

# Florida State University Libraries

---

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

---

2015

## History and Development of Co-Curricular Transcripts

Crista Mary Coven



FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF  
CO-CURRICULAR TRANSCRIPTS

By

CRISTA MARY COVEN

A Thesis submitted to the  
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science

Degree Awarded:  
Spring Semester, 2015

Crista M. Coven defended this thesis on April 13, 2015.

The members of the supervisory committee were:

Robert A. Schwartz

Thesis Advisor

Kathy L. Guthrie

Committee Member

Janet G. Lenz

Committee Member

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members, and certifies that the thesis has been approved in accordance with university requirements.

“My candle burns at both ends,  
it will not last the night;  
But ah, my foes, and oh my friends –  
it gives a lovely light!”

Edna St. Vincent Millay, *First Fig*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My internal will to complete this project would not have withstood the challenges I encountered without the unwavering support of many faculty, friends and family members. Although countless people contributed to the creation of this document, either with or without their knowledge (e.g. wonderful coffee baristas), there are some who deserve special recognition here.

Thank you to the National Association of Campus Activities for supporting my research by providing me the hard copy of the Co-Curricular Transcript Manual. This work would not have been possible without that document and your support. Another thanks goes to the administrators who took the time to participate in this study.

Dr. Schwartz, thank you for allowing me this opportunity. I am so grateful for your support, from encouraging conversations to correcting my horrendous grammar. Thank you for helping me navigate the “thesis option” and my writers block. More than anything, thank you for allowing me space to be creative in my academic pursuits. Dr. Guthrie, you have made me a better academic, professional, student and person. I will always cherish our conversations, both in London and Tallahassee. Your passion for improvement in individuals, institutions and society is beautiful and contagious. Dr. Lenz, thank you for joining this team and supporting my pursuit of this project. I appreciate your insight on the career aspects of these programs and your critiques of my work along the way.

To my friends, you all are the real stars. Thank you for putting up with my stress, rants, and frequent moments of insecurity. Jack, when I feel like a shunned mutt, you remind me I am a prized puggerian. Your sacrifices the last two years in order to support me will not be forgotten. Emily and Nicole, thank you for accepting me as I am and providing a safe space for sips of wine and honesty. To the rest of the HESA family, you all are the most inspiring group of colleagues to share this experience with, thank you for your support and most of all, fun.

A sincere thank you goes to my friends, colleagues and students at the Center for Undergraduate Research and Academic Engagement. Everyday I am inspired by all your hard work, intelligence and compassion for the world. Thank you for accepting me and providing me a home at Florida State. Latika, thank you for your encouragement and for challenging me to be better- I wouldn't have made it through this program without you.

Mom and Dad, thank you for supporting me in moving across the country to pursue my education. You could have just “allowed” me to do it, but you two really pushed through the pain of me leaving, and truly supported my journey from day one. I feel incredibly lucky to have two of the hardest working and wholehearted (refer to Dr. Guthrie for an appropriate definition of the word wholehearted) parents in the world. You two have taught me the definition of the “good life,” and for that I will be forever grateful.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO- LITERATURE REVIEW AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	3
CHAPTER THREE- METHODS .....	21
CHAPTER FOUR- FINDINGS.....	24
CHAPTER FIVE- DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	30
APPENDICES .....	38
A. COPY OF IRB APPROVAL LETTER .....	38
B. CO-CURRICULAR TRANSCRIPT SURVEY 1.....	39
C. CO-CURRICULAR TRANSCRIPT SURVEY 2.....	43
References.....	45
Biographical Sketch .....	48

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Co-Curricular Transcript Manual Institution and Program Listing.....	14
2. Seven Institutions Co-Curricular Transcript Programs, 2015.....	26

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aims to answer the question: How have co-curricular transcript programs developed in the last 20 years? Based on the literature dating back to the late 1970's and the results of the current study, this paper will use the following definition of co-curricular transcript programs: A co-curricular transcript program is a system designed to increase intentional involvement among students, and produces a document of their involvement in activities outside of curricular requirements. These programs are coordinated by institutions of higher education as an affirmation of the value of co-curricular engagement with the goals of assisting students in making strategic decisions with their involvement, and achieving their post-graduation goals. While there are multiple avenues to addressing the topic of co-curricular transcripts, this study looked at the history and development of these programs starting with their conception in 1977, and ending today in 2015. Co-curricular transcript programs have the potential to help increase student engagement, and this study is a aims to highlight the opportunities and challenges that exist with these progra



# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

In the 1920's, as the student personnel movement developed some professionals saw the value in recording their students' experiences (Biddix & Schwartz, 2012). This concept solidified in the 1970's with Robert Brown and the Student Development Transcript (1977). As the student affairs profession has expanded and changed over the years, some practitioners have maintained the idea that recording students' experiences outside the classroom can help in their development. This study looks at the development of the co-curricular transcript movement, starting in the 1970's and moving through the present day. Additionally, this paper explores the potential these transcripts have to aid students in their development.

This paper is a mere introduction to the subject, and more research is needed to fully understand the potential challenges and opportunities with co-curricular transcript programs. While there are multiple avenues to addressing the topic of co-curricular transcripts, this study looked at the history and development of these programs. This decision on what to study to gain greater understanding of these programs was based on many factors, but mainly a belief in two things; if we use history to inform practice, we will make wiser decisions in the present, and there is no reason to re-invent the wheel. We should take advantage of past mistakes and understand the mechanics of success so we can create and maintain successful programs.

The historical development of these programs is vital to understanding their purpose and potential in the current higher education system. With that in mind, this study attempts to answer the question: How have co-curricular transcript programs developed in the last 20 years? The

time period of this study was generated based on the literature surrounding these programs, which started in 1977, and dropped off suddenly in about 1996.

Based on the literature dating back to the late 1970's and the results of the current study, this paper will use the following original definition of co-curricular transcript programs: A co-curricular transcript program is a system designed to increase intentional involvement among students, and produces a document of their involvement in activities outside of curricular requirements. These programs are coordinated by institutions of higher education as an affirmation of the value of co-curricular engagement with the goals of assisting students in making strategic decisions with their involvement, and achieving their post-graduation goals.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The development of the co-curricular transcript movement can be traced back to the origins of the student personnel field, and a pioneer of the profession, Walter Dill Scott. Walter Dill Scott was the tenth president of Northwestern University. Scott had been an undergraduate at Northwestern in the late 1800's and later earned his Ph. D. in Germany. He applied psychology to personnel issues in business and industry and created a very successful business, the Scott Company in the early 1900's (Biddix & Schwartz, 2012).

Scott returned to the U.S. after earning his Ph.D. at the University of Leipzig and quickly rose to become a professor at his alma mater, Northwestern. He then left to work on his consulting career. However, Scott agreed to become president of Northwestern in 1920. The same year he was elected to be president of the American Psychological Association (APA). As president, Scott's experience in consulting led him to establish a "personnel office" at Northwestern to apply the same approach he had used in business and industry to the college campus and the students at Northwestern.

The Personnel Office staff began their work by introducing one of the key steps in the personnel psychology approach---interviewing and classifying all the new students on campus. As Scott had done in his consulting work with the Army and with his many business clients, he and his colleague, L. B. Hopkins created an individual record, known as an "appointment card" format. The appointment cards were established by the new Personnel Office for each new freshman student. Detailed information on each student was gathered and students were interviewed each year as they progressed in towards

graduation. These appointment cards are truly an antiquated version of the co-curricular transcript we know of today.

Scott's early work on "personnel," soon changed to "student personnel" at Northwestern in the 1920's and later, as it spread around the U. S., was a foreshadowing of the co-curricular transcript that was created in the 1970's. In much the same way, but without the extensive interview used by Scott and his colleagues, the co-curricular transcript also attempts to "map" students extracurricular activities and help promote employment opportunities.

