aides' activities should be limited largely to the counseling office, with referral, consultation, and community outreach perceived as inappropriate aide activities. The general belief was that such aides could best be trained in a two-year college program.

The Beal survey presents a more conservative point of view than either of the former surveys. The populations differed, and this may account for the differences in the results. It would appear that
center directors may be more willing to experiment at this point than either their co-workers (at least in the junior college setting) or their academic colleagues.

A Proposed Function

A descriptive model of the dimensions of counseling intervention will help us to define the tasks and functions of the paraprofessional in a counseling setting. Such a model has been developed by Morrill, Oetting, and Hurst (1972) (Figure 1). It provides for the identification and classification of a variety of counseling programs or interventions as a method of describing the potential activities of counseling centers. The three dimensions described are:

A. The target of the intervention, which refers to interventions aimed at (1) the individual, (2) his primary group(s), (3) his associational groups, or (4) the institutional or societal groups that influence his behavior

B. The purpose of the intervention, referring to whether the purpose of the intervention is (1) remedial, (2) preventative, or (3) developmental and not involving a problem orientation

C. The method of intervention, whether direct or indirect. That is, whether the counselor is (1) directly involved in initiating and implementing the intervention, (2) indirectly involved through consultation and training of others (i.e., paraprofessionals), or (3) indirectly involved through the use of media.

In essence, the dimensions deal with who or what the intervention is aimed at, why the intervention is attempted, and who will do the intervention (Morrill, Oetting & Hurst 1972). The authors state that the individual-remedial-direct intervention cell of the dimensions chart or "cube" represent the cornerstone of most counseling center programs. Any programs that move away from this cell in any direction are considered outreach programs. There is a good deal of overlap between the cells in this model. However, the dimensions are useful for categorizing and describing programs and provide a base for discussion of the paraprofessional function.

Use of paraprofessionals constitutes an indirect method of intervention for the center. That is, the service is provided by the paraprofessional and only indirectly by the professional who trains him. A number of programs combine methods by using both professionals and paraprofessionals in the giving of service.

Paraprofessionals can be involved in giving service to any of the four target groups, with a remedial, developmental, or preventative purpose. For purposes of description, services can be divided in terms of the target groups.

A. Individual

1. Intake, screening, and referral. The paraprofessional might be the first staff person to greet the student as he comes to the center. He could gather preliminary information regarding the student's concerns, then refer him to the appropriate person or resource, whether within the center or in another agency.

The paraprofessional can also be trained to do more detailed screening for specific services, such as study skills help or desensitization programs. The purposes of this process would be to determine the appropriateness of the center's program for the student's specific need and to do a brief diagnostic analysis of the problem.

2. Direct help to individuals or small groups. The paraprofessional can be trained to offer specific services to individual students or small groups (with focus on the individual). Help with study skills would be an example here. Paraprofessionals trained in behavior modification methods can run taped desensitization programs. When more highly trained, they can implement a variety of behavior modification programs. In this area, programs involving teaching of social and interpersonal skills should especially benefit from the involvement of student paraprofessionals with their peers.

Co-leadership with professionals in encounter or human relations groups provides another opportunity for the paraprofessional to offer both his interpersonal skills and his peer identification value to the center's programs.

Some centers are experimenting with student paraprofessionals as co-leaders in ongoing therapy groups or as helpers in the individual therapy process. In the latter instance, the student paraprofessional is often used to aid the client in developing appropriate interpersonal skills with peers. The paraprofessionals may be asked by the therapist to participate in the counseling process for a limited period of time in order to accomplish a specific goal. A few centers are experimenting with paraprofessionals working with individual clients.

3. Testing and evaluation. Paraprofessionals can be taught to administer and score the many types of group tests that are used in the center. They may also be able to aid in test interpretation to students, either individually or in groups. In terms of the evaluations for admissions, the student paraprofessional could gather data to be used in the decision making process.

B. Primary, associational, or institutional-societal group

A few paraprofessional functions remain much the same when the intervention changes to an attempt to deal with one or more of the groups that influence individuals. For example, paraprofessionals may lead or co-lead groups composed of
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primary or associational group members, such as a family or dorm group. The focus here is on growth and interaction in the group rather than growth for the individual. The setting thus requires additional skills in group process for the paraprofessional leader.

Most generally, the group target dimensions have developmental or preventive purposes rather than remedial purposes. These programs are in the outreach area, as defined by Morrill, Oetting, and Hurst (1972). Often, they involve a good deal of program development. The tasks required in this process are often new to professionals as well as to paraprofessionals. A team approach is recommended in outreach programs in order to maximize the resources available. Such a program team would best include professionals, allied professionals (professionals in a non-mental health field, e.g., academic faculty or campus ministers), paraprofessionals, and, often, student volunteers. Moore and Delworth (1972) have described steps in the program development process; Figure 2 indicates these steps. Recommended roles for paraprofessionals are checked. However, each team should use the paraprofessional members in terms of their particular skills and interests.

Evaluation plays an important part in the program development process as outlined in Figure 2. The paraprofessional should not be used here simply as an aid in gathering and processing data without any input regarding the design. As a student, aware of his peers’ perceptions of the center and its services, the paraprofessional can often make an excellent contribution to the entire research design.

The paraprofessional has a unique contribution to make in Stage IV—that of trainer of program leaders. After having participated in the earlier stages of planning, implementation, and evaluation, the paraprofessional can be used to train other students in specific techniques and skills relevant to the program delivery system. In some cases, the paraprofessional may also be used to teach these skills to professionals who have not previously worked in the particular program area.

Beyond development of a particular program that involves evaluation of both the need and the program outcome, a broader look at student needs and the campus environment should be undertaken. Such information will serve as the basis for ordering programs and for initiating or terminating agency activities. Paraprofessionals can be well used in this process, both in design and in the collection and interpretation of the data.

Selection

The general guidelines developed in Chapter 2 are appropriate here. Job descriptions are developed first, with students then selected on the basis of appropriate skills. Since paraprofessionals can function in many different roles in the counseling center, a specific job description for each position is especially important. Skills essential in one position may be less valuable for another. For example, some positions will require more expertise with groups than will other positions.

Some counseling center professionals select paraprofessionals exclusively from psychology majors. Although this background may help the paraprofessional to move into an applied psychology setting, a major in psychology is not the only way to gain such background. Social work, education, and business majors often have excellent background training for the required skills in helping relationships or technical statistical tasks.

Training

The basic training model presented in Chapter 3 is recommended for use with counseling center paraprofessionals. This model combines basic core training needed by all paraprofessionals with job-specific training. If all training takes place in the center, the basic core training could be interspersed with the job-specific training. Some positions, such as work in behavior modification, will require more extensive preservice training. Positions in program development might offer only an orientation and then build in training for the paraprofessional as the program is developed and specific skills are needed.

Thorough training, including extensive practice, needs to be given to paraprofessionals before they can work independently in the intake screening function. A portion of the training might involve doing joint intakes with professionals.

If there are a number of paraprofessionals who will need similar job-specific skills, one professional might take the responsibility for training all of them. Some time with the individual professional supervisor should still be scheduled, however, to build that relationship and to check out the applicability of the skills to that particular program.

Confidentiality is a crucial issue in use of paraprofessionals in counseling center operations. A policy regarding paraprofessional access to student records needs to be carefully developed and well understood by paraprofessionals during their training period. An optimal procedure would include paraprofessionals in the process of setting up such guidelines. They are often aware of specific problems that need to be resolved.

If the professional staff has an ongoing inservice training program, paraprofessionals might be invited to participate in this training. Paraprofessionals can often be included in parts of specific training
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Development Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formulate germinal idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Form program development team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assess agency staff - resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Complete checklist for all programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Compile all checklists for agency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Complete worksheet for agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Decide to support new program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assess and demonstrate need for program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Search practice and research literature</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Specify behavior objectives</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Create the delivery system i.e., training tasks</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluation planning</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Select measurement instruments</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Plan control group pilot design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Select staff for pilot run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Effectively and appropriately publicize your program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Offer pilot program to select sample</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Collect evaluation data consisting of</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Objective measurement scores, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Subjective feedback from leaders and participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Peruse all evaluation data and decide whether to continue to Stage IV</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Offer program regularly to wider populations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Develop effective training procedures for program leaders</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Conduct control group experiments to evaluate program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Develop supplementary aids for leaders and participants</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Continually study evaluation data and redevelop program</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pursue spin-off ideas and new directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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programs set up for practicum students or counseling center interns. Many paraprofessionals are highly motivated to increase their own knowledge and skills in a variety of counseling areas, not only those closely connected with their own positions. It is also possible to have selected paraprofessionals or professional-paraprofessional teams present a specific or job-related training program for the rest of the staff.

Evaluation

Chapter 5 discusses the importance of evaluating the paraprofessional, the professional, and the programs with which they are involved. Following guidelines discussed in that chapter, procedures can be developed to ascertain the effectiveness of paraprofessionals giving service to students. If a paraprofessional and a professional are involved in offering the same service, e.g., co-leaders of a group, it is important to assess student reaction to both paraprofessional and professional. It is also relevant to look at cost-benefits. Investment of training and supervision time by professionals should not be out of proportion to the amount of service rendered by paraprofessionals.

In program development, it often becomes difficult to separate out the function of the paraprofessional for purposes of evaluation. In such cases, the evaluation of the total service or program serves as the main evaluation of paraprofessional input. However, assessment by team members of quantity and quality of paraprofessional work can serve as additional data.

Funding

The sources outlined in Chapter 4 adequately cover the funding available for counseling center paraprofessionals. The counseling center or student services budget would be the usual primary funding source. One additional source might be inclusion of paraprofessionals in grants for improving or developing services that are received by senior staff members in the center or by faculty in the psychology department.

A Look Ahead

It seems feasible to assert that increased demand for service and an expanded view of the counseling center's role and function will lead to greater use of paraprofessionals. The functions outlined earlier in this chapter are more indicative of what is possible than of what is currently happening. A number of centers are now experimenting with such functions on a limited basis. An expansion of both the number of paraprofessionals employed and the activities in which they are engaged is predicted.

It seems quite possible too that paraprofessionals will have increased impact on the central function of counseling. As professionals become familiar with specific paraprofessionals through programs and evaluation, they often initiate inclusion of these students in the counseling process. Expanded roles here include greater use of paraprofessionals as co-leaders in therapy groups, as counselors or co-counselors with individuals (especially in terms of teaching and reinforcing relationship skills), and as leaders in specific, goal-directed groups.

Increased interest in the development of program packages, or modules, opens a large area for use of paraprofessional personnel. These modules are designed to teach specific skills and to be readily applicable in a variety of settings. Communication skills, microcounseling, and study methods are examples of such an approach. The programs can be used in the center itself or easily adapted for use in residence halls or other living units. Paraprofessionals can productively be involved in development and organization of such programs, as well as in the training of those who will use them.

Palmer (1970) points out that “the future of counseling and counseling services is bound up with the future of the university [p. 310].” Hopefully, counseling center professionals and paraprofessionals will turn increased attention to the problems of the total university community. The research and interpersonal skills and behavioral science knowledge of such persons could be used in reshaping the environment in classroom, residence hall, and other areas of campus life. In tomorrow's counseling center, as much time and effort may go into studying and altering the college environment as presently is expended in helping students to cope with that environment.

Counseling, perhaps more than any other student service, seems to have built up walls of "professionalism." Extended professional training and degrees have often isolated counseling staff from the students they seek to serve. Effective, visible, and respectful use of student paraprofessionals can do much to break down such walls and allow students to view counseling centers as viable resources.
CHAPTER 8

The Paraprofessional in Residence Halls

Residence hall staffing is often referred to as the most traditional use of paraprofessionals in higher education. Born in the era of the housemother concept and developed within the concern for the "total education" of each student, residence hall life has benefited from the ideas and perseverance of the paraprofessional in residence.

