



Report of the Committee on Advising and Counseling

January 19, 1999

Contents

Advising in the Concentrations

Advising in the Houses

Appendix: Minimum Standards for Concentration Advising

Appendix: Senior Survey Data on Advising for the Class of 1997

Appendix: Data on Satisfaction with Advising from the Survey of the Class of 1998

Appendix: Resident Tutor Job Description

This report summarizes the work of the Standing Committee on Advising and Counseling over the past three years, and some measures the Committee endorses for further action. The work it describes is incomplete, and the report is being presented at this time not as a final account of the Committee's activities but in order to stimulate discussion of issues surrounding academic advising at Harvard and some suggested actions. We are grateful to everyone who has offered comments on earlier drafts of this report, including the members of the Committee on Undergraduate Education and of the Educational Policy Committee. The Committee would welcome comments from readers, by e-mail to the Chair, Harry R. Lewis, lewis@harvard.edu.

Though it has been a standing committee of the Faculty for many years, the Committee on Advising and Counseling had in recent years been dormant, until new members were appointed in the spring of 1996. The membership has included teaching members of the regular faculty, head tutors, Masters, deans, and others. The members of the Committee are listed at the end of the report. We have worked both on advising in the Houses and on advising in the concentrations.

Advising in the Concentrations

The general problem the Committee confronted — a widespread feeling that in spite of the richness of Harvard's human resources, undergraduates do not receive the kind of guidance from the faculty and other advisers that they should expect — resisted efforts to make its formulation more precise and yet simultaneously to keep it usefully general. We spent a certain amount of time philosophizing — trying to distinguish "advising" from "mentoring," for example. This kind of intellectual analysis led us down a path that was not profitable in the end. As we pursued this particular distinction, "advising" became reduced to bean-counting, classifying which course could count for which requirement, the sort of thing that could be done by staff but, it was argued, it was unreasonable to expect any senior faculty member other than the Head Tutor to know. "Mentoring" was the intellectual guidance that our scholarly giants can provide in seminars, one-on-one tutorials, and warm-and-fuzzy dinners at their homes, without study cards and GPA

honors cutoffs to distract the discourse. In some departments the distinction is actually embodied in administrative structure, with faculty prohibited from "advising" lest they make mistakes.

Unfortunately, as the needs for guidance actually present themselves in the cases of real students, the distinction does not work very well. Presented with an actual or implied distinction along these lines, many students are intimidated to seek "mentoring" and do not want to bother faculty unless they have a Very Important Intellectual Question. Staff may be able to answer every question of the form "Does course A count in category X?" without being able answer followup questions such as "Why not?" or "Why are those the requirements I have to fulfill anyway?" A referral to the Head Tutor to petition for an exception is not the right answer; by and large students like to have things explained to them and will adjust their expectations if the faculty seem to be taking their concerns seriously. Every specific question presents an opportunity for education about larger issues.

Seeing the dangers in attempting to develop a philosophy of advising, the Committee veered towards the other extreme. We decided to take no position *a priori* on what was a good advising system, and to accept the possibility, at least as a null hypothesis, that a variety of different advising structures and staffing patterns might be successful. Instead, we worked to gather some concrete data on outcomes. To do this, we had to decide what to measure. The Senior Survey had for years had questions about advising, but those questions were so subjective and lacking in specificity as to render the answers fundamentally uninformative. Satisfaction is, it was objected, not a goal in and of itself; one could certainly imagine a department producing enormous intellectual growth in its students without yielding the kind of "warm glow" that would yield high numbers on a 1-to-5 scale of satisfaction. So we worked instead on a list of "minimum standards," specific expectations that were so basic that it was reasonable to expect that all programs should satisfy them. (A copy is attached.) Departments were given an opportunity to comment on these minima, and almost all their comments were incorporated. The departments' main objections were that these expectations were too low even as minima; for example that the first standard, that students should know their advisers by name, should be expanded to an expectation that advisers should know their students by name. (Though one department objected that good advising does not require that a single identifiable adviser be assigned to each student.)

Though the minimum standards seemed to constitute a very slight expectation for Harvard students to have of their institution, there was a larger motive behind this formulation. First, we were able in this way to avoid assertions that a more qualitative questionnaire would amount to a mere popularity contest, unrelated to educational objectives. Second, we believed that aggregately positive or negative evaluations on these specific points would likely indicate students' good or bad experience with academic support; it would be hard for each of these standards to be satisfied and yet for students to feel they had not been supported by their department, and it would be equally hard for these standards to be broadly unmet and to judge the academic support to be successful overall.

The minimum standards were translated into questions and put on the 1997 Senior

Survey; the results, broken down by concentration, are appended to this report. All the results were given to all departments and to the Crimson, which wrote one article about them. At one level the dissemination of these data was, for the Committee, an end in itself, as we hoped they would spur deficient departments to reflect on their sins and to take steps to do better in the future. Dean Todd or Dean Lewis met with Head Tutors/Directors of Undergraduate Studies in each broad disciplinary area this past spring with the objective of getting them to exchange ideas, practices, and experience. Though we have no systematic way of knowing the full impact these data have had in the departments, we do know that serious discussions, and potential or actual restructuring of the advising systems, are underway in several large departments. The survey on advising was not repeated this past spring (in part because it was too soon to expect measurable changes). It is, however, anticipated that similar questions will be included on the 1999 Senior Survey.

Though it is commonly asserted that advising is better in smaller concentrations, or in programs with small student-faculty ratios, the data do not reveal any simple pattern. There are both successful and unsuccessful small concentrations on each measure of advising; it would be worthwhile to explore ways in which the responsible faculty in the small concentrations could learn from each others' experience. Yet from the standpoint of broad impact on undergraduates' experience, it seems clear that focussing attention on large concentrations will yield the most substantial results.

Among large concentrations, most committee concentrations ranked highly on most measures, and there are examples of departmental concentrations with both high and low ranks. The phenomenon of committee concentrations, constituted solely for undergraduates and overseen entirely by faculty borrowed from their home departments, makes it hard to compare student-faculty ratios (what is the student-faculty ratio in a program that has no faculty of its own?).

Whatever the rankings and potentially relevant variables, the dispersion across fields in mean response values is very large for some questions. For example, in response to the question of whether the student's academic interests are covered in advising conversations, the percentage of seniors answering in the affirmative ranged from 97.7% to 36.5% among just those concentrations for which at least 25 seniors answered the question (we'll call these "large" concentrations in what follows). Again just among large concentrations, the percentage of students reporting that they had been unable to get advice when they needed it varied from as low as 19.2% to as high as 78.4%. The percentage of students who thought that their advisers have academic information about them varied from 92.9% to 38.2% among large concentrations. Even on the question, "Does your concentration provide an oral or written rationale for concentration requirements?" the percentage of positive responses ranged from 98% to 31% for large concentrations, and between 100% and 37.5% for programs with only 5 to 10 respondents. In two large concentrations, more than a third of the respondents reported having at some point been left without any adviser at all; in four other large concentrations this happened to less than 10% of the students. On a 1-to-5 scale, overall satisfaction with academic advising ranged from almost 4 to less than 2 just among large concentrations; the mean for all students was 2.85, with a standard deviation of 1.4. It is clear that there is no one "Harvard" experience of undergraduate advising;

students' experience depends fundamentally on their field of academic concentration.*

In addition to the Senior Survey data, other sources of information for the Committee's subsequent deliberations were direct reports from faculty and students on the Committee about the advising systems in their departments (the complementarity here was, of course, interesting); reports from Deans Todd and Foster about their interactions with Head Tutors/Directors of Undergraduate Studies; and Dean Todd's reflections on what he has learned from the departmental "visiting committees" of the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and from departmental chairs' annual letters to the Dean of the Faculty, which are supposed to address the health of the undergraduate program, among other topics. Overall, we have been impressed by the extent to which attitudes towards undergraduate advising, or more generally towards taking a personal interest in the welfare of individual undergraduates, are deeply rooted in departmental cultures. In some large departments, faculty responsibility for advising is so deeply ingrained that faculty react with surprise to the idea that anyone but faculty might advise students. In other departments, advising undergraduates is by ancient tradition relegated by the faculty to graduate students or others not of faculty rank, and only the potential summas are likely to be received with interest by ladder faculty. Remarkably, these attitudinal extremes can be embodied even in the same professor, if he or she participates in more than one undergraduate program.

Many undergraduates report wonderful experiences with their thesis advisers, research mentors, and others. The level of attention paid to individual guidance in certain undergraduate degree programs is quite impressive. The level of satisfaction showed by concentrators in Classics, History of Science, Social Studies, History and Literature, Engineering Sciences, and Biochemical Sciences shows that there is no necessary connection between advising quality and any obvious variable (intellectual area, departmental status, student-faculty ratio, etc.), though the tendency for the large social science concentrations to gravitate towards the bottom of most lists does provide some opportunity for speculative generalization.