### **Literature before 1993**

In 1977, Robert D. Brown and Richard S. Citrin from the University of Nebraska published an article that gave a detailed overview of potential "Student Development Transcripts." The article explored the assumptions, formats and uses of a development transcript. Although brief, the article touched on many of the issues with the student development transcript and mentions formats and details that are common in co-curricular transcripts. The apparent impetus for this article was recent changes to the academic transcript, such as credit by examination, credit for experiential learning and competency based credit (Brown & Citrin, 1977). These changes in the traditional academic transcript led the authors to wonder if a future transcript might include student development components.

In the assumptions section of Brown and Citrin (1977) article, an interesting sign of future issues was noted. Relating to the assumption that student development is definable, in short, can be identified and tracked, the authors noted that although components of student development are global (e.g. intellectual, personal, cultural), before an institution implements a student development transcript, it will need to refine and define dimensions to make them more

specific and relate them to the institutional mission (Brown & Citrin, 1977). The need for institutions to customize developmental outcomes is one of the issues with the co-curricular transcript movement, as the customizations hinder universal understanding and acceptance. This issue and possible solutions are discussed further in the discussion section.

Another assumption Brown and Citrin (1977) made, that professionals still struggle with today is the issue of assessing student development. The “Student Development Transcript” as Brown and Citrin imagined it, allowed students to see progress on particular aspects of personal development and to see where they needed to expand their learning. They included assessments, where students could see progress when they took the tests over time. Since 1977, research on student development has grown and as a profession, student affairs has moved away from this concept, the developmental transcript and related developmental assessments, as a logical approach to developmental education. However, the basic idea of providing a space for students to see what they are missing, is still a key component of the co-curricular transcript movement.

In contrast, the components of the transcripts of today are not as developmental or personal (e.g. developing autonomy, developing mature interpersonal relationships)(Brown & Citrin, 1977) but rather competency based (e.g. public speaking, critical thinking, teamwork) or experience based (e.g. community service, philanthropy, leadership roles) as found by the this study. This experience of recording experiences, seeing gaps and recognizing missing pieces is part of the benefit of a co-curricular transcript program. The emphasis on this process started in 1977 and continues to be relevant today.

The formats proposed by Brown and Citrin (1977) for their student development transcript fell in two categories, checklists or portfolios. The authors never settled on a preferred format, even through their later publications, which are discussed in detail below. Both

categories exist in various forms today. The checklist they created is a fascinating as the authors proposed three different forms it may take. First is an experiential checklist that would include things such as, “participated in a life-planning workshop” (Brown & Citrin, 1977, p. 166). Second is a competency-based checklist, for example “knows major strengths and weaknesses in terms of aptitudes” (p. 167). The third may be a combination of these two, but it is created by the student with the help of an advisor. A planning committee may create the other checklists with items that attempt to move a student along a developmental pathway. The checklist format is one that is discussed in many articles in the 1970’s and 1980’s but is not present in the Co-Curricular Transcript Manual (*Cocurricular transcript resource manual*, NACA, 1993).

The format discussed in the 1977 article that became the most prominent format for all types of development or co-curricular transcripts was the portfolio format. Amusingly, the portfolio format is discussed in only one short paragraph, as if it was a passing thought rather than a solid proposal. This result may be because the portfolio format would not have fulfilled the dreams that Brown and Citrin held for a development transcript. The portfolio, they proposed, would resemble something like a traditional artists portfolio with samples of work and experiences. Brown and Citrin also mentioned that portfolios and checklists could be combined somehow. This concept foreshadows a practice today where some institutions list specific events for students to attend, while also providing space for unique experiences (for example, the University of Pittsburgh discussed later).

The 1977 Brown and Citrin article is important because it is the spark that ignited the ongoing discussion around co-curricular transcripts. The authors’ insights point to many of the debates that still exist: assumptions about student development, assessment, formats, and

institutional mission connections, to name a few. Brown and Citrin continued to research and publish on this topic, bringing in more colleagues to the discussion through the 1980's.

The next article Brown and Citrin published with co-authors Glenn Pflum and Michael Preston appeared in 1978. The authors surveyed leaders of higher education nationwide about “systematically involving colleges and universities in the personal development of college students” (Brown, Citrin, Pflum & Preston, 1978, p. 291). The survey, conducted in 1976, looked at multiple ways of assessing, defining, and keeping records of students' developmental progress. Respondents in this study were not only in student affairs, but also academic deans and faculty. In this 1978 article, it is clear that the authors have a more precise view of what a developmental transcript should record and the transcript's function. The authors refined their assumptions to two points, that student development is definable and that the transcript or the process of creating one has value (Brown, et al., 1978). Modern co-curricular transcript developers are still struggling with the question of value, and this is addressed in the current study.

The findings from the Brown, et al. 1978 study show that the majority of respondents, all administrators or faculty in higher education in both student and academic affairs, supported the idea that institutions should support personal development in their students. The most interesting finding is that 2/3 of the respondents believed a developmental transcript could be a worthwhile addition to higher education. Additionally, the majority of respondents favored assessment of students' personal development (Brown, et al., 1978). Student affairs professionals were overall more receptive to the transcript and increased focus on personal development, but a clear majority of the academics were also in favor of such initiatives.

As a follow up to this study, Brown compiled a new team and embarked on a second study. This time the other major stakeholders in the project, students and parents, were the focus (Brown, Baier, Baack, Wright, & Sanstead, 1979). The study was conducted in 1977, one year after the initial study on administrators and faculty. The students and parents were selected at random from a university in the Midwest. The results were slightly more positive than the previous study of administrators, with over 2/3 of both groups agreeing that the developmental transcript would be a worthwhile addition to the undergraduate experience (Brown et al, 1979, p. 386).

Of the areas they were most interested in being included in the transcript, intrapersonal skills were most favored by students. When comparing the two studies (1978 and 1979), the greatest difference was between the two career development sections, with students and parents being more interested in developing these areas than campus officers. This difference implied that students and parents saw the transcript as a means for career development, where the campus officers and faculty saw it as a means for personal development. Overall, this study showed that there was “remarkable support” (Brown et al., 1979, p. 390) across the board for a student development transcript, although there were varying opinions on the implementation of such a transcript.

After results like this, it is no wonder that developmental transcripts became a relatively widespread phenomenon in the 1980's and that research on the topic continued after this publication. Additionally, in nearly every publication about co-curricular transcripts since this article, the 1977 study is cited as the source of information about the receptiveness of higher education to such a production.



The students and parents in the Brown, et al. 1979 study believed that the transcript program's career development opportunities were the most valuable. Thus, the natural next step in the development of the Co-Curricular Transcript was assessing of the implications of the transcript for students' job placement. In 1981, two separate studies were published to address this question. First, Pinkney and Brown (1981) looked at the causal relationship between co-curricular transcripts and placement recommendations. Next, Bryan, Mann, Nelson, and North (1981) assessed the receptiveness of employers to the co-curricular transcript movement. Both articles cited Brown's previous three studies discussed earlier. Pinkney and Brown (1981) found a positive relationship between the co-curricular transcript and effective recommendations. They found that the transcripts increased the specific, affective information recommenders included in the letters. Granted, this information could be included in a recommendation through some other means of communication between the student and the recommender.

Bryan, et al. (1981) conducted a national survey of employers giving examples of the co-curricular transcript as well as sample resumes for the same hypothetical student. The results of the survey showed that 71% of employers "would definitely want" or "would prefer to have" a co-curricular transcript included as part of an application (Bryan, et al., 1981, p. 32). Almost all employers indicated that verification of the transcript's contents by a university official was at least "somewhat important," with 42% responding that it was "very important" (Bryan, et al., 1981, p. 32). These results indicate that at the time employers were on the same page with students and parents about the importance of documenting activities that relate to students' professional development.

In September 1982, an edition of *New Directions for Student Services* was published with the theme "Mentoring-Transcript Programs for Promoting Student Growth." This edition

included seven articles addressing the new phenomenon of co-curricular transcripts in higher education. The articles re-stated many of the points addressed in earlier publications but included some new information. Additionally, they provided a broad picture of the purpose of the transcripts, and suggestions for implementation and evaluation.