Prior to any legitimate discussion about the functioning of these positions, one should gain an appreciation of residence hall history. Philosophical reasoning behind the construction and use of student housing facilities over the years has varied proportionately to the basic changes in goals of higher education itself. Stated in a slightly different way, we have attempted to transform living units into dormitories into residence halls into living-learning centers.

Colonial history records show that college housing facilities were constructed out of simple necessity. Most campuses were located in remote areas, and housing was at a premium. Tutors served as staff within these units, having as their primary purpose the controlling of student social behavior. The mid-1800s could be called the most traumatic era for these housing structures, for it was during this period that they lost favor with some of America's leading educators. Condemned as contributors to the amoral behavior of students, many of these structures were converted for faculty and administrative use. The growth of the city college also diminished the need for housing facilities. Free enterprise actively competed to build to suit the needs of the commuting scholar.

The early 1900s proved to be the real turn-about period for college housing facilities. Frustrated with the delinquency of students living in the community and experiencing a resurging fear for the ever-increasing female population, colleges once more began to construct on-campus housing. In contrast to the views of only a half-century before, rationale was developed to support the "educational" worth of these structures. Orientation to college, the sharing of experiences, and better academic conditions were all cited as advantages of residence hall life. In addition, academic faculty more freely volunteered for staff positions during these years. Because of the progressively increasing number of students during this century, colleges began developing master plans for on-campus housing construction programs. Federal subsidies facilitated this growth.

Today we find residence hall life even more significantly aligned to the overall objectives of higher education. The philosophical base of operations for many residence hall systems has changed from a pure business-economic position to written assumptions about educational value. Program objectives consequently became co-curricular as well as extracurricular in nature.

These objectives too must be realistic and not only identified with the general purposes of higher education but aligned to the unique institutional goals of which it is a part. One residence hall system has made an effort to delineate such a position:

This objective can be furthered by the establishment of a "learning laboratory" environment extending beyond but not unrelated to the classroom, laboratory and library. This learning laboratory should include opportunities for every student to grow into a more effective person by being exposed to, and encouraged to experiment with a wide variety of social, cultural and intellectual opportunities; by assuming responsibility for his own behavior, and of fellow students; by learning how to make sound decisions; and by having opportunities for failure, success and self-evaluation.

Within this learning laboratory there should be adequate programs and services to facilitate the student learning process. Further, as the private citizen must understand the limits within which society gives him freedom to operate, so the University has the responsibility to clearly identify for the student the limits within which he is free to function in the academic community. To reinforce the student learning goal of becoming responsible for his own behavior, the student must be dealt with in a known and consistent way should he deviate from established limits [Colorado State University 1972, p. 2].
Staffing in college and university residence halls is a primary variable in determining the educational worth of the structure itself. Granted, other considerations such as physical environment and available services usually are extremely influential. However, without employing the skill of professional and paraprofessional staff, these other variables would lack direction and purpose.

Roles

For the purpose of discussion, these paraprofessional staff members will be called student assistants. Resident assistant, personnel assistant, and program advisor are also familiar titles to those in the profession. They normally perform their functions in floor sections, interacting with an identifiable core group of students. Generally, these paraprofessionals report directly to a professional staff member who is responsible for the total student personnel program of the residence hall. As was mentioned, the initial conception of the position of student assistant was to provide a control agent representing and enforcing the university’s position on the extracurricular life of students. In recent years, however, the paraprofessional’s role in the residence hall has been significantly enhanced. These roles now generally include counselor, advisor, limit setter, and administrator.

Counselor

The student assistant (paraprofessional) is predominantly judged by his competency in the area of counseling. Yet, the area by definition is probably the most ambiguous of all. Undergraduates can effect a “counseling” relationship with their peers that can initiate both growth and self-actualization. Counseling, in this sense, is characterized by the staff member’s ability to: (a) listen to the problem, (b) draw on some knowledge of counseling theory, (c) initiate a predetermined behavior change, and (d) follow up the sessions with progress reports.

There is, however, a limit in both time and involvement that the student assistant can spend on a particular concern. The staff member must be able to justify his inputs in relation to his own academic and social life, and he must be able to effect referral to a “professional” should the counseling relationship deteriorate. Peer group intervention in this area has proven to have positive effects for both the student and the university. Forman (1971) has shown how student alienation decreases with increased use of well-trained paraprofessional staff. Similarly, Wolff (1969) has demonstrated the value of undergraduate counselors in residence when used as group leaders to enhance interpersonal relations among group members. A good overview of this counseling role can be found in The College Student as Counselor (Nickerson & Harrington 1968).

Advisor

The giving of advice is much different from the role assumed in counseling. This is not to infer, however, that no special skill is required. Advice giving requires a knowledge of available resources and the particulars of the total educational community in which the residence hall exists. The advisor not only provides direction but also attempts to clarify positions and enhance communication between members of the total residence hall. Brown (1969) indicated that program facilitation can also be a major function of the paraprofessional within this role.

Limit Setter

Traditionally referred to as a strictly disciplinary role, the role of the “limit setter” has been expanded to integrate additional techniques using management and personnel concepts. As a limit setter, the staff member’s role becomes one of analyzing individual and group behavior problems and responding with alternate models. The effectiveness of this role depends on three variables: (a) the knowledge and understanding on the part of the staff member of what limits exist; (b) consistency in defining the limits to students and student groups; and (c) a commitment to the welfare of the group in its restricted setting.

In effect, what is proposed is an alternate model to the traditional in loco parentis concept. Beder and Rickard (1971) found that in this role the staff member typically arbitrates rather than sitting in judgment. Hefke (1969) supported this relationship in his study on authoritarianism and student assistant effectiveness. It goes without saying that balancing this role with the counseling effort is probably the most difficult problem encountered by staff.

Administrator

This role stands out as dominant in the eyes of the student who has only limited contact with the staff. Student satisfaction with accommodations is probably most directly affected by this role. As an administrator, the staff member’s attention is focused on the services offered, with emphasis on financial budgeting and efficiency of management. In this role, a great deal of time and effort is spent in analyzing methods of operation as they relate to student concerns and opinions. Secondary administrative functions generally include positive role model, public relations officer, and environmentalist.

Finally, three very important considerations need to be mentioned in relation to the aforementioned roles. Unlike any other campus paraprofessional
position, the student assistant has the variables of time (at least 9 months), proximity, and a relatively stable population on his side. As a result, these paraprofessionals in residence represent a primary agent for change and influence within the college setting. It is assumed that the total effect on the residence hall environment will be significant as a result of this form of staff intervention.

Selection

At most colleges, application for student assistant positions is extremely competitive. Consequently, this area is characterized by a great deal of experimentation and a determination to blend efficiency with fair employment practices. Prior to designing any selection procedures, the variables discussed below must be considered.

Functions and Job Description

Generally it is assumed that the student assistant assumes a generalist function. That is, he incorporates the four roles previously mentioned into his individual working model. He must be prepared to evaluate the individual and group needs of his resident population in the context of his employer's expectations. Consequently, it is imperative that the employer set down realistic job responsibilities and make them available to all prospective candidates. In so doing, the employer gains in terms of having forced himself to acknowledge and prepare role positions. Likewise, the candidate is presented a clearer picture of what is expected and can determine if he should seriously pursue application.

Special Qualifications

A second area of concern particularly crucial to the residence hall staff selection process revolves around selection through the identification of special qualifications. Should upperclass students be chosen because of experience? Observation has shown that upperclassmen do enjoy an advantage in "knowing the ropes" of university life, which consequently is an asset to the advising function they must perform. Then too the upperclass student generally should enjoy some degree of academic stability and proficiency in order to set aside time to handle the position in addition to serving as an academic role model. Previous residence hall experience also provides the applicant with some means of predicting patterns of group behavior, which is essential to effective staff functioning.

More specific qualifications might include the pairing of staff academic or extracurricular interests with a floor section pre-assigned on the basis of having this similar interest. A homogeneous versus heterogeneous staff also must be considered when balancing the need to respond to a total living unit against the need for cooperation and trust among the paraprofessional staff members. Traditional attributes such as leadership and communications skills must also be heavily weighted in the analysis of applicants.

Numbers of Applicants and Positions

Another consideration, often overlooked but definitely critical to the selection process, involves the number of candidates for the available positions. One should be cautioned not to make initial screenings a superficial process. A point to remember is that a good selection process can be developed as a successful public relations tool as well. In most instances, where little variety is offered among a total system of residence halls, it is probably more effective and equitable to handle candidate selection on a system rather than individual hall basis. This tends to promote hiring on the basis of qualifications rather than hiring because of proximity to the selection team.

Methods

Based on the aforementioned role expectations, qualifications for such positions would seem comprehensive to say the least. As many authors have noted, there is no model student assistant. Given this perspective, one can appreciate the variety of methods of selection that do exist. Generally, interviews, written applications, references, and pre-hiring sessions that provide an overview of the position itself have proven to be the most widely used methods.

Experimentation with this process has become a preoccupation within the field. Results of inter-personal attitude measurements (Biggs 1971), roleplaying (sociodrama) (Nadin & Sonders 1969), and leaderless group techniques (Banta & McCormick 1969) have all proven somewhat useful in the selection process. This scientific explanation of the selection process is summarized by Wotruba (1969) in an article entitled, "Can Residence Hall Staff Be Selected Scientifically?" It must be noted, however, that even with a definition of student assistant personality types (Durst 1970), there are no instruments available that by themselves have the ability to indicate successful staff potential. Selection procedures should follow an order dictated by one goal—to use combined techniques that indicate an appreciation for the position itself, interest and abilities of the applicants, specific and general student needs, expectations and limitations of the university, the goals of the residence hall program, and the physical setting.

Training

Effective staff training can be accomplished more readily if careful attention is given to the process of
selection. Success with this phase seems to rest with the initiative, understanding, and perseverance of the central housing administration, complemented by the support of professional hall staff. Basically, two forms of training exist, both of which are extremely critical to student assistant development.

Pre-Job (Orientation)

A number of techniques employed here are generally geared to provide the paraprofessional staff with general input on the functioning and expectations of the position. Generally, a historical overview is provided so as to give the student assistant a perspective of changing attitudes and rationales. Normally, a manual of operation is distributed at this time.

Two methods of pre-orientation are generally prescribed. One consists of pairing a newly appointed staff member with a veteran to learn and observe on-the-job techniques. This is helpful providing the selection process occurs significantly before job responsibilities begin and providing the veteran student assistant is interested and adaptable to this form of training.

A second more widely used form of pre-job training consists of a workshop program. Formal and informal sessions are usually designed to impart information as well as to respond to staff concerns. Greenleaf (1967) describes in more detail six potential goals of such a program:

1. To familiarize resident assistants with the student personnel and residence hall staff and to acquaint them with the expectation of the college community
2. To familiarize each resident assistant with the specific responsibilities of his job
3. To provide an opportunity to meet those people on campus with whom they will have a close working relationship and to whom they may refer students
4. To become better acquainted with fellow staff members and those to whom they are directly responsible. These associations are important to the development of real teamwork.
5. To allow resident assistants to become settled in their rooms and ready to greet and help new students
6. To be ready to open the halls effectively and efficiently

Casse and Peckword (1971) and Morgan (1972) have concluded that the workshop format can be innovative in its relationship to the training function. This format is highlighted by its unique ability to satisfy both the needs of the paraprofessional as the recipient of information and the needs of the professional as the communicator of expectations.