On the other hand, the Committee was struck by the distance between faculty perceptions and the reality as reported by students. The advising-mentoring distinction seemed to be seen differently by students and faculty in the department that had codified it. Af-

* As is done every four years, a national survey instrument was used for the class of 1998. Though the questions are different, the level of average dissatisfaction with advising, and the dispersion of responses across departments, are again evident. For example, the mean response to the question, "How satisfied are you with academic advising in your major?" was 2.31 on a scale of 1 (very dissatisfied) to 4 (very satisfied), with a standard deviation of 1.0; the comparable results for the year 1994 when this question was last asked were 2.59 (standard deviation 1.2). But mean responses for individual departments ranged from 1.00 to 3.38 in 1998, with three large concentrations scoring less than 2.0 (more dissatisfied than satisfied). The full data are appended to this report. Interestingly, not all measures of educational quality are so low; the mean rating of instructional quality was 3.07 on the 1-to-4 scale, and of instructional quality for courses in the major field was 3.23. Both these figures are essentially unchanged from 1994. And mean overall satisfaction with one's undergraduate education was 3.93 (standard deviation 0.9) on a 1-to-5 scale, up from 3.79 (standard deviation 1.0) in 1994.

ter reflecting on the particulars in a number of these cases, and integrating them with information from other sources, the Committee wishes to advance the following proposals.

- (1) Instead of broad efforts, focus on one or two departments at a time.
 - Rationale: A small change in the quality of advising in one or two large departments would have more impact than even large changes in many small departments. To be helpful and to have a real impact in these large departments, it will be important to understand the departments better than the data in our broad surveys make possible — to look at such factors as the specifics of staffing patterns and allocation of resources, for example.
 - Observations and Problems: This measure is likely to be met by resistance in departments that are jealous of their autonomy and suspicious of central authority. It is also likely to be met by demands for more resources. It is unclear what person or office would best work with a department to help it address problems with its advising. On the other hand, some chairs might respond positively to our recognition that their departments are trying to reform themselves and to our attempts to support them in those reforms. And in some cases, nothing short of a personal touch may work in getting the internal processes going.
 - (2) Urge that Directors of Undergraduate Studies/Head Tutors be tenured faculty.
 - Rationale: There is no question that many junior faculty are superb and devoted advisers of undergraduates. This recommendation concerns not the advisers, but the person who directs the advisers and stimulates departmental discussions of the undergraduate program. Only senior faculty have the clout to shift departmental paradigms for the priorities and behavior of faculty.
 - Observations and Problems: Naturally, it is important, whatever the academic rank of the chief undergraduate officer, that he or she should be dedicated to the welfare of undergraduates; it would not be constructive to replace a dedicated junior faculty member by an indifferent senior faculty member, with the result of lowering the overall quality of advising. One Committee member, while agreeing with this proposal in theory, doubted it would be effective in practice, as it would tend either to exploit senior faculty who are dedicated to advising or to reduce their teaching scope if they were given some relief for taking on a major advising role. Indeed, it was observed that this tension typifies a deeper problem: inadequate rewards encouraging faculty to take on advising roles. In certain successful programs, especially committee concentrations, where the Head Tutor is not tenured, there would be no point in imposing this change.
- In some departments a nontenured Director of Undergraduate Studies has been moved to act on advising structures with the strong support of the department chair; in other departments this seems not to have occurred. So perhaps this proposal needs to be kept in mind in conversations with chairs, without imposing it as a rule that would be resented by chairs of good will.

- (3) In order to ensure that departments' views of their undergraduate programs are well-informed and not based on an overly theoretical view, resuscitate the faculty legislation requiring each concentration to have some involvement by undergraduates in directing its program.
- Rationale: This responds to the very evident disjuncture between student and faculty perceptions in many programs. Some departments have active and constructive undergraduate committees. Undergraduates are best positioned to explain to the faculty the deficiencies of the advising system, for example by interpreting the results of the Senior Survey.
 - Observations and Problems: There are two relevant pieces of Faculty legislation, and it would make more sense to remind the departments of these, and perhaps to encourage that they be broadly applied, than to try to craft new legislation. On May 17, 1977, the Faculty voted "That every field of concentration shall establish . . . appropriate procedures, formal or informal, to ensure . . . that concentrators are notified of a method by which they can register their views on the program and its courses," and on April 10, 1979, it voted that "each department and program offering tutorial shall constitute a student-faculty committee to review the tutorial program of the concentration on a regular basis as well as the academic guidance which tutors are expected to provide." Thus technically, concentrations do not need to have committees with undergraduate members unless those programs offer tutorial, but it seems wise to us to encourage all departments to have such committees. We recognize that undergraduates may be able to explain the problems, but not to be realistic about the solutions; still, if resource constraints or priorities are an issue, it may be useful to have a somewhat more publicly articulated explanation of these matters than has occurred in the past in some departments.
- (4) Improve the orientation of new faculty, both to Harvard College in general and to their departmental undergraduate program in particular.
- Rationale: FAS's new faculty orientation is today not very intense or fact-filled, and does not therefore equip faculty to answer even basic questions that undergraduates may pose. It is less than a day in length and occurs before the beginning of the fall term, with no followup. The faculty members, as well as their advisees, would benefit from knowing more about Harvard. Much more extensive orientations occur for other groups: orientation for the Board of Freshman Advisers lasts most of a week; orientation of new Resident Deans (Allston Burr Senior Tutors and Assistant Deans of Freshmen) also lasts a full week; orientation of new Masters extends over two days; and orientation of new resident Tutors in the Houses lasts two days. There is a great deal of material and expertise that could be drawn on from these other orientations the College stages annually that could be adapted for new Faculty. Departmental orientations often do not exist at all, and the informal communication of departmental culture from senior faculty to new colleagues may in some departments perpetuate unhelpful practices.

- Observations and Problems: We have to be realistic about how much can be conveyed to faculty at the beginning of their first term, and how willing they will be to cooperate in such an orientation. Moreover, many peculiarities of the Harvard undergraduate culture, such as shopping period and centralized administration of final exams, cannot be comprehended by faculty until they have been experienced. So in addition to the orientation day before the beginning of the academic year, followup might include lunches or a dinner at which new faculty would mix informally with students and/or colleagues from their own or other departments. Moreover, the notion of local orientation of new faculty to their departmental policies and practices has merit. Indeed, such a local orientation could acquaint new faculty with many matters beyond advising (structure of the graduate program, method for determining teaching assignments, support for seeking and administering research grants and contracts, etc.).
- (5) Assign a liaison from the staff of Harvard College or the Office of Undergraduate Education to each new faculty member, to provide a general point of contact for all aspects of undergraduate life.
- Rationale: Faculty pick up habits, good and bad, from their departmental colleagues. An occasional call from or meal with a Senior Tutor or dean may be very welcome during a faculty member's first year. Even a single point of contact for sporadic e-mail inquiries might be welcome. Such connections could also serve to introduce new faculty to the Houses, and to mitigate the sense of isolation that new faculty report frequently.
 - Observations and Problems: This project could be initiated immediately. There is no significant expense involved, and the number of available liaisons (Deans and Assistant and Associate Deans of the College, of Freshmen, or of Undergraduate Education, Allston Burr Senior Tutors, and directors of major undergraduate offices) is comparable to the number of new faculty.
- (6) See to it that there is at least one discussion of the undergraduate program in a departmental faculty meeting each year. Ask the Registrar and the Office of Undergraduate Education to provide statistical information to each undergraduate program annually — numbers of courses and concentrators for the past few years, course enrollments, senior survey results, etc. — so that these discussions can start from an informed basis. Ask for an annual report from each undergraduate program as part of the chair's annual report to the Dean.
- Rationale: One hears too often that faculty do not know the rules for their own departments' concentrations, even though they are the authority under which those concentrations are being administered. An annual discussion might familiarize the departmental faculty with its own rules. Such an annual faculty discussion might also provide a regular opportunity for the faculty to consider whether the concentration structure and specific course requirements actually continue to make good intellectual and practical sense. It might also sensitize those involved with hiring decisions to the need to keep staffing decisions synchronized with concentration requirements. At a minimum, this discussion could

be mandated as part of the EPC review process, though really it should take place every year.

- **Observations and Problems:** The requirement of an annual discussion of the undergraduate program by the departmental faculty is part of the 1977 legislation mentioned earlier, which specifies that every concentration establish procedures to ensure "that the entire faculty affiliated with the program meet at least once each year to review its policies and to identify any current problems. The Chairman shall report annually to the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education on the issues addressed at these meetings." There are probably more departments where these discussions fail to occur than there are where they do happen, and the reporting requirement has in many cases been forgotten completely. In order to avoid more paperwork, the reporting expectation could be shifted to the Chair's annual letter to the Dean. On the other hand, since it is hard to know what the enforcement mechanism could be, there may be no point in resurrecting a rule that will be ignored. All things considered, this is such a minimal expectation on departments that the Faculty should try to get it started again. Some departments that do have schedule a discussion of undergraduate affairs in an annual departmental faculty meeting report that they invite representative undergraduates to attend that meeting, with satisfactory results.