Steps for implementation of the transcripts was not the focus of this current study, nor was the steps for evaluation, however the purpose of the transcripts and their place in higher education were of interest to this study. The articles in this 1982 sourcebook clearly saw the role of the co-curricular transcript as a developmental aid; in other words they found the value of the program not in the final document but rather in the process of creating it. The point is made clear by the many articles that focus on the mentoring components of the programs in existence at the time. The final article in the sourcebook drives this point home by discussing how shrinking budgets and higher enrollment are de-personalizing higher education, but this mentoring-transcript could be a solution to the feeling of being a number rather than an individual (Brown & DeCoster, 1982b, p. 97).

Brown and DeCoster (1982c, p. 20) also discussed the three purposes of a developmental transcript. First, it shows an institutional commitment to student development, second, the process of planning and setting goals leads to a student's self-awareness of developmental growth, and finally, the transcript provides documentation that can be used for career advancement. Initially, the first two goals were more prominent, as shown by the amount of literature included in this sourcebook on the mentoring and developmental components. However, over time priorities within these three goals changed. These three goals accurately summarize the co-curricular transcript movement, as it existed in the 1980's and 1990's. These

three goals are explored further in the review of the co-curricular transcript manual, and the present study of co-curricular transcript programs.

### **Co-Curricular Transcript Manual**

In the spring of 1980, a Mentoring-Transcript Clearinghouse was established at the University of Nebraska- Lincoln (Kramer, Bryan, Rood, & Smith, 1982). The purpose of this clearinghouse was to gather and distribute resources to institutions interested in developing a “mentoring-transcript.” In the early 1990’s, the clearinghouse was moved to the National Association for Campus Activities (NACA) Educational Foundation Commission for Student Development who transformed the resource into the *Cocurricular [sic] Transcript Manual* (CCTM). The commission organized the manual to provide examples of transcripts, current resources, and contact persons to aid institutions looking to develop their own program. This section is an outline of the manual, which was used to form the basis for the current study.

The CCTM was compiled by NACA in the early 1990’s, and it has been housed in their offices ever since it’s creation. The manual does not have a publication date or any information to indicate when it was last updated. However, it contains no information dating past 1995 (*Cocurricular Transcript Resource Manual*, 1995, CCT Resource Listing<sup>1</sup>). The majority of the information covered is from 1992-1994, as 1992 was the last year NACA surveyed institutions about their use of co-curricular transcripts. The CCTM contents fall under three categories: first, information from NACA, including results from two separate surveys they conducted; second, practical resources such as documentation from existing programs at institutions, and contact persons from institutions with co-curricular transcript programs; third, scholarly articles and citations for further research on the subject.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are no page numbers in the manual so to reference the sources I used APA standard of referencing the nearest heading.

In the manual's introduction, NACA gave their parameters for what a co-curricular transcript program is which was also the basis for choosing what to include in the manual. They broke down the multitude of program differences into three areas, assessment, mentoring and record keeping (*Cocurricular Transcript*, 1995, Introduction). Assessment referred to the measuring of students' skill levels to see where they need to improve. Mentoring included the oversight of a staff person or faculty member in the creation and development of a co-curricular transcript. Finally, record keeping was the physical result of the program that documented a student's involvement and achievements outside the college classroom. In the programs discussed both in the manual and in the current study, these three areas are given different weight based on the program's goals.

The "Co-Curricular Transcript Survey Results" section appears directly after the introduction and serves as a short history on the co-curricular transcript movement (*Cocurricular Transcript*, 1995). NACA conducted a survey on co-curricular transcript programs in 1985, then again in 1992. This section of the manual has a short description of the differences, growth and characteristics they saw in these two surveys. The three areas discussed above (assessment, mentoring and record-keeping) were developed as a result of these surveys. The information collected from the 1985 study showed that 43 institutions reported having a co-curricular transcript program of some sort. In 1992 an additional 35 institutions reported starting a program since 1985 (*Cocurricular Transcript*, 1995, 1992 Cocurricular [sic] Transcript Survey Results). There are 18 key findings listed from the study and all were used in creating the current study.

The resources from individual institutions included in the CCTM come in two types. First, there is a listing of 22 institutions with co-curricular transcripts and contact persons from those institutions. This list includes basic contact information, as well as whether the program in

question is computerized or not, and which of the three components discussed earlier are included (assessment, mentoring and record keeping). Ten of the 22 programs were not computerized as of 1995, and of those computerized, it is unclear how extensively the program was computerized (*Cocurricular Transcript*, 1995, CCT Resource Listing). All except one institution listed record keeping as a component of their program. Eight of the institutions included assessment, and six included mentoring.

The second type of resource included in the manual is collections of documentation about co-curricular transcript programs from 14 institutions. These institutions were all also included on the contact list in addition to providing documentation. The current study focuses on these 14 institutions, so it is important to spend some time here focusing on the details they included in the co-curricular transcript manual. These institutions provided a variety of information in the manual about their programs including: marketing pamphlets, recruitment letters, report forms, example transcripts, letters to faculty and staff, request forms, and activity listings. These documents were meant to be a resource to institutions looking to develop a similar program. Table 1 shows the institutions that provided documentation, their institution type and which of the three components (assessment, mentoring and record keeping) they utilized.

Every institution listed has, at minimum, the component of record keeping. Originally, the University of San Diego did not list record keeping in the resource listing, but includes documentation of record keeping later in the manual. I chose to include record keeping on their listing in Table 1, believing the original list to be an oversight. Notice also that if an institution includes more than record keeping, they include all three. More detailed information about each program is discussed as it relates to the current study in the results and discussion sections.

Table 1: Co-Curricular Transcript Manual Institution and Program Listing

Institution	Institution Type	Three Components	Program Title
Slippery Rock University (PA)	4-Year Public	Record Keeping	Student Activity Transcript
Hamline University (MN)	4- Year Private	Record Keeping	Involvement Transcript
Loyola University New Orleans	4-Year Private	Record Keeping	Student Development Transcript
Spalding University (KY)	4-Year Private	Assessment, Mentoring, Record Keeping	"Charting Success" Co-curricular transcript program
St. Norbert College (WI)	4-Year Private	Record Keeping	Co-Curricular Transcript
University of Cincinnati	4-Year Public	Assessment, Mentoring, Record Keeping	EXCEL Program
Niagara County Community College (NY)	Community College	Record Keeping	Co-Curricular Activities Transcript
University of San Diego	4-Year Private	Assessment, Record Keeping	Student Development Transcript
University of Pittsburgh	4-Year Public	Record Keeping	Student Development Transcript
East Stroudsburg University (PA)	4-Year Public	Assessment, Mentoring, Record Keeping	Student Activities Transcript
Bemidji State University (MN)	4-Year Public	Record Keeping	Student Development Transcript
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	4-Year Public	Assessment, Mentoring, Record Keeping	Student Leadership Development Program
St. Cloud State University (MN)	4-Year Public	Record Keeping	Student Activities Transcript
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	4-Year Public	Record Keeping	Student Involvement Transcript

The final section of the manual includes four articles and papers published or presented relating to co-curricular transcripts. The first of these articles is “Is Anybody Out There: the results of the Cocurricular [sic] transcript survey” by Dr. Tom Cosgrove, originally published in October 1986. The article outlines a study not unlike the current study, only on a larger scale and in a different time. The NACA Leadership Development Committee undertook the study in 1985. This study was the predecessor to the study results discussed in the first section of the manual, “Co-Curricular Transcript Survey Results.”

A few interesting points arise in this article. First, the creation of the manual is discussed in the introduction. As mentioned earlier, in 1980, a “Student Development Mentoring Transcript Clearinghouse” was established at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. In 1983, the clearinghouse was moved to the NACA National Office and renamed the NACA Cocurricular [sic] Transcript Library. In the years since the move, the library did not see a lot of use, so the NACA Leadership Development Committee wanted to gauge the national interest in the co-curricular transcripts, thus the initiation of the 1985 study. One of the most important findings of this study, and something that reoccurs in the current study, is the purpose of the co-curricular transcript. Not necessarily the publicized, formal purpose, but rather the value that student affairs professionals see in the transcript. This quote accurately summarizes the sentiment shared by most of the articles:

What does matter is the process that is initiated early on for students, a process which assists them in becoming more intentional in their choices of cocurricular [sic] activities and which assists them in becoming more conscious of skill development as it is occurring... Students so aware of their development are in a better position to present themselves articulately and convincingly to potential employers (Cosgrove, 1986, pg. 3).