On-the-job (Inservice Training)

Training must be viewed as a continuing process, particularly where the residence hall staff is concerned. The generalist functions indicate that training must be wide in scope yet detailed to the points of exploration and understanding. Consequently, skill acquisition must reflect staff roles within the hall and might include effective administrative/operational roles, crisis intervention training, communication skills workshops, auxiliary/referral service operations, and discipline process.

Methodology

The presentation of training programs can either substantiate or destroy the aforementioned content. A general approach might be as follows:

1. Gear training to observable needs and program objectives.
2. Differentiate between individual and group needs.
3. Give staff an opportunity to express opinion (supportive or dissident).
4. Follow up on ideas and suggestions offered.
5. Be able to provide a good rationale for decision.

Some training methods, such as with an academic presentation, are designed for total staff participation. Programs conducted on a hall level have more potential for relating to specific interests of the group. Rand and Carew (1970) and Weinstein (1969) have cited the benefits of group training in relation to the student assistant role. Because residence hall staff work as a team within a given hall, the form of training facilitates open communication and direct behavioral feedback.

Evaluation

Little has been written about effective staff evaluation. One might expect that because these staff in residence have existed longer than any other paraprofessional group that evaluation measures would be more refined. Such is not the case. Therefore, suggestions for evaluation are proposed to be used as an assessment of staff growth and development.

Student assistant evaluation must center on a defined feedback mechanism. The goal with this type of model is to provide staff with support as well as to issue constructive criticism when necessary. Much staff alienation and frustration can stem from non-use of this particular model.

Legitimate feedback can come from three main sources. The professional student personnel person in charge of the total living unit should provide a main source of information. Feedback of this na-
ture should be regular and systematic in nature, covering all aspects of the job description.

Floor members with whom the paraprofessional works can also contribute significantly to his evaluation. Probably these people are in the best position to make suggestions or offer alternatives if two conditions exist: (a) personal friendship does not interfere with objective appraisal and (b) there is a good understanding of job functions by floor members.

A third source of evaluation can come from the paraprofessional himself. That is, given the proper techniques or measures, the paraprofessional can run a self-assessment procedure integrating feedback from the two other sources.

A variety of forms exist to facilitate evaluation in each of the abovementioned areas. However, caution should be rendered in adopting forms without giving thought to job descriptions or specific program objectives. Major areas that should be noted in student assistant evaluation are: (a) adherence to job description/role functioning; (b) support, dedication, and attitude issues; (c) effect on the floor environment; (d) creativity; and (e) development of skills.

Funding

Because of the unique live-in nature of the position, remuneration usually comes in the form of a room/board waiver. Staff with additional programming or supervisory functions may be given a small monetary allotment as well. Typically, waiver of tuition is not possible for undergraduate staff.

In designing on-duty time, consideration should be given to the fact that this paraprofessional position demands 24-hour on-call duty. The Fair Labor Standards Act should be reviewed in light of this unique arrangement.

Look to the Future

Future uses of these paraprofessionals in residence become a question of imaginative thinking, available funds, and additional research. Stated more specifically, we need to develop and refine roles in addition to performing a more comprehensive evaluation of outcomes and effects. If this is accomplished, we can proceed to a more imaginative state. Riker's (1965) analysis of residence halls of the future includes four major points:

1. Basically, housing units of the future will be designed as means for organizing students at large and small institutions into comprehensible living communities.
2. Student living communities will be encouraged as educational aids because of their motivational qualities.
3. Student housing will be used to focus student energy on learning.
4. Group living will be identified as a part of the curriculum and used in teaching human behavior, development, and relationships [pp. 4-5].

Given this medium of operation, future uses of these paraprofessionals might then include their involvement in group facilitation, developing crisis intervention programs, consulting on physical design of buildings, developing ombudsman functions within the hall, facilitating psychometric evaluation of students, and serving as primary liaison between the hall and other student services areas.
The Paraprofessional in Academic Assistance

As recently as 1968, student participation in academic affairs was largely limited to the traditional roles established by department chairmen. Such roles included membership on curriculum committees, the use of graduate students as teaching assistants, and student input into course and teacher evaluation (Crookston 1968). The turbulence in academic circles caused by student activism during the late 1960s brought about a realization on the part of many administrative and faculty members that students needed to be directly involved in their own education. The opportunity for selected and trained upperclassmen to contribute to the education of their peers arose from this realization.

The diversity of academic assistance programs that paraprofessionals participate in today developed in response to a number of institutional changes. The need to offer both compensatory and developmental programs to facilitate the academic adjustment of culturally disadvantaged students, the emphasis on individualized approaches to learning, and the need for centralized advising have thus contributed to the use of student staff. Academic advising has become a more specialized area because faculty advisors on some campuses were unable (or unwilling) to commit the time necessary to keep up with new developments in college requirements and curricular offerings. The need for more individualized approaches to instruction and the recognition that education should relate to the needs of the individual student brought about small group learning techniques and increased emphasis on tutorial programs.

One of the first areas to use student help in academic assistance was one-to-one tutoring. Typically, an outstanding student was recruited by an instructor to tutor a number of low achievers in his class for remuneration on a private basis.

Perhaps the greatest influence on academic assistance programs has been the advent of open admissions. With the initiation of open admissions policies in a number of public institutions, more high-risk students are being admitted to colleges and universities. If open admissions is not to be any more than a cruel experiment for the moderate- and high-risk student, remedial and compensatory education programs must be provided.

Paraprofessionals are now being used more extensively in academic assistance programs as a result. Compensatory programs have been dominated by the peer-group approach. Rochford (1972) found that peer tutoring has been a prominent factor in many pre-college remedial programs for culturally different students. In addition, he noted the following trends in student responsibility: (a) greater student responsibility toward fellow students, (b) merging of students and administration in developing and maintaining programs, and (c) awareness of the ability of students to recruit others into the program.

Student assistants have been used widely in learning laboratory programs. These programs contrast to summer remedial sessions because they continue throughout the academic year. Student paraprofessionals have been widely used to provide individual support and instruction within the learning lab setting for those whose anticipated success in college is negligible (Baker & Beckenstein 1970; Brown 1965; Cheadle 1969; Milander & Simmons 1971; Miller, Antenen & Duncan 1971; Rochford 1972; Taylor, Roth & Hanson 1971).

Additional use of paraprofessionals in academic assistance can be delineated. In the area of academic advising, for example, at many institutions student paraprofessionals have taken over the roles formerly held by the traditional faculty advisor. Student, staff, and faculty evaluation of such programs has been positive, with the student advisees rating their satisfaction with peer advisors as very satisfactory. Faculty have not resented this take-over by the
paraprofessional, as it frees them to spend more
time with their academic fields of specialization and
provides more time for counseling individual pupils
(Baxter 1971; Brown et al. 1971; Upcraft 1971).

Compensatory programs for high-risk students,
such as SEEK (Backer & Beckenstein 1970), SPEED
(Miller, Antenen & Duncan 1971), and Transitional
Year (Cheadle 1969), have used students effectively
as tutors, study skills group leaders, and learning
laboratory staff. Special individual and group tutor-
ing programs facilitated by paraprofessionals have
positively affected the academic achievement of
high-risk students. They have lowered attrition
rates as well. Student exposure to peer counseling,
subject-matter tutoring, and learning lab instruc-
tion indicates a positive effect on grade point average
and lower attrition rates among participants (Agar
1971; Cartwright 1970; Froman 1972; Taylor 1969;
Taylor, Roth & Hanson 1971; Tribolo 1971).

Peer academic adjustment counseling has also
contributed toward positive changes in the attitudes
and study orientation of freshmen (Brown et al.
1971). Brown and Zunker (1966a) found student
counselors to be as effective as professionals in
the area of academic adjustment counseling. In addi-
tion, they found that freshmen counseled by stu-
dent counselors made considerably greater use of
information received during academic adjustment
counseling as reflected by their grades and lack of
residual study problems.

Experimental housing programs have been de-
signed to include peer counseling and tutoring as
part of the living-learning concept. Shafer (1969)
found that residence hall academic assistance pro-
grams were effective in preventing dropouts and
increasing grade point averages among potentially
low-achieving college freshmen. Where student
tutor counselors were trained to tutor small
groups of freshmen, academic achievement among
participants was positively affected. Taylor, Roth,
and Hanson (1971) found that where upperclass
tutors were used to implement individual and
group tutorial assistance, consistent academic ad-
vantage was reported for students of high and mid-
dle socio-economic background. In addition, they
found that residence hall tutorial programs showed
positive effects by lowering attrition rates among
students from low socio-economic backgrounds as
well.

**Rationale**

It seems clear from the preceding research that
student paraprofessionals, given adequate training
and supervision, can effectively tutor, advise, counsel,
and even teach other students. Little has been
said here about the efficacy of using graduate stu-
dents as tutors. It is assumed, however, that
graduate teaching assistants serve in a professional
capacity, and they will thus be excluded from the
discussion of paraprofessionals.

The traditional concept that faculty or a profes-
sional advising staff must carry out the academic
advising function is increasingly being challenged.
One reason is that faculty members have been
known to not keep up to date with changes in pro-
grams and procedures. In addition, when the fac-
ulty of an institution is predominately part-time, or
where a high rate of turnover exists, the continuity
of the advising function becomes limited (Upcraft
1971).

In the past, the needs of freshmen may have been
slighted. A freshman who arrives on campus with-
out firm plans or career commitments sometimes
finds he has to prolong his stay or curtail the
breath of his program later on because of inade-
quate advising.

One alternative to faculty advising is to hire a
professional advising staff. Another is to use up-
perclassmen as academic advisors. Brown and
Zunker’s data (1966a) suggests that a student coun-
selor can provide a positive addition to the campus
guidance program. Murry (1972) went on to sug-
gest that considerable savings could be realized at
no loss in quality if properly trained seniors were
used as academic advisors.

Additional reasons are available to support the
use of paraprofessionals. Brown (1965) specified
that peer advising assures earlier guidance for
freshmen. In addition, he maintained that it frees
professional guidance workers from routine tasks
in order to pursue more specialized counseling ac-
tivities. It also provides for improved communica-
tion channels between students and faculty.

In summary, use of paraprofessionals in academic
assistance is not only useful but economi-
ocal. Brown (1965) found that it is acceptable in
terms of both student and faculty approval. In addi-
tion, he found it to be effective in terms of de-
creased attrition and increased grade point average
and practical in terms of both facilities and supervi-
sion.

Use of student counselors for academic assistance
has additional advantages. Peers are sometimes
more willing to listen to other students’ advice. The
peer counselor can understand the problems of the
freshman and speak his language. In addition,
capable paraprofessionals may be able to communi-
cate the academic needs of their clients back to the
faculty and student personnel staffs in order to
assure that student input is heard.

Developmental programs designed to prevent
academic deficiencies from occurring, by placing
emphasis on individual attention and learning, have
a stronger potential for improving the problem solv-
ing skills of the participants than the more tradi-
tional approach to education (Miller, Antenen & Duncan 1971). Paraprofessionals can be used to facilitate developmental and remedial programs by developing a peer-group atmosphere characterized by informality and flexibility. As a result, the student participant feels more comfortable in his learning surroundings. Students can sometimes receive more direct and detailed information than professionals can provide. Information about courses, the quality of certain instructors, grading systems, and other informal matters can be more accurately and naturally filtered down through the peer culture. Care must be taken, however, that such a process does not lead to the spreading of officially sanctioned myths and misinformation among students. It is hoped that proper training and supervision will prevent the informal communication channels from becoming a grapevine.

In short, greater gains from academic assistance programs will occur when instruction can be designed to meet the individual needs of the student. Paraprofessionals can offer constant individual attention in an informal atmosphere. They can counsel individuals separately or in groups and create a relaxed, nonpressured learning atmosphere that will help students develop their academic talents to their fullest potential.