A certain amount of systematic data is already prepared in advance of the annual "staffing meeting" between the department chair and the office of Academic Affairs; it would not be hard to expand these reports to profile the statistical state of the undergraduate program.

The proposal that chairs be certain in their annual letters to report on these matters in their letters to the Dean of the Faculty is designed to provide for a regular point of reflection and documentation by the chair, while avoiding the creation of more pointless paper. By making the report a confidential communication from the chair to the dean as part of a document the chair has to write anyway, we hope to minimize the overhead and maximize the candor. We understand that many chairs' letters already provide this kind of information, and that followup now occurs in varying degrees.

- (7) Focus on advising in the regular reviews by the Educational Policy Committee of departmental programs.

- **Rationale:** These visits are conducted not just by deans but by faculty "lay citizens" from other departments, so they generally have a collegial tone. They are a natural locus for considering advising problems in the context of other departmental issues and constraints.
- **Observations and Problems:** The Committee recognizes that advising is already discussed in these Educational Policy Committee reviews, and wants to be on the record in support of that enterprise. Educational Policy Committee reviews occur only every few years, so depending on when problems may arise in the cycle, the most needy departments may not be gotten to anytime soon. There are no

students on the Educational Policy Committee so it is not clear how to ensure that a realistic picture of advising will be conveyed.

(8) Allocate some funds for improving advising systems in certain departments.

- Rationale: None of the proposals above involve significant financial investments, and strong arguments can be made that in most departments culture, not funding, is the barrier to satisfactory advising. Still, we must recognize that there are very wide variations between departments in student-faculty ratios, administrative and clerical support for advising, and outreach to individuals (not always faculty) outside the department to provide advising. Some programs whose advising is rated highly by students have successful tutorial or "junior project" courses that bring faculty and students together in intimate contact; while the faculty leaders of these groups may not be formal "advisers" of the students in them, it seems that students perceive a noninstructional benefit from these interactions. In one highly rated program, there is a very robust administrative structure for keeping tabs on concentrators, tutors are paid from a restricted (though not highly restricted) endowment, and there is an intense competition, even among faculty at MIT and the Harvard professional schools, to be admitted into the fellowship of Tutors. While money cannot solve all problems, there seem to be some problems for which money can be helpful.
- Observations and Problems: It is disquieting to think that advising might be provided most successfully by contracting it out to persons who are not FAS faculty. The human resources to mount such an effort would likely not exist in every field. Nonetheless, there is sound evidence that by providing strong administrative support (which badgers both students and advisers to see that they meet as appropriate), by documenting important information in an accurate and accessible form, and by linking advising to instructional efforts, a remarkably successful system can be implemented.

It should be noted that the office of Undergraduate Education already makes some monies available for promising programs to improve advising.

(9) Review the efficacy of study card signing as an adjunct to advising.

- Rationale: While in many departments and with many faculty, appropriate advance consultation with students about course selection is the norm, the Committee heard too many anecdotes of study cards being signed without any meeting between adviser and advisee. Indeed, the Committee heard a report of study cards being "signed" by a clerical staff person equipped with a rubber stamp bearing the signature of the Head Tutor, leading one of us to quip that with modern technology the Registrar could simply preprint the adviser's signature on the study card. In such cases the fundamental purpose of the departmental signature seems to have been forgotten: notwithstanding that students are ultimately responsible for their own course choices, by signing the study card the department is *approving* the student's course choices, and thereby providing some level of assurance that the student's course selections will, over time, enable the student to earn a bachelor's degree in that field of concentration. Thus

departments should not sign study cards of students who are pursuing academic programs that would not lead to a degree in that field, even if the student reports that he or she intends to switch concentrations. There are fees for late filing of study cards, but they are not onerous. In extreme cases, departments' repeated failure to enforce concentration requirements when signing study cards could result in a student completing eight terms in residence without satisfying the concentration requirements of any field and hence being unable to earn a degree.

- Observations and Problems: There are cogent arguments that the *moment* of study card signing is not the right moment for advising to occur; thinking about course selection should begin much earlier, during the previous term. Yet the study card protocol is the only point each term at which the College enforces (or attempts to enforce) a meeting between adviser and advisee, and it is not clear how else an advising meeting could be mandated. The Committee did hear of schemes at other colleges whereby students must obtain meal cards or passwords from their advisers, so that they could not eat or access email without meeting their advisers first; but reports of the efficacy of such devices were not fully persuasive.

Advising in the Houses

As a Committee we have worked on several aspects of House-based advising. Harvard is unique in the richness and extent of its resident advising system. There is probably not another college in the country that is as fully staffed as we are: 12 independent units of some 400 students each, each with some 20 resident Tutors, mainly graduate and professional students receiving room and board with some also receiving stipends, in addition to the faculty Senior Tutor and Masters. We are obliged to get the maximum benefit to undergraduates from this richness. Were we to go back to first principles to articulate roles, this would be hard enough; to make changes in a functioning system, laden with decades of traditions, is a very large challenge. Over the past three years, much effort has been expended on appointments of Senior Tutors and Masters, and on training and orienting the new appointees to give them the best guidance on how to serve students well. The provision by the Dean of the Faculty, effective this year, to fund the teaching "halves" of suitably qualified Senior Tutor appointees has been very helpful in cementing departmental-House linkages.

We would mention here three aspects of advising in the Houses: coordination with departments on appointments and tutorial roles; House-based nonconcentration advising; and the role of resident Tutors.

- (1) *Appointment of Tutors.* Masters appoint resident Tutors, departments do not. Only a few departments now rely on House Tutors to lead formal tutorials in the Houses or otherwise to provide academic instruction in the Houses. A few departments, Psychology and Biology in particular, have talked about moving back to a House-based Tutorial or advising system. But the obstacles to instituting such systems are quite significant. First is the problem of proportionate staffing: Only for the very largest

departments would it make sense to have a Tutor resident in each House, and even for a large department, the statistical variations from uniformity in the distribution of concentrators can be very significant, when students of a given class are distributed at random among 12 Houses. Second is the fact that tutorials and advising are today more often organized along lines of topic of interest than coresidence. The net effect is that with only a few exceptions, resident Tutors no longer provide Tutorial or other formal instruction in the Houses.

In some fields they do, however, act as official academic advisers, with rights to sign study cards. And in a broader set of fields, they help with problem sets, conduct informal academic counseling, and engage in like activities that may require only a limited knowledge of the academic curriculum. In a more general sense, Tutors in certain fields may add critically to the intellectual life of the House in their field of expertise, yet not in a way that is at all related to the undergraduate concentration. Good examples are music and computer science: music Tutors may arrange programs of performances, and computer science Tutors may keep the local network up and running and replete with interesting software, without in either case needing to know anything about the course sequencing or requirements in the concentration of the same name.

The problem created by this continuum of academic officialness in the roles of resident Tutors is ensuring that Masters, students, Tutors, and departments all have the same expectations for what an individual Tutor can and should be providing academically, given that those expectations may vary wildly depending on the individual and the field. Over the years, various schemes have been tried for validating departmental endorsement where that is appropriate. We have tried once again this past year to see to it that no resident Tutor refers to him- or herself, or is referred to in House publications, as "Tutor in field X" unless an appropriate official in department X certifies that such a title is appropriate. At the moment, this effort might best be called a work in progress; at bottom, with the Houses now so far out of the orbit of institutions relevant to the academic departments, it is hard to summon much interest on either side in effecting a simple and effective exchange of information between the departments and the Houses. The happy news is that there is no shortage of qualified individuals seeking to become resident Tutors, and while the desire to create a tutorial staff that is representative on dimensions of gender and ethnicity as well as academic field create significant challenges to the Masters, the overall quality of the individual members of the tutorial staffs is gratifyingly high.

- (2) *House-Based Nonconcentration Advising.* This is funded by the Dean for Undergraduate Education, and creates a framework for Houses to complement departmental advising in the area of the Core and on "no-man's land" issues such as whether to change concentrations. The system is administered in a very decentralized way, and there are in fact twelve different systems in place in the twelve residential Houses. In some Houses all the attention is given to the sophomores; in other Houses each student has a "nonconcentration adviser" who is intentionally not the student's entryway Tutor; and so on. It is hard to imagine that all these systems are equally efficient in their use of resources, and there is some suspicion that the historical coincidence that

the Dean for Undergraduate Education made these funds available just as the Dean of Harvard College cut House budgets may have resulted in the use of these funds in the Houses for purposes that are not genuinely advising functions at all. It may be that the simplest system works the best: give each Tutor responsibility for advising the students in his or her geographical vicinity.

The Committee had a single discussion of this issue. As with concentration advising, reports from students about how nonconcentration advising actually works in the Houses were at variance with the ideal described by the Masters and envisioned by the Dean for Undergraduate Education when he made these funds available.