This view of the co-curricular transcript program is helpful to keep in mind when evaluating the components of various programs existing around the country. If we say that the process of creating a transcript is the most important part of the transcript program, one can evaluate the effectiveness of various components as they relate to this central theme of awareness, strategic decision making, and career development.

The focus on student development is carried through the remaining articles in the *Cocurricular [sic] Transcript Manual*. The remaining articles focus on the mentorship aspect of some programs, the developmental gains possible with the program, and the programmatic system to make such a program work. In the remaining articles, there are a few interesting findings. The University of San Diego implemented a study in the Fall of 1982 on their newly formed co-curricular transcript program (Cosgrove, 1985). They used a homegrown assessment tool based on Chickering's vectors of development. They found that students who participated in the program showed significant gains in goal setting, decision making, and problem solving (Cosgrove, 1985). These results were directly aligned with the program's goals. We come back to the University of San Diego and their assessment in the next section.

### **Literature Through Present Day**

During the late 1980's and early 1990's everyday use of computers and the internet became more and more common on college campuses nationwide (Treuer & Belote, 1997). As computer use became more common, student affairs professionals became more interested in possible uses for the internet to increase student engagement. In this time period, journals like *New Directions for Student Services* and the *Journal of College Student Development* were filled with articles addressing different concerns and areas of opportunity for computers and the internet, or as many articles called it, the "WWW." Concurrent with this growth in technology,



clarified initiatives were passed for the student affairs profession in the Student Learning Imperative, produced by ACPA, College Student Educators International (1996). Reading the first few sentences of the imperative, one could think this was written in 2015, not 1996:

Higher education is in the throes of a major transformation. Forcing the transformation are economic conditions, eroding public confidence, accountability demands, and demographic shifts resulting in increased numbers of people from historically underrepresented groups going to college. More people are participating in higher education than ever before, yet the resources supporting the enterprise are not keeping pace with the demand (ACPA, 1996, Preamble).

The issues raised in the Student Learning Imperative were not new in 1996, higher education has been plagued with the same challenges for a century or more. However, tools available to address these issues have changed significantly. The advent and adoption of personal computers and the internet is the most impactful recent tool we have been given as educators. In the development of the co-curricular transcript access to technology was a turning point. Thomas Cosgrove and Merrick Marino (1997) discussed assessment they conducted on their own co-curricular transcript program at the University of San Diego, starting with the study discussed earlier, published in 1985. Their program had all the main components of traditional co-curricular transcripts, record keeping, mentoring, and assessment. The results were impressive, study showed that students who participated in the program had an increased connection to the university, heightened awareness of opportunities, and demonstrated more confidence in decision making and setting and achieving goals. The study also showed that the part of the program students reported appreciating and learning from the most was the mentorship (Cosgrove &

Marino, 1997). In 1996 they chose to adapt to the new technology and change the program completely, then documented those changes in the 1997 article.

The part that the students claimed to like the most about the University of San Diego's program was the interaction with mentors. Thus, Cosgrove and Marino (1997) made the leap to think that interaction with the transcript itself could also aid in student development. They worked with campus partners and created a new computer system that students could update at their convenience. This transition moved the program from an administration-driven program to a student-driven program (Cosgrove & Marino, 1997). In the discussion section of this paper, this change to student-driven, administrative hands-off approach becomes more and more evident as technology became more ubiquitous. Cosgrove and Marino (1997) summarized the results of their new system, showing massive growth from 47 students participating to 200 students. The new system could be accessed anywhere, and students could see the balance of where they were spending their time and energy. The mentorship component was no longer formal, but rather about teaching students the program. The University of San Diego relied on faculty and staff across campus to promote use of the program.

Despite what appeared to be increased interest, very little literature exists past 1997 on the subject of the co-curricular transcript. The perfect storm of the Student Learning Imperative and technology growth could have produced a large uptick in co-curricular transcripts. Instead, based on the lack of literature on co-curricular transcript programs while technology articles filled journals, higher education became distracted by the plethora of opportunities within educational technology and left the co-curricular transcript in the dust.

Conversations shifted in the 2000's to e-portfolios, of which there are three types, learning-based portfolios, assessment applications, and career development and employment

systems (Garis, 2007). The learning-based e-portfolio system has a similar philosophy to the co-curricular transcripts of the 1980's and 90's. The systems would be only to support user learning, and provide an environment for self-reflection. However, if one looks at all three types of portfolios, their collected efforts would look strikingly similar to a co-curricular transcript. The reflective, flexible piece being the learning based system of the e-portfolio, and the mentorship component of the co-curricular transcript. The assessment component has two goals, to help students assess their own learning and allow the institution to assess student activities and outcomes. Finally the career development and employment component helps students make intentional choices to develop their career readiness, and produce a final output that could help the student gain employment. The literature shows that institutions that adopted an e-portfolio have done so under career services, utilizing the third type of portfolio, the career development and employment systems option (Garis, 2007).

Today, interest in co-curricular transcripts seems to be picking back up. In 2014 at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrator's (NASPA) annual conference, there were three separate programs on co-curricular transcripts. All three proposed their institutional framework for developing a co-curricular transcript program, all three had programs in process or just getting off the ground (NASPA, Search NASPA 2014 Conference Programs, 2014). In Dura's (2014) presentation titled "Beyond the Co-Curricular Transcript- What about a 'Personalized Outcomes Record'?" he gave a brief overview of the strengths and weaknesses of a co-curricular transcript. One of the main challenges he saw was the value of the programs. With low participation, low student buy-in and no real assessment happening, justifying many existing programs is difficult. His proposed program for his institution revolves around direct

assessment of measurable outcomes (Dura, 2014) We will come back to this concept in the discussion section as it relates to the findings of the current study.

## CHAPTER THREE

### METHODS

The ideal method for understanding the current status of co-curricular transcripts would be a national survey of institutions to determine if they had co-curricular transcript programs and how those programs developed. Such a study is outside the scope of this master's thesis and thus alternative methods for understanding the development and current status of co-curricular transcripts was needed. After the extensive literature review outlined previously, the *CoCurricular [sic] Transcript Resource Manual (CCTM)*, produced for the last time by NACA in approximately 1995, rose to the top as solid a base of knowledge to be used as a comparison for the current study. The 14 institutions that included documentation in the manual were used as the foundation of this study.

Surveys were created for contacts at these institutions. Three surveys were created, one for contacts at institutions that still have a co-curricular transcript program, one for the original contacts listed in the manual, and one for contacts at institutions that no longer have a program. The surveys can be found in this paper's appendices. The first survey, for contacts at institutions with a current co-curricular transcript program, is the longest and most in depth. The questions were derived to directly correlate with the information in the CCTM. The survey covered information about the institution, the current program, organizational structure supporting the program, assessment, and institutional buy-in. The most questions were under the current program section with questions pertaining to learning outcomes, verification, submission, computerization and mentoring. The second and third surveys, for contacts listed in the manual

and for institutions with no program, the questions were more general. The focus was on institutional commitment, development, and how the program ended.

Due to the fact that this study included human subjects, Florida State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was sought and obtained. Each survey began with an informed consent form including contact information for the principal investigator, faculty advisor, and IRB Human Subjects Committee at Florida State University. The IRB approval letter can be found in appendix A of this document. During the waiting period of IRB approval, information about each institution was researched via their public websites. Information pertaining to the current status of their co-curricular transcript programs was most critical to the study, along with publicly available contact information for all institutions.

Once IRB approval was obtained, contacts were sought at all 14 institutions. Contact information was obtained from public institutional websites. Emails were sent to every office that either currently or formerly oversaw the co-curricular transcript program. For the contacts listed in the CCTM originally, Google searches found most of the contacts at new institutions, with new email addresses. Of the 14 institutions, nine of them responded, with one person from each of the nine agreeing to participate. Two of the respondents preferred to share their knowledge over the phone rather than via written survey. The researcher spoke with both of these respondents personally, and took notes based on their responses, which were then entered into a blank survey.