Functions and Roles

The various functions and roles of the paraprofessional can be delineated for each of the three general types of academic assistance programs: academic advising, tutorial assistance, and learning laboratory. There is considerable overlap among the job descriptions for the academic assistance paraprofessionals. Specifically, assistants operating in all three types of programs can perform the following functions: (a) scheduling and conducting individual or group sessions with clients; (b) collecting data relevant to the operation of the program; (c) keeping records of sessions and their outcomes and progress reports on clients; (d) establishing and conducting liaison with faculty and staff; and (e) making appropriate referrals.

Academic Advising

The campus office of academic advising should be concerned with advising certain groups of students on matters pertaining to their programs of study. The advisees may consist of only freshman students (Brown 1965; Upcraft 1971), or all general studies students, or students who have yet to declare a major or are between majors (as is the case at Colorado State University). Accordingly, paraprofessionals could schedule individual sessions with each advisee to discuss questions of curriculum and course planning. Choice and change of major and selection of courses and their sequence are among the subjects the academic advisor should discuss with his clients. The paraprofessional can advise the student concerning his course options, balancing electives and core curriculum, and his program as it relates to the advisee's individual needs.

Knowledge of the institution should play a large part in the academic advisor's job. This entails familiarity with academic requirements and changes in curriculum. Registration procedures and their implication for the advisee's program of study also need to be understood. The bulk of this information can be found in the college or university catalog and in department bulletins. Career information is typically found in the placement center or career services office on campus. This information should be collected and stored where the advisor will have access to it during advising interviews.

In addition to resource information, records of advisees' course programs, grades, schedule changes, and progress toward the degree should be kept and made available to the advisor. This gives the paraprofessional some information to use to prepare in advance for advising interviews. These records should be semi-confidential and thus viewed solely by the advisor, the student, and the director when appropriate.

The academic advising role concerns matters ranging from signing the advisee's registration program to confronting serious academic and personal adjustment problems. It is expected that the paraprofessional will not attempt to deal with sensitive personal problems his clients may confront him with. Matters beyond the advisor's expertise should be referred to qualified counselors, faculty, and other appropriate agencies.

The academic advising paraprofessional can work with students in the traditional role of the faculty advisor. Faculty, on the other hand, can be useful to the paraprofessional as resource persons. One concern is that faculty may fear becoming more distant from students when relieved of the advising function. In order to facilitate faculty acceptance of the paraprofessionals, communication with the academic departments must be extensive. One mode of communication, used at Colorado State University, is to designate a "key professor" in each department. The key professor serves as the departmental official with whom academic advising paraprofessionals communicate regularly on matters that concern the department. Another way of bringing the paraprofessionals and departments closer together is to have the paraprofessionals advise within the department offices.

The academic advising office can be directed by a professional who, in addition to carrying an advising load, should be responsible for selecting and
training the paraprofessionals. In addition, the director establishes the original liaison with other pertinent agencies within the institution and represents the office at divisional meetings.

**Tutorial Assistance**

Tutorial assistance programs may consist of individual or group sessions conducted by student tutors. The tutors can assist underachievers to improve their grades in specific subject or course areas. Tutorial sessions, accordingly, should be aimed toward mastery of subject matter.

During tutorial sessions, the paraprofessional can assist his clients to become proficient in the subject area. He can suggest methods of study, review examination expectations, and drill participants over specific subject matter. Clients should be provided individual sessions, group sessions, or a combination of types of sessions as deemed necessary by the tutor.

The record-keeping function is also important in tutorial assistance. Records of test grades, semester or quarterly grade point averages, and progress toward the degree should be kept on file. Progress reports are a necessary instrument of evaluation and a good diagnostic tool.

Tutors should make referrals to graduate teaching assistants, instructors, and academic advisors for inquiries concerning academic concerns such as course content. Personal problems of a serious nature should be directed to professional staff in the residence halls or to staff counselors in the counseling center or student personnel division.

**Learning Laboratory**

Learning laboratory operations should provide the incoming student with academic "first aid." The programs are designed to assist students in overcoming learning deficiencies resulting from cultural or educational disadvantages before these deficiencies hinder academic adjustment. For example, students from foreign backgrounds are often referred to this type of program for language assistance.

The learning laboratory paraprofessional should provide each client with an individual intake interview. During the interview, the assistant can make a diagnosis of the client's learning deficiencies. In order to facilitate proper diagnosis, the paraprofessional should have access to the student's academic records and test scores.

After the student's learning deficiencies have been determined, the paraprofessional should consult with the director and relay his findings. He can then refer the client to the appropriate remedial tasks. Learning labs use the latest educational technology. Among the instruments included are programmed texts, teaching machines, audiovisual aids, and multimedia programs. The paraprofessional should assign tasks that will relate to the individual's needs, based on a working knowledge of each instrument. For example, a student who is deficient in mathematics can be referred to a programmed text to determine his level of proficiency. Afterwards, he can be assigned to tutoring or given other technical assistance. The director and other professionals should provide supervision by consulting with the paraprofessional on the assignments of remedial tasks. In addition, the professional can act as a remediation specialist and may conduct some of the remedial sessions.

In addition, students who are found to have study skills deficiencies may be referred to the study skills section. Study skills sessions should cover the following types of developmental and/or remedial work: (a) efficient methods for reading textbooks, (b) taking better notes, (c) writing themes and reports, and (d) preparing for and taking examinations (Brown 1965). These students also commonly exhibit a need for improvement in time budgeting, concentration, and note-taking habits during lectures.

The paraprofessional should schedule and conduct sessions in which he is directly involved with the client's remedial learning. For example, the paraprofessional may act as a group leader for a study skills session.

Progress reports, grades, and other relevant data should be kept by the paraprofessional. This becomes necessary for both diagnostic and evaluation purposes. Students who are not making progress can be given additional work and individual attention, while those who are progressing can be reinforced and assigned higher level tasks.

**Selection**

All paraprofessionals in academic assistance programs should be selected according to some basic criteria. More specific criteria for each type of program are also suggested. Of course, it is assumed that a minimal characteristic important for every person working in academic assistance is a favorable attitude toward helping students academically, either directly or indirectly. In addition, the following general selection criteria are recommended: (a) academic achievement exhibited by grade point average, (b) leadership potential, (c) adequate interpersonal skills and ability to relate to others, (d) self-confidence and significant degree of interest in the program, (e) the ability to relate to other students, and (f) expertise in a specific academic area or program.

All academic assistance programs should be staffed with people who display the above qualifications. Academic achievement is a necessary criteria, because if a student is to put sufficient time into his program, his grades must not suffer. Lead-
ership abilities, as evidenced by past activities and/or current potential, are important because of the group work involved in each program. The paraprofessional may frequently be called on to lead group discussions, especially in the learning lab and tutorial assistance programs, as well as to function as a role model for freshman advisees.

Verbal skills are important prerequisites because the professional needs to communicate effectively with his clients. The applicant's self-confidence and degree of interest give an indication of his motivation toward obtaining the position. An ability to relate to other students is a more obvious necessity. In order to be effective in a student-oriented program, the paraprofessional must be able to communicate with the clientele.

In addition, the paraprofessional needs abilities related to the specific program area in which he is to work. For example, academic advisors need some working knowledge about the institution's academic set-up, including scholastic standards and academic review procedures. Tutors need to have a good working knowledge of the subject matter in which they will be helping students.

Each academic assistance program also requires additional qualifications specific to its functions. Academic advising paraprofessionals must be able to relate to faculty and administrators as well as to students. This job entails more liaison with a wider range of departmental and student personnel staff than any other. It is important that the paraprofessionals selected establish this important liaison. Student academic advisors in turn must be able to accept supervision more readily and limit their advice to matters for which they have been trained. The academic advising role relates closely to the student's progress toward a degree, and careful, adequate training must be provided so that advisors will not give incorrect information.

Tutorial assistants should be selected on the basis of mastery in their subject area. Grade point average in the discipline in which he will tutor is an important selection criterion for the student tutor. A tutor can better relate his expertise to clients if he is acknowledged as somewhat of a specialist in his subject area.

The learning lab professionals will have to deal with many high-risk students. An interest in working with students who have learning or motivational deficiencies is therefore a prerequisite. Clients for learning labs are frequently chosen because of their deficiencies, and supportive attitudes on the part of student staff are important if helping relationships are to develop. Patience and understanding are qualities that are desirable, as is competence in the programming areas. These qualities may often be found by selecting paraprofessionals from students of disadvantaged backgrounds. For example, the learning lab may wish to hire students who have successfully undertaken a remedial program themselves.

The method of selection should include a formal application process and an interview. The formal application should include general data about each applicant. Applications should be coordinated through one office so interviews can be set up.

If possible, the candidate's skills should be explored more deeply through some type of an interview in order for verbal and interpersonal skills to be exhibited and assessed more directly. Both individual and group interviews can include simulated testing of group and interpersonal skills. Group interviews and leaderless group discussions are potential selection devices, because they allow the selection committee to observe the applicants in a close-to-real situation. Attitude and interest batteries can be used but only in conjunction with self-report information.

Training

All academic assistance paraprofessionals should be provided with preservice training. The amount and type of this preservice training will differ according to the program.

In all programs, incoming employees can be trained in part by the current student staff. This method permits past experience to become a factor in the training of new paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals can relate their own experience directly to the newly hired staff in order to inform them of realities of the program and the positions for which they have been selected.

Preservice training for academic advising paraprofessionals should include developing familiarity with core curriculum and various college degree requirements, as well as some communication skills training and general readings on advising techniques. Inservice training for academic advisors can be developed through individual and group conferences with the director (a professional). In addition, weekly staff meetings and human relations training to further develop the advisor's interpersonal and advisory skills can be effective. Upcraft (1971) reported the use of sensitivity processes in training academic advisors. Small groups were used over an extended period of time to train advisors in group skills through analysis of experience, feelings, reactions, perceptions, and behavior.

Tutorial assistants and learning lab paraprofessionals who will work with high-risk and culturally disadvantaged students should be provided with some empathy training. In addition, lectures and discussions by culturally disadvantaged people concerning their heritage, feelings, and needs have been proposed (Pierce & Norrell 1970).
Special tutorial techniques courses have been designed to train tutors for underprivileged children. Blankenberg (1971) reported on the use of a student-initiated course for tutors. Through the course, student-tutors learned about the life of the underprivileged child, his home and school environment, specific tutoring techniques, and methods of formulating lesson plans. Similar courses could be applied to the higher education setting. Speakers from the academic community and outside speakers who are familiar with minority relations could be brought in to discuss areas that concern tutors. Of special interest may be the background and resulting attitudes of the culturally different student. Education specialists can instruct on teaching and tutoring techniques as well as methods of increasing students' motivation.

In order to increase the likelihood that the high-risk students will return for further tutorial or learning lab sessions, a productive helping relationship must be established between the paraprofessional and the participant. In many programs, maintaining a stable relationship between tutor and student may determine whether or not a student remains in the program. Training should help to increase the paraprofessional's effectiveness in facilitating such relationships.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the paraprofessionals and the programs in general must be comprehensive. Participants, supervisors, and the paraprofessionals must all be directly involved in the process.

Paraprofessionals, through staff conferences, individual interviews, or anonymous questionnaires, should be asked whether they are satisfied with their function and whether they believe the program has been worthwhile for the participants. In addition, suggestions for re-designing or strengthening the program should be solicited. Conferences and supervisory sessions scheduled on a regular basis provide opportunities to facilitate such input from the paraprofessionals.

Consultation meetings allow the paraprofessionals to channel direct feedback to the supervisor. This feedback should include student reaction to the program and student suggestions for revision of the program objectives and methods employed.

