A Historical Case Study of the Ohio Fellows:

A Co-Curricular Program and its Influence on Collegiate and Post-Collegiate Success

A dissertation presented to

the faculty of

The Patton College of Education of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Stephen A. Cocumelli

December 2019

This dissertation titled

A Historical Case Study of the Ohio Fellows:

A Co-Curricular Program and its Influence on Collegiate and Post-Collegiate Success

by

STEPHEN A. COCUMELLI

has been approved for

the Department of Counseling and Higher Education

and The Patton College of Education by

Peter C. Mather

Professor of Counseling and Higher Education

Renée A. Middleton

Dean, The Patton College of Education

Abstract

COCUMELLI, STPEHEN A. , Ph.D., December 2019, Higher Education

A Historical Case Study of the Ohio Fellows:

A Co-Curricular Program and its Influence on Collegiate and Post-Collegiate Success

Director of Dissertation: Peter C. Mather

With an increased focus on accountability in higher education, particularly concerning institutional effectiveness, it has become vital for universities to determine what experiences students consider influential to their success. Although academics tend to be most emphasized in discussions surrounding institutional effectiveness, co-curricular programs also have the potential to play a crucial role in student achievement. Due to the impact these programs may have on student success, this qualitative case study sought to explore the influence the Ohio Fellows program had on collegiate and post-collegiate success at Ohio University. Through analysis of archival information about the Ohio Fellows in conjunction with interviews conducted with original and current participants, the purpose of the program, its connections to success, and changes since its inception were recognized. The students who participated in the Ohio Fellows were reliant on an influential community, which evolved over time, as it focused on developing them into actively socially-conscious future leaders, while illustrating which attributes lent themselves to collegiate and post-collegiate success.

Dedication

To my niece, Victoria, who inspired my career in education

through elementary school projects.

Acknowledgments

The Ph.D. journey is never an easy one and because of my family's unwavering support this accomplishment is as much theirs as it is mine. From my Dad who has always believed in me even when I did not believe in myself to my Mom who has always pushed me to better myself, this degree would not have been possible without them. I would also like to thank my sisters, Kiki and Mary, for their encouragement during this process. An additional special thanks goes to Mary who was always ready to offer a helping hand. To my cousin Nicole whose visits provided a respite from the stress of graduate school, she proved that sometimes family-time is the best medicine. And a special thanks to my partner John who not only served as a sounding board as I wrote this dissertation but has also read and helped me edit every paper I have written since my undergraduate career. Although our time in Athens was a challenge more often than not, our commitment to one another helped get us through the darkest days.

I would be remiss to not also thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Mather, Dr. Yang, Dr. Harrison, and Dr. Kessler, who have helped me think more critically about my dissertation through their varying perspectives and expertise. I also want to give further thanks to my committee chair and adviser, Dr. Mather, whose guidance and encouragement over the past four years was instrumental in my academic success and the completion of this dissertation. And, finally, Dr. Yang it was a pleasure serving as your GA these past several years. The consideration and compassion you have for your students was always evident and your desire to grow as an educator was inspiring.

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables

Page

Chapter One: Introduction

Shortly after the conclusion of the American Revolution, the Northwest

Ordinance was enacted by the United States Congress, creating the first territory west of

the Appalachian Mountains. For the newly established government, the Northwest

Ordinance served the purpose of creating the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan,

Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and to fund a university in the new territory (Hollow, 2003;

Hoover, 1954). Operating as directors of the Ohio Company, Manasseh Cutler and Rufus

Putnam played a significant role in the creation of both the state of Ohio and the

territory's first college (Hollow, 2003; Hoover, 1954). Founded in 1804 by Manasseh

Cutler, Ohio University was established a year after Ohio gained statehood and was the

first public institution of higher learning conceived in the Northwest Territory. By 1808,

a two-room building housed the first professor and students of Ohio University (Hollow,

2003; Hoover, 1954).

Like many colleges of its time, Ohio University was a White-male-dominated

institution with an academic focus on providing students with a classical education

(Geiger, 2015; Hollow, 2003; Hoover, 1954; Rudolph, 1990). In the late 1860s, however,

the university began accepting female students, with Margaret Boyd becoming the first

women to graduate from the institution in 1873 (Hollow, 2003; Hoover, 1954). Women

soon accounted for a third of the student body and Ohio University was evolving. By the

turn of the century, Ohio University hired its first female faculty member, began moving

away from the classical curriculum, and admitted students of color. As the student

population began to increase and diversify, non-academic organizations also began to

become fixtures on not only Ohio's campus, but college campuses around the country as well.

By the 1750's the "extracurriculum" (Rudolph, 1990, p. 137) was carried out through organizations created for and by students to engage pupils when not attending class. Because developing the minds of young men was the main goal of early colleges in the United States, clubs still had an academic purpose. At Harvard, Princeton, and Yale, the first extracurricular activity was the literary society, which was at its core a debate club (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990). According to Rudolph (1990), debates outside the classroom helped further develop intellect, as they required different mental abilities not found in recitations and memorization. Literary societies also began to publish and purchase other books and magazines of various subjects, helping students to escape the narrow intellectual confines offered by a classical education (Rudolph, 1990). On the non-academic spectrum, fraternities and sororities began to form.

Wishing to increase social interaction amongst students, Greek-letter fraternities and sororities were born. As well as allowing for social interaction between peers, fraternities and sororities were viewed by students as filling the void left when moving away from family (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990). With a reputation for promoting drinking, smoking, and talking about women, fraternities were not welcomed at all universities, especially in states and institutions which believed them to be an affront to religious piety (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990). But Rudolph (1990) argued the "extracurriculum played a major role in sustaining collegiate values … was also an agency of the collegiate emphasis on fellowship, … character, [and] well-roundedness"

(p. 464) and helped bridge the gap between the university ideal and the collegiate ideal. Due to the rigidity of the collegiate classroom in the early days of the American university, societies, clubs, fraternities, and, later, sororities allowed students to have a voice of their own to express themselves and their opinions, which was forbidden within the confines of the lecture hall.

At Ohio University, the trend toward the creation of literary societies and other social organizations was much the same as it was around the rest of the country during the 19th century. Beta Theta Pi was the first Greek-letter fraternity founded at Ohio University in 1841; in 1889 Pi Beta Phi became the first Greek-letter sorority. In line with the slow diversification of the Ohio campus was an equally slow emergence of clubs and organizations. Though Black and international students were a fixture on campus in the 19th century, it was not until the early 20th century when the Chinese club and Alpha Phi Alpha, a Greek-letter Black fraternity, were created (Hollow, 2003). During the 20th century, there was also an emergence of honors programs and courses which saw students placed with a small group of likeminded peers, aiding in their growth both socially and academically (Geiger, 2015). In the next section, we explore a brief history of the program for which this research is based.

The Ohio Fellows

Ohio University's Honors College was established in 1964, which, while not an extracurricular entity in itself, provided students with opportunities to hone their social and academic skills outside the classroom. For instance, selected participants in the program were given the chance to talk to leaders around the country about important

events (Hollow, 2003). With the success of the Honors College, President Alden went on to create other programs and organizations which brought students together outside of class to interact with faculty and peers and sought to assist in creating future leaders. One such program was the Ohio Fellows. Though the goals of the program were not easily defined, some documents provide insight into the program's aims.

Created in 1964 as the Ohio Plan, the Ohio Fellows' mission was "for exceptional students to work on their leadership skills outside of the traditional classroom setting … [through interactions with] distinguished campus visitors, and access to professional internships" (Pellechia, 2013). Furthermore, students participating in this program were provided with faculty mentors during their years as undergraduates (Pellechia, 2013). To gain a more in-depth insight into the program as it was envisioned in the late 1960s, I turn to a pamphlet written by Robert Greenleaf in 1967, a founder of the servant leadership movement.

Although at its inception and revitalization the Ohio Fellows was not meant to be viewed as an honors program, in the pamphlet, Greenleaf (1967) explicitly stated the program was for exceptional students. While it can be argued exceptional students do not necessarily correlate to high grades, and in our system of meritocracy many may construe that as meaning so, but a flyer from the 1960s indicates only a 2.0 grade point average (GPA) was necessary for consideration. Greenleaf (1967) said the program was intended to "develop: 1) knowledge of persons, situations and structures external to the academic realm, 2) self-awareness and personal growth and 3) active and constructive assumption

of responsibility" (para. 1). The development of the student was said to be done all for the intention of the person becoming a good steward of the public.

Interestingly, the Ohio Fellows was for any student from any major because it was assumed one's goal in becoming a Fellow was to have the ability to make contributions to society in the future (Greenleaf, 1967). To be capable of serving society in the future, Greenleaf (1967) asserted students must learn how to develop a lifestyle of greatness, be creative, explore morality and wisdom, begin to trust their instincts, become realists, and understand anxiety as a part of life which should motivate us. Though not explicitly stated, his premise appears to be that these assets and your dreams could be obtained by joining the Ohio Fellows. Here, it can be argued, we see a document linking membership in a program to helping with future success. Because the association between a singular program and success during and after college is a stretch, it is essential we remember the Greenleaf document as a brochure to attract students.

Terminated with the resignation of President Vernon Alden in 1970, the Ohio Fellows reemerged in 2013 after a 42-year hiatus through donations by Ohio University alumni of the program. With goals similar to those from the late 1960s, today's fellows are working toward being future leaders through interaction with speakers, travel, and discussion on a wide array of topics (Pellechia, 2013). Although a program with such lofty goals may seem out of place, especially in today's world of cutbacks in higher education, as in the 1960s, today's program is completely donor-funded. Though a completely donor-funded program at the collegiate seems elitist (claims of which may have been well-founded in the 1960s), leaders of the modern Ohio Fellows attempt to

attract a wide array of students from diverse backgrounds, giving them opportunities which may otherwise have been unobtainable. While this does not absolve the program completely of elitist behavior it is a step in the right direction. Extracurricular activities have been part of colleges and universities around the United States for generations, and there may be benefits to keeping these programs and organizations alive, and, in the Ohio Fellows' case, reviving them after forty-three years.

Research Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this qualitative research is to explore the Ohio Fellows program participants' collegiate and post-collegiate success at Ohio University. As mentioned, co-curricular programs have the potential to increase student involvement and retention. To obtain a well-rounded view of the program since its inception to modern times, a historical case-study was conducted. Through the study, the following questions were answered:

1. How do participants of the Ohio Fellows define the mission of the program?

2. How do those affiliated with the Ohio Fellows (students, faculty, alumni, administration) define success in and out of college?

3. How do students experience the community (peers, mentors, alumni, directors, invited guests) of the Ohio Fellows?

   a. Has what defines a community evolved over time amongst the Ohio Fellows' cohorts? If so, why, and what are the possible explanations for the differences?

4. How does participation in the Ohio Fellows community aid in student success in college and beyond? In particular, I will investigate the role the Ohio Fellows program and, particularly the community developed within the program, and its part in the persistence and success of participating students.

Although my focus is on a singular donor-funded co-curricular program which exists at Ohio University, I approached this with the recognition that what the mission of the program is and what is actually enacted may have been cohesive. As a result, a goal in the research was to be open to examining gaps between stated goals and enacted realities.

Significance

Importance of co-curricular activities. Extracurriculars, or co-curricular activities as they are referred to in modern terms, have evolved over the years. In the early years of co-curricular programs, there was an obvious separation between those founded for social means versus those for academic purposes (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990). Even today, colleges and universities around the United States vie for the best and brightest students each year through the development of co-curricular programs on both the social and academic ends of the spectrum. Students admitted to honors and scholars' programs may enjoy extra opportunities and benefits not available to the average student.

Ohio University, for instance, offers its honors and scholars students different housing options, early registration, undergraduate research possibilities, funding for study abroad, smaller class sizes, and access to graduate level courses (Ohio University, 2019). In addition to these incentives, students have the chance to interact and collaborate with

other high-achieving individuals and faculty. Other students may choose to enroll due to an active Greek-life system, which falls under the umbrella of student affairs. Regardless of whether they are academic or social in nature, Suskie (2015) believes all co-curricular activities should enhance a student, be it either developmentally or academically.

To attract more students, however, universities are creating experiences where the social and academic sides are not so distinct (Dean, 2015). Cooperation among academic affairs and student affairs in creating both social and academic experiences outside the classroom can be witnessed with programs such as learning communities (Dean, 2015). Learning communities work by ensuring students in the same major take classes together, which helps build a community amongst students where helping each other cope with the difficulties of college life can hopefully lead to higher student retention. Co-curricular programs may have the potential to attract and retain students just as academic programs have done so in the past.

Dean (2015) pointed out studies have shown a relationship between "traditional measures of success and the co-curriculum" (p. 28). Though measuring the success of a co-curricular event is not as clear as an in-class experience (Roberts, 2015), there are said to be benefits which are not necessarily measurable. One of the arguments for co-curricular activities, especially those which are academic or both academic and social in nature, is that the programs encourage self-reflection. Reflection can occur at any time during the process of an activity or program but is said to help students develop a deeper understanding of who or what they are interacting with and, more importantly, themselves (Meents-DeCaigny & Sanders, 2015; Roberts, 2015; Voges & Lyons, 2017).

This was evidenced by Voges and Lyons (2017) who found students became more globally conscious through completing a week-long co-curricular activity and journaling their experiences. It is further suggested that co-curricular experiences are considered a High Impact Practice (HIP).

Because universities are interested in the retention of their students, HIPs are essential in retaining a diverse group of students. According to Voges and Lyons (2017), HIPs are precise "teaching and learning methods that have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for first-year college students from diverse backgrounds" (p. 3). Furthermore, for average or below-average students, high-impact educational practices (HIPs), such as group work, internships, research projects, and writing courses, have the tendency to increase persistence (McNair et al., 2016). Many co-curricular experiences are tied directly to HIP. As Suskie (2015) points out, students gain the most out of co-curricular programs when activities take place both in and out of the classroom. While there is continual debate as to how to make co-curricular practices more meaningful and how to accurately measure students' gains in learning from these programs (Dean, 2015; Meents-DeCaigny & Sanders, 2015; Roberts, 2015; Suskie, 2015), to determine why a program is successful it is significant to go to the source of success: the students themselves.

Honors and scholar students are provided exclusive benefits, so I am additionally curious as to whether these educational advantages assist the student in becoming successful later in life. Furthermore, as the government demands more accountability

from public institutions of higher education, universities may need to begin to justify expenditures which only benefit a small population of the campus.

Co-curricular programs and assessment of colleges and universities. The assessing of higher education institutions in the United States is not a new phenomenon, having occurred since the early 20th century (Banta, 2002). Our general understanding of assessment in modern terms as a method used by federal and state governments to hold post-secondary institutions accountable for student learning and financial matters began in the 1980s (Banta, 2002). By the 1990s, assessments at institutions of higher education became standard practice (Banta, 2002). Though many forms of assessment take place at the college level, one of the mostly widely known is accreditation. Six accrediting bodies exist in the US which oversee kindergarten through twelfth grade education, as well as our 2- and 4-year colleges and universities (Volkwein, 2010b). Although each accreditor oversees a different area of the country, the agencies share similar standards (Volkwein, 2010b). These standards include an "institution's financial status, governance, faculty and staff relations, institutional achievements, student services, and student learning outcomes" (Volkwein, p. 6, 2010b). Even though they may no longer be fully connected or associated with the university, alumni may play a role in this process.

Though not explicitly mandated through the accrediting bodies, alumni outcome surveys generally play a role in the accreditation process as a method of showing evidence of standards being met (HLC, 2014; MSCHE, 2014; NEASC, 2016; NWCCU, 2010; SACSCOC, 2012; WASC, 2013; Volkwein, 2010a). As Volkwein (2010b) states, this is partly due to the fact that "[a]lumni offer important perspectives for evaluating

academic programs and student services and are often used in student recruitment and mentoring" (p. 215), so it only makes sense to include their input during the accountability process. Moreover, through studies conducted using alumni surveys, universities can determine the effectiveness of areas such as the general education curriculum, university programs, and major education programs (Volkwein, 2010b). Therefore, through alumni surveys, we can learn what experiences at the university level assisted in post-college success.

Contribution to Ohio University and higher education. Because this dissertation focuses on a specific program as it existed in the past and today at Ohio University, I contend this research is an important resource for the university and higher education in general. In addition to adding to the already extensive university archives, the study of the Ohio Fellows program has the potential to provide Ohio University insight into a program which potentially had considerable influence on students' lives following graduation from the university. Seeing as the original Fellows graduated approximately 50 years ago, the idea that skills obtained from a university program had possibly guided former students to be their idea of successful is significant. Considering the Ohio Fellows has recently been re-established, this research can assist in narrowing down the vital attributes of the 1960s program and attempting to recreate them through a modern lens. While my research will determine whether some of these experiences are currently taking place for the modern Fellows, it also may serve as a model for which other programs around campus may adopt similar practices.