The nine institutions included in this study are: East Stroudsburg University(PA), Slippery Rock University(PA), Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, Spalding University(KY), St. Cloud State University(MN), St. Norbert College(WI), University of Pittsburgh, and University of San Diego. The contact person

for each university ranged from Assistant Director to Faculty level. For the institutions with a current program (7 of the respondents) the contact person was professionally tied to the program by overseeing it either directly or indirectly. For the two institutions included who responded and did not maintain a program, contacts were previously involved in the program by overseeing it either directly or indirectly.

Once all the survey results were compiled, the information from the surveys and the information provided in the manual were compared. Analysis was conducted by reading each answer provided in the survey then comparing it to the information provided in the manual. Similarities and differences were noted for each institution, then compared against one another. The information provided in the surveys was not as robust as would have been preferred for analysis. If this study were to continue or be replicated, additional data could be collected from documentation of institutional programs, as well as flexible interviews with staff members. The phone interview technique used in two of the nine collections provided more detailed information, and insight into the challenges of the programs. More notes relating to future directions can be found in the discussion section.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS**

The information collected through the surveys provides a window into the co-curricular transcript landscape of today. Using history as a guide for analyzing this data there are definite patterns that emerged. The three areas Robert Brown (1977, 1978, 1979) described and advocated for are found in the language used by practitioners today, even if their programs do not reflect all three components (mentoring, assessment and record keeping.). The secondary area that was evident in both historical literature and the current study was the struggle for institutional support and validity. Coinciding with the challenges of institutional support is the never-ending struggle for funding and personnel support. In the discussion section there is a detailed description of how the historical information weaves into the current data, but for this section, the focus will be on where these themes emerged in the current study's data.

#### **Three Components**

With the adoption of technology in the co-curricular transcript world, there was great opportunity to collect all three of Brown's components into a comprehensive software system and program. However, as is shown in Table 2 below, no programs included in this study have all three components, and most struggle to maintain one.

#### **Record keeping**

The "record keeping" component of the program, as seen in Table 2, is clearly the most popular. However, often the record keeping is no longer in line with the original purposes of the co-curricular transcript movement. For example, Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville stated the purpose of their program was to "provide students with a record of their outside the



classroom involvement.” This sentiment is echoed in multiple purposes recorded in the surveys, stating purposes like “official documentation” (East Stroudsburg) and “holistic view of a student’s skills and abilities” (St. Cloud State). This record keeping focus stands in contrast to programs like the University of Pittsburgh which stated, “ ...co-curricular program designed to educate the whole student through completion of programs, events, and experiences that provide a pathway for students to have the best possible collegiate experience and gain needed skills [for] employment or graduate school.” The difference between the two types of programs is, from the perspective of the student, one is outward looking and one is inward looking- how people see you, versus how you see yourself.

Another aspect of the record keeping component that has significantly changed between the CCTM and the current study is the way in which records are recorded and kept. In every program in the manual, students were required to fill out paper forms and submit them to either their advisor or the office where the program was housed. If the system was computerized, as most were, then the unlucky advisor/program coordinator/ graduate assistant would input each completed form into the system. If students wanted a copy, they had to formally request one for printing. None of the CCTM participating institutions provided numbers for how many students submitted documentation, but one can only imagine with even a small number of students, how tedious and time-consuming this process must have been for all involved. In fact, one institution still does it this way. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC) still collects paper forms from students (Center for Service Learning, 2015). However, SIUC mainly focuses on volunteering at this point in their program. The office is in charge of recording volunteer hours for their programs as well as Fraternity and Sorority Life, and Registered Student Organizations.

Table 2: Seven Institutions Co-Curricular Transcript Programs, 2015

Institution	Three Components	Title of Program	System Used
East Stroudsburg University (PA)	Record Keeping	Co-Curricular Transcript	CollegiateLink
Slippery Rock University (PA)	Record Keeping	Co-Curricular Experience Program	Between Systems, Formerly CollegiantLink
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	Record Keeping	Student Involvement Transcript*	In-House System
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville	Record Keeping	SIUE Involvement Record	CollegiateLink
St. Cloud State University (MN)	Record Keeping	Collegiate Link	CollegiateLink
University of Pittsburgh	Record Keeping, Assessment	Outside the Classroom Curriculum	CollegiateLink
University of San Diego	Record Keeping	Student Learning & Development Transcript	In-House System

\*Same Name as appeared in the *Cocurricular Transcript Manual*

Most institutions included in this study, as shown in Table 2, relied on Campus Labs CollegiateLink software. Researching the details of the services this organization provides is outside the scope of this study. However, what is clear is that each institution employs the system differently. For example, the University of Pittsburgh uses it for basic record keeping, as well as categorizing experiences into sections that match up with the learning outcomes. They also use forms of reflective assessment for students to critically look at their experiences in relation to the opportunities available. Students at the University of Pittsburgh also swipe into most major events, automatically tracking their participation in many activities.

No other program included in this study has the level of learning outcome association, assessment, or student engagement that is provided by the University of Pittsburgh. Additionally, the University of Pittsburgh uses a combined model of checklist and student generated documentation. Each category has suggested activities, while also allowing for students to record unique experiences (Outside the Classroom, 2015). It is interesting to note here, the University of Pittsburgh is also the only institution that reported having a full time staff member devoted to the program.

### **Mentoring**

The mentoring component was also lost in all the programs. As an example, at the University of San Diego (USD), the documents provided in the CCTM state that students participating in the program will be paired with a peer mentor who will help them through the process. In 1997 Cosgrove and Marino (both of whom were from USD) outline the mentoring component as it existed before they transformed the program to a computer system in 1996. They argued that the students responded best to the mentoring component, and that professionals gained from the experience as well. This point indicates that not only were there peer mentors but also professionals helping students. In the post 1997 program, student affairs professionals conducted monthly trainings, and some individual sessions, to help students with the process, but most of the mentoring duties were taken over by the computer system. The mentorship structure was lost, requiring proactive buy-in by faculty and staff to engage students in the program because the mentorship was no longer a required component (Cosgrove & Marino, 1997).

In the current study, the mentorship component appears to be completely gone, USD reported very little institutional commitment and stated that the program was only alive because it was almost self-sufficient online. Not only is there no mentorship, there is no longer any

tracking of how many students are utilizing the program. This slow demise of the co-curricular transcript program at USD is only visible because of the information provided in the 1997 article. Unfortunately, this information was not available for every institution. However, not a single institution reported including a mentoring component today.

### **Assessment**

In an interview with a former administrator from Spalding University, the administrator spoke about the assessment component of the former program, which they had designed personally. The assessment was built as a way for students to manually engage in their development, it was a “mechanical” way to get students to think about and reflect on experiences. This mechanical process comes up in descriptions of current programs as well. Slippery Rock University reported, “...program is an opportunity for students to become engaged and involved in their education outside of their academic courses.” Slippery Rock is also the institution that reported ending their contract with CollegiateLink and searching for an alternative. This type of assessment loops back to the older versions of the co-curricular transcript as an introspective developmental process.

External assessment of the programs is another issue that arose through the current study. All but one institution reported not having an assessment system in place to see if the co-curricular transcript was achieving its goals. However, none of those institutions have a staff member specifically over-seeing the co-curricular transcript program. All the institutions without assessment have staff members overseeing the program who are also in charge of multiple programs and even entire offices. Additionally, even if assessment efforts were made, it is unclear what they would be assessing because most of the co-curricular transcript programs are not linked to any specific learning outcomes.