Student-participant feedback is a necessary part of evaluation. In addition to the direct reaction the participants provide to the paraprofessional, students can provide other useful forms of feedback. An open-ended questionnaire concerning the efficacy of the program, whether it should be continued, how it should be revised, and elaboration of these points can be administered. The paraprofessional and supervisor should collaborate on the design of the evaluation instrument in order to maximize its effectiveness and objectivity. In addition, progress records (including grades and other indicators of academic adjustment), attrition rates, and changes in attitude and confidence can be compared to similar data from samples of students from the university with abilities similar to those participating in the program.

Faculty members should be brought into the evaluation process. For academic advising especially, faculty should be systematically questioned to determine their feelings concerning the effectiveness of advising. This feedback is especially beneficial for academic advisors, since they will have taken on the faculty advisor's traditional function. A faculty poll can also assist in the assessment of the total university reaction to the academic assistance programs.

Funding

Funding for academic assistance paraprofessionals can come from a number of sources, depending on where the program falls in the organizational set-up of the institution. Academic advising salaries can be funded through the campus office of student relations, the equivalent of the student affairs operation. Residence halls can also provide funding for their tutorial programs. Counseling center funds can be tapped for learning lab paraprofessionals. Work-study funds are available for salaries of low-income background paraprofessionals who are likely to be working with compensatory education. The use of work-study salary funds can result in considerable savings when budgeting for salaries if the employee qualifies by exhibiting unmet financial need. Other possible forms of remuneration include room and board for residence hall tutors and waivers of tuition. Departments might also grant academic credit for participation in tutorial training programs.

Another potential source of funding is student government. Student governments can fund the facilities and salaries needed for paraprofessionals to implement a tutorial assistance program. In return, professional staff can donate their time and expertise to train and supervise the tutors. Facilities in the student union or student government offices (if available) can be used for meetings between students and tutors.

A Look to the Future

Positive reaction has been reported concerning the use of student paraprofessionals in academic
assistance programming. As far back as 1966, Brown and Zunker (1966b) reported that the majority of respondents to their survey believed the use of student counselors was likely to increase during the next ten years. Their predictions have been borne out.

Considering the positive student and university reaction to the programs, it is likely that the para-professional will increasingly be used in the staffing of academic assistance programs. Along with this, centralized academic advising offices, a relatively new phenomenon on the campus, will continue to increase in importance. In addition, student advising offices within each college, like those established at the University of Michigan in 1969 ("Student Advising Office," Capsule 1970), may appear to offer more informal peer tutoring and useful information to students.

Tutorial assistance can be expected to increase, providing more students decide to take advantage of the service. In addition, tutorial assistance is becoming part of the job description for resident assistants in many housing programs. As residence halls move closer to the living-learning center concept, special tutoring within residence hall units should increase.

In addition to the foregoing, there are two other potential areas for expansion of tutorial assistance that should be explored. First, academic departments should be encouraged to fund their own tutorial service. Academic honorary societies can be tapped for students of outstanding ability. These students could then tutor lower division students and conduct review sessions for large lecture courses, thus relieving the graduate teaching assistants of that task.

Undergraduates will likewise move toward a more central academic function—that of teaching. A number of departments are currently experimenting with undergraduate teaching assistants who serve as discussion group leaders and lab assistants.

It is likely that increased numbers of high-risk students will be entering our public institutions. This trend will necessitate more remedial learning programs. Year-long learning laboratory programs and compensatory summer workshop programs for culturally deprived students are likely to increase accordingly. This trend has already become apparent in the community colleges.

As more high-risk students enroll in the community junior colleges and as the number of community colleges continues to expand, compensatory education will become as much of a necessity for the incoming students as books and classrooms. Here lies a great potential for expanded use of paraprofessionals, if the open door admissions concept is to be prevented from becoming the "revolving door" for the high-risk student. In this manner, paraprofessionals should continue to aid the academic adjustment of students with more diverse levels of ability who increasingly inhabit our classrooms in the 1970s.
CHAPTER 10

The Paraprofessional in General Student Services

The phrase "general student services" is a catch-all term we use to encompass programs not outlined individually in the other chapters. These services are found in a variety of forms on most campuses. Specifically, this chapter will deal with paraprofessional involvement in the following areas: admissions and records; student relations; intramural athletics; student activities; food service; off-campus housing; financial aid; placement service; and health center operations. There are common threads of responsibilities running throughout these programs.

First, all represent a form of direct service to students. Programs such as admissions, food service, and health service might be termed mandatory contact programs. In other words, it would be extremely difficult for students to proceed through four years of undergraduate education without relying on the special services these programs offer. Other programs such as intramurals, placement, and financial aid provide a type of optional service dictated by student need and interests. Whichever type of service we are discussing, however, the possibility of paraprofessional involvement still exists.

Second, these services are grouped together with operational budget ties and generally all fall under the responsibility of the chief student personnel administrator on campus, i.e., the Dean of Students or Vice President for Student Affairs. Usually, similarity of goals is a result of this budgeting and supervisory alignment.

Finally, it is important to note that all these services developed as a result of the expressed needs of both the students and the university to increase efficiency of operations. As a result, each service has become more specialized in the field of student personnel, particularly as the size and complexity of our colleges and universities increase.

Each of the individual services can be analyzed through consideration of the following variables: (a) overview of service, (b) current involvement of students as staff, and (c) potential uses of paraprofessionals.

Admissions and Records

Office responsibilities with the admissions and records division remain mostly clerical in nature. Processing freshman and transfer applications, screening candidates, and distributing information are procedures typically given a high priority. Recruitment—the active competition for qualified students—must also be rated as an important service function. The records function within the office is often fully or partially computerized to facilitate accuracy and ready access to information.

Current use of student staff has been limited. The "campus guide" function, using students in an orientation role with prospective students and parents, is prevalent (Pearson, Logan & Beath 1969). These same students are often used in high school “College Night” orientation programs for purposes of peer identification. Obviously, student recruitment is emphasized in these programs. An additional successful use of student involvement is cited by Shook (1970). At Western Maryland College, two students have been added as full members of the admissions committee. Their input is reported to be invaluable in the area of application review. In his concluding remarks, Shook indicates that "the experiences support the argument for student representation on admissions committees. Assuming that the student representatives are carefully selected and dedicated to the task at hand, the outcome could be most beneficial to everyone [1970, p. 20]."

There exist three major areas of potential involvement for paraprofessional staff beyond those outlined. First, it seems possible that students could
be of tremendous assistance in handling intake interviews. The paraprofessional, in this instance working directly within the office, would deal with the extensive amount of walk-in traffic most admissions offices receive. This role would combine the skills of advising, providing information, and actual recruitment expertise.

A second potential area of responsibility might be termed alumni relations. Alumni have often been recognized as an important source of community contact. A possible paraprofessional position could be developed to handle ongoing liaison responsibilities with this group. The paraprofessional would regularly attend alumni meetings with two objectives in sight: providing current information regarding the purposes and goals of the admissions program and in turn reporting feedback to the office regarding alumni perceptions and criticisms.

A final paraprofessional responsibility relating specifically to the record-keeping function of the office might evolve in the area of computer programs. Qualified students could be used effectively in programming and data interpretation.

Student Relations

The student relations function is synonymous with what many campuses call the Dean of Students or Student Affairs office. Typically the responsibilities are general in nature, with office staff possessing various special skills and abilities. Major responsibilities under this division might include withdrawal counseling, women’s relations, scholastic standards, fraternities and sororities, discipline, research, minority programs, veterans’ advising, crisis intervention, and drug education.

This office is typically viewed as a primary resource center for students. Consequently, the referral process is of major importance. Beyond simple clerical type functions, students have been used minimally as support staff in this area. The programs offered, however, represent one of the best media for paraprofessional involvement. Of the areas listed above, the most common use of student input to date seems to be in the area of drug education or crisis intervention. The peer relationship aspect seems to be paramount when considering the use of students in these two areas. Benion and Martire (1970) advocate the use of students as group leaders in the process of drug education.

At Colorado State University, three successful paraprofessional positions have been initiated within the student relations office. The task of withdrawal counseling can be delegated in part to paraprofessionals. This function means more than merely advising students on the procedure of withdrawal. Major responsibilities include reviewing the student’s decision and making sure the student has carefully reviewed the alternatives to his decision. Counseling and advising skills are critical to this role. Chickering and Hannah (1969), in their article entitled “The Process of Withdrawal,” discuss characteristics of this procedure that would support paraprofessional involvement.

A second successful position has been funded within the women’s relations program. This paraprofessional, in an attempt to meet the unique needs of female students, assists in program development and resource personnel information.

Finally, student ecological studies can come under the direction of trained paraprofessionals. Gathering data, reporting findings, and drawing conclusions about student populations is an important service to be offered. In many respects the student relations office needs to become more proactive in nature. What better way to proceed than through the use of a paraprofessional staff?

Intramural Athletics

Many institutions have acknowledged the value of intramural athletics to the extent of constructing lavish facilities and diverting a good proportion of student fees to the support of such programs. Likewise, a professional staff has been employed to develop and supervise programs. Students typically have been employed to officiate events and handle routine maintenance tasks, leaving the bulk of programming responsibilities to professional staff from the athletic or physical education department.

Paraprofessionals can and should be employed to handle other responsibilities. For example, this involvement might include supervising officials; scheduling events; developing individual program budgets; purchasing equipment and supplies; developing policies, rules, and regulations; and editing publications.

Finally, it would be advantageous to look to the paraprofessional for teaching assistance skills. The possibility of training paraprofessional staff to teach first aid and other service-oriented classes seems plausible in light of their other responsibilities.

Student Activities

Student activities programs typically hold a rather nebulous, ill-defined position on today’s campuses. The programs are generally centralized within a student center operation with little concern given to outreach because of lack of funds and trained professional staff. Responsibility for planning and following through on projects tends to fall to volunteer student help.

Fine arts programming, lecture series, campus-wide student government advisement, maintenance
of club accounts, and managing in-house recreational facilities tend to be representative of contemporary involvement by professional staff. Beyond the volunteer student labor force, some students are typically employed in clerical or custodial positions. Other paid positions might include managing the reception center or running audiovisual equipment.

Siggelkow's (1969) article, "The College Union: A Model for Student Power," emphasizes a model for program planning using students' input as a valuable resource. He advocates the use of students as partners in all aspects of the operation including management and evaluation.

Given this model of operation it would seem reasonable to expect that paraprofessionals could be used effectively in this medium. Potential uses of trained student staff might include the following: (a) advising groups and organizations; (b) contracting for and scheduling events; (c) assessing student needs and interests; (d) designing priorities for use of student fees; (e) working with faculty and administrative staff to co-sponsor programs, e.g., career nights; and (f) outreach, taking centralized programs such as arts and crafts into decentralized living units.

Food Service

This area is often overlooked as a viable student service. Instead, the operation is classified under auxiliary enterprises, and management rarely seeks or receives input from the other service areas mentioned. Student feedback is usually limited to complaints regarding the quantity or quality of food served.

This service typically employs a large number of part-time student help. However, the typical positions filled, such as meal checkers and kitchen help, have few, if any, responsibilities that could be termed paraprofessional in nature.

Anderson (1971) advocates the use of student committees to review all aspects of the food service program. Meyerson (1970) takes an even more comprehensive approach:

Sharing similar objectives with the educational and physical plant staffs, the food service operation has greatly expanded its role beyond that of supplying nourishing food, to include meaningful life and educational experiences for the student. The training of food service workers at all levels must reflect this changing concept. Since its services cross many management and educational lines, the food service must be led by administrators who have responsibility for both, thus insuring decisions representative of all interests.