Examining why this research is significant to higher education I turn to the purpose of higher education. As with any well-established entity, this purpose has evolved. In the US, higher education has transformed from institutions training future clergymen (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990) to providing a holistic educational experience where both academic and personal development occurs (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019). Even today, there is pressure for universities to focus more attention on ensuring future graduates are employable by passing on skills, such as critical thinking, sound reasoning, the ability to create sound arguments, and social skills (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019). Involvement in active learning, such as internships and working with diverse populations is said to enhance students' employability and civic engagement (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Scott, 2006; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019; Sutton, 2016).

Based on knowledge completed through preliminary research of the Ohio Fellows, both incarnations of the program can be seen as models of co-curricular programs which embody the purpose of higher education due to the students selected and their experiences. Students who were and are active in the Fellows have had opportunities to research and complete internships, and are encouraged to delve deep into controversial topics. Furthermore, the administration of the Fellows aims to recruit a diverse group of participants each year. There is an understanding of how vital it is for students to be around more than those who look the same and believe the same things, especially if those other individuals challenge their established opinions. These types of experiences can lend themselves to academic and personal growth. For universities

which struggle to provide students with this type of exposure in the classroom, programs like the Ohio Fellows may serve as a model of how the co-curricular setting can help make up for classroom inadequacies. Lastly, because this is a non-traditional program, it has the potential to attract those on campus who are not the most academically gifted but can still add value to the program.

Audience

Those who may find research on a co-curricular program influential are varied. First are post-secondary administrators. As stated previously, higher education must come to terms with increasing demand for accountability from shareholders such as the government and taxpayers. Through this study, it remains possible to provide evidence of the value in retaining, and even creating, co-curricular programs similar to the Ohio Fellows when decisions are being made as to what programs to cut.

It is no secret colleges and universities look to each other for innovative ideas. Colleges around the country have created programs to attract certain populations to their institutions. From honors colleges to first-generation programs, it has become essential for universities to continually develop programming which not only encourages students to work to their full potential, but also helps retain students for accountability and funding issues. Through this research, it is possible another post-secondary institution will believe in the usefulness of the Ohio Fellows as a contributor to post-collegiate success, and, as a result, want to create a co-curricular program similar in nature at their college or university. Moreover, it can be argued if there is a link between co-curricular

activities and post-collegiate success specific programs may be used as a tool to recruit students.

With the rising costs associated with obtaining a bachelor's degree and beyond, students need to make wise choices when deciding which college or university to attend. Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) college choice model consists of a three-step decision process: predisposition, search, and choice. The second step, search, is where students and parents come together to make decisions about where the child will attend college (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). Because this is a multi-faceted decision, universities must be able to sell their institutions to parents and students alike. The ability to tout research showing the effectiveness of a co-curricular program past the collegiate years may factor into the decision-making process.

Limitations

One of the first limitations I expected to encounter dealt with the age of the first cohorts of the Ohio Fellows. Because of the passing of time, I worried some participants from the original cohorts would have trouble recollecting information about their involvement with the Ohio Fellows. While I did not anticipate this to be a factor with all participants from this generation of Fellows, I find it impossible for individuals to remember in great detail all the activities and people they interacted with during their time at Ohio University. Furthermore, age prohibited me from interviewing certain Fellows due to mental decline and, in some cases, death. With this in mind, it could also be argued time is a limitation as well, when taking into account the age of the original cohorts. While I did not believe age would have an undesirable impact on my ability to

collect useful data, age may limit some in-depth detailed data. Time also impacted other aspects of the study.

The number of Fellows I had the opportunity to interview was low due to the lapse in time between the original program and the conducting of my research. Although the archives did have several rosters of the students who participated in the program, all contact information was out-of-date as it was from their time as students at Ohio University. Much of the current contact information provided by Dr. Fowler was from Fellows who have either participated in a reunion at the university or were in contact with other Fellows who had attended a reunion. As a result, all the participants except one had attended at least one Ohio Fellows reunion. While I believe it would have been beneficial to my study to speak to those who had not been in contact with the other Fellows, the time commitment to track them down was not feasible for this project. Though this is a historical study, keeping in mind the time period of when the original Ohio Fellows existed, diversity is also a limitation.

One major limitation of the study was the lack of diversity in my sample of Original Fellows. Most of the participants attended Ohio University in the mid to late 1960s, so unsurprisingly many were white males. Though qualitative research is not about generalizations, this lack demographic diversity limited even the slightest hint of generalizability to today's co-curricular programs. Also, the experiences at OU which they found lent to their success were potentially not comparable to the experiences of today's students. This particular limitation is somewhat rectified by the inclusion of the modern-day Ohio Fellows, as these cohorts tend to be more diverse; however, it is still

significant to recognize the experiences of the Original Fellows may have been distinctly different due to the lack of inclusion of the 1960s. The final limitation which I feel exists is financial constraints.

Though interviewing current members of the Ohio Fellows may be as simple as a drive to campus, those who have graduated and moved on may not be so easy to reach. Ideally, all interviewing would have taken place in-person. This, I believe, not only allowed for better rapport, but also permitted for more in-depth observational field notes. Because of the distance between myself and alumni, travel was not financially reasonable for all interviews. As a result, some interviews took place over Skype and through phone interviews. Conducting interviews through Skype, and particularly over the phone, limited my ability to establish a more personal connection which could have led to more openness on the behalf of the subject. Moreover, when interviewing in-person, particularly at the interviewee's home or office, observational data can be collected which aids in data analysis. It is also pertinent to mention technology has it quirks and does not always work how we would like it to. This translated to interruptions during the interviewing process, trouble connecting to the person, and the loss of a recorded in-person interview.

Summary

Chapter 1 began with the history of the establishment of Ohio University and the development of co-curricular programs. There was also a specific focus on the creation of co-curriculars at Ohio University and an explanation of the modern day need for such programs. Furthermore, a history of the Ohio Fellows was explored. The purpose of the

research project, of wanting to explore the impact of community on the Ohio Fellows in

regard to collegiate and post-collegiate success, was also discussed. Additionally, the

significance of the study, the audience, and the limitations were also explained.

In Chapter 2, I discuss literature as it pertains to my theoretical assumptions,

success, alumni assessment, and co-curricular programs.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This study focused on a particular co-curricular program as it existed in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The program was revived in 2013. In addition to enhancing the academic and social lives of students, co-curricular activities also have the potential to help students become more socially aware and engaged. Although there were dramatic differences in society between the earlier and modern periods of the Ohio Fellows, they shared a reality of social discord, leading to campus unrest in both timeframes. Indeed, protests have occurred since the inception of the college in colonial America (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990). However, uprisings on the early college campus stood in stark contrast to those of today or in the 1960s, as participants tended to be wealthy young white men (Horowitz, 1986) and protests often focused on consumer-related issues. Similarities exist in regard to the influence of co-curricular activities in the context of this activism.

In a study conducted in 1998, Van Dyke (1998) asserted schools which have a history of activism are more likely to have students who participate in protests. Furthermore, the author maintained these subcultures are part of the campus' culture itself, spanning generations. Campus organizations which attracted student radicals have their roots in the 1930s and may have gone underground during the 1940s and 1950s when these types of student organizations were being suppressed (Van Dyke, 1998). A particular organization which the author pointed to having the most impact on protests on college campuses during the 1960s was the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). SDS had ties to a 1930s-era student organization, the American Student Union and

Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID). Using a sample of 423 colleges, Van

Dyke examined universities which had protests in the 1930s and found these institutions

were four times more likely to have student activism in the 1960s. She additionally noted

larger universities were also more likely to have student demonstrations than smaller

institutions. Results also indicated the presence of SDS on a college campus increased

the likelihood of student demonstrations on a variety of social issues. Though this study

focused on a singular co-curricular entity, it lends credence to the claim made by Bayer

and Dutton (1976) that increased participation in student governance and programs

created to aid in the advancement of women and minorities on campus were also essential

to the rise in student activism on university campuses around the United States.

Because my research is focused on the efficacy of co-curricular programming as it

relates to success, it is essential to examine the impact these organizations have on

students during their time in school. As the research encompasses individuals who not

only attended a university at a time of civil unrest on college campuses, but were also

part of a co-curricular organization, these historical events are important to recount.

Even for the modern-day Ohio Fellows, fights for certain social issues are once again

finding a home on college campuses. With this in mind, to further investigate what role a

co-curricular program may play in helping students navigate college life and develop

habits which lead to successful post-collegiate lives, data gathered through my research

were filtered through multiple student success-related theories. In the next section,

Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship, Tinto's theory of social integration, and

Park's theory of mentorship are examined in relation to the study of success and co-curricular programs.

Theoretical Assumptions

      Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship. I am particularly interested in the ways in which involvement in the Ohio Fellows shaped participants and prepared them for their subsequent careers and lives. One area helping to guide my data collection and analysis was Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship. The idea of self-authorship was first conceptualized in Robert Kegan's 1982 book The Evolving Self. By exploring the meaning-making process and its influence on daily life struggles, Kegan's (1982) goal was to provide a framework for counselors, therapists, and psychiatrists to begin to understand the uniqueness of the meaning-making process for each individual and how to help develop mutually beneficial relationships (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Within what is known as Kegan's (1982) theory of the evolution of consciousness was born the notion of self-authorship. Described by Kegan (1982) as the ability to "generalize across abstractions" or "systems of thinking," Baxter Magolda took the concept of self-authorship and further investigates how individuals create meaning and make sense of themselves and events occurring around them.

      Self-authorship as described by Baxter Magolda (2008) is "the internal capacity to define one's beliefs, identity, and social relations [which is viewed] as a developmental capacity that helps meet the challenges of adult life" (p. 269). Furthermore, the author identified three areas related to cultural diversity essential for collegiate and post-collegiate success. These three "capacities" are: "epistemological," which requires a

person to understand and utilize multiple cultural frames of interacting with others; "intrapersonal," which allows for building a self-identity free of race, gender, and sexual orientation biases; and finally an "interpersonal" capacity which allows oneself to establish relationships with a diverse group (Baxter Magolda, 2008, p. 269). The ability or inability to thrive in these areas may have an impact on development and hinder success later in life; though those populations which tend to experience discrimination and oppression are more likely to develop self-authorship earlier in adulthood (Baxter Magolda, 2008). As is the case of most education, it is somewhat expected college professors aid in this developmental process (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Based on a longitudinal study of adults in their 30s, Baxter Magolda (2008) sought to develop a more in-depth understanding of the components involving self-authorship in order to assist college-level educators in helping students become more introspective.

The theory of self-authorship grew out of Baxter Magolda's longitudinal study. In addition to the three dimensions of development (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and epistemological), the theory describes a developmental process, including trusting the internal voice, building an internal foundation, and securing internal commitments (Baxter Magolda, 2008). These three meaning-making elements in conjunction with the capacities discussed above are seen as supporting the development of self-authorship. Trusting the inner voice also means having the ability to be confident enough in oneself to ignore what external voices are telling you what is best (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Looking inward and trusting the inner voice allows for students to come to terms with the fact that while outside events are uncontrollable, their reactions to these events are in

their control. The recognition of having the ability to choose and take ownership of their

reactions to uncontrollable events shaped how they made meaning of said event (Baxter

Magolda, 2008). A study conducted by Pizzolato and Ozaki (2007) found students'

inability to take responsibility for their actions due to continued focus on what others

were doing hindered self-authorship. Next is the element of building an internal

foundation.

An internal foundation is created when a person has begun to fully trust their

inner voice, leading to an establishment of "beliefs, identity, and relationships" (Baxter

Magolda, 2008, p. 280). During this period of self-authorship, choices are made by

referring to the inner voice which allow for a deeper understanding of why a decision was

made and the possible impact the decision may have. King, Baxter Magolda, Barber,

Brown, and Lindsay (2009) in their study of 174 students established even negative

experiences are developmentally effective in encouraging self-authorship. Negative

experiences, it can be argued, are part of building the internal foundation which an

individual may reflect upon and use as a guide when decision making (Baxter Magolda,

2008). By taking stock of all experiences and being confident in one's inner voice,

Baxter Magolda (2008) believed a person's internal foundation is constantly evolving and

aids in the building and establishment of confidence in decision making. The final

element as described by Baxter Magolda was securing internal commitments.

In the element of securing internal commitments, the internal foundation is

established and has become synonymous with the person themselves. According to

Baxter Magolda (2008), a person who has reached this stage of self-authorship is able to

live their authentic self with a sense of natural confidence. Securing internal

commitments allows for an individual to live free of worry about choices and decisions

being made, because of the assurance everything will work out in the end. This sense of

self-assurance allowed participants who reached this stage of self-authorship to live life

with a feeling of freedom, now having an understanding of who they are as an individual

(Baxter Magolda, 2008). Although the meaning-making elements of self-authorship

appear to be distinct, each plays a significant role in "internally determining one's beliefs,

identity and social relations" (Baxter Magolda, 2008, p. 281), which is the end goal of

self-authorship. But as Baxter Magolda (2008) pointed out, self-authorship is not a linear

process and moving back and forth between the meaning-making elements will occur.

Moreover, the author impressed upon the fact that self-authorship does not necessarily

improve current relationships, as the goal of the elements of the meaning-making process

is geared towards an individual becoming their authentic self, which does not ensure

smooth transitions concerning relationships.

When examining the current study, the use of self-authorship as a theoretical

perspective makes sense. Looking at research conducted by King et al. (2009), which

aimed to find experiences promoting self-authorship, co-curricular activities were found

to be developmentally effective. One must keep in mind, however, that co-curricular

activities must allow students to have control over learning experiences which allow them

to take risks, interaction with peers from diverse backgrounds, and the ability to explore

and challenge currently held beliefs (King et al., 2009). Furthermore, as Pizzolato and

Ozaki (2007) discussed, when colleges are too scripted or what they refer to as

"formulaic" as it relates to student needs and activities the self-authorship process may be hindered. In this study of the Ohio Fellows, I examined participants' process of self-authorship, giving attention to the degree of freedom of academic exploration students possessed in the program

Tinto's theory of social integration. Based on his work "Leaving College," which focuses on the theory of individual departure, Tinto's (1987) theory of socialization concentrated on the impact of academic and social systems in higher education as they pertain to persistence and retention. Simultaneously taking into consideration pre-collegiate student attributes and current college experiences, Tinto (1987) believed "experiences with the institution, primarily arising out of interactions between the individual and other members of the college, are centrally related to further continuance in that institution" (p. 115). Hence, he argued that by being more integrated into the academic and social life of their university, a student raised the likelihood of graduation (Tinto, 1987). As simple as it sounds, however, the academic and social systems of higher education are complex.

When discussing the academic side of a student's college experience, it is normal to assume we are always concerned with in-class experiences, especially as they relate to grades. This is what Tinto (1987) viewed as the formal academic setting; yet, additional value for students can be found in informal academic-related settings. Student interaction with professors and other professional staff outside the confines of the classroom or office are said to help students develop a deeper understanding of the multifaceted nature of academic work and lead to better performance in the classroom (Tinto, 1987). It is

still essential we do not discount the significance of the relationship a student has with a professor in the formal academic setting as this may impact success too (Tinto, 1987). Regarding the social aspect of college-life, formal and informal settings also exist.

Perceptions of social life in college are generally relegated to thoughts of partying and hanging out with friends. Nonetheless, we must keep in mind there are formal social situations. Co-curricular programs, work-study, and student government are all examples of times when students are interacting in a formal setting. Albeit, Tinto (1987) admitted that access to some of these institutional organizations are granted through more informal social settings. Regardless, both formal and informal social interactions further assist in providing students with connections to the university and therefore increasing the prospect of graduation.

Examining the model, the academic and social systems appear independent of each other, but this does not mean each system does not interact or influence the other (Tinto, 1987). Take into consideration co-curricular activities. Despite the history of co-curricular programs being student-run (Geiger, 2015), today there are directors and faculty advisors associated with these organizations. This example gives a distinct example of the interplay which occurs between the academic and social systems because as students interact with each other in a formal situation, their academic interaction is informal. Tinto (1987) argued when both the academic and social systems work in cooperation with one another to emphasize affiliation with systems at the institutional level, students potentially increase their chances of retention. Granted, this not to say complete integration in both systems is necessary for students to be successful or the

inability to affiliate with one increases the chances of a student leaving (Tinto, 1987).

The model emphasizes that some involvement in each the social and academic system is

necessary for student persistence, while large deficiencies in one or both areas may be

cause for non-completion of a degree (Tinto, 1987). With a deeper understanding of

Tinto's model, it is important we also see how it has been integrated with research.