This is a good time to bring up the proliferation of CollegiateLink again. This system is not only a co-curricular transcript system. It is used by most of these institutions to organize their student organizations, and centralize information about student activities and leadership opportunities. Institutions can customize the user experience, allowing space for student organizations to upload files, advertise events, and send information to members (Campuslabs, 2014). This computer system, unlike many of the home-grown systems, is not built specifically for the co-curricular transcript. More investigation would need to be done into these institutions to understand the reasoning behind using CollegiateLink and if the co-curricular transcript aspect of the software was adopted as an afterthought or as something intentional to increase student engagement. St. Cloud State University reported, “We currently have CollegiateLink as our student organizations software provider. Part of the package includes a co-curricular transcript for students.” Investigation into the software, and its adoption by these institutions is needed to draw firm conclusions about how these co-curricular transcript programs have stayed afloat. In other words, more information is needed about the intervening years between 1995 and today to know how the program that existed in 1995 transformed, or was replaced by the current CollegiateLink system.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

#### **Discussion**

In the information both past and present there emerged two opinions on the value of co-curricular transcript programs, three if you count the opinion of those who think it is worthless. First, there are those who see it as a final product, a piece of paper that tells employers or graduate schools what the student did at an institution. The second is those who see the primary value of the program in the process of developing the transcript. This might include a mentoring component, or it might be a computer program that shows students areas they are missing and suggests activities virtually. These opinions are not mutually exclusive. However, it is clear that almost all the institutions surveyed chose one over the other in the way they shape of their program.

In the group of those who see the primary value in the final document, verification is a big issue. Southern Illinois University- Edwardsville for example, makes an attempt to verify every record a student submits to their transcript. Three institutions of the seven in this study with programs verify, or attempt to verify, every record on a student's transcript. One institution, Slippery Rock University, verified a random assortment of entries. The verification process takes time, and programs that verify a lot of entries must value the verification process and what it adds to the final product. Without some aspect of the mentoring component (virtual or in person), or the validation, what would be the difference between the co-curricular transcript document and what a student might generate on LinkedIn? In this age of social media and build-your-own websites, there doesn't seem to be a place for institutions in the world of creating a

viable medium for conveying ones experiences. However, here we are only talking about this final product. There still is hope for the co-curricular transcript *program*, that is the process of teaching intentionality in decisions about co-curricular activities.

In the studies done in 80's and 90's, results showed that the most important aspect of the programs were the developmental components. The programs helped students make intentional decisions about what they got involved in outside the classroom. The 1982 *New Directions for Student Services* sourcebook focused the majority of the articles on the mentoring component. Stating that with higher education bursting with students, the college experience was becoming de-personalized, and this transcript could be an answer to that deterioration (Brown, DeCoster, *Mentoring-Transcript*, 1982). In the early days, the focus on the process was exemplified by the mentoring component to the transcript. In current programs, it is shown through extensive online software. For example, at the University of Pittsburgh their system, supported by CollegiateLink, has interactive components that clearly describe each goal, and how students can achieve that goal (Outside the Classroom, 2015). It is a comprehensive program and the title reflects that it is more than a product, the *Outside the Classroom Curriculum*.

The impact of technology on the co-curricular transcript movement cannot be understated. It seems the programs in the CCTM that were "computerized" were only computerized on the administration side. Professionals still had to manually input all the data and produce the final report manually. The advent of the personal computer and the internet opened doors to create a system students could use independently. However, it also gave an alternative to personal interaction. The idea that a computer can replace a human as a mentor is something a philosophy candidate would be more apt to argue than myself. But, the current study suggests that institutions have gone in the direction of opting for computer-generated suggestions over

one-on-one mentoring. It is quite clear when looking at the lack of institutional support noted, that the resources available, or in this case not available, to administrators of the program influenced this decision. This is not to say that computerized systems could not be effective for this function, however there would need to be intentional decisions made about how the system is formatted to make sure it was generating the results desired.

Divisions of Student Affairs have been struggling to find legitimacy since the dawn of the profession. We have moved from *in loco parentis* to a formal profession, defined by organizational standards and grounded theory. However, the struggle continues around the country as it did in the early 1990's at Spalding University. The contact I spoke with, who worked at Spalding in the early 1990's, discussed part of his draw to creating this program was trying to find "legitimacy" in student activities. He found that the student activities department he came into was operating with classic activities, and he wanted to bring some of the theory he had learned in graduate school to his practice at Spalding. By bringing the transcript program to Spalding, he worked to build relationships across campus, and earn respect as a member of a legitimate field. However, the transcript program eventually failed at Spalding, even before the creator of the program had left the institution.

This idea of gaining legitimacy through mimicking academic transcripts is popular. However, academics have the benefit of a universally understood document that has much more meaning to the reader than what is stated on the transcript itself. A recent *Inside Higher Ed* (Pittinsky, 2014) article echoed this sentiment. Here the author is talking about the co-curricular transcript movement, as well as competency-based transcripts, and data-enabled eTranscripts.

While these institutions are already extending their transcripts, there are good reasons for concern that the grassroots nature of their innovations will conspire against its own



success. Specifically, I fear a Tower of Babel if we do not find a way to converge around a *lingua franca* that describes the basic structure of such 21st century extended transcripts of the type being issued by pioneering universities across the country. (Pittinsky, 2014)

In other words, without a universally understood language around co-curricular or other new types of transcripts, there will be a struggle for legitimacy in the eyes of those who receive these documents.

This language issue is prevalent within the current study as well. Most institutions surveyed broke down the student's involvement into various categories. In the more developmental programs, like the University of Pittsburgh, these categories have almost a checklist of potential opportunities under each of them. However, every institution has different language for each category, and in many instances don't call them categories, further increasing confusion among users. Brown and Citrin (1977) acknowledged this issue of language when first conceiving of the program. They also anticipated that the language would need to be individualized for each institution based on the different missions and visions of the thousands of higher education institutions in the US. The interaction between language, missions and transcripts needs to be explored further to understand how different co-curricular transcripts would need to be, and how different they could be, to maintain successful programs that produce products that are understandable to the stakeholders. Then again, if the program's goal is to encourage intentional decision-making and the final product is of little concern, maybe we do not need a universal language. If we ignore the language issue, the value in the transcript cannot be in the final document, it must be in the process.

## **Limitations and Future Directions**

There are many subjects related to the co-curricular transcript movement that are outside the scope of the current study. One is institutional commitment. Although the surveys asked about institutional commitment for the program, and had an open ended follow up question related to the institutional support, very few respondents gave any feedback about support for the program, other than a simple yes or no. This is one area where it was more effective to ask the question over the phone, rather than on paper. Both of the respondents who answered the survey over the phone gave more detailed answers about the institutional support, or lack thereof, for the programs than their colleagues who wrote out the survey on their own. So, although all but one institution reported there being a lack of institutional support, without the details behind this information it is hard to draw conclusions about the impact of this on the program itself.

Another area that would have added to the understanding of the development of these programs is additional information about the intervening 20 years between 1995 and 2015. With the University of San Diego, there was slightly more insight based on the 1997 article, and even that small amount of information was very helpful in creating a more holistic image of the program's development. I hypothesize that many of the institutions currently using CollegiateLink's co-curricular transcript feature, lost their programs sometime between 1995 and 2015 only to bring them back when this convenient option came available. Some of the participating institutions indicated as much. If that were not the case, I would have expected to see well developed programs at institutions that had maintained their programs for 20+ years.

That brings up another limitation of this study. In the original proposal for this study, the choice to go with such a limited number of institutions was because of the presumably rich data available from institutions that had maintained co-curricular programs for such an extended

period of time. However, when the results started coming in, it didn't take long to realize that the study could have been more successful using an alternative method for selecting institutions. When one considers other options there would have also been limitations on those methods as well. For example, using a list of institutions generated by word of mouth about good co-curricular transcripts, there would have been no comparative data about their history, and there inevitably would have been institutions with great programs that would not have been included. If this study were to be replicated, it would be best to include more institutions. A natural extension of this study would be to consider one specific type of institution and dig into the programs existing nationwide in those institutions. This added step would provide a broad picture of what is being done and how effective those programs are achieving their goals.