Physical facilities should be aesthetically pleasing and so arranged as to stimulate small group interaction and discussion helpful to the student in search of personal identity, and to provide opportunities for building peer relationships. Rooms for study and other diverse activities may be made available by flexible scheduling of dining rooms. Supervisors should be trained to advise students on the planning of social affairs, on the necessary abilities for group work, and on skill in interviewing. . . . Students need to be involved in evaluating the operation, in the budgeting, and in the hearing of student grievances [p. 298].

Within this framework, paraprofessionals can provide the following functions: (a) participating in menu design; (b) serving as liaison between food service and members of the academic community; and (c) redesigning alternate dining environments.

Off-Campus Housing

Universities should experience success in using paraprofessional staff in this area. The current trend in housing across the country has been for colleges to disassociate themselves from the off-campus student tenants. As a result, the student is left to deal independently with community landlords. Campus housing offices are less prone to inspect these units and typically limit their involvement to listing services. Housing staffs tend to justify this position not on the basis of low student need, but on the more realistic basis of lack of funds and available support personnel.

Three years ago, Colorado State University found itself in a similar position. In order to cope with the obvious needs that exist (10,000 students live off-campus), the Office of Renters Information was developed under the direct supervision of paraprofessional staff. Today this program represents one of the best uses of paraprofessional skills in the University. The paraprofessional works closely with the off-campus community in the following ways (taken directly from the job description):

1. Maintains resources and referral office
2. Distributes "Before You Rent" brochures and revises if necessary
3. Maintains lists of available rentals off-campus
4. Coordinates temporary housing for students (fall quarter)
5. Becomes knowledgeable re: Community resources available and is able to give good advice in disputes over rental agreements
6. Publicizes efforts making students aware of services offered
7. Develops a library of off-campus information
   a. Community fact sheet
   b. Chamber of Commerce information
   c. List of realtors
8. Conducts research regarding community rentals
   a. Number of units
   b. Types of units
   c. Rates/deposits/contractual conditions

This position has been particularly successful in meeting all three goals of the paraprofessional
Financial Aid

Responsibilities in today's financial aid offices have changed drastically in recent years. Economic pressures, inflation, government programs, increased enrollments, and fluctuating institutional budgets have influenced the role and position of this service. As a result, the office tends to be reactive rather than proactive in approach. Typically, staffs have added additional clerical type positions to keep up with the increased demand for processing loans, grants, and scholarship applications. Internal budgeting complexities have often involved the use of computer data processors. Student work programs such as state and federal work study are typically administered through this office as well.

Very little student help beyond clerical assistance has been used within this operation on campuses. Confidentiality of records has often been used as an excuse for such neglect. It would seem that paraprofessionals could be adequately trained to handle the following responsibilities: (a) public relations agents—updating students, administration, and faculty on current trends and issues and making students aware of what types of financial assistance are available and the processes for making application for such aid; (b) coordinators for on-campus employment—assisting students in finding work and coordinating departmental requests for help with student interests and abilities; and (c) intake interviewers—analyzing need and processing applications.

Placement Service

There is no office within the student services area that has come under more severe attack in recent years than the placement operation. This pressure has been the result of a combination of circumstances: A saturated job market for students with nontechnical skills, academic advising deficiencies, and a general lack of aggressiveness on the part of placement administrators have added to its demise. As a result, operational budgets have been cut, and in many cases the placement responsibilities have been decentralized under individual academic departments.

Historically, the purpose of the placement office has been to provide specific services for students and employers: credential service, job listings, and interviewing programs (company and school recruitment). Currently, the role of placement has been expanded to include student advising, career information, job hints, resource information, resume guides, interviewing training, and research and follow-up data. The consensus of opinion in the national professional placement organizations is that the emphasis in the seventies should move toward student advising or student career planning programs. Given this added dimension, it would seem possible that paraprofessional staff could contribute significantly to such a program.

A pilot program at the University of Virginia, studying the use of group counseling techniques in a placement setting, proposed the following: (a) training as counselors graduate students whose major area of study is not related to counseling; (b) training full-time, nonprofessional employees of the placement service to participate in placement counseling; (c) expanding the number of students served in each counseling group; and (d) combining group and individual counseling (Pate, Simpson & Burks 1969–70).

It is projected that the major outcomes of the project would be to: (a) attack the stated problem within reasonable budget and personnel limits; (b) prepare a body of experienced material that others can use as a basis for undertaking related programs; and (c) establish a cooperative model for attacking this major problem. Paraprofessionals consequently could be trained in these group counseling techniques.

Other examples of paraprofessional involvement in the placement operation might come in the area of resource information and career planning. Outreach programs such as "career nights," placement libraries, and research and evaluation of alumni job status would be directly beneficial to the prospective graduate. Colorado State University has successfully experimented with using paraprofessional skills to train students in job interview techniques. Videotape feedback is an important part of the program.

Health Services

Health services have traditionally valued a type of autonomous status on campuses. The physician-student relationship is typically not considered in the same light as the other student personnel services previously mentioned. This is not to say, however, that health center administrators hold little regard for various forms of student input. The manner in which this input is generated could be greatly facilitated through the use of trained paraprofessional aides. The paramedic programs employed by many physicians show a strong support for this concept.

Within the university structure, this same concept
could be employed at various levels of involvement. Paraprofessionals could be trained to provide birth control counseling and information, develop periodic hygienic inspections of living units, train student personnel staffs to be attuned to the physical needs of students, present educational health and safety programs, provide liaison responsibilities with other offices in the academic community, and conduct follow-up research on student satisfaction with services performed.

Student advising committees are a popular form of communication between health centers and students. The University of California at Berkeley has one of the most successful programs.

The functions of the Committee are established as follows:

1. Student Health Services Committee shall voice student opinion on general health services and policies and act as liaison between the Director of Health Services and the Associated Students of the University of California.

2. The Committee shall study and review any changes in Health Service policies in regard to direct services to students.

3. The Committee shall aid in informing students of special health problems on campus, for example, sale of illegal drugs, possibility of epidemics.

4. The Committee shall help to create a student awareness of general and special services offered by the Health Service, such as preventive immunization programs.

5. The Committee shall be in charge of the Health Service Volunteers.

6. The Committee shall coordinate the annual student blood bank drive [Plumb & Van Loewenfeldt 1971, p. 174].

Organizing and chairing such a committee would be an obvious and valuable function for the paraprofessional staff.

Wolff (1973), at the University of Massachusetts, attempts to take this health committee role one step further. His goal is to train students to be effective change agents. A course entitled “Consumer Participation in Health Care Delivery” was offered as a training medium. “The specific model of social change that was promoted was a ‘Ralph Nader’ approach, that is a model of doing ‘watch dog’ research and investigation and employing this data to promote change [Wolff 1973, p. 6].”

This chapter has attempted to show the many ways paraprofessional help might be employed in the variety of student services departments. If the model for developing these positions is followed, the resultant benefits from such positions should far outweigh time devoted to training and supervision and the expenditure of funds.
The Colorado State University Experience

Colorado State University, like many other institutions of higher education, became caught in a manpower shortage within the student services area at a time when new programs and service commitments were being proposed and accepted. The use of carefully selected and trained students as program implementers seemed a feasible partial solution to this dilemma. This approach had been reported by human service agencies and some colleges and appeared to have a good deal of potential.

During the spring quarter of 1970, three students were employed. They were used in (a) minority relations programs (organization and leadership of group discussions and simulations), (b) life planning workshops (organization and group leadership), and (c) encounter tape programs (videotaping of sessions and consultation with the leaderless groups). These students had been active volunteers in these programs for at least one quarter preceding implementation of the paraprofessional program, and all had taken part in various leadership and human relations training offered through the University Counseling Center and other student services agencies. Each was paid a stipend of $200.00 for the quarter, and each worked approximately 10 hours per week. Funds were made available through the general student services budget.

Professional and student reactions to this pilot program were very positive. The paraprofessionals saw their job contributions as important to themselves and their programs. Supervisors were able to clearly document tasks accomplished by the paraprofessionals that either would have had to be done by the professional himself or would not have been accomplished at all during that quarter. In view of this positive initial evaluation by both professionals and paraprofessionals, the decision was made by the student services administration to continue and expand the program.

Program Goals

Goals for the program followed the model proposed in Chapter 1 (see p. 13). The role of relieving professionals of basic tasks took precedence, both in actual practice and in program philosophy. Paraprofessionals are very visible "service givers" in almost all the positions opened through this program (goal 2). They have also been able to give ongoing input into both the particular program and the broader operations of the agencies for which they work (goal 3). As a result, programs such as study skills have changed radically through the input and active involvement of paraprofessionals. One position, Renter's Information, was proposed by a paraprofessional and almost entirely implemented by a paraprofessional during its first year of operation.

Organization

At CSU the system coordinator is a student services staff person, specifically a psychologist with the University Counseling Center, who serves the program approximately five hours per week. One paraprofessional works closely with the coordinator in helping to provide core and inservice training and in developing a sense of "paraprofessional identity" and cohesion within the group. A secretary takes care of time cards, payroll, and other administrative matters. The duties of the coordinator, aided by her paraprofessional, are as follows:

1. Publicize the program to prospective paraprofessionals and to student services agencies
2. Consult with agencies who wish to apply for a paraprofessional
3. Develop and implement selection procedures for positions and for paraprofessionals
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4. Design and implement core and inservice training for paraprofessionals
5. Provide ongoing consultation service to paraprofessionals and their supervisors
6. Design and implement evaluation procedures
7. Provide regular reports on the program to the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, the chief student affairs administrator on campus

Selection

Positions

Any professional employed in student services may request a paraprofessional by submitting a position request. The position requests are reviewed by a committee of professionals and paraprofessionals selected by their peers. Recommendations are then sent to the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs for approval and funding. Positions must meet the criteria described below in order to be accepted.

First, the position should adhere to the definition of a paraprofessional. That is, tasks to be performed must be central to the operation of a particular office or service. Support services are excluded. These tasks should (a) free the professional from tasks that do not require his specific expertise; (b) provide service to students, either directly or through training and evaluation functions; and (c) provide for input into the program from the paraprofessional.

Second, a professional must be identified to do the following: (a) supervise and consult with the paraprofessional for a minimum of one hour a week; (b) provide specific, on-the-job training; and (c) participate in evaluation of all components of the system.

Finally, the office or service must agree to participate in core training and evaluation as requested.

Acceptable positions are then rank ordered, as funding is generally not available for all positions. Preference is given to ongoing positions that have been evaluated positively during the past year and to new positions that seem to fit the model best. Since paraprofessionals are placed in three of the five main organizational units in student affairs, an effort is made to give added consideration to the units that have had fewer positions in the past.

Positions funded for the 1972-73 academic year are listed below. New positions are marked with an asterisk. The office that directly supervises these positions is indicated in parentheses.

*Educational Planning Team (Housing)
Behavior Modification Programs (Counseling Center) (two positions)

Communication Skills Workshop (Counseling Center)
Study Skills Workshops (Learning Laboratory)
*Activities Programs (Student Center)
*Research, Evaluation (Housing)
*Program Research (Student Relations)
Implementation of Procedures for Withdrawing from the University (Student Relations)
Life Planning Workshops (Counseling Center)
*Arts and Crafts Program (Student Center)
*Faculty Test Scoring and Career Development (Counseling Center)
*Married Students Programs (Housing, Counseling Center)
*Faculty Consultation Team (Counseling Center)
*Student Services Liaison with Detained Students (Student Affairs Assoc. VP)
Trainer for Paraprofessionals and Volunteers (Counseling Center, Student Affairs)
Roadhouse—Campus Crisis/Information Center (Counseling Center) (two positions—one for training)
Drug Information Team (Counseling Center)
Renter’s Information (Housing)
Women’s Programs (Women’s Relations)

Additional paraprofessional programs operate in specific student services agencies. Examples are student assistants (residence halls) and paraprofessionals in orientation and the Office of Academic Advising.