   Literature on Tinto's social integration theory. In three studies I examined how

Tinto's theory has been connected to recent research. Kommers and Pham (2016)

centered their research on how the theory was different for Asian and non-Asian

international students. Using the data of 170 international students from the Beginning

Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study, the authors found disparities between the

two research areas. While academic integration showed little impact on Asian students'

persistence, those Asian students who were more socially active showed less persistence

than their non-Asian peers (Kommers & Pham, 2016). This trend was shown to exist up

until the third year of enrollment where Asian students who were more socially

connected were more likely to persist than those of non-Asian descent, with rates of

persistence for Asian students who were socially active even higher after the sixth year

(Kommers & Pham, 2016). Furthermore, Kommers and Pham (2016) found that though

academic integration's role for Asian international students was not statistically

significant, for non-Asian international students, a higher level of academic integration

was positively correlated to a higher degree of persistence. Based on these results we see

detrimental effects of social integration for some students.

Tinto (1987) proposed some academic and social integration was necessary to be a successful college student. However, this study indicated too much social involvement may be, for some, detrimental to persistence and the academic system may have an inconsequential role on a student's ability to persist (Kommers & Pham, 2016). These results indicate the probability that Tinto's theory may not be compatible for all ethnic groups as it appeared Asian students' reactions to integration were contrary to Tinto's model. In the next study we also explore an area in which Tinto's model was not specifically developed, Community Colleges.

Though created with four-year institutions in mind, Tinto's (1987) theory was explored as it related to community college students. What Karp, Hughes, and O'Gara (2010) found from a sample of 44 community college students was those who felt a connection to the campus through social integration were more likely to persist. The rate at which those who felt a sense of belonging persisted was approximately 90% while the rate for those who felt little or no connection was about 30% lower (Karp, Hughes, & O'Gara, 2010). As the authors point out, many of those socially integrated into the school had a social network which helped them navigate the university as well as provided support in and outside the classroom (Karp, Hughes, & O'Gara, 2010). Relationships made ranged from students to professors.

As a result, Karp, Hughes, and O'Gara (2010) concluded that unlike four-year universities where there is some interconnectedness between the social and academic systems, at the community college these two areas are interwoven. The authors defend this position by clarifying that many of the social relationships formed by students all

began as academic in nature. So, what we can conclude based on the research is that though Tinto's Social Integration theory is said to not be applicable to the unique nature of the community college experience, the model does in fact play out in a somewhat more complex and intertwined manner which was shown to be crucial to retaining students past their first year (Karp, Huges, & O'Gara, 2010). And although the sample size was relatively small for a study, it can be argued results may be reproduceable at similar institutions as the one where the study was conducted. In the final study we see how the formal academic setting may influence student seeking out assistance in the informal academic setting.

Sidelinger, Frisby, and Heisler (2016) focused their study on social integration, specifically in the formal academic setting, and its impact on students' willingness to connect in the informal academic area. Using a sample of 144 undergraduates in an introductory communications class, the authors established two hypotheses. The first hypothesis assumed instructor rapport predicts the likelihood of a student's out-of-class communication with the professor, while the second tied instructor rapport to student willingness to seek outside of the classroom support services. The authors found a positive connection between how students perceived their professor and their willingness to contact the professor outside of class time and support seeking behaviors (Sidelinger, Frisby, & Heisler, 2016). Here it becomes apparent that the professor plays an essential role in assisting the student in becoming more academically integrated. It appears the possibility exists students may struggle to become academically integrated if some connections are not made with faculty. Though Tinto's model seems to focus on the

student's initiative, it implies an important role for faculty in terms of accessibility as well.

As these studies show, Tinto's social integration theory plays out in various realms of higher education. Although, as witnessed by Kommers and Pham (2016), the theory may not be as applicable to all students. Regarding the Ohio Fellows, participation in the program may allow for students to become more informally integrated academically through the exposure to faculty fellows. Additionally, a deeper formal social integration occurs through events sponsored by the program while it is possible connections made through the Ohio Fellows may lead to more informal social integration. In the next section, mentoring is explored as it related to student success and its interconnectedness with social integration and self-authorship.

Park's theory of mentorship. A key takeaway from Tinto's (1993) social integration theory is the significance of students establishing meaningful relationships, both academic and social, early on in their college careers. Extending beyond the bounds of student-student friendships, professors and other campus leaders have the potential to positively impact a student's college experience. In some cases, during these formative years, young adults are also said to begin to create bonds with students and authority figures who are viewed as mentors. As with social integration, mentors come in a variety of forms, even peers (Parks, 2000). Defined by Parks (2000) as providing "recognition, support, … challenge … [and] inspiration" (p. 128), mentors provide long-term guidance for young adults who are beginning to develop a deeper understanding of themselves and the world around them. Mentoring students is said to be a balancing act as one must

provide the correct amount of support and challenge, while at the same time remembering there is no positional power in this relationship (Parks, 2000). Mentors are there because of their experience and ability to provide guidance while also understanding the reciprocal nature of the relationship. Although commonly thought of a one-on-one relationship, Parks (2000) also discussed the idea of mentoring communities.

Unlike a one-on-one mentor relationship, a mentoring community provides a wealth of knowledge and experience not found in a one-on-one relationship. Mentoring communities, according to Parks (2000), function in a way as to introduce and help individuals to familiarize themselves with a profession or organization. Similarly, while recognition, support, challenge, and inspiration are key components of a mentoring community in addition to a person creating a relationship with more than one mentor, other features are also present (Parks, 2000). Within a mentoring community a network of belonging is established. Through this network, students have the ability to be in a judgement-free environment where one can be comfortable enough to try new things with support (Parks, 2000). Furthermore, people who have found a network of belonging are willing to ask and analyze some of life's "big questions" (Parks, 2000, p. 137) with others. This allows students to engage with and understand themselves and the world around them while at the same time fostering critical thought (Parks, 2000). The final unique component of a mentoring community is "encounters with otherness" (Parks, 2000, p. 139). Parks (2000) viewed diversity as an essential piece of the mentoring relationship as it teaches us to become more empathetic and compassionate to those different from ourselves. Moreover, developing an understanding that everyone has

something to contribute aids in changing an "I"-mentality to a "we"-mentality, which, in turn, creates a sense of belonging (Parks, 2000). As Parks (2000) asserted, people need to be accustomed to being around and interacting with a diverse population to have the ability to properly integrate into society.

An appropriate mentoring environment can assist in proper integration into society. With a diverse network, we can become more accustomed to having actual dialogue where listening, understanding, and openness to changing one's mind is just as essential as talking (Parks, 2000). By obtaining the ability to exchange dialogue with others, we also further develop our capacity for critical thought. In a supportive environment, students engaged in dialogue can challenge ideas and discuss differing opinions; helping to develop communication skills necessary for the workforce (Parks, 2000). Effective mentoring communities lead individuals to think about their future.

Called "worthy dreams" by Parks (2000), students begin to imagine what a successful life would look like to them. A strong mentorship encourages a person to go for what they believe is their ideal life, this includes career and self-image (Parks, 2000). This means while understanding the world is not always a happy place, it is possible to believe you can make a change for the better and develop a positive self-image even in the face of adversity (Parks, 2000). This notion brings us back to the idea of self-authorship.

Self-authorship is portrayed as when a person comes to realize and be comfortable with their authentic self (Baxter Magolda, 2008). As we can see, a mentoring community is related in that an effective mentor or mentoring community has the potential in

facilitating the self-authorship process. Akin to Baxter Magolda, Parks (2000) saw the significance in diversity and the need to be challenged and removed from your comfort zone in order to develop fully as an individual. By creating opportunities for students to think critically and develop holistically, it can be argued we are aiding students in becoming their version of successful.

Because the focus of this research is on the role co-curricular programs, in conjunction with the development of self-authorship, social integration, and mentorship, may play in post-collegiate success, the next section aims to define what constitutes success for the purposes of this study.

Defining Success

What does it mean to be successful? How do we define success? If we look at two dictionary definitions, we gain a minimal understanding of how some define success. According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, success is a "favored or desired outcome; also, the attainment of wealth, favor or eminence" (Success, n.d.a). Breaking down this definition we see first that success is related to something we want to happen. For instance, wanting a good grade on a paper and earning that grade is viewed as being successful. In the next portion of the definition we see success is also equated with financial and positional gains. But how does this definition stack up against another dictionary entry?

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) states success is "[t]he prosperous achievement of something attempted; the attainment of an object according to one's desire: now often with particular reference to the attainment of wealth or position"

(Success, n.d.b). Comparing the two definitions, it is immediately evident both are incredibly similar. Each mentions success is based on achieving a goal and shares a relationship with wealth and position in society. Interestingly, the OED definition includes in the portion of the definition about financial gain and stature "now often" being considered as the main indicators, which shows a possible evolution in the definition. Though these two words do little to change the meaning of "success" it gives the reader an impression that what constitutes success is not only an evolving concept, but also that the notion of success equating to wealth and power is a newer phenomenon. With this in mind, it is essential to go past the traditional method of defining words through the use of a dictionary and see how literature interprets success.

Literature on success. In an article from Inside Higher Education, "Defining College Success", Guess (2008) asserted that generalizing success is difficult to accomplish because of the diversity of college campuses. Due to size, population, academic focus, and other college-specific variables, it is hard to definitively conclude what successful graduates of post-secondary institutions will look like (Guess, 2008; Kuh et al., 2006). For example, a student attending a music conservatory for college may not see financial gains after college as a mark of success while someone who earns a degree in business may not see expanding their cultural and artistic range as success. The difficulty in defining success also means measuring post-collegiate success can prove to be challenging as well (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2015; Guess, 2008). Because most outcome surveys are focused on economic and personal gains, there are no truly reliable metrics to measure other areas related to post-collegiate

success, such as civil engagement (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2015; Guess, 2008; Kuh et al., 2006). Given the focus of outcome surveys on financial success, post-collegiate institutions insinuate a relationship between success and financial gain, so it makes sense why the Merriam Webster and OED definitions are similar. Furthermore, some researchers may use wealth as their only variable in defining post-collegiate success.

Oehrlein (2009) explicitly stated the purpose of the research was to "[study] the effect of a student's college GPA, major, and standardized test scores in order to see what is most influential on future income … so that they have the best opportunity to succeed" (p. 59). Here the perceived connection to success and wealth is evident. From the study, those who major in the areas of business and engineering will obtain higher average incomes, referred to as "positive effects" (Oeherlein, 2009, p. 64). On the other hand, Psychology and Art degrees were seen to have a "negative effect" (Oehrlein, 2009, p.64) on post-collegiate income. Concluding his study, Oehrlein (2009) emphasized the importance of earning good grades, especially in math, and being cognizant of the earning potential of your degree when going to college. Though some might view Oehrlein's suggestion to go for the top-earning degrees to ensure success as distasteful, White (2017) believed that, while some level of financial earning (though societally imposed) is tied to success outside of college, but it is more of a personal goal, and not societal. Still others find the emphasis of success and wealth harmful.

With an increased emphasis on accountability at the post-secondary level, there has been talk over the last few years concerning college majors which are viewed as not

being worth the economic price. Others argue, however, the focus on economic outcomes as dangerous and ignores the benefits of degrees which are not seen as high-income earners (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2015; Kuh et al., 2006). Cognitive skills, such as critical thinking, and social capital, such as civic engagement, are areas which are hard to measure but beneficial to a global society and are argued to be part of the success picture (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, 2015; Kuh et al., 2006). In Heath's 1991 book *Fulfilling Lives*, he focused on various aspects of what people consider to be success post-college.

Conducting a longitudinal study of college-educated men and women, Heath (1991) set to find out not only what success looked like, but also what it took to succeed. Heath (1991) concluded finding success as an adult requires effort and does not naturally occur. Moreover, success is about deciding about what is and is not important to you. This is similar to the ideas Frost (2018) had about success as not always meaning happiness and different levels of success existing. This means while some achievements may be viewed as successful to others, this big accomplishment may not be what the person is most proud of because something else holds more intrinsic value (Frost, 2018; Heath, 1991). Conceptually, this idea is played out in a survey given by Heath (1991) where participants listed from greatest to least what they felt identified success in their lives. Interestingly, happiness ranked first, while high income ranked last for most individuals who participated in the study. Findings of this nature lead to questions about the accuracy of the two definitions mentioned at the beginning of this section, as neither specifically mentioned well-being contributing to success but did speak of financial and

positional power. Though not easily generalized, participants of Heath's study did appear to agree on some similar attributes connected to the concept of success.

Broken down by importance, Heath (1991) revealed personality plays a significant role in developing success as an adult while dismissing the idea that grades and test results are the true indicator. The traits which were the most valued were caring and compassion, honesty and integrity, and a sense of humor, while other areas such as dedication, commitment, tolerance, and acceptance were also seen as vital (Heath, 1991). Additionally, imperative to viewing oneself as a successful adult is the ability to make meaningful relationships, find a career which is more than a job, and having a sense of well-being. Meaningful relationships are seen as having friends, a significant other, and even becoming a good parent (Heath, 1991). Working someplace where one feels valued also plays a role in overall well-being as a bad work environment may adversely affect one's health. There is one final area which Heath (1991) found most participants had in common when discussing being a successful adult.

In his study, those who were active participants in co-curricular activities were apt to find their adult lives successful (Heath, 1991). Citing another study, Heath (1991) once again dismissed the notion of the importance of grades as a predictor of success, but instead pointed to engagement outside the classroom as helping to increase creativity and critical thinking and increase the likelihood of success in adulthood. Heath's study suggested examining the impact of co-curricular programs on student learning and subsequent success as a worthwhile endeavor. It should be mentioned, however, that Heath's study is somewhat limited by the fact that while the sample was comprised of

women from various racial and ethnic groups, all the men were white. In other studies,

all the participants being college-educated might be identified as a limitation but having a

college education is a critical piece to my research. With this in mind, what does all this

material tell me about the definition of success?

Based on the literature, I have concluded there is no single concrete definition of

success. Instead, I find the concept of success to be a very personal and complex. By

providing a definition I would give the impression success is a one-size-fits-all approach.

This mentality is one I wish to avoid as it appears to be shared only by those who solely

measure success by wealth and power. Throughout the literature, there were some

similarities concerning what constituted post-collegiate success; however, I did not find a

consensus on the meaning. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate to box-in participants

of my study with *my* ideas of what constitutes success. It is more important for me, as a

researcher, to allow them to define success as they view it and for me to find common

ground within their definitions. As I stated previously, the definition of success appears

to be constantly evolving, so I am interested in determining whether the ideas of post-

collegiate success amongst Ohio Fellows have changed as the program has transformed.

In the next section, I will look at one of the methods colleges and universities use to

obtain data about alumni and post-collegiate success.

Alumni Assessment

Colleges and universities across the nation provide a myriad of experiences to

their students to help them develop both personally and academically. Every year college

students take advantage of the many services, events, organizations, and programs their

respective universities have to offer. For reasons such as accountability, effectiveness, and hopeful future university donors, universities are interested in what alumni have to say about their experiences before and after college (Volkwein, 2010a). Though not a new phenomenon in higher education, alumni outcome surveys are regarded as an inexpensive way to gather and dissect information about alumni experiences, while also serving as an outcomes assessment (Volkwein, 2010a). In the following section, several studies relating to alumni outcomes and the relationship between the university experience and the factors which contribute to alumni success will be examined.

The studies on alumni outcomes explored were not university-wide surveys, but instead focused on specific programs in Psychology, Library Science, Nursing, Fine Arts, Music, and Political Science. Though each research project included data on alumni and their perceptions of their college experience, the purposes of the studies were not always related to alumni success. In some cases, data was explicitly used for program improvement.

In "Using Alumni Views to Connect the Past, Present, and Future in Political Science" by Raile et al. (2017), a link to an online survey was emailed to Montana State University political science graduates from the years 1999 to 2014. The express purpose of the research was to review the current curriculum in the political science department and to begin collection data for a more ongoing assessment. Professors in the department also wanted to determine if suggestions from literature and professional organizations regarding curriculum changes would be similar to the ones they were anticipating (Raile et al., 2017). The authors further believed alumni input was an equally valuable source of

information (Raile et al., 2017). Based on survey results, the Montana State University

political science department went through a major overhaul. Respondents said the skills

of critical thinking, reading comprehension, and writing learned at the university

contributed to their readiness for the workforce (Raile et al., 2017). Many alumni,

however, felt jobs in the field were hard to find and suggested the college supply more

chances for experiential learning (Raile et al., 2017). In another study, internships and

other similar opportunities were the norm, while researchers were interested in their

effectiveness.