- (3) *Resident Tutor Job Description.* There is significant variation among the Houses in the way Tutors understand their roles, the way those understandings are communicated, and how effectively Tutors carry them out. While most Masters would accept the notion that resident Tutors are analogous to what other colleges call "resident advisers," some insist that we not lose sight of Tutors' roles as junior scholars in residence. Well and good, but not if casting their roles that way tends to lessen their interest in the personal welfare of undergraduates. And the 1997 Senior Survey data suggest that it does exactly that: one House scores 2.65 on the 1-5 scale on the question of tutor interest in undergraduates, another weighs in at 3.33.) A bit of imagination is required to interpret the responses to the question "How many House tutors do you know by name?", but on the 1-5 scale (1 meaning none of them, 3 meaning 4-7, and 5 meaning all of them), the average responses range from a low of 2.84 to a high of 3.66.

Student members of the Committee raised the issue of evaluation and reappointment of Tutors. They were surprised that the Houses do not systematically ask students to evaluate Tutors, in the way that evaluation of faculty teaching is now all but universal, and evaluation of freshman proctors and advisers is completely standard.

We approached this issue by deciding to work first on a common definition of what Tutors are supposed to do (another "minimum standards" document, in effect; a copy is appended to this report). The Masters worked cooperatively with the Committee on this project, and the resulting document has been made widely available and should provide a common understanding, by students and Tutors, of what is expected of Tutors (individual Masters will, of course, add further responsibilities).

We anticipate in the coming year proposals to develop a College-wide Tutor evaluation form, which we will encourage Houses to use before reappointing Tutors. The results of these evaluations should also be made available to the Dean's office, to supplement the Senior Survey data and to ensure that a Tutor who fails to be reappointed to one House will not be appointed to another without close scrutiny.

- o -

Two projects should be mentioned that are not Committee business but are College efforts aimed at improving the quality and consistency of the guidance undergraduates receive.

First is the Tutor training program, which has matured a good deal since it was initiated three years ago. As a result of a steady process of evaluation and feedback, and

the work of a committee of Masters, Tutors, and deans throughout the year, there are now well-organized and informative programs at the beginning of each academic year for both new and returning Tutors. There is also a program of semimonthly evening meetings during the academic year, which has also gone through a process of evolution. These semimonthly meetings are now planned and hosted by groups of Houses, and focus on issues of common interest that have been identified by the Houses themselves. However, attendance by Tutors has been disappointing at some recent meetings; the problem of motivating attendance is being addressed by the Masters.

As a second final note, the Office of Career Services is working to improve the quality of information and consistency of support provided by preprofessional (pre-law and pre-medical) advisers in the Houses. Harvard is unique among colleges in decentralizing this function into the residential setting, and is also, because of its urban location and strong alumni base, especially well situated to draw heavily on volunteers and resident advisers who are themselves candidates for professional degrees to provide this advising. But decentralization has its downside as well, resulting in inconsistency among the Houses in the degree of expertise of preprofessional advisers. With a heavy program of orientation for both Tutors and Masters that has been developed in the past few years, we are poised to provide much greater consistency of advising in the future. These efforts were kicked off in the fall with a very successful dinner at the Faculty Club under the sponsorship of OCS, at which the House pre-medical Tutors met the new Dean of Admissions at Harvard Medical School.

- o -

All these efforts are yielding slow but steady progress for the benefit of our students. We list below those who were members of the committee during the time when this work was done. (Only the current members have reviewed this report.)

Current members:

Harry R. Lewis, Chair
Thomas A. Dingman
Daniel G. Donoghue
Deborah Foster
Howard Georgi
Elizabeth Studley Nathans
Donald H. Pfister
Louise M. Richardson
William Mills Todd III
William Wright-Swadel

Former members:

John Dowling
Stephen Kosslyn

With thanks to the student members of the Committee, who made many valuable contributions to its work.



Concentration Advising: Minimum Standards

Format

- (F1) The adviser is an individual known by name to the student. (In small concentrations the Head Tutor/Director of Undergraduate Studies might be the adviser of all students.)
- (F2) The concentration provides the adviser with information about concentration requirements and general academic recommendations.
- (F3) When the adviser goes on leave or departs the university, the concentration recognizes the need for a new adviser, appoints the new adviser, provides that person with information about the student, and notifies the student of the change.
- (F4) At least two conversations per year occur between student and adviser, planned to inform course shopping.
- (F5) A student file (electronic or paper) exists and is reviewed by the adviser at each meeting with the student. The file contains pertinent information about the student's history and plans, including a list of the student's courses and grades, and a study plan for completing concentration requirements.
- (F6) The adviser records comments on advising sessions in the student's file.
- (F7) The student's study card is signed by the adviser.

Content of Advising Conversations

- (C1) Identification, review, and reconsideration of student's academic interests.
- (C2) Discussion of how those academic interests can be addressed in the curriculum, including courses to be considered, appropriateness of the student's background, fit with concentration requirements, and alternative plans.
- (C3) Discussion of concentration requirements and review or revision of the student's Plan of Study.
- (C4) Discussion of possible summer, post-graduate, or other opportunities.
- (C5) Discussion of referrals to other sources of expert advice.

(December 22, 1998)

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 116

Did your concentration provide a written or oral rationale for concentration requirements?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Literature	0	11	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
Social Studies	1	50	98.0%
History of Science	2	34	94.4%
Classics	1	12	92.3%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
History & Literature	9	34	79.1%
Afro American Studies	3	10	76.9%
Mathematics	6	20	76.9%
Linguistics	1	3	75.0%
Computer Science	10	25	71.4%
Sociology	6	14	70.0%
Chemistry	11	23	67.6%
Anthropology	15	31	67.4%
Biochemical Sciences	30	62	67.4%
Astronomy	1	2	66.7%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Government	35	70	66.7%
Engineering Science	10	20	66.7%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	11	21	65.6%
No concentration information	37	67	64.4%
Romance Langs & Lit	4	7	63.6%
Economics	54	94	63.5%
Music	6	9	60.0%
History	22	31	58.5%
Visual & Environ Studies	6	8	57.1%
Psychology	26	31	54.4%
Fine Arts	6	7	53.8%
Philosophy	9	10	52.6%
East Asian Studies	10	10	50.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	4	4	50.0%
Physics	14	14	50.0%
Biology	59	57	49.1%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	47	39	45.3%
Chemistry & Physics	7	5	41.7%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	5	3	37.5%
Applied Mathematics	20	9	31.0%
Soc Sci	175	391	69.1%
Nat Sci	173	240	58.1%
Hum	104	163	61.0%
ALL	490	866	63.9%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 117

Do you have a concentration adviser, that is, a particular person from whom you are supposed to seek advice about your concentration? (In a small concentration this might be the Head Tutor.)

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Astronomy	0	3	100.0%
Biochemical Sciences	0	93	100.0%
Classics	0	14	100.0%
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	0	9	100.0%
History of Science	0	36	100.0%
Mathematics	0	26	100.0%
Music	0	15	100.0%
Physics	0	28	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Social Studies	0	52	100.0%
Special Concentrations	0	6	100.0%
Visual & Environ Studies	0	14	100.0%
Chemistry & Physics	0	12	100.0%
Literature	0	11	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	4	100.0%
Computer Science	0	37	100.0%
Chemistry	1	33	97.1%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	1	31	96.9%
Applied Mathematics	1	28	96.6%
History & Literature	2	42	95.5%
East Asian Studies	1	20	95.2%
Engineering Science	2	28	93.3%
Fine Arts	1	13	92.9%
Biology	10	108	91.5%
Romance Langs & Lit	1	10	90.9%
Sociology	3	19	86.4%
Afro American Studies	2	9	81.8%
Philosophy	4	17	81.0%
No concentration information	26	78	75.0%
Linguistics	1	3	75.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	2	6	75.0%
Government	26	77	74.8%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	22	65	74.7%
History	14	40	74.1%
Anthropology	15	31	67.4%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Psychology	24	34	58.6%
Economics	97	51	34.5%
Soc Sci	182	384	67.8%
Nat Sci	14	405	96.7%
Hum	35	239	87.2%
ALL	257	1112	81.2%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 118

Whether or not you have a particular person as a concentration adviser, have you ever wanted any kind of concentration advice and not been able to get it quickly?

Concentration	Yes	No	Pct No
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Classics	2	12	85.7%
Mathematics	5	21	80.8%
Women's Studies	1	4	80.0%
Sociology	5	16	76.2%
History of Science	9	27	75.0%
Linguistics	1	3	75.0%
Literature	3	8	72.7%
Visual & Environ Studies	4	10	71.4%
Physics	8	19	70.4%
History & Literature	13	30	69.8%
Astronomy	1	2	66.7%
Chemistry & Physics	4	8	66.7%
Computer Science	13	24	64.9%
Fine Arts	5	9	64.3%
Social Studies	19	33	63.5%
East Asian Studies	8	13	61.9%
Philosophy	8	13	61.9%
Government	42	63	60.0%
Music	6	9	60.0%
Biochemical Sciences	38	54	58.7%
Engineering Science	13	17	56.7%
Anthropology	20	26	56.5%
Chemistry	15	19	55.9%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	4	5	55.6%
Psychology	26	32	55.2%
Romance Langs & Lit	5	6	54.5%
Special Concentrations	3	3	50.0%
History	27	26	49.1%
Economics	76	71	48.3%
No concentration information	57	53	48.2%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	17	15	46.9%
Biology	65	52	44.4%
Afro American Studies	7	5	41.7%
Applied Mathematics	19	10	34.5%
Germanic Lang & Lit	2	1	33.3%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	69	19	21.6%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	8	0	0.0%
Soc Sci	249	318	56.1%
Nat Sci	185	231	55.5%
Hum	134	140	51.1%
ALL	628	745	54.3%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 119

Have you ever found yourself without a concentration adviser, because your previous adviser went on leave or left the university and a new adviser was not assigned to you?