Taking the results of this study and moving forward, the ideal way to see if a co-curricular transcript program is worth the resources that it needs to be successful, is a single or multi institutional experimental study. This study would need to be multiple years long to be able to understand the outcomes, preferably following a cohort of students from admission to graduation. First, it would be useful to have a control group going through the institutional experience like so many of their predecessors. The second group would be assigned to participate in a co-curricular transcript program that is solely online. The third group would be assigned to a similar program, with less online work and in place they would be assigned a mentor to meet with each semester to discuss their progress in the program. This type of intensive study is necessary at this point because of the lack of research that exists about these programs, the inconsistency between existing programs, and the resources of various types that are needed to implement a successful program. Without more intensive, grounded research about

the co-curricular transcript, it is hard to make a judgment about whether this type of program is a viable option for increasing intentional engagement.

### **Conclusion**

Reaching back to the original question, “How have co-curricular transcript programs developed over the last 20 years?” The answer is more complex than originally anticipated. With the introduction of technology into education, the purpose of co-curricular transcripts has been called into question and the goals of these programs re-evaluated. Many institutions with remaining programs run them as a side-project with very little institutional commitment to the programs.

This lack of commitment is evident in the lack of assessment being conducted about these programs, and the absence of the mentoring component. With the prevalence of personal webpages, and sites like LinkedIn, the importance of the co-curricular transcript document can be easily argued against. However, the need to counter the de-personalization of higher education should be at the forefront of conversations in administration nationwide now just as it was in the 1980’s. The words of Katz (1979) resonate today and emphasize the struggle to fight de-personalization in higher education:

Times of budgetary scarcity often go together with an undervaluation of the individual. Less caring, less service, even less courtesy, coupled with the great increase in the number of students, have increasingly made the students part of a mass. This turning of students into a passive mass of people, bereft of a sufficient sense of individuality, may become one of the most ominous effects of higher education (Katz, 1979, as quoted in Brown, Decoster, 1982).

The challenge to create programming that will reach all students, and encourage strategic involvement in co-curricular activities is daunting. However, a program like a co-curricular transcript could prove useful in reaching the maximum number of students with a structured program that requires only a small time commitment from a large amount of people. With more research on existing and trial programs, we could discover whether Robert Brown's creative program is still as useful as it once promised to be.

## APPENDIX A

### COPY OF IRB APPROVAL LETTER



Office of the Vice President for Research  
Human Subjects Committee  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742  
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

#### APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 01/28/2015

To: Crista Coven <EMAIL>

Address: [ADDRESS]

Dept.: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research  
History and Development of Co-Curricular Transcripts

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 01/27/2016 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Robert Schwartz <EMAIL>, Advisor  
HSC No. 2014.14468

## APPENDIX B

### CO-CURRICULAR TRANSCRIPT SURVEY 1

*[The following survey was sent via PDF form to contacts at institutions with co-curricular transcript programs. All open-ended questions were given unlimited space for the respondent to use.]*

#### **Informed Consent**

The following survey is part of a research project looking at the development and status of co-curricular transcripts in American Higher Education. By consenting to participate in this research you are helping the researcher gain a deeper understanding of the history of this complex subject. Eventually this research may be used as the basis for articles submitted for publication, presentation proposals for professional conferences, and even a future co-curricular transcript manual. Your personal information will not be shared without your consent, to be obtained before the publications or presentations. To clarify, your personal information will be confidential to the extent allowed by law, until you specify otherwise by written consent.

Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty for nonparticipation. You have two weeks to complete this survey in full and return it to the researcher.

If you have any other questions you may contact:

PI: Crista Coven, [email]

Major Professor: Robert Schwartz, [email]

Florida State University IRB: [contact number]

Are you willing to participate in this study?

Yes

No

#### **Institution Information:**

1. Your Name:
2. Your Title:
3. Your connection to the co-curricular transcript program:
4. Institution Name:
5. Institution Type:

Four-Year Public

Four-Year Private

Community College/ Two Year Institution

Other: Specify

**Co-Curricular Transcript Program Information:**

6. Title of Co-Curricular Transcript program:
7. What was/is the stated purpose of the co-curricular transcript?
8. Is the entire Co-Curricular transcript process computerized?      Yes      No
  - a. If No, explain what parts are not computerized and how this is managed (Who keeps the files? What needs to be paper copies? What is the rationale behind not computerizing?):
9. Does your campus use purchased software to operate your Co-Curricular Transcript (Example: OrgSync)?      Yes      No
  - a. If Yes, Which one?
  - b. If No, please explain how the program is operated (Example: proprietary software):
10. Is the program available to all undergraduate students?      Yes      No
  - a. If no, what students is the program available to?
11. Is the program required for any students?      Yes      No
  - a. If yes, who is required to participate in the program?

Entries, Verification and Mentoring:

12. Who is responsible for submitting entries to be included in the transcript?
  - Students
  - Advisors/Staff
  - Campus Registrar's Office
  - Other:
13. How often can the co-curricular transcript be updated?
  - Continually
  - Once a semester
  - Once a year
  - Other:



14. What entries on the co-curricular transcript (CCT) are verified?

Every entry on the CCT is verified

Random entries on the CCT are verified

No entries on the CCT are verified

Other:

15. Please explain the verification process (ex: who does the verification):

16. Are entries from off campus (not organized by a campus program) activities included?

(Example: volunteer work a student organized for themselves and completed while home over the summer)      Yes      No

a. Please explain the guidelines for including off campus activities on the transcript:

Categories and Learning Outcomes:

17. What categories are entries listed under: (Example: Organizations, Athletics, Presentations, Volunteer Service)

18. Are there specific learning outcomes tied to categories or entries?

Yes      No

a. If Yes, Please Explain:

19. Is there a mentoring component to the program? (For example, does each student have an advisor who oversees their co-curricular transcript?)      Yes      No

a. If Yes:

i. Who can be a mentor (faculty, staff, advisors, etc.)?

ii. How are mentors and students matched (ex: students select mentors, random assignment)?

20. Is there a personality assessment connected with the program (Example: StrengthsQuest)?

Yes      No

21. Does the co-curricular transcript program attempt to assess or showcase a students' development, not just activities or accomplishments?      Yes      No

a. Please explain:

22. Is there another form of assessment built into the program that is intended to aid in a students development (ex: critical thinking assessment)?

Conclusion or Summary

23. Is there an exit interview for the program?      Yes      No

24. How do students access their final transcript?

25. Can transcripts be sent directly to employers/graduate schools?

Yes      No

Assessment:

26. Does the institution on any level (office, department, division) assess the effectiveness of the co-curricular transcript program?      Yes      No

a. If yes, would you be willing to share any of the findings with the researcher?

Yes      No

27. What percentage of total undergraduate students are currently enrolled in the program?

Organizational Structure:

28. What office oversees the program?

29. Is there at least one staff person dedicated to the program full-time?

Yes      No

a. How many staff are dedicated to the program?

30. In your opinion, is their institutional commitment or the program?

Yes      No

a. Please elaborate if possible:

31. Are faculty involved in the implementation of the program?      Yes      No

32. Please explain any other relevant information about the organizational structure/institutional buy-in:

33. Please use this space to let the researcher know if there is any information about the program that the survey did not ask but that you think should be included in this project:

If there are annual reports or other materials pertaining to the program that you would like to share please email them to Crista Coven at [email]

## APPENDIX C

### CO-CURRICULAR TRANSCRIPT SURVEY 2 AND 3

*[Survey 2 was sent to contacts whom worked at each institution at the time of the CCTM, and whose former institution still has a co-curricular transcript. Survey 3 was sent to contacts whom worked at each institution at the time of the CCTM, and whose former institution does not still have a co-curricular transcript.]*

#### **Informed Consent**

The following survey is part of a research project looking at the development and status of co-curricular transcripts in American Higher Education. By consenting to participate in this research you are helping the researcher gain a deeper understanding of the history of this complex subject. Eventually this research may be used as the basis for articles submitted for publication, presentation proposals for professional conferences, and even a future co-curricular transcript manual. Your personal information will not be shared without your consent, to be obtained before the publications or presentations. To clarify, your personal information will be confidential to the extent allowed by law, until you specify otherwise by written consent.

Participation in this study is voluntary and there is no penalty for nonparticipation. You have two weeks to complete this survey in full and return it to the researcher.