Rathbun-Grubb's (2016) study focused on library and information science (LIS)

graduates' involvement with End of Program Assessments (EPAs). Surveys were sent to

graduates of 39 LIS programs. Unlike prior research where students mentioned a lack of

experiential learning, students who participated in this survey were either required to or

had the option of participating in an EPA (Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). According to

Rathbun-Grubb (2016), literature concerning EPAs finds the experiences help develop a

student's skills in library science and may make them more employable. Those

participants in the previous study not only mentioned a lack of this type of pre-college

training, but also not being able to find employment in their field, so there appears to be

some truth to the literature concerning EPAs. Alumni success in this study was defined

by the subjects' ability to obtain a job post-graduation (Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). What

Rathbun-Grubb (2016) found was alumni who took part in an EPA found jobs quicker

than those who did not. It was hypothesized the easier job placement was due to work

experience where "[s]tudents have to apply theoretical and practical knowledge to solve

real problems" (Rathbun-Grubb, 2017, p.54). Other studies also looked at how well the universities prepared students for the workplace.

"Alumni Perceptions of Workforce Readiness" reported on suggestions from holders of psychology degrees to universities to assist students' progression to the workforce (Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010). This study, like Rathbun-Grubb's (2017) research, focused on college graduates' transition to the workforce. As with the previous studies, a survey was the tool used to collect data. However, instead of sending invitations to complete surveys online via email, one third of the alumni of Boise State University's Department of Psychology were mailed paper surveys. Of those who responded, though their work life required these traits, alumni found their college experience lacked high expectations, research projects, group work, and the anticipation of timeliness (Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010). Alumni stressed how during their time in college, they found relationships with professors and mentors, taking honors courses, and becoming more involved in the community added to their success in the workplace (Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010). Former students also felt a class focusing on transiting to full-time careers would have been beneficial (Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010).

Three studies which looked at alumni success and university experience used the same data set. The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) is an online survey used to gather information about arts education in colleges and universities across the United States (Dumford & Miller, 2015; Dumford & Miller, 2017; Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017). "Are those Rose-Colored Glasses You are Wearing?: Student and

Alumni Survey Responses" used the data set to compare and contrast the experiences of alumni and graduating seniors' perspectives on their collegiate careers (Dumford & Miller, 2015). What Dumford and Miller (2015) found was the alumni had more positive comments about their time in college than did the graduating seniors. However, alumni reported both academic and career advising as lacking. Moreover, alumni believed internships and other field-of-study-related work experiences would have been beneficial to early career success (Dumford & Miller, 2015). Though seniors did not mention internships as something they felt missing from their time in college, Dumford and Miller (2015) argue this is because they have not been out of the system long enough to realize how missed opportunities may affect their career paths. Alumni opinions on experiential learning has been a reoccurring theme in most of the literature, whether these opportunities were directly related to early career success or identified as an area where improvement is needed to aid in finding employment (Dumford & Miller, 2015; Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010; Raile et al., 2017; Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). Though the same data set was utilized, very different information may be extracted from it.

Fine arts degrees are notorious for being labeled as providing little utility and are always a matter of discussion when conversations about so-called "useless" degrees are had. Dumford and Miller (2017), using SNAAP survey data from 2011 to 2013, chose to explore other areas which alumni indicate success than financial gains. This is a departure from previous studies which tied post-college achievement to gainful employment. To assist them in finding other avenues of success, Dumford and Miller (2017) used Throsby's work-preference model, which is based on the idea that

"acknowledging that a minimum level of monetary compensation is necessary for physical existence, beyond this threshold those in certain occupations, like artists, may not recognize the same types of utility from income" (p. 196). Results from the study divide the ideas of job satisfaction into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic (satisfaction from doing their art versus monetary rewards) (Dumford & Miller, 2017).

The authors found alumni were motivated almost equally by both intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction, but "[t]he more alumni see the connection between what they had chosen to study in college and the current job … the happier that they seem to be" (Dumford & Miller, 2017, p.202). Furthermore, Dumford and Miller (2017) state "the magnitude of the relationship between overall job satisfaction and intrinsic satisfaction was larger; indicating … intrinsic satisfaction plays a larger role in how one thinks about occupational success" (p.203), which is in line with Throsby's model. In this study, we see a departure from the normal linking of alumni success to financial success. And, though many of the alumni surveys ask about personal happiness, this study shows for fine arts majors, success is not always about monetary gains, but instead the ability to use skills learned in college which may not traditionally be thought of as economically advantageous.

The final research study using the SNAAP data set once again looked at alumni from 2011 to 2013, but only focused on those with music degrees. "Music Alumni Play a Different Tune: Reflections on Acquired Skills and Career Outcomes" addressed skills alumni music majors acquired which are beneficial to their life after college (Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017). Unique to this study is the fact the authors searched for

attributes acquired in college music majors which helped to make alumni successful, and not so much what coursework or experiences were connected to success. The skills reported by music majors learned in college necessary to be successful were reported based on major. For music history, composition, and theory majors, writing, critical thinking, creative thinking, and research skills were developed (Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017). Performance majors, on the other hand, perfected technique related to their instruments and learned entrepreneurial skills (Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017). Though not viewed as the most lucrative degree, music majors appeared to become competent in many areas employers may find beneficial.

Finding studies which tied alumni success to experiences in college proved to be a challenge. Additionally, though some universities in their surveys asked about specific programs which assisted students in developing accomplished careers, I could find no research which investigated this connection further. Most research found strictly adhered to classroom experience and experiential learning as pathways to career success while ignoring the impact university-sponsored organizations may have on a student's post-college achievement. This can be attributed to the fact most alumni research was quantitative in nature and relies on a large sample size in order for the research to be more generalizable. Moreover, organizations and programs offered by universities are not always large, so finding members might be somewhat of a challenge. From my research, alumni surveys do not get too in-depth with the types of university-sponsored programs students were involved with. Because alumni surveys are purported to be utilized to help the university make improvements in a variety of areas, it seems essential

to explore other areas which contribute to success, not just purely academic endeavors. This leads one to conclude studies on specific college organizations may be better completed with qualitative research methods where generalization is not the goal.

The following section contains a more in-depth discussion about the characteristics of co-curricular programs as well as the impact co-curricular programming has on college success.

Co-Curricular Programming

Defining co-curricular programs. As mentioned in Chapter 1, co-curricular activities are not a new phenomenon in higher education. Elias and Drea (2013) stated that co-curricular activities should strengthen and align with students' academic coursework. Originally created and operated by students (Geiger, 2015), co-curricular programs have become an essential part of the college experience with faculty and staff taking a more active role in the creation and maintenance of these organizations. Additionally, Suskie (2015) found these experiences enhanced student learning outcomes, increased problem-solving potential, and aided in the development of leadership skills. In contrast to the in-class environment, where professors serve as facilitators of knowledge and encourage growth, co-curricular programs give students opportunities to become more autonomous in their learning and evolution (Elias & Drea, 2013). Since colleges have begun to fund and sponsor these types of organizations, it is apparent there is an understanding of the significance of engaging students outside the classroom (Elias & Drea, 2013; Suskie, 2015). In light of this, we should look further into what programs are considered to be co-curricular.

Looking at the explanation of co-curriculars, we know they are most beneficial when events and organizations closely align with academic learning outcomes. Suskie (2015) gave examples of such programming options: "athletics, cultural experiences such as lectures, exhibits, and performances, service learning experiences, clubs, and field experiences such as internships, practicums, and clinical activities" (p. 6). Although at first glance questions might arise as to why athletics is listed, we need to remember playing sports can teach cooperation and persistence, two skills necessary to be successful both in- and outside the classroom. To differentiate between what is co-curricular and what is extracurricular, we need to remember co-curricular activities should be connected on academic outcomes. For instance, events such as dances and concerts are generally viewed as extracurricular. Still, Suskie (2015) cautioned events which appear to be academic-free may not be, especially if students are planning and organizing said events. It can hardly be argued that learning is not taking place when an activity such as organizing a concert involves budgeting and extensive cooperation with others. While it can be agreed learning is occurring in these organizations or during sponsored events, does this translate to academic success within the classroom where the impact is said to be most relevant? Contained in the following section is an investigation into what current research is telling us about co-curricular programming and its influence on academic learning.

Literature on co-curricular programs.

Passive co-curricular involvement. The following studies focused on co-curricular programming as it relates to college success. In "Exploring the Association

between Campus Co-Curricular Involvement and Academic Achievement," Bergen-Cico and Viscomi (2012) explored the connection between passive student engagement in co-curriculars and in-class academic performance. For the purposes of their study "passive student engagement is defined as student attendance as campus-sponsored co-curricular programs, but does not involve co-curricular involvement, which is more active, such as … student organizations" (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012, p.330). The authors chose to study two cohorts of students (n = 1437 and n = 1710) who attended events moderately over an eight-semester period. Student identification cards were used to monitor attendance at programs as well as obtain information relating to academic performance over this eight-semester time frame. Results for both cohorts were similar.

Those students who attended five or more events each semester tended to have higher grade point averages (GPA) at the end of each semester than those students who did not attend at least five events. Bergen-Cico and Viscomi (2012) concluded the results of this research showed a relationship between attendance at passive co-curricular events and achievement. These results lend further credence to the idea that academic performance may be enhanced by activities outside the classroom (Elias & Drea, 2013; Suskie, 2015), though the authors felt further research was necessary to determine why the connection between co-curricular event attendance and GPA exists. The next two studies are both centered around service-learning and its impact on students participating in these programs.

Service learning. Service-learning is a co-curricular program in which "opportunities for learning and reflection are integrated into the structure of the program

… [and] is explicitly designed to promote learning about [various] contexts that underlie the needs or issues the students address" (Jacoby, 2015, p.3). So, service-learning courses and programs attempt to be intentional about associating in-class learning objectives with outside-of-class activities. Samuelson, Smith, Stevenson, and Ryan's (2013) original focus of their study was more of a program assessment, as they were initially interested in why people chose to participate in the service-learning project and what changes could be made to improve the student experience. The program the authors were evaluating was based on a learning community housed in the same residence hall with a focus on completing service-learning projects involving international communities. Data from participants was collected through interviews and surveys.

In addition to learning about possible improvements to the program, Samuelson et al. (2013) discovered many of those who joined this learning community did so because of their interest in creating social change. Moreover, although little of what was completed for the service-learning project was directly related to their coursework, the researchers found the students evolving on their perceptions of teamwork (Samuelson et al., 2013). Students now saw working together as a way to solidify partnerships and improve the quality of their work (Samuelson et al., 2013). The idea that these projects did not necessarily relate to on-going coursework, but had students still gaining an understanding of the significance of working on a team is an example of why Suskie (2015) cautioned against judging co-curriculars which do not appear to have any academic value. Similar findings were present in the other service-learning study.

Conducting a longitudinal study on students participating in a service-learning scholarship program, Keen and Hall (2009) wanted to determine whether these types of programs result in students receiving the whole college experience, specifically as it related to diversity. Students awarded the Bonner Scholarship come from various colleges and universities around the country but are mainly found in the Appalachia region (Keen & Hall, 2009). After four years, students complete, on average, 1,680 service hours (Keen & Hall, 2009). To collect data, the authors used surveys which Bonner scholars completed each year they attended college.

What Keen and Hall (2009) found were students who not only performed well academically, but also grew personally and became more civic-minded. Moreover, as students progressed through the program, they became aware of the need for skills which allowed the, interact with those different from themselves (Keen & Hall, 2009). The authors attributed participants' recognition of this ability to individuals the students interacted with, including each other, during their service-learning experiences. Like the Bergen-Cico and Viscomi (2012) study, this study found an increase in academic performance, though results were not specific as to what academic areas where this improvement occurred. On par with Samuleson et al. (2009), students of this study became more civic-minded and developed an appreciation for working as a team. With one of the basic tenants of service-learning being a reflective learner (Jacoby, 2015), these two studies on service-learning show while not directly related to academic measures, skills like working cooperatively with others and becoming culturally aware is an expectation of college-age students.

In recent years, the United States has hosted twice the amount of international college students than any other country in the world (Zong & Batalova, 2016). These statistics corroborate the notion that we are more and more becoming a global society. It is then not surprising co-curricular programs are being developed to help students become more globally competent and to help international students adjust to life in the United States.

A first-year course at Southeastern University has been created for students who want to understand what it means to be a global citizen. Students who take this course are expected to advance life skills, acquire skills for academic success, and understand the importance of the relationship between the campus and the community which surrounds it (NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017). Also, students are asked to compete in an essay contest, with 10 students selected to participate in a trip to Washington, DC. Those chosen to visit various government institutions and officials to gain a more in-depth understanding of what it means to be a global citizen (NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017). Using widely accepted practices of service-learning, including journaling, written and group reflection, field notes and observations (Jacoby, 2015), NguyenVoges and Lyons (2017) gathered data from their students. Below are the results.

Unlike the service-learning specific and the passive co-curricular studies (Bergen & Cico, 2012; Keen & Hall, 2009; Samuelson et al., 2013), NguyenVoges and Lyons (2017) found students directly connected their experience to what was happening within the confines of the classroom. This is not surprising so much as one can see how the developers of the course took strides to ensure the co-curricular activity could be related

back to the coursework. While not directly related to the desired course outcomes, students also became familiarized with the differences of living and working in a big city versus a small town or suburb where most students lived (NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017). Although this seems somewhat trivial, as the authors mention, this experience gave students insight into how to live and establish relationships with people different from themselves (NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017). These results appeared to be indicative of what co-curriculars should enhance in students' lives outside the classroom (Elias & Drea, 2013; Suskie, 2015). The next study examined how co-curricular programs contribute to creating a sense of community.

　　　　Sense of community. Understanding the influence of creating a sense of community while at college and the impact co-curricular programs may play in various arenas of college success, Glass, Gesing, Hales, and Cong (2017) investigated faculty interaction outside class and its influence on students' sense of community and participation in co-curricular activities. Using a sample of 2252 undergraduate international students enrolled in degree programs across the United States, Glass et al. (2017) collected data through an online survey, the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI). The analysis of data brought three major findings. First, interaction with professors outside of class had a significant relationship with students' sense of community and co-curricular participation (Glass et al., 2017). Second, communication with students from a variety of cultures was related to higher participation in co-curriculars and building a sense of community (Glass et al., 2017). Finally, results indicated there was no

significant relationship between sense of community and participation in co-curricular
events (Glass et al., 2017).

Of the results, the last one was somewhat surprising. However, if we take into
account the purpose of co-curricular activities as not necessarily being to create a sense of
community, it does not diminish the importance of these events. Because this was simply
a survey, all we know is interactions with professors outside of class and with a group of
diverse peers increases sense of community and engagement with co-curriculars.
Although we know there was no significant relationship between sense of community and
co-curricular events, we cannot be for sure students gained nothing of merit regarding
skills related to college success. Contrary to the other studies discussed, Glass et al.
(2017) seems to be more useful in giving insight into how to get international students
involved with the campus versus how co-curricular activities shaped the student. Once
again, with US colleges and universities having the largest population of international
students in the world (Zong & Batalova, 2016), we need to know how to best get them
involved in co-curricular activities, which according to the other studies may aid in
college success (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012; Keen & Hall, 2009; NguyenVoges &
Lyons, 2017; Samuelson et al., 2013). The concluding study's focal point is on how to
promote student leadership amongst undergraduate engineering students through co-
curricular activities.

Student leadership. Seeing a need to determine how best to provide
undergraduate engineering students with the skills to be leaders in their fields, Knight and
Novoselich (2017) looked toward co-curricular programs. The purpose of their research

was to understand what experiences are most beneficial to creating leadership skills in engineering students. Online surveys were sent to students at approximately 150 engineering programs at a total of 30 different schools. Knight and Novoselich (2017) found participation in research, internships, clubs (engineering and non-engineering), and community service were statistically significant when it came to the relationship between these activities and the growth of leadership skills. Although these results appear to shed a positive light on co-curricular activities, the authors argued these programs do not align closely enough with the engineering curriculum (Knight & Novoselich 2017). As a result, Knight and Novoselich (2017) stated engineering-specific skills needed for leadership in the field are not actually developed through co-curricular programming, therefore making them ineffective for this use. Interestingly, this study is different from the others discussed previously.

While Knight and Novoselich (2017) found students believed there was development of their leadership skills through co-curricular programming, the authors discount this experience, as it is not assured these experiences are directly related to the engineering curriculum. Though the other studies may have viewed these results more positively, it makes sense there was hesitation on the part of Knight and Novoselich (2017). Although we know co-curriculars do not have to be explicitly linked to a course's learning outcomes (Elias & Drea, 2013; Suskie, 2015), it makes sense if the goal is to assist students in gaining the leadership skills necessary for a professional engineer. In these instances, it is essential whatever activities they are participating in help exclusively in this area. This leads to the other difference between this research and the

others. College success appeared to be the main focus of the other studies (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012; Glass et al., 2017; Keen & Hall, 2009; NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017; Samuelson et al., 2013) while Knight and Novoselich (2017), on the other hand, were concerned with students acquiring the leadership skills to be successful in the workforce. This may also further explain the desire for a more intentional link from the engineering curriculum to the co-curriculum.