Concentration	Yes	No	Pct No
Astronomy	0	3	100.0%
Classics	0	14	100.0%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	0	9	100.0%
Germanic Lang & Lit	0	3	100.0%
Linguistics	0	4	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Literature	0	11	100.0%
Fine Arts	1	12	92.3%
Mathematics	2	24	92.3%
Social Studies	4	46	92.0%
History of Science	3	32	91.4%
Chemistry	3	31	91.2%
Sociology	2	18	90.0%
Engineering Science	3	27	90.0%
Government	10	87	89.7%
Applied Mathematics	3	25	89.3%
Physics	3	25	89.3%
Computer Science	4	33	89.2%
Biochemical Sciences	10	82	89.1%
History & Literature	5	38	88.4%
Music	2	13	86.7%
Economics	20	111	84.7%
Anthropology	7	36	83.7%
Psychology	10	45	81.8%
Romance Langs & Lit	2	9	81.8%
History	10	42	80.8%
Philosophy	4	16	80.0%
Women's Studies	1	4	80.0%
Biology	33	84	71.8%
No concentration information	31	78	71.6%
East Asian Studies	6	15	71.4%
Afro American Studies	4	8	66.7%
Special Concentrations	2	4	66.7%
Chemistry & Physics	4	8	66.7%
Visual & Environ Studies	5	9	64.3%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	3	5	62.5%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	33	54	62.1%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	14	18	56.3%
Folklore & Mythology	1	0	0.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	1	0	0.0%
Soc Sci	85	447	84.0%
Nat Sci	65	351	84.4%
Hum	63	208	76.8%
ALL	246	1088	81.6%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 120

How often do you meet with your concentration adviser each year?

Concentration	Never	Once	Twice	3 times	4 times	mean	total N
Slavic Lang & Lit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	4.0	1
Religion	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	80.0%	3.8	5
Biochemical Sciences	3.2%	5.3%	8.5%	8.5%	74.5%	3.5	94
Literature	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	72.7%	3.5	11
Germanic Lang & Lit	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	3.3	3
History & Literature	7.0%	4.7%	7.0%	11.6%	69.8%	3.3	43
Fine Arts	14.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	78.6%	3.2	14
Women's Studies	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	60.0%	3.2	5
Earth & Planetary Sciences	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	55.6%	3.1	9
Classics	7.1%	7.1%	21.4%	7.1%	57.1%	3.0	14
History of Science	5.6%	11.1%	19.4%	5.6%	58.3%	3.0	36
Linguistics	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	2.8	4
Astronomy	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	2.7	3
Special Concentrations	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	2.7	6
Sociology	5.3%	15.8%	26.3%	26.3%	26.3%	2.5	19
Engineering Science	6.7%	10.0%	33.3%	26.7%	23.3%	2.5	30
English & Amer Lit & Lang	23.3%	14.0%	15.1%	7.0%	40.7%	2.3	86
Chemistry	14.7%	5.9%	44.1%	8.8%	26.5%	2.3	34
Social Studies	7.8%	13.7%	45.1%	17.6%	15.7%	2.2	51
Music	0.0%	20.0%	60.0%	6.7%	13.3%	2.1	15
Computer Science	10.8%	16.2%	40.5%	16.2%	16.2%	2.1	37
Folklore & Mythology	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0	1
Visual & Environ Studies	7.1%	35.7%	28.6%	7.1%	21.4%	2.0	14
Romance Langs & Lit	18.2%	9.1%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	1.9	11
Physics	21.4%	3.6%	53.6%	7.1%	14.3%	1.9	28
Biology	13.7%	16.2%	52.1%	8.5%	9.4%	1.8	117
Applied Mathematics	13.8%	10.3%	62.1%	6.9%	6.9%	1.8	29
Afro American Studies	27.3%	9.1%	36.4%	9.1%	18.2%	1.8	11
No concentration information	22.1%	27.4%	20.4%	7.1%	23.0%	1.8	113
History	38.5%	15.4%	9.6%	1.9%	34.6%	1.8	52
Philosophy	23.8%	9.5%	38.1%	23.8%	4.8%	1.8	21
Chemistry & Physics	25.0%	8.3%	50.0%	0.0%	16.7%	1.8	12
Environ Sci & Public Policy	21.9%	18.8%	34.4%	15.6%	9.4%	1.7	32
East Asian Studies	9.5%	19.0%	66.7%	4.8%	0.0%	1.7	21
Anthropology	29.3%	22.0%	24.4%	12.2%	12.2%	1.6	41
Mathematics	33.3%	25.9%	22.2%	7.4%	11.1%	1.4	27
Psychology	36.7%	16.3%	32.7%	2.0%	12.2%	1.4	49
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%	1.3	8
Government	41.3%	21.2%	25.0%	6.7%	5.8%	1.1	104
Economics	49.2%	16.9%	28.0%	5.1%	0.8%	0.9	118
Soc Sci	32.4%	17.0%	27.4%	8.1%	15.1%	1.6	518
Nat Sci	12.4%	11.4%	37.6%	10.0%	28.6%	2.3	420
Hum	14.7%	12.1%	23.5%	10.3%	39.3%	2.5	272
ALL	21.4%	15.1%	29.3%	9.1%	25.1%	2.0	1329

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 121

Does your concentration adviser have information about you, such as your academic record?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Classics	0	14	100.0%
Fine Arts	0	13	100.0%
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Germanic Lang & Lit	0	3	100.0%
Linguistics	0	4	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
East Asian Studies	1	20	95.2%
Music	1	14	93.3%
History & Literature	3	39	92.9%
Romance Langs & Lit	1	10	90.9%
Literature	1	10	90.9%
Social Studies	7	41	85.4%
Sociology	3	17	85.0%
Philosophy	3	16	84.2%
Physics	4	20	83.3%
Biochemical Sciences	16	76	82.6%
Engineering Science	6	25	80.6%
Anthropology	8	31	79.5%
Computer Science	8	26	76.5%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	8	22	73.3%
Biology	32	86	72.9%
Applied Mathematics	8	20	71.4%
No concentration information	31	75	70.8%
Astronomy	1	2	66.7%
Special Concentrations	2	4	66.7%
Chemistry	11	20	64.5%
Government	35	54	60.7%
Psychology	19	27	58.7%
Afro American Studies	5	6	54.5%
History of Science	16	16	50.0%
Visual & Environ Studies	5	5	50.0%
Economics	55	50	47.6%
Mathematics	11	10	47.6%
History	25	20	44.4%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	4	3	42.9%
Chemistry & Physics	7	5	41.7%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	47	29	38.2%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	5	3	37.5%
Soc Sci	181	289	61.5%
Nat Sci	109	293	72.9%
Hum	66	187	73.9%
ALL	389	848	68.6%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 122

Does your concentration adviser sign your study card?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Astronomy	0	3	100.0%
Classics	0	14	100.0%
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	0	9	100.0%
Germanic Lang & Lit	0	3	100.0%
Linguistics	0	4	100.0%
Music	0	15	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Romance Langs & Lit	0	11	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
Engineering Science	0	30	100.0%
History & Literature	1	41	97.6%
Biochemical Sciences	3	91	96.8%
Applied Mathematics	1	28	96.6%
Philosophy	1	20	95.2%
Computer Science	2	35	94.6%
Social Studies	3	48	94.1%
Biology	10	106	91.4%
East Asian Studies	2	18	90.0%
Sociology	2	18	90.0%
History of Science	4	31	88.6%
Chemistry	5	29	85.3%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	16	64	80.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	1	4	80.0%
Chemistry & Physics	3	9	75.0%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	8	24	75.0%
Literature	3	8	72.7%
Physics	8	20	71.4%
No concentration information	31	70	69.3%
Government	40	63	61.2%
Anthropology	18	24	57.1%
Fine Arts	6	8	57.1%
Psychology	24	26	52.0%
Mathematics	13	14	51.9%
Economics	53	56	51.4%
Afro American Studies	6	6	50.0%
History	25	24	49.0%
Visual & Environ Studies	13	1	7.1%
Soc Sci	183	325	64.0%
Nat Sci	45	374	89.3%
Hum	43	218	83.5%
ALL	303	992	76.6%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 123

If not, who does?