Paraprofessionals

One well-publicized general meeting, open to all students, is held each quarter on campus. An overview of the system is given, and each veteran paraprofessional presents a brief outline of his specific position during this meeting. Students may fill out applications at that time or at any time during the year. Recommendations for the applicants are gathered, and an up-to-date file is maintained. When a review of the file indicates that applications are more than two quarters old, the student is notified and asked to update his file if he is still interested in the paraprofessional program.

When a job vacancy occurs, the professional responsible for that position reviews the applications on file. He then contacts those whom he wants to interview and makes his selection. In some cases, the professional decides to work with a student who does not have an application on file. The choice of the professional is respected, and the student then fills out the application for inclusion in his paraprofessional folder.

Late in the spring quarter, when the largest number of positions become available for the following fall, group meetings are held to inform applicants about openings and specific requirements for these openings. Students may apply for as many
positions as they wish, but in practice most students apply for the two or three positions for which they feel best qualified. Current paraprofessionals go through this process also if they wish to change positions for their second year or if their supervisor wishes to open up the position to new applicants as well as the veteran paraprofessional.

General Profile of a Paraprofessional

A general picture of the paraprofessional group can be outlined. Most paraprofessionals are either juniors or seniors, though sophomores and freshmen are not excluded from making application. Several graduate students have worked with the program as well. Our preference is to employ those entering the junior year who will then probably remain with the program for their senior year. Frequently, the paraprofessional chooses to move to a new position for his second year in order to gain a different experience.

Approximately 60 percent of paraprofessionals so far have been women. In addition, almost all paraprofessionals have been white. Two minority students have been employed: one Chicano was a paraprofessional for two years, and a black student is now working as a paraprofessional. A second black student was also selected, but resigned because of other commitments. The majority are psychology or social welfare majors but, more recently, business majors have been represented in higher numbers.

Most paraprofessionals plan to attend graduate school, either immediately following their BA work or in the future. The three paraprofessionals initially employed in the program have since earned MAs, two in counseling and one in speech and hearing.

Training and Supervision

Training and supervision are set up to closely conform to the model outlined in Chapter 3. The decision regarding what skills and knowledge are essential for all paraprofessionals and thus belong in core training is an ongoing one. So far, we have identified the following topics for inclusion in the core training segment:

1. The Paraprofessional Program—goals and process, specific roles.
2. Overview of Student Affairs—emphasis on the relationship of services and offices.
3. Organization and procedures in the program—work cards, payroll, job descriptions, setting up and using supervision, use of facilities (telephones, office space, etc.).
4. Issues—confidentiality, appearance, general "ethics of paraprofessionalism."

5. Program Development and Evaluation—an overview of the process with check sheets on specific steps and stages.
6. Behavioral Change Goals—training in setting specific, observable goals for personal growth, program objectives, and evaluation.
7. Consultation Skills—training in giving and receiving constructive feedback in the relationship with supervisors and peers in the program.
8. Building a Cohesive Group—helping paraprofessionals to use each other for problem solving help and setting up consultation triads that meet once a week during the quarter. Issues in these triads range from specific help in job performance to help in setting appropriate limits on one’s time involvement as a paraprofessional, so that other areas of life are not neglected.

Specific training for each position is handled by the individual supervisor. In some cases, part of this training is facilitated by the program coordinator. Inservice workshops are offered when need or desire is indicated by at least several paraprofessionals and/or their supervisors. Such training is optional for paraprofessionals, although a specific supervisor may require that his paraprofessional attend.

Supervision—consultation is offered to each paraprofessional by his supervisor for a minimum of one hour per week. Some of this time may be spent on task discussion, but the emphasis is on providing mutual feedback and renegotiating the job description as new needs and situations arise. If a supervisor has two paraprofessionals working in the same service, he can combine much of the supervision time. However, feedback from paraprofessionals regarding the importance of this time has led to an insistence that each paraprofessional receive individual supervision—consultation time at least every other week.

Supervisors meet in small groups with the program coordinator each quarter to consult on problems. Additional consultations are set up as requested by the supervisor.

Evaluation

Evaluation is a two-pronged process. First, the paraprofessional program itself, or the system, must be evaluated. Evaluation of the specific position, the paraprofessional, and the professional supervisor then follows. As a corollary to these efforts, some effort needs to be made to determine what paraprofessionals are gaining from their participation in the program.

The evaluation area is the one in which we are, in practice, the farthest behind our model. The follow-
ing is an outline of our rather sketchy evaluation efforts to date.

First, feedback from supervisors and paraprofessionals is solicited, and the overall program (system) is modified on the basis of such feedback.

Second, each paraprofessional has the responsibility for keeping his job description up to date, to reflect the tasks on which he and his supervisor place priority. Near the end of each quarter, each supervisor-paraprofessional dyad is asked to complete a three-page form dealing with the following areas: (a) tasks performed by the paraprofessional, divided into two areas: those that the professional would have had to do and those that would not have been accomplished without the paraprofessional; (b) the professional's analysis of strengths, weaknesses, and further training needs for the paraprofessional and analysis of ways he provided for training and supervision of paraprofessionals; and (c) the paraprofessional's analysis of his own strengths, weaknesses, and how further training needs were met by the supervisor.

Each professional and paraprofessional team discusses this form and makes plans for remediation and change based on this analysis. The form is used by the program coordinator to discover and evaluate discrepancies between the job description and tasks actually completed and to have an accurate listing of specific ways in which the paraprofessional relieves the professional and provides service to other students (goal 1). In some cases, amount and type of student input is also reflected here. An attempt to assess more accurately viability of goals 2 (services by students) and 3 (input into the program) is currently under way.

Third, evaluations of services and programs undertaken by program teams are reviewed to determine whether program efficacy and efficiency merit retention (or addition) of paraprofessional involvement. In some of these studies, it has been possible to evaluate the specific contribution of the paraprofessional to the total impact of the program.

Fourth, professionals who are involved in the program have voiced unanimous support. They value the time gained by use of paraprofessionals, as well as the cooperative association with students that the program affords. Many of these professionals are requesting help in upgrading their supervisory skills in order to make the service more productive.

Finally, follow up on former paraprofessionals has been done to assess their response to the program. At this point, there are approximately 20 former paraprofessionals. All but two of these have received their BA degrees; one will do so this year. Five of this group feel that their paraprofessional involvement was highly important in their acceptance into graduate school, and several others reported that they thought the experience was helpful in that regard. One former paraprofessional obtained a well-paying and highly responsible job with the State Department of Education, in which she is utilizing skills learned as a paraprofessional. Without such experience she could not have qualified for the position. Other paraprofessionals also report their experience helpful in obtaining post-BA positions.

The following gains listed by paraprofessionals are typical comments from both the former paraprofessionals and those still involved in the program.

"From working directly with professionals, I developed high ethical standards and found the reason and motivation to continue into graduate studies."

"The position helped me to learn to assume responsibility and be innovative."

"It has built up my confidence in myself. I have been able to prove to myself that I am capable of working to successfully complete many responsibilities. I have also learned some of my limitations as well as capacities."

"Being a paraprofessional is the most significant thing that has happened to me in my whole college experience. The experience has brought me into contact with people who have enough confidence in me to say that I am capable, and with help I will be even more capable in another year. The thing about the promise is that it has come true."

"The most important thing I gained by being a paraprofessional was being able to use and apply some of the things that I read about in books and heard about in classes."

In terms of benefits gained by other students as a result of paraprofessional services, the paraprofessionals commented:

"Student paraprofessional input in program planning helped produce better programs for students."

"Some students will come up to me a quarter after study skills and tell me how they got a 4.0 grade average. The pre-post testing shows significant changes. To me the most dramatic instance of someone else being helped was marked by what one of the students I saw individually for study skills said. She said, 'I have been to two different counselors, and you are the first person to talk to me like a human being.'"

"A student working as a paraprofessional has a chance to be used as a valuable resource for something he/she knows the most about—students and what is needed in student services. This is helping us build a more functional area of student services."

"We were able to work with many more students because I was there as a paraprofessional."

The paraprofessionals, in effect, have become the leading spokesmen for their program. They are able to point to specific positive changes in their own
lives and those of the students to whom they offer services. As yet, the impact of the paraprofessional system on the total institution is not easily evaluated.

**Funding**

The Associate Vice President of Student Affairs (through the Counseling Center) contributes the time of the coordinator and secretary to implement the paraprofessional program. Office supplies, desk space, telephones, and other necessary materials are contributed by the offices served by paraprofessionals.

The only money paid out directly are paraprofessional salaries. Funds for these salaries come from three sources: (a) labor payroll through the budget of Student Affairs, (b) funds available to selected Colorado students through the Colorado work-study program, and (c) funds available through federal and state need work-study to those students who qualify. The majority of the CSU funding is through the first source, but work-study funds have been used when the student paraprofessional qualifies for one of these programs.

Paraprofessionals are classified as junior staff assistants and earn a minimum of $2.35 per hour. Those on labor payroll may earn up to $300 per quarter. On the work-study funding programs, ceilings have sometimes been set at $250; at other times ceilings have been set at $300 per quarter.

There are numerous difficulties for the paraprofessional placed on an hourly wage program. Very accurate accounting of hours spent must be kept. This is practical in programs such as "withdrawal-from-college" counseling, in which the paraprofessional works a set number of hours per day in an office. It is much less feasible for those involved in program development and implementation, where miscellaneous phone calls and other tasks may be accomplished at varying times during the day or evening. Also, such a procedure makes it difficult to integrate work and training in a maximally effective manner. Since the program has a heavy training-supervision emphasis, rather than an employment emphasis, we are working toward the possibility of moving to a monthly stipend system. This would allow more flexibility in training and work performance. Appropriate safeguards against requiring excessive numbers of hours of work from students would need to be developed and implemented in this situation.

**What We Still Do Not Know**

We are not sure whether professionals who are assigned to supervise paraprofessionals can be as effective in that role as those professionals who request a paraprofessional. Our program has worked only with volunteer professionals thus far. Data from New Careers programs indicate a resistance factor when paraprofessionals are assigned to agencies or services without requests from or involvement on the part of the professionals who will be responsible for training and supervision.

We do not know how much and what kind of core training will produce maximal results in terms of the three goals of a paraprofessional program. What we are doing is well received, but we have not used alternate training tasks for comparison.

We do not really know how much and what kind of help in the training-supervision process would be of benefit to professionals. We think more than we are doing is needed, but we have not yet developed this area well.

We know very little about how the involvement of ethnic minority groups and "less represented" students (such as older students) in the paraprofessional program would implement and advance the goals of the program. If valid, representative input is to be gained through paraprofessionals, it seems logical to suppose that paraprofessionals should be more diverse a group than they presently are at CSU. We have selected only top candidates for positions. Additional funds would enable us to place second and third choices and test their effectiveness.

We have probably not developed our training or our program implementation far enough to test the limits of paraprofessionals. They can do a lot. We are not yet really sure what they cannot do.
We have not developed very fully our notion of the differences between a first-year paraprofessional and a more experienced paraprofessional. In practice, we see the second-year people branching out in many new directions and assuming additional leadership functions within their own programs and in the paraprofessional system. We need to further explore this and build in ways in which this additional role continues to be possible. We do not have solid evidence that goals 2 and 3 of the model are as important or viable as we state they are.