If you have any other questions you may contact:

PI: Crista Coven, [email]

Major Professor: Robert Schwartz, [email]

Florida State University IRB: [contact number]

Are you willing to participate in this study?

Yes

No

#### **Survey 2**

1. Your Name:
2. Your connection to the co-curricular transcript manual:
3. If you were present when the program was started please describe what you remember about its development:
4. Describe what you remember about the institutional support for the program (for example, was there support from faculty, staff and administration?):
5. From what you remember how was the program structured within the institution (what office was in charge of it, was there a staff member dedicated to it, etc.):
6. Is there anything you would like to add or comment on based on the documentation provided or your memory?

### **Survey 3**

For institutions with no existing program the following questions will be added to survey #2 to create survey #3- to be sent to contacts in the manual and/or at the institution where there is no longer a program.

1. From your understanding, why was the program cancelled?
2. Did another program or initiative replace the transcript?
3. Do you believe the institution would ever bring back a co-curricular transcript program?

## REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297–308.
- Baackf, J. E. (1982). Evaluation of mentoring- transcript programs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 79-90. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821908
- Biddix, J.P. and Schwartz, R. A. (2012) "Walter Dill Scott and the Student Personnel Movement", *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, Volume 49, 3, p. 285-298.
- Blimling, G. S. 1. (2013). Challenges of assessment in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 142, 5-14. doi:10.1002/ss.20044
- Bresciani, M. J. (2005). Electronic co-curricular student portfolios?putting them into practice. *New Directions for Student Services*, 112, 69-76. doi:10.1002/ss.185
- Brown, R.D., Baier, J.L., Baack, J.E., Wright, D.J., & Sanstead, M. (1979). Implications of student, parent, and administrator attitudes for implementing a student development transcript. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 20(5), 386.
- Brown, R. D., Citrin, R. S., Pflum, G., & Preston, M. (1978). Is higher education receptive to a student development transcript? A national survey. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 19(4), 291.
- Brown, R. D., & Citrin, R. S. (1977). A student development transcript: Assumptions, uses, and formats. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 18(3), 163-168.
- Brown, R. D., & Decoster, D. A. (1982a). Editors' notes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 1-3. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821902
- Brown, R. D., & Decoster, D. A. (1982b). Mentoring-transcript programs and the future needs of higher education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 91-97. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821909
- Brown, R. D., & Decoster, D. A. (1982c). Student developmental transcript systems: An impetus for student growth. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 19-31. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821904
- Bryan, W. A., Mann, G. T., Nelson, R. B. & North R.A. (1981). The co-curricular transcript: What do employers think? A national survey. *NASPA Journal*, 19(1), 29-36.
- Campuslabs, CollegiateLink. (2014). Retrieved from:  
<http://www.campuslabs.com/products/collegiatelink/>

- Cayan, S. A. (2001). *Effect of the transferable skills record in facilitating post-baccalaureate employment* (Ph.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (250221814).
- Center for Service Learning and Volunteerism, Southern Illinois University- Carbondale. (2015). *Forms*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cslv.siu.edu/students/svc/forms.html>
- Cocurricular transcript resource manual* (1993). In National Association for Campus Activities (Ed.), . Columbia, SC: NACA Educational Foundation.
- Cosgrove, T. (1986). Is anybody out there: The results of the cocurricular transcript survey. *Campus Activities Programming*, 19(4), 58-61.
- Cosgrove, T., & Marino, M. (1997). Technology and the transcript interactive interface provides renaissance in cocurricular skill document. *Campus Activities Programming*. 54-58.
- Decoster, D. A., & Brown, R. D. (1982). Mentoring relationships and the educational process. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1982(19), 5-17. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821903
- Dura, S. (2014). Beyond the Co-Curricular Transcript- What about a 'Personalized Outcomes Record'? *NASPA 2014 Conference Program*
- e-portfolios: Emerging opportunities for student affairs. (2007). *New Directions for Student Services*, 119, 3-106.
- Garis, J. W. (2007). e-Portfolios: Concepts, designs, and integration within student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 119, 3-16. doi: 10.1002/ss.245
- Hartz, C. V. 1., & Parker, J. (2012). Overview of curricular approaches. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2012(138), 59-73. doi:10.1002/ss.20006
- King, J. M., & Anderson, D. M. (2004). A practitioner's guide to a learning-centered co-curricular activities program. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 24(1), 91-100.
- Kramer, M. C., Bryan, W. A., Rood, R. P., & Smith, M. A. (1982). The national scene: Other alternatives and models. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 33-48. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821905
- Lowery, J. W. (2004). Student affairs for a new generation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2004(106), 87-99. doi:10.1002/ss.127
- Lumsden, J. A. (2007). Development and implementation of an e-portfolio as a university-wide program. *New Directions for Student Services*, (119), 43-63. doi:10.1002/ss.248
- Moneta, L. (2005). Technology in student affairs: Supporting student learning and services. *New Directions for Student Services*, 112, 3-107.

- Moneta, L. (1997). The integration of technology with the management of student services. *New Directions for Student Services*, 78, 5-16. doi:10.1002/ss.7801
- NASPA, Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2014). Search NASPA 2014 Conference Programs. Retrieved from: <http://apps.naspa.org/engage/programs.cfm#srq>
- Outside the Classroom Curriculum, University of Pittsburgh. (2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.studentaffairs.pitt.edu/occ>
- Penn, J. D. (2011). The case for assessing complex general education student learning outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2011(149), 5-14. doi:10.1002/ir.376
- Pinkney, J. W. & Brown, R. D., (1981). Contextual influence on placement recommendations: the developmental transcript and causal attribution. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, (22)2, 156-161.
- Pittinsky, M. (February 10, 2014). Extending the transcript. *Inside HigherEd*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2014/02/10/essay-calls-broader-concept-transcripts>
- Sheikh, S. A. (2007). *Use of student learning portfolios assessment and student learning achievement outcomes in regional continued accreditation process* (Ed.D.). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (304706836).
- Strohmeier, S. (2010). Electronic portfolios in recruiting? A conceptual analysis of usage. *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 11(4), 268-280.
- Thomas, R., Murrell, P. H., & Chickering, A. W. (1982). Theoretical bases and feasibility issues for mentoring and developmental transcripts. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 49-65. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821906
- Treuer, P., & Belote, L. (1997). Current and emerging applications of technology to promote student involvement and learning. *New Directions for Student Services*, 78, 17-30. doi:10.1002/ss.7802
- Williams, V., & Simpson-Kirkland, D. (1982). Implementation of a mentoring-transcript project. *New Directions for Student Services*, 19, 67-77. doi:10.1002/ss.37119821907
- Woodard, D. B., Love, P., & Komives, S. R. (2000). Learning and development. *New Directions for Student Services*, 92, 49-60. doi:10.1002/ss.924

## **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

In June of 2013, Crista graduated from the University of Oregon in her hometown of Eugene, Oregon. She majored in History, with a minor in European Studies. During her undergraduate years she traveled on the Summer 2010 voyage of Semester at Sea. She was an active member of Pi Beta Phi, and the Vice President of Membership for Panhellenic Council. Based on her positive experiences and inspired by mentors at Oregon, she chose to pursue a graduate degree in Higher Education, with an emphasis in Student Affairs. At Florida State University she has pursued these academic dreams while also engaging in professional development opportunities and research. She was a Graduate Assistant for the Center for Undergraduate Research and Academic Engagement. In that role she planned three research symposia a year and advised students on their academic and co-curricular plans. In the summer of 2014 she participated in the NODA internship program, serving as an intern for New Student and Family Programs at the University at Albany, State University of New York. She also spent time in graduate school participating in research with the College Educational Quality Study, interning with University Housing at Florida State and being a teachers assistant to LDR2101: Leadership Theory and Practice with Dr. Kathy Guthrie.

In the future Crista plans to be a family oriented career woman, and pursue her education further in obtaining a doctorate degree in higher education or a related field. Her passion for weaving the co-curricular and curricular experiences of students together will no doubt shape her career path far into the future.