Concentration	staff	House tutor	Head Tutor/ Asst HT	other faculty	other graduate student	total N
No concentration information	33.3%	20.4%	22.2%	16.7%	7.4%	54
Afro American Studies	75.0%	0.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	8
Anthropology	88.5%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	26
Applied Mathematics	40.0%	40.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	5
Astronomy						0
Biochemical Sciences	73.3%	6.7%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15
Biology	44.4%	25.9%	7.4%	22.2%	0.0%	27
Chemistry	33.3%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	6
Classics	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
East Asian Studies	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	3
Economics	8.6%	36.2%	32.4%	3.8%	19.0%	105
English & Amer Lit & Lang	9.7%	48.4%	6.5%	29.0%	6.5%	31
Fine Arts	20.0%	0.0%	70.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10
Folklore & Mythology						0
Earth & Planetary Sciences						0
Germanic Lang & Lit						0
Government	13.6%	13.6%	42.4%	11.9%	18.6%	59
History	72.7%	6.1%	12.1%	3.0%	6.1%	33
History & Literature	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	3
History of Science	28.6%	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	14.3%	7
Linguistics	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
Mathematics	0.0%	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%	0.0%	16
Music	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	20.0%	40.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	5
Philosophy	16.7%	50.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6
Physics	9.1%	9.1%	63.6%	18.2%	0.0%	11
Psychology	18.9%	5.4%	5.4%	10.8%	59.5%	37
Religion	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Romance Langs & Lit	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
Slavic Lang & Lit						0
Social Studies	57.1%	0.0%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	7
Sociology	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	3
Special Concentrations	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
Visual & Environ Studies	61.5%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13
Chemistry & Physics	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	4
Literature	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	5
Women's Studies						0
Engineering Science	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
Computer Science	28.6%	42.9%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	7
Environ Sci & Public Policy	18.2%	9.1%	36.4%	36.4%	0.0%	11
Soc Sci	28.7%	17.9%	25.3%	9.1%	18.9%	296
Nat Sci	34.7%	17.9%	24.2%	22.1%	1.1%	95
Hum	26.2%	28.6%	23.8%	15.5%	6.0%	84
ALL	29.8%	19.8%	24.9%	13.2%	12.4%	531

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 124

Are the following covered in concentration advising conversations: your academic interests?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
History & Literature	1	42	97.7%
History of Science	2	34	94.4%
Literature	1	10	90.9%
Biochemical Sciences	12	80	87.0%
East Asian Studies	3	17	85.0%
Classics	2	11	84.6%
Visual & Environ Studies	2	11	84.6%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
Social Studies	9	41	82.0%
Physics	5	22	81.5%
Mathematics	5	20	80.0%
Engineering Science	6	24	80.0%
Fine Arts	3	11	78.6%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	2	7	77.8%
Linguistics	1	3	75.0%
Sociology	5	15	75.0%
Music	4	11	73.3%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	8	20	71.4%
Anthropology	13	28	68.3%
Astronomy	1	2	66.7%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Biology	42	71	62.8%
Chemistry	13	21	61.8%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	33	51	60.7%
No concentration information	41	59	59.0%
Computer Science	15	21	58.3%
History	21	29	58.0%
Government	45	48	51.6%
Chemistry & Physics	6	6	50.0%
Applied Mathematics	15	14	48.3%
Romance Langs & Lit	6	5	45.5%
Economics	73	49	40.2%
Philosophy	12	8	40.0%
Afro American Studies	8	5	38.5%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	5	3	37.5%
Psychology	33	19	36.5%
Soc Sci	217	293	57.5%
Nat Sci	122	288	70.2%
Hum	74	192	72.2%
ALL	455	837	64.8%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 125

Are the following covered in concentration advising conversations: what courses are appropriate for you to take, given your interests and background?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Linguistics	0	4	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	1	8	88.9%
Physics	3	24	88.9%
History & Literature	6	37	86.0%
Classics	2	11	84.6%
Visual & Environ Studies	2	11	84.6%
Mathematics	4	20	83.3%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
Literature	2	9	81.8%
History of Science	7	29	80.6%
Engineering Science	6	24	80.0%
Social Studies	11	39	78.0%
Biochemical Sciences	21	72	77.4%
Sociology	5	15	75.0%
East Asian Studies	6	15	71.4%
Fine Arts	4	10	71.4%
Astronomy	1	2	66.7%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Computer Science	13	24	64.9%
Applied Mathematics	11	18	62.1%
Chemistry	13	21	61.8%
No concentration information	38	58	60.4%
Anthropology	17	25	59.5%
History	20	29	59.2%
Philosophy	9	11	55.0%
Government	43	49	53.3%
Biology	53	60	53.1%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	4	4	50.0%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	14	14	50.0%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	44	40	47.6%
Economics	69	53	43.4%
Music	8	6	42.9%
Psychology	30	22	42.3%
Afro American Studies	7	4	36.4%
Romance Langs & Lit	7	4	36.4%
Chemistry & Physics	8	4	33.3%
Soc Sci	223	284	56.0%
Nat Sci	134	277	67.4%
Hum	95	171	64.3%
ALL	491	795	61.8%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 126

Are the following covered in concentration advising conversations: concentration requirements and how you plan to satisfy them?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Astronomy	0	3	100.0%
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Germanic Lang & Lit	0	3	100.0%
History of Science	0	36	100.0%
Linguistics	0	4	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Literature	0	11	100.0%
Women's Studies	0	5	100.0%
East Asian Studies	1	20	95.2%
Psychology	3	48	94.1%
Music	1	14	93.3%
Engineering Science	2	28	93.3%
History & Literature	3	40	93.0%
Classics	1	12	92.3%
Social Studies	4	46	92.0%
Sociology	2	19	90.5%
Philosophy	2	15	88.0%
Physics	3	24	88.9%
Fine Arts	2	12	85.7%
Biochemical Sciences	15	78	83.9%
Mathematics	4	20	83.3%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
Romance Langs & Lit	2	9	81.8%
Chemistry	7	27	79.4%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	18	65	78.3%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	6	21	77.8%
Applied Mathematics	7	21	75.0%
Economics	31	93	75.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	2	6	75.0%
Computer Science	9	27	75.0%
No concentration information	25	74	74.7%
Anthropology	11	31	73.8%
Government	26	67	72.0%
History	15	35	70.0%
Visual & Environ Studies	4	9	69.2%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	3	6	66.7%
Chemistry & Physics	4	8	66.7%
Biology	39	75	65.8%
Afro American Studies	6	7	53.8%
Soc Sci	104	408	79.7%
Nat Sci	93	317	77.3%
Hum	36	230	86.5%
ALL	259	1034	80.0%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 127

Are the following covered in concentration advising conversations: possible summer or postgraduate plans?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Astronomy	0	3	100.0%
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Literature	1	10	90.9%
Biochemical Sciences	12	81	87.1%
Classics	2	11	84.6%
Fine Arts	3	11	78.6%
History of Science	9	27	75.0%
Music	4	11	73.3%
Engineering Science	8	22	73.3%
Mathematics	8	17	68.0%
East Asian Studies	7	14	66.7%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	3	6	66.7%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Physics	9	18	66.7%
Special Concentrations	2	4	66.7%
Sociology	7	13	65.0%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	11	17	60.7%
History & Literature	17	26	60.5%
Women's Studies	2	3	60.0%
Biology	46	68	59.6%
Chemistry	14	19	57.6%
No concentration information	47	51	52.0%
Social Studies	25	25	50.0%
Computer Science	19	18	48.6%
Visual & Environ Studies	7	6	46.2%
Romance Langs & Lit	6	5	45.5%
Philosophy	11	9	45.0%
Anthropology	26	16	38.1%
History	31	19	38.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	5	3	37.5%
Government	58	34	37.0%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	53	31	36.9%
Applied Mathematics	19	10	34.5%
Chemistry & Physics	8	4	33.3%
Economics	91	33	26.6%
Psychology	38	13	25.5%
Linguistics	3	1	25.0%
Afro American Studies	10	3	23.1%
Soc Sci	308	203	39.7%
Nat Sci	146	266	64.6%
Hum	120	147	55.1%
ALL	623	671	51.9%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 128

Are the following covered in concentration advising conversations: people and offices where you can get further information and advice?