An examination of the literature concerning co-curricular activities and their impact on students reveals these programs may be beneficial in helping students enhance their academic prowess as well as helping them developmentally. In particular, the literature which focused on service-learning and global citizenship appeared to allow students to become more culturally aware and understanding of the difference that exist amongst communities (Glass et al., 2017; Keen & Hall, 2009; NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017; Samuelson et al., 2013). These experiences seemed to help support students' self-authorship, especially as it pertained to becoming more culturally aware. It should be mentioned, however, that the studies were for the most part somewhat narrow in scope, as their primary concern was college success. Only one study, Knight and Novoselich (2017), examined how co-curriculars impacted students during and after college. Moreover, there was a lack of explanation as to *why* these programs were so beneficial in aiding students academically and developmentally. How co-curriculars may affect students well beyond college life and why co-curriculars are so influential to college success are areas which appear to need further study.

Summary

In this chapter I explored the unique history of the campus protests in the 1960s and 1970s. Specifically, I examined how co-curricular programs played a role in establishing a culture of student activism at certain universities which still exists today (Van Dyke, 1998). Next, I established the theoretical assumptions which will guide my research. Because of the wide array of co-curriculars available on American college campuses, it makes sense that some of the programs may play a hand in helping to support students' development of self-authorship, socially integrate, and develop a sense of community. Knowing self-authorship creates the ability to understand your own belief system (Baxter Magolda, 2008), I made the decision to allow participants in the study to pontificate on their personal understanding of success versus limiting them with my notion of success. This led to an examination of alumni assessments.

Alumni assessments are critical to universities as they provide value insight into a college or university's performance in a wide array of areas (Volkwein, 2010a). Where these surveys fail is how many appear to lump success with financial wealth. Furthermore, survey questions focused on co-curricular activities and their relationship to student success were narrowly focused on experiences such as internships, which are requirements of graduation for some programs. Because of this, we are not given a complete picture on the types of co-curricular experiences which aid in success after college. This discrepancy is also noticeable in studies focused the impact of co-curriculars on students, as most focus on college success (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012; Glass et al., 2017; Keen & Hall, 2009; NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017; Samuelson et al.,

2013). As a result, there are gaps in the literature as it pertains to co-curricular program and their relationship to post-collegiate success, specifically what aspects of the program may have aided in future successes.   In the next chapter, I give a detailed explanation on the methods I used to conduct my case study of the Ohio Fellows.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Seeing the potential to attract better qualified students, Ohio University president Vernon Alden initiated the creation of the honors college and other programs which sought to challenge students and develop critical thinking and leadership skills. One such program created under the direction of President Alden was the Ohio Fellows. Though housed under the guise of an honors programs, those affiliated with the program in the past and present are quick to challenge this assumption as student grades are not a factor in acceptance to the Fellows. Coordinated and directed by President Alden, the Ohio Fellows brought together a unique group of individuals with talents in a myriad of areas. Students participating in the Ohio Fellows were expected to go on to lead successful lives by utilizing the connections made and skills gained from interactions with leaders from various industries during their time in this program.

Based on previous research (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012; Elias & Drea, 2013; Keen & Hall, 2009; Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010; Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017; NguyenVoges & Lyons, 2017; Rail, et al, 2017; Rathburn-Grubb, 2016; Suskie, 2015), we know co-curricular programs, such as the Ohio Fellows, may have a significant influence on student development, retention, persistence, and contributes to workforce preparedness. With this knowledge, the purpose of this study is to investigate whether a donor-funded program creates experiences which provides opportunities for student growth. Moreover, if this growth does occur and students become more self-aware, integrate more fully into the university, and develop a sense of community, does this also contribute to student success in and out of college and if so, how? To determine whether

the Ohio Fellows played a role in student development and success, a plan was developed to study the program and its participants. In Chapter 3, I describe the research design for this study, data collection methods, population and sample, data analysis, and validity and reliability.

Research Design

To answer the research questions addressed in Chapter One, I conducted a qualitative case study. Merriam (1998) described qualitative research as having five characteristics: interest in meaning constructed by people, the researcher as the instrument for which data collection and analysis occurs, fieldwork, the implementation of inductive research, and a rich descriptive product. Like Merriam, Patton (2015) believed the qualitative researcher wants to capture narratives of individuals in order to make meaning of why issues exist in relation to the participants' perspective and context. For some educational researchers, knowing *why* certain university experiences lead to alumni success is more significant than simply knowing they do. In my opinion, providing evidence beyond results found in a Likert scale survey can serve as justification for the financial expense which goes into co-curricular programming. Because I was interested in how the experiences of the participants in the Ohio Fellows program may have contributed to their post-collegiate success, qualitative research was conducted using a case study approach.

Case study. Creswell (2017) defined a case study as "an in-depth exploration of a bounded system (e.g., activity, event, process, or individuals) based on extensive data collection" (p. 465). Merriam (1998) asserted that a bounded system is the defining

characteristic of a case study. Furthermore, if the phenomenon is not inherently bounded, Merriam (1998) argued the topic cannot justifiably be a case study. For instance, my focus was on participants in the Ohio Fellows. Due to such a specific population parameter, documents analyzed were bound by archives specific to the Fellows, and who I observed and interviewed were individuals who either participated in or were affiliated with (donors and directors) the program. Therefore, the case is defined as the Ohio Fellows program in this study. Additionally, the utilization of a case study for this research can be viewed in two ways. First, as an "intrinsic interest" (Creswell, 2017, p. 465; Merriam, 1998, p. 28), as some of the original cohorts of the Ohio Fellows are financially successful. Secondly is what Creswell (2017) called instrumental, since what was studied aimed to highlight the significance of co-curricular activities on alumni success. Regardless of the situation, because the focus was maintained on the Ohio Fellows program, the case is classified as a bounded system. Beyond a bounded system, case studies have other characteristics.

Though there is not a definitive consensus on the major characteristics of case studies, any aspect defined as such bears the essence of qualitative inquiry. Though not phrased in the same manner, both Patton (2015) and Merriam (1998) held case studies are "particularistic" (Merriam, 1998, p. 29). This means the attention of the study is particular to a certain person, event, program, culture, or any phenomenon which one wants to study holistically (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2015). Because case studies are holistic in nature, results of this approach are descriptive (Merriam, 1998). Unlike quantitative research which relies on numbers to assist in accurately portraying findings,

qualitative research is concerned with in-depth descriptions and analyses which aid the reader in gaining a full perspective of the entity being studied (Creswell, 2017; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). Moreover, data collected for case studies are always analyzed and reported by considering the context surrounding the data (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). Finally, case studies are heuristic, meaning the researcher "illuminate[s] the reader's understanding of the phenomenon under study" (Merriam, 1998, p. 30) by explaining how, what, and why events occurred to hopefully strengthen the research's applicability. Specific types of case studies are also unique in their own right.

For this study on the Ohio Fellows, I completed a historical case study. A historical case study can be viewed as a coalescence of historical research and case study (Merriam, 1998). While some historical research depends heavily on primary source material (Merriam, 1998), a historical case study builds on data collection through interviews and observations, which is seen as a strength in historical case studies (Yin, 2009). Since my particular case study is focused on the past and modern-day operations of the Ohio Fellows there may be some questions about denoting my research as a historical case study; however, as Yin (2009) pointed out, histories can be based on contemporary events. Correspondingly, historical case studies completed in the field of education generally describe the evolution of practices or, in my case, programs at institutions (Merriam, 1998). It is hoped through the completion of a historical case study that not only can programs offered by the university be improved, but for results to be used to help inform policy as well (Merriam, 1998). But for results to be scrutinized,

data must first be collected. In the following section, I discuss data collection for my study.

Data Collection

Data relating to the Ohio Fellows and post-collegiate success were collected via three methods: semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and observation. In this section, each of these approaches are discussed.

Interviews. Semi-structured interviews stylistically fall between structed and unstructured interviews. Edwards and Holland (2013) explained the semi-structured interview as having a set of guiding questions which are adaptable depending on how the interview is progressing. Because I am a novice researcher, I felt a semi-structured interview allowing for pre-planned questions or topics which needed to be covered would ensure I collected the necessary data. Unlike a structured interview, which is more quantitative in nature, the researcher has the option to ask follow-up and probing questions. Through this interviewing style I also was able to respond to the interviewee's experiences more freely. Hence, I was able to further explore areas of interest which naturally came up during interviews due to the style not being as rigid as structured interviewing. Semi-structured interviewing, due to its nature, is viewed as a formal conversation (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; Josselson, 2013; Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Seidman, 2013), which allows the researcher to have the ability to establish a friendly rapport while at the same time keeping their distance from the participant as the researcher. Due to the fact that the Ohio Fellows' history begins in the late 1960s and

was defunct for decades, I believed document analysis was important in gaining a holistic understanding of the program.

Document analysis. Visiting Ohio University's archive in Alden Library gave me the opportunity to search for pictures and written documents related to the first several cohorts and new cohorts of the Ohio Fellows. When doing a document analysis, it is important to look past what is directly written or shown in pictures. Exploring the context in which the documents are produced can lead to greater insight into the information presented to the reader. The notion of ensuring context is accounted for is one previously discussed as being essential to case study research (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). Additionally, when we look at pictures, they also tell a story not written by the clothes, hair, or even the environment in which the photo has been taken. By taking the time to completely immerse myself in the documents, I hoped to learn more about the history of the Ohio Fellows program and their impact on campus.

Interestingly, during the 1970 campus riots and sensing the Ohio Fellows would not be continued the following year, one of the original cohort members made the decision to take some of the documentation concerning the Fellows with him when the campus was closed. These files were made available to me and were a source of valuable data. Although the archives provided no photographic documentation, there was a wealth of written and typed information. Spending approximately ten hours over a course of 3 days in the archives I examined papers relating to everything from the initial planning stages of the program to memos on best recruitment practices. Of all the documents examined, the program proposal was probably the most beneficial, as it provided

justification for the creation of the Fellows as well as detailed the experiences the founders hoped to provide students in order to facilitate the stated goals of the program. Though not part of my research, I gained insight into the actual operation of the Fellows versus the theoretical plans. Moreover, through these documents, I could see the continued assessment of the program and the desire to improve areas such as recruitment, internships, and field experiences. This was significant because it provided context behind changes made during the actual implantation of the Ohio Fellows. Although much data can be gained from interviews and document analysis, observation adds further dimension to the data.

Observation. Unlike quantitative observations which concentrate on a measured or numerical value of what is being witnessed, qualitative observation is concerned with description and deep understanding of everything in the field where research is being conducted. Patton (2015) stated "[s]cientific inquiry using observational methods requires disciplined training, systematic preparation, and readiness" (pg. 330). As an observer, the job is not to interpret what is happening in the location, but to collect data using one's senses to describe that which is being witnessed. Through participant observation the researcher develops a further understanding of the topic being researched which, in turn, allows for the creation of more precise interview questions in context to observed interactions and behaviors (Glesne, 2016). Glesne (2016) made the argument that the idea of participant observation is a contradiction in that it can fall within various locations on a continuum with the observer-end being one where there is little interaction with those being studied. There is no correct place to be on the scale; where a researcher

places him- or herself solely depends on what is right for what he or she is trying to accomplish.

The observations carried out for this research put me more as an observer than a participant observer. Observational data about the Ohio Fellows was collected during a reunion held on June 2, 2018 from 10:00 am to 3:00 pm in the Vernon R. Alden library on the Ohio University campus. Since my goal was to allow this meeting to flow as naturally as possible, observations made during interviews were noted and I did not fully insert myself in the goings-on of this event. At the reunion, my notes were taken on a laptop using a .txt file and in a composition book. Students from recent cohorts presented research funded through the Ohio Fellows and discussed the impact the program had on their time as undergraduates at the university. While this was occurring, one of the original Fellows, Tom, was interviewing other Fellows from his generation in a different room. What I consider the main event of the reunion occurred when the Fellows of both generations gathered and spoke of the influence the program had on their lives in college and beyond. Recording of these conversations occurred but was not included in my data as much of what was shared at the tables was also spoken about during my individual interviews.

Sampling procedure. Qualitative research requires the researcher to perform purposeful sampling. Using purposeful sampling increases the possibility of obtaining a quality in-depth interview which adds to our research, not detracting from it (Patton, 2015; Seidman, 2013). Seidman (2013) asserted by employing purposeful sampling there is a higher likelihood that readers will resonate with the research. This sampling method

speaks true to the intent of my research, as my goal was to gain the perspectives of students whose experiences on the Ohio University campus would not necessarily be similar but still lead to successful lives.

Because I completed a historical case study focusing on the evolution of a co-curricular program and how the program contributes to post-collegiate success, possible interviewees came from a predetermined group of individuals. Due to the fact there were relatively few people I could interview for my study, as they must be associated with the Ohio Fellows program, purposeful sampling was utilized. To identify potential interviewees, I was provided with a list of current and former members of the Ohio Fellows program from the director, Dr. Christine Fowler. Some of those on the provided list were Fellows I had limited interactions with during the reunion. Though, Dr. Fowler may also be viewed as a gatekeeper as she provided me access to participants from both generations.

Participants. Before beginning the process of contacting former Ohio Fellow participants, I received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (Appendix A). Due to the fact my research posed minimal risk to participants, the research was approved as "exempted." After receiving IRB approval, I contacted possible research participants via email (Appendix B) from the lists provided to me. Those who agreed to participate in the study signed consent forms (Appendix C) and were verbally made aware of their rights as participants in a research project before interviews began. Participants were notified of the intention to use real names, but first-names only, in the consent form. Those who wished to remain anonymous were given pseudonyms. Of those from the provided lists

of former and current Ohio Fellows, I interviewed 10 members of the original 1960s cohorts, 6 members of the new incarnation of the Ohio Fellows, and 4 Faculty Fellows. From those in the new cohorts, 3 have graduated from Ohio University. Furthermore, I interviewed the current director of the Ohio Fellows, Dr. Fowler, as well as 2 other administrators associated with the program. This provided for a sample size of 23 individuals who either participated in or are affiliated with the program.

Interview protocol. I conducted semi-structured interviews, and the data were recorded on my phone and iPad. Interview questions varied depending on if the participant was an Ohio Fellow from the 1960s, recent member, Faculty Fellow, or administrator (Appendix D). Conducting in-person interviews was important as I believed this is the best way to establish rapport. When thinking about location, it was obvious a quiet place was ideal, but I also took into consideration where the interviewee felt comfortable. As a result, interviews took place in offices, study rooms, private residences, a coffee shop, and a church basement. For alumni who were too far to travel to, interviews were done via Skype or telephone. Interview transcription was completed through a transcription service, Rev.com. During this process it was discovered the audio file for the director was corrupt. In consideration for her time, a new in-person interview was not scheduled; instead, the director was gracious enough to complete a written interview.

Data Analysis. According to Yin (2009), the analysis of case studies can prove to be a daunting task, even for experienced researchers, due to the multiple sources of data collected throughout the research process. In contrast to statistical analysis, where

analytical methods have constraints and guidelines to aid the researcher, analyzing

qualitative data from a case study relies heavily on the individual researcher's "rigorous

empirical thinking" (Yin, 2009, p. 127) in conjunction with adequate evidence and well-

thought-out alternate explanations. In presenting the large amount of data, the researcher

must provide readers with the thick and rich description characterizing qualitative

research (Merriam, 1998; Patton 2015; Yin, 2009). With knowledge of the challenges

associated with case study analysis, this section discusses the analytical methods

employed during data analysis for this investigation and explores the reasonings behind

these approaches.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the theoretical frameworks guiding my research

were Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship, Tinto's social integration theory, and

Park's sense of community. Yin (2009) found grounding research in theory as one of the

ideal strategies for case study analysis, as it requires the researcher to refer to said theory

when conceptualizing various stages of the research process. The theory utilized plays an

integral role as the researcher is guided by the chosen theory throughout the process of

the study. Furthermore, this aids in data analysis as the researcher has a specific focus

and therefore is particular regarding the evidence and results presented, as each should

hold some relation to the theoretical framework (Yin, 2009). Because of the abundance

of data created through a case study, the focus a theory creates is a necessity (Yin, 2009).

To find elements of Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship, Tinto's social integration

theory, and Park's sense of community in documents and interviews, a combination of

content analysis and Merriam open and axial coding was utilized.

Content analysis requires the researcher to analyze text from interviews or documents rather than observation notes (Patton, 2015; Merriam, 1998). Through this process, meaning is made of the data from interviews through the analysis of patterns (descriptive data) and themes (a category with similar patterns) (Patton, 2015; Merriam, 1998). Due to the reliance on the frequency of patterns and themes which occur in interviews while completing document analysis, content analysis is historically viewed as a qualitative analysis (Merriam, 1998). But, as Merriam (1998) points out, when used qualitatively, the emphasis shifts from a focus on frequency to one of making meaning of the communication. To add further depth to the analysis of interviews, Merriam open and axial coding was utilized in conjunction with content analysis.