The Future

In three years of struggle, we have developed a viable small-scale program and a tentative model for paraprofessional programs in higher education. We now wish to turn our attention to more thorough testing of variables involved in (a) selection, training, supervision, and evaluation of paraprofessionals and supervisors and (b) maximal efficiency and efficacy in achieving the three program goals, involving development of new positions and use of additional strategies of intervention with individuals and systems.

We are presently developing a grant proposal that would allow us the time and funding to more adequately pursue these objectives and to aid other institutions in implementing paraprofessional programs on their own campuses. We are committed to implementation of the model in diverse higher education settings, with feedback and mechanisms for change as part of this process. Within the next several years, we hope to move from our "tentative model" to an "open model," more firmly rooted in research and practice, yet sufficiently flexible to allow for change as student services in higher education themselves develop and change.
The New Curriculum: Education for Human Services Workers

The needs and demands that point toward use of paraprofessionals on the college campus have been even more widely felt in the larger society. The necessity for relevant programs and trained child care workers, mental health technicians, and generalists in human services has in no way been met by the available professionals. In some instances, this has been due to inadequate numbers of professionals and in others to lack of persons possessing the specific kinds of skills needed in certain human service roles.

One answer to this dilemma has been the creation within higher education of several hundred training programs for paraprofessionals. In 1966, Purdue University initiated the first "associate professional" program in mental health or human services within the mainstream of American collegiate education. The main thrust in the development of such programs, however, has been within the nation's community colleges.

These programs differ from the focus of our model in that they prepare the student to render service after he leaves the campus, rather than while he is on campus. Despite the difference of focus, this new human services curriculum is presented at this time for two reasons. First, fairly large numbers of student services staff are becoming involved in these programs as faculty members or as policy and decision makers. Second, the movement appears to hold promise of involving these students in field work programs on campus, which could increase the paraprofessional force already operating. Indeed, such students could conceivably become the paraprofessional group on campus, and graduates of the program may well be effective student services staff members. For both these reasons the role of the college in providing planned growth for the paraprofessional curriculum merits close attention.

The Programs

Almost 700 college programs to educate human service paraprofessionals currently exist (Gartner & Johnson 1970). Programs in early childhood work or education are the most plentiful. Other programs prepare workers for careers in mental health, corrections, recreation, or medical assistance. The National Institute of Mental Health is involved in funding for about 30 programs nationwide.

Programs are generally two years in length, although there are some one-year programs. A few colleges have initiated paraprofessional baccalaureate degree programs. Graduates of these programs are employed in a wide variety of mental health, education, recreation, correction, and other public service programs. Some are continuing work toward bachelor’s or graduate degrees.

The Southern Regional Education Board, which has assumed a leadership role in development and implementation of such programs, sees one role of the paraprofessional as that of a "generalist who would empathize with the problems of the patient and be his advocate in the system [SREB 1966, p. 5].” Hadley and True (1967), speaking of their program at Purdue, said, "We are training persons who we believe can perform some functions better than professionals, and we are not training persons simply to do the things professionals don't have the time to do or don't like to do [p. 1]."

Many programs have followed this model of preparing a generalist with definite skills who can apply his abilities in a variety of human service fields. Others have narrowed their range to prepare specialists for specific duties in well-defined fields.

In a number of cases, the college curriculum is set up to provide certain types of knowledge and skill
for paraprofessionals already employed in a human service occupation. The New Careers movement has strongly advocated this idea of "job first, education concurrently" as a means of bringing minority and other disfranchised populations into both the career market and the educational mainstream. Graduates of New Careers programs are variously referred to as paraprofessionals, associate professionals, or new professionals. The latter term is preferred by the New Careers movement.

Impetus for the paraprofessional curriculum has come from a number of sources. The Southern Regional Education Board has spearheaded the movement in the southern United States, developing guidelines and rationale for such programs. Maryland's Department of Mental Hygiene published a paper (Vidaver 1968) that outlines the state's need for health manpower and provides a reasonably complete outline of an educational program for paraprofessionals. Such curriculums have since been established in at least six Maryland community colleges.

In other cases, key persons within the college, the local community, or a service agency have pushed for a program to prepare paraprofessionals either for work as generalists in human services or for a specific career position. Although paraprofessional human service programs are found throughout the country, they have grown and flourished most fully in those states, such as Maryland, in which leadership was present at the state level and a genuine cooperative model developed among colleges, agencies, and state departments. Whenever such a program is undertaken, cooperative planning is of utmost importance. In order to provide career mobility for the graduate paraprofessional, civil service ladders must be revised. Arrangements for both field work and eventual employment must be established with appropriate agencies. The curriculum must fit the needs of agencies that will hopefully employ the graduates.

Selection and Admissions

Selection procedures for programs have varied widely. The initial group at Purdue was selected in terms of ratings on academic aptitude and an extended group interview in which two or more staff members talked with the applicant. In many community colleges, admission to the college assured admission to the program. In general, there has been a de-emphasis on such measures as high school grade point average and standardized tests in choosing students for these programs. Interviews, simulation experiences, and recommendations are widely used. If the college courses are set up in conjunction with an agency employing paraprofessionals, classes are open to all members of the paraprofessional group.

A number of colleges have altered admission requirements to allow students to participate in paraprofessional educational programs. These variations include trial admissions, use of a committee to review all facets of an applicant's request, open admissions to all who can profit from the curriculum, and waiving of the requirement that an applicant possess a high school diploma.

Curriculum

A typical two-year curriculum for human service paraprofessionals includes the following components:

1. General college-required courses for the Associate in Arts degree
2. Core courses in behavioral sciences (some of which may be included in the general requirements)
3. Courses in human service programs and development of appropriate cognitive, manipulative, and interpersonal skills
4. Field experiences in human service agencies, generally accompanied by a practicum to enhance the learning potential of the field placement

Programs appear to differ most in the emphasis and time put into each of these areas. For example, the learnings under item 3 might be more cognitively oriented and didactically presented or may involve extended encounter group or other interpersonal experience. A number of programs expand the field work requirement to a full summer of intensive experience in a human service agency.

Reordering of current college courses is more frequent than the implementation of entirely new courses of study. However, some significant curriculum innovations have come about in these programs. One of these is the placing of job-related courses first in order in the curriculum, thus giving the new student a chance to be actively involved in learnings relevant to his job from the start. Therefore, many traditional upper-division courses are taught to beginning students.

A number of programs include field placement from the beginning of the program, with the purpose of actively involving the student in his chosen area more quickly. The first experience in this area may be a structured observation experience, but it may also include performance of some basic tasks. In the case of employed paraprofessionals who are taking classes on a part-time basis, credit may be given for work experience.

A variety of behavioral science courses have been restructured to deal more satisfactorily with the goals and needs of students in the paraprofessional
programs. In some schools, paraprofessionals are taught in separate sections of required classes, so that the instructor can pay increased attention to their specific interests and needs. However, other programs feel that it is important for these students to have contact with students in other majors and schedule them into regular sections of required courses. Courses may be held on the main college campus, but the program-specific classes are equally likely to be held in college extension facilities, agencies employing paraprofessionals, or other community facilities. Programs at most junior colleges include a majority of courses that will transfer to a four-year institution, should the student decide on that option.

Organization and Staff

The paraprofessional program is most often found as a component of a traditional academic department or area. In some cases, it is set up as an interdisciplinary unit.

A director or coordinator is the first essential staff member. This person is responsible for the overall development, implementation, and evaluation of the program. He may also carry responsibility for teaching or field supervision, especially in a small or new program. The director should take responsibility for establishing and maintaining contact with field agencies. It is vital to plan field experiences that will coordinate well with the academic phase of the program.

The faculty for a paraprofessional program needs to have broad practical experience and be generally less academically oriented than the general college faculty. There is excellent opportunity here for members of the student services staff to teach in areas of their own expertise.

Additionally, paraprofessionals have unique familiarity with the process and curriculum, which will allow some of them to become effective in the instructional role. They may be used as small group discussion leaders, teachers of specific skills, liaison persons with service agencies, or in other roles.

Field supervisors and instructors may well be staff members of cooperating agencies. Pearl (1972) sees such an instructional role for the agency professional as an opportunity to keep communication open between agency and school. It may also allow an “exchange” in which the college instructor works within the service agency. It is important to provide training in the supervisory role for such staff and to offer ongoing consultation as well.

Establishment of an advisory committee, composed of the director, representatives from program faculty, field work agencies, and students, is recommended. Such a committee can suggest program directions and deal with any misunderstandings or information gaps, which certainly will arise from time to time.

Students

So far, female students have predominated in paraprofessional human services programs. A number of programs have placed special emphasis on the recruitment of qualified males. Many programs report large numbers of ethnic minority students among their enrollees.

Students often have been out of school for some time before starting in the program. In many programs, they are working while attending classes. Generally, a large number are married and have family responsibilities. Some questions have been raised regarding the ability of such students to perform well academically. Gartner and Johnson’s (1970) report on 162 programs indicates that grades and dropout rates for these students are about equal to those of other college students.

Funding

A number of these special programs are funded, at least initially and partially, through federal funds. The problem then becomes one of establishing sufficient support to maintain the program after government funding is phased out. Tuition and the regular funding (state, city, county) of the institution are the most widely used nonfederal funding sources. In some cases, field placement agencies contribute indirectly through donations of teaching and supervisory time. Work-study programs support many of the students.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the program should be set up from the beginning and be the specific responsibility of the director or other staff person. It is recommended that evaluation center on (a) the impact that the program has on students in terms of behavioral goals and (b) the subsequent performance of graduates on the job. So far, programs have reported such data only in general terms. Students report gains in self-confidence and competence, and a survey of programs indicates that most graduates have been able to attain satisfactory job placements. Whether, once on the job, college-trained paraprofessionals perform effectively has yet to be demonstrated. How these “new students” are affecting the college is another area worthy of investigation.
The Future: Problems and Potential

The nationwide explosion of paraprofessional education programs since 1967 certainly merits attention. So far, there is every indication that these are healthy, vital ventures whose graduates are becoming assimilated into human service agencies of many types. The best guess is that more precise evaluation data will be forthcoming in favor of the continuance and increase of such programs.

Numerous difficulties beset most of these new curriculum programs. Among the more prominent, according to Gartner and Johnson (1970), are: (a) need for funding to continue program, (b) transferability of credit to four-year colleges, and (c) rigidity of faculty.

A predicted trend is toward greater use of personnel trained in the "new curriculum." Looking at student personnel services, it is possible to delineate a number of positions that might open up to paraprofessional graduates of two-year programs. Some might be employed in a paraprofessional program such as those outlined in this monograph while continuing their education. Others, perhaps more properly termed associate professionals, could find career opportunities in various student services areas. Admissions, academic advising programs, and testing functions are three areas that appear to be making some limited use of such persons at the present time.

Another move is toward the paraprofessional taking greater responsibilities in terms of curriculum and other program guidelines. The National Organization for Human Services (Brown 1971) has recently been established by and for paraprofessionals. This group intends to help provide more uniform training programs, establish career ladders and job opportunities, and establish recognized status for human service workers.

A more broadly defined role can be envisioned for the student services professional in such programs. In terms of both education and experience, he is often very well suited to assume both teaching and supervisory roles in paraprofessional programs. At this time, field placements on campus are lacking in most generalist programs. A definite effort by student services professionals to develop and implement such placements can result in valuable aid and input from students, who are often overlooked as a potential resource on campus.

Additionally, such effort helps further define the role of student services staff as persons co-responsible with academic faculty for the educational growth and development of students. Brown (1972) takes this as a primary thesis when he asserts that "student development staffs must have input into and involvement with the academic dimensions of the collegiate experience [p. 48]." He states that this could well be one of the most important functions of the student personnel worker of the future. Educating paraprofessionals through the new curriculum is a viable way to initiate this role.
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