Concentration	No	Yes	Pct Yes
Folklore & Mythology	0	1	100.0%
Religion	0	5	100.0%
Slavic Lang & Lit	0	1	100.0%
Special Concentrations	1	5	83.3%
Literature	2	9	81.8%
Fine Arts	3	11	78.6%
Engineering Science	7	22	75.9%
Sociology	5	15	75.0%
History of Science	9	25	73.5%
Classics	4	9	69.2%
Earth & Planetary Sciences	3	6	66.7%
Germanic Lang & Lit	1	2	66.7%
Biochemical Sciences	35	55	61.1%
East Asian Studies	9	12	57.1%
Environ Sci & Public Policy	13	15	53.6%
Anthropology	20	22	52.4%
History & Literature	21	22	51.2%
Mathematics	13	12	48.0%
No concentration information	53	48	47.5%
Physics	15	12	44.4%
Computer Science	20	16	44.4%
Biology	63	50	44.2%
Music	8	6	42.9%
Chemistry	20	14	41.2%
Social Studies	29	20	40.8%
Government	54	37	40.7%
Women's Studies	3	2	40.0%
Visual & Environ Studies	8	5	38.5%
History	33	17	34.0%
Astronomy	2	1	33.3%
Psychology	34	17	33.3%
Chemistry & Physics	8	4	33.3%
Economics	83	40	32.5%
Philosophy	13	6	31.6%
English & Amer Lit & Lang	59	25	29.8%
Romance Langs & Lit	8	3	27.3%
Afro American Studies	9	3	25.0%
Applied Mathematics	21	7	25.0%
Linguistics	3	1	25.0%
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	6	2	25.0%
Soc Sci	292	213	42.2%
Nat Sci	207	199	49.0%
Hum	145	120	45.3%
ALL	698	585	45.6%

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 134

How satisfied have you been with any academic or personal advice received from your departmental adviser or tutor?

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied 5 = very satisfied

Concentration	Mean	N	Std
Folklore & Mythology	5.00	1	
Slavic Lang & Lit	5.00	1	
Classics	4.64	11	0.7
Religion	4.40	5	0.9
History of Science	4.14	35	1.0
History & Literature	4.02	41	1.2
Literature	4.00	11	0.9
Women's Studies	3.80	5	1.6
Earth & Planetary Sciences	3.78	9	1.7
Fine Arts	3.77	13	1.1
Linguistics	3.75	4	1.0
Sociology	3.75	20	1.2
Special Concentrations	3.67	6	1.5
Biochemical Sciences	3.65	93	1.3
Engineering Science	3.55	29	1.2
Music	3.36	14	1.1
Visual & Environ Studies	3.36	14	1.5
Astronomy	3.33	3	2.1
Germanic Lang & Lit	3.33	3	2.1
Mathematics	3.29	21	1.4
Social Studies	3.29	49	1.3
Computer Science	3.25	36	1.5
East Asian Studies	3.24	21	1.1
History	3.12	50	1.4
Chemistry	3.06	33	1.6
Physics	3.04	27	1.3
Psychology	3.02	48	1.3
Romance Langs & Lit	3.00	10	1.6
Anthropology	2.95	40	1.5
Philosophy	2.94	18	1.3
English & Amer Lit & Lang	2.90	81	1.5
Biology	2.89	113	1.4
Environ Sci & Public Policy	2.87	30	1.6
Chemistry & Physics	2.82	11	1.1
Economics	2.72	127	1.2
Afro American Studies	2.69	13	1.8
Government	2.63	100	1.3
Applied Mathematics	2.25	28	1.3
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	2.25	8	1.2
Soc Sci	3.00	517	1.4
Nat Sci	3.17	403	1.4
Hum	3.38	256	1.4
ALL	3.13	1287	1.4

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 141

Indicate your satisfaction with the academic advising provided by your concentration.

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied 5 = very satisfied

Concentration	Mean	N	Std
Folklore & Mythology	5.00	1	
Religion	4.60	5	0.9
Women's Studies	4.20	5	1.8
Literature	4.18	11	1.2
Classics	4.00	12	1.2
Slavic Lang & Lit	4.00	1	
History of Science	3.94	36	1.0
Linguistics	3.75	4	1.3
History & Literature	3.73	44	1.4
Visual & Environ Studies	3.57	14	1.3
Earth & Planetary Sciences	3.56	9	1.5
Engineering Science	3.55	31	1.2
Sociology	3.41	22	1.3
Fine Arts	3.36	14	1.6
Germanic Lang & Lit	3.33	3	2.1
Music	3.33	15	1.1
Mathematics	3.31	26	1.5
Biochemical Sciences	3.30	94	1.4
Computer Science	3.30	37	1.6
East Asian Studies	3.29	21	1.5
Social Studies	3.22	49	1.3
Physics	2.93	27	1.5
History	2.89	54	1.4
Environ Sci & Public Policy	2.84	32	1.4
Special Concentrations	2.83	6	1.5
Anthropology	2.82	44	1.4
Chemistry	2.82	34	1.6
Romance Langs & Lit	2.73	11	1.6
Astronomy	2.67	3	2.1
Psychology	2.64	56	1.3
Chemistry & Physics	2.58	12	1.5
Philosophy	2.57	21	1.3
Biology	2.50	117	1.4
Government	2.49	106	1.4
Economics	2.45	146	1.3
Afro American Studies	2.38	13	1.6
Applied Mathematics	2.18	28	1.3
English & Amer Lit & Lang	1.94	89	1.1
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	1.88	8	1.3
Soc Sci	2.78	563	1.4
Nat Sci	2.94	418	1.5
Hum	2.93	274	1.5
ALL	2.85	1369	1.4

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 142

Indicate your satisfaction with the personal advising provided by your concentration.

Scale: 1 = very dissatisfied 5 = very satisfied

Concentration	Mean	N	Std
Astronomy	4.50	2	0.7
Classics	4.00	11	1.3
Folklore & Mythology	4.00	1	
Religion	4.00	5	1.2
Slavic Lang & Lit	4.00	1	
Women's Studies	3.80	5	1.6
Literature	3.60	10	1.2
Linguistics	3.25	4	1.3
History of Science	3.23	31	1.3
Sociology	3.21	19	1.4
Computer Science	3.13	32	1.6
Visual & Environ Studies	3.07	14	1.7
Engineering Science	3.00	27	1.2
Special Concentrations	3.00	6	1.9
History & Literature	2.92	38	1.5
Earth & Planetary Sciences	2.86	7	1.8
Fine Arts	2.86	14	1.5
Chemistry & Physics	2.82	11	1.2
Environ Sci & Public Policy	2.75	28	1.4
Music	2.75	12	1.4
East Asian Studies	2.70	20	1.2
Physics	2.68	22	1.5
Biochemical Sciences	2.67	90	1.5
Social Studies	2.56	39	1.3
Mathematics	2.55	20	1.4
Anthropology	2.54	41	1.4
Germanic Lang & Lit	2.50	2	2.1
History	2.38	45	1.3
Romance Langs & Lit	2.33	9	1.4
Philosophy	2.28	18	1.6
Psychology	2.16	51	1.2
Government	2.14	99	1.2
Chemistry	2.10	29	1.2
Biology	2.04	107	1.2
Afro American Studies	2.00	13	1.1
Economics	1.97	128	1.1
Applied Mathematics	1.92	25	1.0
English & Amer Lit & Lang	1.73	81	1.1
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	1.29	7	0.8
Soc Sci	2.34	499	1.3
Nat Sci	2.47	372	1.4
Hum	2.50	247	1.5
ALL	2.42	1222	1.4

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 159

How difficult was it to find an adviser for your senior thesis/project?

Scale: 1 = very difficult 5 = very easy

Concentration	Mean	N	Std
Astronomy	5.00	1	
Germanic Lang & Lit	5.00	2	0.0
Linguistics	4.67	3	0.6
History of Science	4.56	34	0.9
Physics	4.50	6	0.6
Visual & Environ Studies	4.50	8	0.8
Literature	4.45	11	0.9
Chemistry & Physics	4.33	6	0.8
Classics	4.25	8	1.4
Music	4.21	14	1.3
Biochemical Sciences	4.20	61	1.1
Religion	4.20	5	1.3
Romance Langs & Lit	4.20	5	0.8
Earth & Planetary Sciences	4.17	6	1.6
Biology	4.03	59	1.2
History & Literature	4.02	43	1.2
Mathematics	4.00	22	1.2
Women's Studies	4.00	5	1.7
Computer Science	3.85	13	1.5
Engineering Science	3.75	16	1.1
Philosophy	3.73	15	1.2
Social Studies	3.66	50	1.3
Fine Arts	3.46	13	1.8
History	3.43	42	1.4
Chemistry	3.42	12	1.7
English & Amer Lit & Lang	3.39	61	1.5
Anthropology	3.33	27	1.4
Economics	3.27	71	1.6
Sociology	3.24	17	1.2
Government	3.22	63	1.5
Special Concentrations	3.17	6	1.6
Environ Sci & Public Policy	3.15	20	1.4
East Asian Studies	3.00	13	1.8
Applied Mathematics	2.92	13	1.8
Psychology	2.85	34	1.6
Afro American Studies	2.80	10	1.8
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	2.71	7	2.1
Folklore & Mythology	1.00	1	
Slavic Lang & Lit		0	
Soc Sci	3.40	373	1.5
Nat Sci	3.97	215	1.2
Hum	3.75	209	1.4
ALL	3.63	880	1.4

Class of 1997 Supplemental Senior Survey

Question 160

If you began but did not complete a senior thesis or project, please indicate your primary reason for not completing it?