Merriam's (1998) coding requires two levels of coding: open and axial. The first level, open, was completed by identifying and highlighting significant concepts on interview transcripts. This is followed by the second level, axial, where notes were made in the margins to explain the reasoning behind identifying these concepts. Because content analysis does not include the highlighting of concepts and justification in the margins, I felt it was essential to combine the two methods of analysis. While much can be learned from simply reading and studying interviews repeatedly, highlighting and making notes of what and why certain content is significant allows the researcher to more easily identify patterns and themes. Moreover, a combination of the methods is necessary because Merriam open and axial coding cannot be used for document analysis while content analysis can.

Establishing the patterns and themes found in the interviews of the Fellows was a lengthy process. I first read each transcript without focusing on any one aspect of my research, which allowed me to get a feel for the flow and construction of the interview. Then, for every research question, I re-read the transcripts, searching for and highlighting information pertaining to that question. Highlighting was done in varying colors as to allow me to align a specific color to each research question. Notes were made in the margins when I saw patterns and themes emerging or when data was glaring different from the rest. Ensuring I did not overlook any important data was essential, so I again re-read the transcripts to determine if I missed any significant content. To finalize the themes, I reviewed each research question, re-read the highlighted information associated with said question, and was very intentional about reviewing any notes previously made about reoccurring comments I saw in prior readings. As with the highlighting and note-taking, the finalizing of themes and patterns found in the interview transcripts was completed twice. From these analyses, a final theme construction occurred using all data.

Using evidence gathered from my three methods of data collection (observation, document analysis, and interviews) the next part of the analysis process was to create final categories or themes. For instance, when students of the original cohorts spoke of vital components of the program across their individual interviews, it was possible for me to return to the archival data and determine if these areas were also part of the original plan for the Fellows. It is essential to note that these three methods of data collection were only fully used in the making of themes for the Original Ohio Fellows, as archival material did not include modern day information on the Fellows and observation was

completed at a reunion primarily attendee by the original cohorts. Still, categories for both generations of Fellows were not arbitrarily generated but instead formed based on evidence from data and related to the direction of the research (Merriam, 1998).

As a result of the nature of the creation of categories, it is imperative that not only is data analysis occurring throughout the data collection process, but also being translated with the purpose of the research in mind. Essential to this process is the ability of the researcher to identify categories which arise across and within data collection methods (Merriam, 1998). By doing so, the researcher shows commonality between the data thereby creating "units of data" (Merriam, 1998, p. 179). These units of data are generally information significant to the study which do not need additional context to be comprehended by the reader. During the data collection stage of my research this creation occurred quite frequently, as information shared with me during interviews would connect with information found in the archives and vice versa. Making notes of these connections in my composition book or on my laptop were vital to the theme-creation process.

Finally, the number of categories and subcategories created from the units of data is reliant on data and the research itself (Merriam, 1998). Through analysis of my data, I found it necessary to create subcategories in some instances, as there were times when I found patterns within the overarching theme that required the development of a subtheme. For some research the process of developing categories leads to the development of a theory, but this was not the aim of my research. Instead, only themes

will be presented in the subsequent chapters. Crucial to the research was also the ability

to ensure the validity and reliability of the study.

  Validity and reliability. To construct a superior analysis, Yin (2009) argued the

researcher must be mindful of all evidence, address other possible interpretations, report

the most meaningful aspects of the case, and utilize their own expertise through

knowledge of the literature. In order to address these areas within my case study and

attend to validity and reliability, I employed several methods.

  Triangulation. Through the collection of data from a multitude of areas, my goal

as a researcher was to ensure validity to my data through triangulation. Triangulation is a

method used by researchers as a way to validate their data and make it more trustworthy

(Creswell, 2012; Patton, 2015). There are four types of triangulation widely employed:

data, investigator, theory, and methodological (Patton, 2015; Yin, 2009). For the

purposes of this study, methodological triangulation was used. For methodological

triangulation, the researcher uses more than one method for data collection (Patton,

2015). In this case study, I used interviews, document analysis, and observation as my

approaches to the collection of data. Some qualitative researchers argue the practice of

triangulation as being unnecessary, as finding a common-sense approach by using more

self-awareness generally helps to guarantee validity (Seidman, 2013).   Personally,

though, I viewed the use of multiple data sources – interviews, document analysis, and

observation – as strengthening my research. Interviews have the potential to confirm

thoughts on occurrences during observations, while document analysis may give the

researcher an idea of aspects to focus on during observations and interviews. Through

the combination of multiple collection methods, it was my hope to not only add depth of detail to my research, but also mitigate any perceived biases of the researcher as instrument. The next validity check I used was peer examination.

Peer examination. Because all analysis was completed by me, it was important there be no apparent biases in the reporting. To circumvent overt bias and add to the quality of the case study (Yin, 2009), I utilized peer examination, which is simply "asking colleagues to comment on findings as they emerge" (Merrian, 1998, p. 204). While creating themes and categories, I periodically had a fellow doctoral student and others familiar with higher education review my findings. Through the process of peer examination, I ensured the analysis and reporting done was based on evidence found in the data collection process and not based on my feelings or opinions. By allowing peers to comment on findings I hoped they would give me differing opinions than those I drew (Yin, 2009). Another area of validity utilized was that of member checking.

Member checking. Member checking is the act of taking data you've collected and analyzed back to said participant to determine whether what was collected and interpreted was an accurately represented them (Creswell, 2015; Merriam, 1998). According to Creswell (2015) this process may be completed through writing (email) or in-person in an interview-type format, but always requires the participant to decide if what was said during the interview or the conclusions the researchers came to were accurate. For the purposes of my research, I completed what I called "member check lite."

Though the voice of the participant is essential to qualitative research, I feared the loss of my voice as the researcher if my analysis and conclusions were dependent upon those in the Ohio Fellows being studied. Therefore, participants were sent their respective interview transcripts to examine. The email requested participants read over the interview transcript to clear up any possible misunderstandings and clarify points they were trying to make. Although I only heard back from 9 of my 23 participants, with only 5 providing edits, by completing member checking in this manner I could ensure participants' voices were represented accurately without compromising the integrity of the analysis. The final method of reliability and validity used was the identification of researcher bias.

Researcher bias. An important distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is the role the researcher plays in the process. In qualitative research, the primary instrument for data collection and analysis is the researcher. As such, the researcher must acknowledge they are a human instrument and the primary research tool. This plays in stark contrast to quantitative research which relies on statistical analyses usually run through programs such as SPSS to analyze data. With this in mind, qualitative researchers should consider their own biases and views throughout the data collection, analysis, interpretation, and reporting phases of the research. Because of our intimacy with the data, it is significant to clarify assumptions, personal perspectives, and the worldview of the researcher (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2015).

In the case of this researcher, it is important to note that I have never taken part in a co-curricular program. From an outsider's perspective, I believe if I had participated in

such programs, I myself would not have struggled as much during my undergraduate career. It should be mentioned, however, that my undergraduate institution did not appear to have near the programs other colleges and universities had at the time. Moreover, I know there are cases of forced participation by parents which may end in results similar to mine. This lack of participation in a co-curricular program limits my insight, but also leaves me with an open mind.

Finally, while there are many definitions of success, some of which were discussed in my literature review, I ascribe to the idea that success is multi-dimensional and lies on a spectrum which changes depending on where one is in their life. One of the aspects which drew me to this project was the fact that many of the original Ohio Fellows found success in a myriad of ways. Personally, I define success past the financial aspect, believing it also deals with personal and professional happiness. My understanding of success compared to other's understandings might constitute a bias.

Summary

Chapter 3 began with an overview and history of the Ohio Fellows program. This included the founding by President Alden to the re-establishment of the program by alumni donors. The chapter also encompassed information pertaining to the methodological design of this study, more specifically the use of a historical case study to examine the impact of the Ohio Fellows on post-collegiate success. Highlighted were the reasonings behind why such an approach made sense in terms of this research. Additionally, a discussion on data collection methods was had. The use of observation, interviews, and document analysis to collect data would also help with validity through

methodological triangulation. Concluding the chapter was a discussion on researcher

positionality to add to the trustworthiness of the research.

Chapter Four: Results

In this chapter, I explore the development of the Ohio Fellows and those who played a role in its inception. Additionally, by analyzing participants' interviews, I answer my research questions introduced in Chapter One. For the purposes of this case study, the first section of this chapter focuses on the Ohio Fellows Program from 1964 to 1970, while the second half focuses on the redevelopment and reestablishment of the program from 2013 to present.

The Ohio Fellows: Development and Recruitment History

Exploring the information on the Ohio Fellows housed in the archives of Ohio University provided insight into the inner workings of the early days of the program. At its inception, the Ohio Fellows was developed to serve as an experimental program with high aspirations: specifically, producing future leaders of the United States. Planned as a completely self-sustaining program in 1964, the Ohio Fellows sought and received funding from a variety of organizations such as the Mead Foundation, the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trust, the Ford Foundation, and the Richardson Foundation (Ohio University (OU) Archives). Dean Leslie Rollins, who served as assistant dean of the Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration from 1942 to 1966, was a research fellow at Ohio University and consultant for the Ohio Fellows from 1966 to 1970, and was instrumental in securing private funding (OU Archives). Because of the focus on developing future leaders, it made sense to President Alden and Dean Rollins to seek out grants from organizations that might potentially be future beneficiaries of these students. Grant money provided for more autonomous use of funds and allowed the

program to be tailored to fit the experiences the developers envisioned for participating students without the oversight required when using state appropriations.

Specifically, the Ohio Fellows was designed to guide men and women who showed leadership potential through their four years at the university in a supplemental co-curriculum, which included opportunities to participate in research, seminars, internships, and interactions with leaders from around the country (OU Archives). Plans for students to journal their experiences were also included in the original proposal for the Ohio Fellows as it would serve as a culminating piece on the students' life in the program (OU Archives). Interestingly, the initial blueprint for the program was very structured, unlike what is reported by participants, which will be discussed further later in this chapter.

With one exception, students entered the Fellows in their sophomore year and began to take seminars on subjects ranging from self-development to the formation of society (OU Archives). As with the journal, which requires the student to be reflective on their participation in the program, these types of seminars are what researchers today point to in helping students gain a deeper understanding of themselves and society as a whole (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Meents-DeCaigny & Sanders, 2015; Parks, 2000; Roberts, 2015; Voges & Lyons, 2017). In the following years, students were slated to explore such topics as human relations and societal theory and participate in compulsory summer internships. In addition to seminars and internships, students were also introduced to speakers from various industries from which one-on-one or group conversations would be possible (OU Archives). It is possible to extrapolate from these archival materials that

some of these seminars were created to follow basic tenets of Greenleaf's (1967) servant

leadership philosophy where the focus is on the significance of personal growth. Finding

students who may be best suited for this type of leadership philosophy was also a task for

the administrators of the Ohio Fellows program.

As described in Chapter One, the Ohio Fellows program was not developed to be

a typical scholarship or honors program. Only requiring a 2.0 GPA allowed for students

who may have shown potential but often were not the most academically gifted to be

considered for the program. Although it should be noted, according to documents in the

archives, administrators still viewed test scores from high school, including ACT and

SAT scores. While a strong emphasis was not placed on these areas of a student's

background, one may argue these metrics did seem to play a role in selecting potential

Fellows, although a minimal one.

In the planning stages of the program, Dean Rollins suggested a population of

potential Fellows be generated through students who attained high scores on Standard

Oil's Early Identification of Management Potential and NASA creativity tests, in

conjunction with predicted GPA (OU Archives). Preliminary plans also included the

creation of a test with the Richardson Foundation, an organization that addresses public

policy relating to social, economic, and governmental institutions in the United States, to

identify students. After the first cohort of Fellows was selected, Dean Rollins and Dr.

John Chandler, the Ohio Fellows Director and English Professor, attempted to identify

potential Fellows by having current Fellows complete personality tests. Seeking out

participants in the early days of the Fellows, however, was primarily done informally by

faculty who saw students they believed fit the profile Dean Rollins and Doctor Chandler were searching for in members. Students selected as potential members were interviewed by a committee which included both Dean Rollins and Dr. Chandler. Original plans included interviews designed to cover family background, overcoming obstacles, values, articulation, appearance, goals, and creativity. This interview was followed by a written essay and second interview if the student showed potential. While the archival documents do not include detailed descriptions of the selection process, it appears students who were chosen as finalists for the program participated in a day-long process which included a variety of group activities. Based on the outcome of this process, students determined to be ideal for the program were notified via mail.

Gaining acceptance into a program with such ambitious goals as the Ohio Fellows was an achievement in its own right, but it is valuable to determine whether a college program with the aim to nurture successful future leaders can accomplish this feat. From interviews conducted with the alumni who participated as members of this program, one can gain insight into the operations and relevance of the program. In particular, I investigated alumni's understanding of how the program aided them in both their mid- and post-college lives.

Case I: The Original Ohio Fellows

Background. Before describing the analysis and results of interviews with the original Ohio Fellows, it is important to first understand the individuals who agreed to participate in this study. Of the 23 participants, 10 were Fellows who took part in the program during its initial inception from the Fall of 1964 to the Spring of 1970. Of the

10 interviewed original Fellows, two were female and eight were male; all were Caucasian. Although I had control over recruitment of participants in this study, the gender and racial makeup of the sample was indicative of this time at Ohio University where there was a higher percentage of male students than female students (Ohio University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.a) and consistent with the trend of high Caucasian enrollment in relation to other races (Ohio University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.b). Similarly, those who attended the reunion held in June 2018 were predominately white males. Past the obvious physical markers, I will also discuss other aspects of Fellows alumni.

The original cohort of alumni who took part in this study were all residents of the state of Ohio when they were students. Furthermore, many came from lower- to middle-class backgrounds and were first-generation students. Polly, the only original Fellow I spoke with who was recruited to the program from high school, stated she "came from a family where no one had even gone to high school, much less attended college." Mike shared comparable sentiments saying "[w]hen I started college... no one in my family had really completed college." A large population of first-generation students during the 1960s would not have been unusual, however, due to a 120 percent enrollment increase in the country's colleges and universities during this era (National Center for Education Statistics, 1993). Aptly named the Baby Boomer generation, many of these students had parents who were raised when college was reserved for the wealthy elite. While this attribute was not unique to the Ohio Fellows, the idea that the program was inter-disciplinary was.

Co-curricular programming, dating back to the colonial times, has always revolved around gathering students with similar academic or non-academic interests. One dimension which set the Ohio Fellows apart was the idea that, while Dean Rollins and Dr. Chandler were searching for future leaders, they knew the students they were searching for would come from a variety of academic disciplines. Some of the original cohort members' fields of study included political science, economics, math, journalism, English, and zoology. Needless to say, career aspirations were varied as well amongst this group of alumni. From my interviews with these alumni, it seemed the administrators of the Ohio Fellows were not only interested in helping those who are obviously on the path for success but also more interested in those students who exhibited the characteristics they believed would assist in becoming successful and effective leaders.

In the following sections, an in-depth analysis provides insight into how the original cohort of Ohio Fellows define the program, success, their community, and how this co-curricular activity shaped their lives in and out of college. In Table 1 I have provided the names, college majors, and occupations of those Original Fellows who participated in this case study.

Table 1
Original Ohio Fellow Participants

Name	Major	Occupation
Bill	Political Science	Energy Lawyer
Craig	Zoology	Physician
Joel	Journalism	Musician
Mike	Independent Studies	Artist
Nancy	Political Science	Finance/Management
Polly	English	Psychologist
Ralph	Economics	Banking Consultant
Robert	Math	International Banking
Terry	General Studies	Business/Consulting
Tom	Journalism	Lawyer/Judge/Professor

Research question one: Original Ohio Fellows and defining the mission.

From the outset of this research, one issue that continually arose was how to best define

the Ohio Fellows program. Even though a brochure exists from the 1960s, which goes

into detail about what the program offers, it does not provide a distinct definition of the

mission of the program. To this day, many of the Fellows from the 1960s described the

program as somewhat mysterious and questioned why they were selected to participate.

When one thinks about programs like the Honors College or Literary clubs, by their

names one knows they are scholastically inclined or focused on literature. There is often

little ambiguity in relation to what these programs will offer students. As I examined

how this specific co-curricular program may have supported student success in college and beyond, it is useful to additionally determine what the mission of the program was from the perspective of the participants and how fulfilling the promises of the program may be associated with the 1960 Fellows' success.