Concentration	lack of time/interest	lack of topic/adviser	lack of progress	other	total N
Slavic Lang & Lit	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Applied Mathematics	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	0.0%	7
Near Eastern Lang & Civ	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3
Psychology	16.7%	58.3%	16.7%	8.3%	12
Germanic Lang & Lit	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
Social Studies	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2
Special Concentrations	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
Environ Sci & Public Policy	28.6%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	7
Government	19.0%	38.1%	19.0%	23.8%	21
History	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	9
Computer Science	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	6
English & Amer Lit & Lang	50.0%	31.3%	0.0%	18.8%	16
Sociology	0.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	4
Engineering Science	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	4
Economics	56.5%	21.7%	17.4%	4.3%	23
No concentration information	46.4%	21.4%	17.9%	14.3%	28
Afro American Studies	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	6
Biology	45.0%	10.0%	35.0%	10.0%	20
Biochemical Sciences	41.7%	8.3%	16.7%	33.3%	12
Anthropology	28.6%	0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	7
Chemistry	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	2
Classics	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1
East Asian Studies	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3
Fine Arts	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	2
Earth & Planetary Sciences	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
History & Literature	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1
History of Science	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1
Linguistics	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
Mathematics	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	3
Music	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	1
Philosophy	33.3%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	3
Physics	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	4
Visual & Environ Studies	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	2
Chemistry & Physics	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1
Literature	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2
Astronomy					0
Folklore & Mythology					0
Religion					0
Romance Langs & Lit					0
Women's Studies					0
Soc Sci	29.3%	31.5%	18.5%	20.7%	92
Nat Sci	42.6%	18.0%	23.0%	16.4%	61
Hum	42.1%	23.7%	5.3%	28.9%	38
ALL	37.6%	25.3%	17.2%	19.9%	221

1998 COFHE Survey: Concentrations

How satisfied are you with each service or aspect of your college: academic advising in your major

Scale: 1=Very dissatisfied to 4=Very satisfied

Overall Means: 1998 2.31 (std) 1.0
 1994 2.59 (std) 1.2

1998 Rank	Concentration	1998 Mean	1994 Rank	1994 Mean
1	Women's Studies	3.38	9	3.25
2	Music	3.27	39	1.88
3	Literature	3.26	17	3.00
4	Folklore & Mythology	3.20	8	3.40
5	Religion	3.20	6	3.63
6	East Asian Studies	3.09	24	2.76
7	Fine Arts	3.00	7	3.43
8	Engineering Science	2.96	22	2.78
9	Sociology	2.89	20	2.88
10	Near Eastern Lang & Civ	2.86	42	1.33
11	Visual & Environ Studies	2.86	40	1.80
12	Afro American Studies	2.83	10	3.17
13	Biochemical Science	2.70	21	2.80
14	Classics	2.64	16	3.00
15	History & Literature	2.60	12	3.09
16	Linguistics	2.60	3	3.90
17	Social Studies	2.57	14	3.07
18	History of Science	2.49	5	3.63
19	Earth & Planetary Sciences	2.45	13	3.07
20	Special Concentrations	2.44	4	3.87
21	Physics	2.40	34	2.33
22	Government	2.37	31	2.38
23	Anthropology	2.30	19	2.98
24	Mathematics	2.26	33	2.33
25	Slavic Lang & Lit	2.20	11	3.14
26	Biology	2.18	28	2.41
27	Environ Sci & Public Policy	2.17	2	4.00
28	Romance Langs & Lit	2.17	35	2.20
29	Chemistry	2.14	23	2.76
30	Philosophy	2.10	26	2.52
31	History	2.08	27	2.49
32	Psychology	2.05	32	2.38
33	Chemistry & Physics	2.00	25	2.67
34	Computer Science	2.00	29	2.41
35	Economics	1.99	30	2.41
36	English & Amer Lit & Lang	1.99	37	2.05
37	Applied Mathematics	1.76	36	2.13
38	Physical Sciences	1.00	41	1.67

Social Sciences: 2.24
 Natural Sciences: 2.29
 Humanities: 2.46

▶ HOME

▼ EXPLORE

▶ EVENTS

▶ SEARCH



get informed

HARVARD
COLLEGE

house resident tutors

student life

[get involved](#) ▲

[get around](#) ▲

[get informed](#) ▲

[who/where](#)
[freshman dean's office](#)
[houses](#)
[resident tutors](#)
[information for students](#)
[campus news](#)
[get services](#) ▲

[get help](#) ▲

academic life

[get courses](#) ▲

[get departments](#) ▲

[get registrar](#) ▲

[get resources](#) ▲

[text only](#)

House Tutors are valued and important members of the staff of Harvard College who play a vital role in the residential and educational life of undergraduates. Each House in the College forms a small academic and social community in which resident tutors and undergraduates live, eat, socialize and study together within the larger context of the College and University. Because of the informal nature of this environment, and the unique character of each individual House, it is important for both tutors and students to understand tutors' multiple roles within the House system as a whole.

We see the roles and responsibilities of residential tutors falling into three broad areas: "neighborhood" or entryway activities; academic advising; and community involvement. Houses may articulate these roles differently, but they have in common some basic sets of tasks or duties. These are outlined below.

Neighborhood or Entryway Responsibilities

Each tutor lives in a part of the House where he or she is the College officer of his or her designated area. In this capacity, it is expected that the tutor will engage in the following tasks with the student members of his or her area:

- meet individually with assigned students, with the goals of getting to know each student and establishing a relationship of trust;
- be available to students, directing them as necessary to the counseling resources;
- regularly schedule and organize study breaks;
- explain to students the rules of the House and the College, e.g., fire safety, parties, alcohol, drugs, etc.;
- help create and maintain a safe and livable environment and be familiar with all emergency procedures;
- be a liaison to the many resources within the College, e.g., the Office of Career Services, Public Service Network, Student Employment Office, etc.;
- bring to the attention of the Master and Senior Tutor students' academic or personal problems, or serious infractions of House or College rules.

Academic Advising

The Houses are an ideal location for general (non-concentration) academic advising. Allston Burr Senior Tutors have responsibility for working with students on advising issues outside of concentration requirements. Additionally, the nature of the tutorial staffs of the Houses, drawing together graduate students and faculty from across the departments, makes the Houses natural environments for a system of cross-referencing that can provide the broad context in which a student, with the counsel of his or her adviser, will make the choices and decisions that comprise a large part of his or her education. Each House designs the academic advising structure differently, but it is expected that tutors, in addition to being in good standing in their department, will be or do the following for the group of students assigned to them as academic advisees:

- meet regularly to discuss academic questions and concerns with advisees;
- be familiar with the Handbook for Students, with special reference to the academic rules of Harvard College, and "Fields of Concentration" and Introduction to the Core Curriculum;
- advise students on Core curriculum, non-concentration course choice, and other academic opportunities, for instance, Study out of Residence, UTEP, Fellowships, etc.;
- direct students to appropriate sources for further information, and help them formulate appropriate questions to ask these sources;
- share with the Allston Burr Senior Tutor relevant information concerning advisees;
- advise students on post-graduate plans and opportunities, including, but not limited to, law, medicine and graduate school.

Tutors bring their academic interests to the life of the House in a number of ways:

[search](#)

▶ go!

[what's new](#)
[Text-only site](#)
[Improved events calendar system](#)
[1998-1999 course catalog](#)

[feedback](#)

Want to add a link?
[Let us know](#) what you think.

some invite special speakers from their field, others establish regular discussion or language tables, still others may create opportunities for course review sessions. Some tutors also will be expected to represent their academic departments in the House and to carry out responsibilities in the area of concentration advising. Tutors with any uncertainty about their role should contact the relevant department(s). Those given House-based tasks related to a concentration should be clear with concentrators in the House about what those tasks are and they should participate in all training provided by the department.

Community Involvement

While varying from House to House, the responsibilities of community involvement may be generalized as follows:

- be in residence in the House during the academic year except for vacation periods and, with the explicit permission of the Master, an occasional short trip;
- attend College-wide and House tutor meetings;
- take meals in the dining hall regularly;
- be especially available during the stressful reading and exam periods;
- attend House functions, including sophomore outings and orientations, commencement and other functions as designated by the Master;
- participate in Senior Common Room activities;
- assume responsibility for House tasks as designated by the Master and Senior Tutor;
- serve on weekend duty;
- have active Centrex telephone service.

Tutors are most effective and get the most satisfaction when they support undergraduate activities generally and join them as their interests and talents dictate.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it is assumed that all interaction between resident tutors and students will be professional, as outlined in the College's Professional Conduct Discussion Document.

Useful Resources:

[Handbook for Students](#)

[Courses of Instruction](#)

[CUE Guide](#)

[Peer Counseling and Peer Health Education at Harvard](#)

[Guide to Grants \(Office of Career Services\)](#)

[Professional Conduct: A Discussion Document](#) (see *The Teaching Fellows Handbook*)

[Writing with Sources \(The Expository Writing Program\)](#)

[Introduction to the Core Curriculum: A Guide for Freshmen](#)

[Bureau of Study Counsel](#)

Last Updated September 3, 1998



▷ HOME

▷ EXPLORE

▷ EVENTS

▷ SEARCH