Engaging multidisciplinary students. Based on the interviews with members of the Ohio Fellows there were several themes that emerged related to the mission of the program. The first theme related to engaging a group of students from a variety of academic disciplines. Of those interviewed, I spoke with majors from political science, economics, math, journalism, English, and zoology. On this topic Nancy stated, "I think it was ... about selecting very talented people, or people who appeared to have unique qualities or special qualities from all walks of interest and bringing them together to see what kind of a climate that would make." In a similar vein, Tom discussed how the program was intended to identify "multi-disciplinary talent" and nurture it. Beyond the multi-disciplinary nature of the program there were other areas Fellows associated with the mission.

Bringing in the outside world. In addition to convening a group of students from various colleges around the university, the second theme involved administrators of the program hoping to enrich students' lives by providing a perspective of the outside world. Nancy described this element of the program as "this idea about bringing the outside world to Ohio and bringing those folks to the outside world, making that connection, opening people's eyes." One way to accomplish this mission was by bringing in leaders from around the country. Ralph, adding to Nancy's position, explained "[the Ohio

Fellows] was giving young people the opportunity to see a wider horizon … We were exposed to important, and interesting people who visited the campus." As they were predominately from Ohio and first-generation students, it seems it was crucial for the Ohio Fellows to be given an opportunity to interact with people in varying careers from around the country, either in the form of guest speakers or internships. These interactions were seminal events for some of the Fellows and are discussed in further detail later.

Helping students reach their potential. The final theme was the idea that the program had the potential to bring out the best in people. As simply put by Polly, she felt the program "was to help us become the best people that we could become." The Fellows believed opportunities provided to them through the program aided in developing them into professionals who could go out into the world and be successful. By what Mike called "supercharging the educational experience," the administrators of the program were aiming, according to Terry, to "[teach] kids who were brilliant and passionate, not to underestimate themselves, not to be satisfied with lower thresholds to reach for the highest things they could possibly reach for, and to never be satisfied with anything other than that." From the words of the Fellows, I interpreted part of the mission of the program, as Robert and Craig also postulated, was to engage students who showed future leadership potential, so they could also be leaders in their fields. Using these three themes I developed a succinct way of viewing the mission of the Ohio Fellows.

My interpretation of mission. Focusing on the possible implications the Ohio Fellows program may have had on success in and out of the classroom, it was first

imperative for me to determine what the mission of the program was in order to draw conclusions about whether or not these goals were accomplished. For the purpose of this section of the paper, particularly in answering the fourth research question, I have drawn from the interviews to create my personal mission statement for the Ohio Fellows: *To engage students from a multitude of academic interests in order to develop successful and passionate future leaders in their field through a variety of exceptional educational opportunities.* By establishing a universal mission statement that resonates with the perspectives and experiences of the Fellows, I was better able to examine the efficacy of the program. Yet it is important to remember the concept of success has been defined in a myriad of ways. In the following section, I explore how success is viewed through the eyes of the Original Ohio Fellows.

Research question two: Original Ohio Fellows and their perspective on success. As discussed in Chapter Two, how individuals define success varies, but it is generally defined by an acquisition of financial wealth (Success, n.d.a; Success, n.d.b). Heath (1991), on the other hand, found happiness as paramount to success while wealth ranked last amongst participants. As a result of the ambiguous nature of success, I asked participants in my study to define this concept, so I could best establish how the Ohio Fellows program possibly aided them is attaining this ideal.

Personal and professional success. From the interviews of the original Ohio Fellows, there were shared themes that emerged in relation to their vision of success. First, success was generally categorized as personal or professional. Personal success may or may not be attributed to outcomes which are related to a person's career. For

instance, Mike felt success was "to have a satisfactory set of loving relationships in life

… in other words my wife, my children, my friends, that whole interpersonal part of life

is very key." Polly drew a connection between how professional success can also speak

to personal success when she expressed the importance of having a meaningful life with

no regrets, but for her this also includes leaving a legacy through her work and

manuscripts. On the professional end of success, Ralph expressed the desire to have a

positive impact on clients and to do well financially. Craig explicitly stated he does not

measure professional success by the amount of money he has made but is instead

concerned with having a positive effect on his patients' lives through providing care

based on decisions made together to best serve that person. The next theme revolves

around civic responsibility.

 Contributing to society. As Tom spoke about the different ways he categorizes

success, his definition of personal success revolved around the idea of "being able to

make the human condition better." Whether accomplished through a career or

volunteering, this was a reoccurring theme in interviews. For instance, Robert spoke of

people finding success through community works, such as becoming an alderman or

mayor, which can be interpreted as positions which give people the power to enact

change. Additionally, those who have been financially successful use income for

philanthropic causes.

 Although Ralph defined his success in terms of professional and financial success,

he uses this income to help support a variety of areas, such as the Ohio Fellows, non-

profits, and scholarships to first-generation students. Similarly, Terry has sponsored

projects which have won the Nobel Prize in Chemistry, and he helps fund a project at the Center for Radiological Research at Columbia University to kill bacteria and viruses with ultraviolet waves. Among the Fellows there were a variety of definitions of success. And while financial success appears to be part of the broader definition of the term, it is also apparent this type of success can be more meaningful when you give back with thoughts of improving the human condition.

Success is the ability to fail. The final theme present in success is related to risk taking and failure, particularly the willingness to take risks even if it means the possibility of failure. When asked to define success, Bill stated "[b]eing allowed to fail." While he did not expand on this concept, this simple definition spoke to me as an educator as I believe failure allows us to see our mistakes and learn from them, which in turn makes us resilient and more adept at being successful. For Mike, taking risks was not only connected to being successful, but also to growth. Mike explained,

> We get so good at what we do, eventually in life, that we almost go into automatic cruise control, and I think that's very poisonous. I think we need to continue to grow, to take on challenges, to push ourselves into uncomfortable areas, if necessary, to grow. And we have a great reluctance, by nature, to be uncomfortable, and so I think risk taking continues to be key to creative success.

As I discuss later in this chapter, the Fellows reported that an ability to challenge your way of thinking is related to success. The idea of risk-taking was one spoken about by many of the Original Fellows, although not always within the confines of defining success, so this concept is one which will be explored more in-depth relative to other

research questions. In the subsequent section of this chapter, I examine the main entities which comprise the community of the Ohio Fellows during the 1960s.

Research question three: Original Ohio Fellows and their community. Co-curricular programs serve a purpose beyond the traditional sense of providing additional interaction amongst students, faculty, and other shareholders with similar interests. The creation of a community is just as paramount. By answering my third research question, I gained insight into what constituted the Ohio Fellows community of the 1960s. Throughout the process of my conversations with the Ohio Fellows from the 1960s, there were three areas that made up the community of the program which were brought up consistently: other Fellows, guests invited to speak with the Fellows, and Dean Leslie Rollins and Dr. John Chandler.

Peer Ohio Fellows. One of the obvious members of any co-curricular community is fellow students. Unlike many programs in existence where students are brought together based on similar interests, the Ohio Fellows was an amalgamation of a diverse group of individuals representing various majors across the university. I should be clear, however, that when I speak of diversity in terms of the program during the 1960, I am referring mostly to gender and academic interests, as Ohio University at the time was a predominately white-male institution (Ohio University Office of Institutional Research, n.d.a). In having a common meeting space at Chubb House, students had opportunities to congregate and discuss a wide arrange of topics. Nancy found "a higher intellectual level [with the Fellows] ... thinking about the world, our place in it … [i]t was terrific for people that were complex thinkers, and they would delve deeply into topics." Robert

shared similar sentiments, but particularly appreciated everyone's differences in perspectives and the ability to learn from his peers, and began to "[realize] how rich the tapestry and diversity can be." Here Nancy and Robert shared experiences which promoted social integration, self-authorship development, and were indicative of a peer mentoring community. However, not everyone lauded the experiences with other participants in the program.

Joel stood out from the rest of the Fellows I interviewed. He, in contrast to other participants of the program was not stimulated by his interactions with his peers. Described as a non-traditional program, Joel felt he may have had the opportunity to make connections with others who shared his passion for certain social causes. Speaking of his impressions of those he met as his time as a Fellow, Joel stated "… I thought maybe these were people among whom I could organize against the war, I found that most of my other Ohio fellows were too career-oriented to respond to what I thought was important." Joel's experience is important because it reminds us that not all students will share the same experience and may be turned off by the community that exists in a program which is the antithesis of the co-curricular experience. Beyond the immediate and sustained interaction with other participants in the Ohio Fellows program, invited guests played a significant role with the community of the Fellows.

Invited guests. While not a permanent part of the community of the Ohio Fellows, invited speakers and guests were an indispensable component of the program during the 1960s. Ohio University President Vernon Alden and Dean Leslie Rollins, both from the Harvard Business School, had connections which allowed for well-known

leaders of industry to come and interact with the Fellows. Access to the visitors was an integral part of the program. Mike explained

> the Ohio Fellows … would bring in these highly successful, very accomplished people, interesting people, well-known names, authors, whatever and you'd really get to sit down and meet with them, ride with them to the airport, discuss their lives, ask them personal questions.

From Polly's perspective, the ability to interact and converse with these guests on a personal level was vital. In particular, she spoke about meeting the author of *The Religions of Man*, Huston Smith, and how she "began to see a whole sort of frame of reference on my own life, and then on the issues surrounding philosophy and religion, and those issues opened up deep questions for me." Craig, too, was influenced by lecturers, such as Robert Greenleaf and Joseph Fletcher, who he described as playing a motivating role in his interest in social ethics. Some guests to the Ohio Fellows were not as innocuous, however, and student reaction to these individuals were mixed.

Although guest lecturers have the potential to give students first-hand accounts of issues and information, not all students may be as open to hearing other points of view, especially depending on the current political climate. With the war in Southeast Asia and a general cultural shift occurring during the 1960s, students were becoming more active and vocal about certain issues. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State from 1961 to 1969, was one of the more controversial picks to come speak with students during this time. Robert stated, "I can remember that night being so riled up … [b]ecause I wanted to sort of tell Rusk that I felt this war was stupid." A similar, yet more extreme, reaction came from

Joel in response to Robert McNamara, who was the Secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1968. Joel described him as "one of the true villains in the United States." Interestingly enough, both Robert and Joel were impressed with having met such high-ranking officials in the United States government, but the impressions left by the men were different. While Joel never felt like he would ever want anything to do with McNamara again, Robert found Rusk to be "engaging [and]… respectful of our opinions" and came to believe his actual persona was different from that seen by the public.

As influential as the invited guests were, it is apparent extended mentoring was an important part of the Ohio Fellows Community. Ongoing mentoring was provided by the regular program leaders.

Program administrators. Probably the one of the most critical pieces of the Ohio Fellows community was embodied in the administrators, Dean Leslie Rollins and Dr. John Chandler. Dr. Chandler and Dean Rollins appeared to have similar roles within the organization, although Dr. Chandler was the Director of the Ohio Fellows. In addition to securing internships and guest speakers, both men played a mentoring role for students. Described as being uniquely different in their leadership styles, both men would leave differing impressions on the participants of the program and shape their lives in different ways.

Dr. John Chandler. Of the ten original Fellows I spoke with only a couple spoke about Dr. Chandler in length. According to Bill, "Les did a lot of the business people and John Chandler took some of the other[s]," which makes sense as Dean Rollins was from the Harvard Business School. So, it is not surprising that those who spoke about Dr.

Chandler did not go the business route after college. Bill further explained he believed their leadership styles differed, as he found Dean Rollins to be "very pushy and very demanding," where in contrast Dr. Chandler "was more the guy behind the scenes … and modeled more Greenleaf [style of leadership]" where an emphasis is placed on servant leadership and public service. This leadership style is evidenced by a memory Craig shared of Dr. Chandler who encouraged students to participate in acts of public service, such as helping to register black voters in Selma, Alabama in the 1960s. Based on interviews, Dr. Chandler was presented as more of an encourager and not as controversial as Dean Rollins.

Dean Leslie Rollins. Dean Rollins was a polarizing figure in the Ohio Fellows. From the outset of my research, he was one of the first names I heard associated with the program due to the mentoring he provided many of the students in the 1960s. As previously mentioned, his leadership and mentoring style differed greatly from that of Dr. Chandler; Dean Rollins was more focused on pushing students to maximize their potential, but in ways he saw as beneficial. Craig mentioned an incident involving Dean Rollins:

> I happened to run into him on the street of when we were getting ready to graduate from OU, and he said, "What are you going to do?" I said, "Well, we've been accepted to Ohio State and we're going to go to medical school." His demeanor sort of fell and he said, "Oh, I'm so sorry. If you want to do something important and significant with your life and I'm still around, come back and talk to me."

Craig further stated regarding Dean Rollins, "I think he looked at us as breed stock as you would on this farm with sheep or cattle. He was trying to do herd improvement and he had picked these individuals to further those ideals." Although it is essential to point out that Craig had no ill will towards Dean Rollins, he felt their relationship lacked any depth due to more formal connection with Dr. Chandler. Craig, nonetheless, was not the only one to have encounters with Dean Rollins which may be construed as less than positive.

Having mentioned his distaste for Robert McNamara, Joel additionally was not fond of Dean Rollins. For example, Dean Rollins had a role in influencing McNamara's career trajectory while at Harvard Business School; a career path that Joel did not appreciate. Joel expressed his belief that "such people [as Dean Rollins] should not be allowed around college children because they can give them dreams of power, but they don't understand the price tag." I can assume from this strongly worded statement that Joel did not have a positive impression of Dean Rollins. Joel's ultimate judgement on Dean Rollins differed from the rest of the Fellows' assessments.

As someone who helped in the creation of the Ohio Fellows, it is apparent Dean Rollins had ideas on how he believed students could be shaped into future leaders of industry. Robert described Dean Rollins as "somebody who had tremendous instincts about people … [a]nd loved to basically mentor young people and challenge them." The idea of Dean Rollins challenging his students was a recurring theme when his mentoring style was discussed. Terry described him as a "very, very crotchety, difficult director" but genuine in the fact that he also "conveyed to you … that you're different and it's okay," and also knew he wanted more from students because "whatever you're doing, it's

not enough." Robert had similar feelings about Dean Rollins stating, "he was forever sort of kind of berating me, and saying 'What are you going to do? What are you going to do?'" Despite his style of leadership being, as Bill called it, "pushy," some of the Fellows took these challenges from Dean Rollins as inspiration to continually search for ways to improve themselves and their careers.

From Terry's perspective, Dean Rollins' goal was "teaching kids who were brilliant and passionate, not to underestimate themselves, not to be satisfied with lower thresholds to reach for the highest things they could possibly reach for, and to never be satisfied with anything other than that." In a similar vein, Tom found "[Dean Rollins] instilled in us that your career and your professional contributions to the world, were lifelong" and "[h]e just knew how to push the right buttons, at the right time, to get you to self-motivate … to reach your full potential." While Terry and Tom did not fully understand his ability to help students push themselves or how he determined who would be the best fit for the program, they knew Dean Rollins had an innate ability to do so. As Polly expressed, "[Dean Rollins] believed that I had something unique to offer the world and he was going to help me find it." For those who worked well with Dean Rollin's mentoring and leadership style, there was an appreciation for his methods, as they felt they were beneficial to them and were part of Dean Rollins' desire for students to begin opening their worldview.

The last section on the Original Ohio Fellows focuses on how varying components of the program had the potential to set students up for success in and out of college.

Research question four: Original Ohio Fellows and creating success.

Through my interviews with the Ohio Fellows of the 1960s, I discovered elements of the Ohio Fellows program that some members have attributed to their collegiate and post-collegiate success. And, while I will not be measuring the success of the program through traditional numeric methods, the words of participants of the Fellows gives us an idea of the impact this type of program can potentially have on students.

Multi-disciplinary participants. Elements of the program the Original Fellows associated with success were intertwined with aspects of the community which made up the program. For instance, those who found the program to be influential during and after college spoke to the multidisciplinary nature of the program. As Robert discussed, he "found a lot of my fellow Fellows were very different from what I was. And I learned from them. And I learned to enjoy them very much and enjoy their perspectives." Because the war in Southeast Asia was occurring, Robert also spoke of having "great debates some nights", further stating "I don't think we ever solved any of the problems of the world, but we really tried." Tom additionally spoke of the significance of the multidisciplinary nature of the program, saying

> … you could learn peoples' viewpoints. I looked at things as a journalist. You may look at things as a politician. You may look at something as a researcher. You may see it as an artist. But we saw things differently, and we could share that. I thought that was a real advantage.

And, finally, Bill believed this intentional practice of bringing together such different individuals was to "push [us] to think outside the box. Jump into things [we'd] never

thought of before. Or thought to question." By allowing interaction with students from various majors around the university, the Ohio Fellows assisted the students in developing academically and personally. Development in these two areas helped students in another area they attribute their success to the Fellows program: confidence.

Confidence building. Of all the themes discussed relating to the role the Ohio Fellows program had in creating successful students and professionals, the one which occurred the most was the role the program played in instilling confidence in its participants. Confidence was built in a myriad of ways through participation in the program. The three areas mentioned by the Fellows of the 1960s as aiding in the confidence building were: being selected, mentoring and internships, and interaction with guest speakers. As with any club or organization with exclusive membership, just being chosen helped boost the morale of some.

Both Tom and Mike mentioned this being the case with their selection to the program, with Tom stating "with me it was that I was selected in the first place was a confidence builder," while Mike found it raised his and others' confidence in themselves due to "the prestige that some of us felt that we were selected mysteriously out of a population." The building of self-image helped Tom to realize he had the potential to excel anywhere or as he phrased it "play in the big leagues," whereas Mike began to feel more secure in pursuing a career in art. Because the program did focus on potentially creating future leaders in their respective career fields, it is not surprising student were encouraged to reach beyond where they felt their potential lie. With adequate mentoring and internships, students could gain confidence to set their goals high.

Mentors and internships. Parks (2000) showed how an influential mentoring community can help introduce students to their profession and plays a role in student behavior concerning seeking out a meaningful life in- and outside of their career. Dean Rollins had significant influences on the students he interacted with in Ohio Fellows programs, both through mentoring and internship placements. Robert stated that Dean Rollins "loved to basically mentor young people and challenge them." Looking at some examples I can see how meaningful this mentoring was for some of the Original Fellows. With Mike, it is possible to tie his rise in confidence from being selected with the fact that he also felt authenticated by those running the program. Mike said "[a]uthentication is part of that esteem building, that can-do feeling, and it's key to really doing something excellent." This authentication was a piece of what allowed him to pursue art. Ralph specifically attributed Dean Rollins to his career path, stating

> Dean Rollins essentially redirected the path of my life to a much better path.
> Even if I had just met him there and had not been the program. If I had stumbled
> into him one day and we had a talk. That might have made a difference.

While Dean Rollins' words were often more challenging than encouraging, something about his personality or demeanor helped the students build confidence in themselves. Dean Rollins' additional connections with businesses around the country was also an asset to the Fellows.

Because the program was focused on creating an environment where future leaders could grow and develop, it makes sense internships were also provided to willing students. In speaking of Dean Rollins and his work on finding the students internships,

Terry's experience supports the research. The internship for Terry was valuable because "[b]y providing contacts and experiences that let me grow and let me ask the questions that I needed to ask and expose me to things that I would not have been exposed to had I not had connections." Polly also found her internship with the Bell Labs program to be influential because she

> [felt] like I owe that kind of confidence specifically to the experience in the Ohio
> Fellows because they put me into situations as a very, very young person where I
> had to compete with people who were from very elite, privileged backgrounds,
> and people who had already accomplished [a lot].

Tom additionally developed more confidence through his experience with the Mead Corporation finding "[t]hose internships, and those opportunities, not only gave me more confidence, but allowed me to understand that I could play in the big leagues, and it gave me the confidence to do so." I assume Dean Rollins knew the influence of such experiences, and encouraged (in cases like Polly's, seeking out) students to participate in these seminal events. Administration of the Ohio Fellows, while crucial in their role as mentors, also played a part in the final area where students related success and confidence, guest speakers.

Guest speakers. Guest speakers, as part of the Ohio Fellows community, filled an important role by bringing in an outside voice and perspective which served to challenge the students' current line of thinking on a myriad of topics. Robert found this to be one of the defining features of the Fellows program, as meeting with these well-known leaders would "essentially take you out of your comfort zone and introduce you to people

that you weren't going to meet otherwise." Remembering the types of individuals the original Fellows had intimate interactions with, such as high level government officials, well-known authors and artists, and leaders of major companies, I know such experiences would most likely not be available to students today. Even so, from conversations with the Original Fellows, I see such events were confidence builders.

For some of the Fellows the ability to speak with well-regarded figures in society provided an additional boost in confidence. Tom found these chances "[n]ot only gave you the social confidence you that you could do this [speak with high-level guests]… [but] you got to really see how a person thought or functioned, and how thoughtful they were or not." When looking at Tom's statement, I get the impression these meetings allowed students to humanize these guests. People in positions of power can be presented as untouchable and out of sync with the "real-world," and these close encounters allowed the Fellows to see the speakers for who they were. Mike, who aspired to become an artist, said these events were particularly influential as they provided personal insight into following your own path. Specifically, he said the guest speakers were

> informative about working independently and striking out into new frontiers and risk taking, which was the main thing about my career path, was risk taking … when you're striking out to create a business without compromising your artwork, it's nice to have that kind of information and experience.

Polly also spoke of these experiences as paramount to being a Fellow in relation to helping build her confidence:

Well, from my own point of view it was the exposure to very high-level leaders, teachers, scholars on a personal level. Actual conversation, not just hearing them lecture, but being able to have conversations, ask questions, be interactive with somebody that otherwise would be unreachable for a 19-year-old freshman in Midwestern college, no matter how smart you were.

It makes sense that, once you have met someone as influential as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, communicating with other well-known people may be easier. Speaking of her meeting with Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, Polly said "by that time I wasn't that intimidated because I'd been sitting down, speaking to people that I admired more than Hubert Humphrey." While the ability to meet high-profile figures is a rare occurrence for most students, I understand from Tom, Mike, and Polly's experiences why these once-in-a-lifetime meetings can be significant to building life-long confidence.

The realities of the Ohio Fellows. Creating a co-curricular program where all students have the same positive experience is virtually impossible. While many of the Fellows I spoke with attribute their time in the program as playing a critical role in their successes as an adult, there are those who do not. Nancy was very matter of fact in this stating, "I think, to a little extent, they over-ascribe the success that Fellows have had to the Fellows program. I'm not sure I wouldn't have made my way to where I did without the Fellows program." Still, it is important to mention Nancy does not discount the opportunities the program provided them but is confident enough to believe success would have been possible without the Ohio Fellows. Craig, similar to Nancy, enjoyed his

time with the Fellows but found some practices which, in his mind, are contrary to being

successful.

Craig's criticism mainly focused on the individualistic nature of the program. He

felt as if

they didn't teach or recognize that you can't accomplish all these noble things

unless you deliberately recruit others to your cause, like-minded … They didn't

address that at all and I think that [was a] major deficit of the program.

Because of his focus on servant leadership and a desire to give back to society, he

understood effective change is not possible without others who support your ideals.

Though there was a distinct focus on the individual, I felt Craig implied Dean Rollins did

somewhat understand the need for working together based on a former comment made

concerning looking at the students as breed stock explicitly for use as overall herd

improvement. Interestingly enough, as discussed earlier in this chapter Joel did not

particularly care for Dean Rollins and his perception of him may have been similar to that

of Craig's. Like Craig, Joel believed that the organization of like-minded people was

important to enact change and found his time in the program was not as beneficial as it

could have been, due to this shortcoming.

Specifically, Joel was critical regarding students he interacted with, whom he

found not as socially aware and active as he was. Particularly, he showed a distaste for

some of the speakers invited to interact with the Fellows, as he believed them not suitable

as role-models for impressionable college students. Being in the Ohio Fellows and

Honors College Joel found "it was useful for [me] specifically right there in that year in

being able to take whatever courses I wished and I took advantage." While probably not the outcome Dean Rollins, Dr. Chandler, or President Alden were hoping for, at least he found one benefit of being involved.

Summary: The Original Fellows

In this section my focus was on the Ohio Fellows program as it existed in the 1960s. While having no pre-established mission, I created my own mission based on the characterizations of the program by the participants: *To engage students from a multitude of academic interests in order to develop successful and passionate future leaders in their field through a variety of exceptional educational opportunities.* Based on the interview data, several participants described the outcomes of the program matching this constructed mission. Through program-related mentoring, internships, and involvement with guest speakers the students further developed and matured. This was witnessed through interactions between students in the Fellows, and students and guest speakers. Personal development occurred with many of these Fellows as they discussed becoming more confident in themselves and desiring to do good for society. Moreover, the program served as a place where students could receive mentoring and feel intellectually engaged with other students to a degree that did not happen in many of their classes.

Diverse student populations can help provide an increased sense of community and participation in co-curricular activities (Glass et al., 2017). In a sense, I see this with the Original Fellows because many of them pointed to having conversations and debates with other Fellows and guest speakers as a seminal part of their experience, as it provided a variety of opinions and viewpoints on topics. Tinto's (1987) theory on social

integration tells us students are more likely to persist if they have created a bond with the institution, whether it be through academic settings, social settings, or a mix of both. For those Fellows who struggled to connect in the academic setting, establishing a community through the program may be tied to their persistence and retention at the university.

The final piece of my constructed mission statement focuses on the role of creating leaders. For the Ohio Fellows, the mentors, particularly Dean Rollins, played a significant role in pushing students to never settle and continue to set goals to work towards. This mindset is one many leaders have: the notion that there is always room for improvement. Not only did I get the impression Dean Rollins knew this frame of mind was important, he knew it was as important for students to see it in action. This is why students were provided with internships at large well-respected businesses.

While co-curricular experiences have been shown to help with leadership skills (Suskie, 2015), Knight and Novoselich (2017) argued they must be focused towards the student's major to be impactful. The Ohio Fellows is a counterexample of this. Conceived as a multi-disciplinary program, the administrators worked on identifying strengths and placing members in the appropriate internship to best assist in student growth. Based on my interpretation of the mission of the Ohio Fellows, the administrators of the program worked towards meeting these goals. And though not everyone benefited from participating in the program, it did leave an impact on them and possibly helped them become more attuned to themselves.

Unfortunately, the time of the Ohio Fellows program was short-lived. With students protesting the war in Southeast Asia across college campuses in the United States and the early closing of universities around Ohio in the spring of 1970 after the shooting at Kent State University, the Ohio Fellows program quietly ceased operations with the departure of President Alden, who left the year prior. The program would not be reinvigorated for over 40 years. In the proceeding section of this chapter I will explore the re-establishment of the Ohio Fellows and gain insight into its impact on students today.

Case II: The Current Ohio Fellows

The re-birth of a program. Following the early closure of Ohio University in the spring semester of 1970, the Ohio Fellows program remained shuttered for many years. Because many of the Original Fellows had such fond memories of the program, there were reunions throughout the years, but it was more than 40 years before an effort to revive the program began. As with the original program, the one with the idea to bring back the Ohio Fellows was Vernon Alden, 15th President of Ohio University. Scott Seaman, who was Dean of the Ohio University Libraries from 2008-2018, had been in contact with President Alden since assuming his role at the university. Impressed by his legacy and the lasting impact President Alden had on both the university and surrounding area, Dean Seaman eventually met with him in Boston.

When asked what he felt his lasting accomplishments were, President Alden mentioned the Ohio Fellows. Unaware of the program Dean Seaman inquired as to what it was. To explain, President Alden shared with Dean Seaman that he envisioned Ohio

University as a "blend [of] the best of the private [universities] and the best of public [universities]." Furthermore, the Ohio Fellows program was a mechanism to "to bring forward those people, those students, who embodied just that." Dean Seaman further explained how President Alden saw the program as

a way to take students who weren't necessarily from a privileged background or really understood how to make social contacts and how to parlay those into doing good for your community and for your business and give them that expertise.

With his curiosity piqued about the program, Dean Seaman spoke with a Development Officer at the university who discovered "quite a few alums who have done significant things for either the state of Ohio or the country or for their professions." When he next spoke to former President Alden about the program, he proposed the idea to reestablish the Ohio Fellows. Although the initial thought from President Alden was to transplant the program of the 60s to today, Dean Seaman was aware an exact replica of the program was not feasible in modern higher education.

Not sure what direction the program would take, Dean Seaman set out to find a college to house the Ohio Fellows. Because the library is not degree-granting and the "Fellows Program was at least going to be dealing with students and recruiting faculty members … I really felt we needed to have a partner, an academic college as a partner that had that expertise and had those contacts." As a result, Dr. David Descutner, Dean of the University College, was approached with this opportunity as the college was "dealing mostly with undergraduates, undergraduate development." Unbeknownst to Dean Seaman, Dr. Descutner had previous interactions with the Ohio Fellows during one

of their reunions in 2002. Similar to what Dean Seaman had discovered, Dr. Descutner had much praise for the alumni he met, stating:

> Even then it was plain to me not only were these folks successful, but they were very successful. They weren't just business people. They weren't just creative people. They weren't just nonprofit people. They were doing all that different stuff, and they thought that program had a lot to do with why they ended up doing what they were doing

So, when approached by Dean Seaman to restart the Ohio Fellows program, I believe Dr. Descutner was on board for two reasons.

First, speaking of the Fellows from the 1960s, Dr. Descutner said, "[t]hey were the kind of alumni you're proud to have … [T]hey have a real sense of social value and cultural value and justice, things that you really want folks to learn, or at least internalize." Because many of the Fellows I spoke with tie who they are and their success to the program, it stood to reason creating a modern-day version of the program could be a benefit to the university. The second reason speaks to Tinto's (1987) theory of social integration and the merit of a sense of belonging with the university. Meeting with the Fellows, Dr. Descutner began to learn that, many of the Fellows did not feel a connection to the university when attending, but the Fellows program gave a group of students who may have felt like they were different from other students a place to connect by "rub[bing] up against each other, to bounce off each other, to talk with each other, to learn with each other." From Dr. Descutner's perspective, because universities

admit students who feel similarly to the Original Ohio Fellows, it made sense to create a program which would address their needs, as President Alden did in the past.

Creating the Current Ohio Fellows program. Once the decision was made to begin the formation of the modern-day Ohio Fellows, the next vital step was to determine what the program would look like. Yet, as Dean Seaman mentioned, it was impossible to transfer the program which existed in the 1960s to a modern university. Dr. Descutner stated "students who are going to school right now, are not like students in the mid '60s … if you got a college degree you were going to find a job … because it wasn't that common then still," but today because a college degree is more commonplace, students worry about finding employment to help pay off student loan debt. One of the Faculty Fellows chosen to assist in the implantation of the program agreed with Dr. Descutner, because "[w]e have different students, the campus is different, and the culture of students and learning is different ... [w]e tried to capture … what the spirit of the original program … rather than a let's just update it." With this understanding, the program went into development.

The new Ohio Fellows Program shared common features and goals of its antecedent program. Speaking of the new program, Dr. Descutner saw the Current Fellows as

> Provid[ing] a sustained and intensive opportunity for students to learn some
> things they wouldn't learn otherwise, including about who they are, what they
> would like to get done, how they fit in society, how they could make contributions
> to society, and to develop some confidence in their ability to think creatively and

analytically about themselves, their role in society, and what ultimately they

would like to get done.

Dean Seaman added to this, stating the program:

is really a way of expanding potentials beyond anything students might recognize

that they are capable of and channeling that passion, sort of jogging those

capabilities to where their mind opens enough and they're able to have that

courage to walk into a boardroom.

In both descriptions of the new program, there was an emphasis on students surpassing

their own expectations of themselves and developing a better understanding of who they

are as individuals. Moreover, we see the hope from both Dean Seaman and Dr.

Descutner that students will use this knowledge to make an impact outside of college.

While I will explore this connection in more detail in the following chapter, I think it is

vital we acknowledge that the Original Fellows expressed having this type of personal

development during their time in the program. Dr. Pillay, who was a Faculty Fellow

during the development and first years of the program, furthers this connection in regard

to the idea of the Fellows creating future leaders, as he believed "the goal of the program

is to develop a group of leaders who are gonna make a difference in society." And so, the

inability to create a facsimile of the program from the 1960s did not prevent the new

Ohio Fellows administration and Faculty Fellows from desiring the same activities and

outcomes present in the Original Fellows. After determining the overarching goals of the

program, a decision on the type of student to recruit was next.

Having a lack of specific requirements such as major or discipline makes for challenges in student selection for programs such as the Ohio Fellows. For example, Dean Seaman said he was watching "for students who are not necessarily high academic achievers but are very capable and are extremely passionate … [who] can take those capabilities and that passion and direct them in a way that they'll be a much better adult." Dr. Descutner echoed Dean Seaman's ideal student for the program saying

> I think it's important to have students who are strivers, know what it means to be successful, and going at it full bore, because those are exemplars for other students. But I think mixing them up with students who are struggling a bit, who aren't sure this is right thing for them.

The type of students Dean Seaman and Dr. Descutner described are similar to those sought out by the original program, as we have learned it was not just created for high achieving students, but for those who showed potential for leadership, in general. Additionally, there was a push to find a diverse set of students, because in Dr. Pillay's experience "having the diversity within the group would not only impact those individuals who become leaders in society, but within that cohort of fellows, I think there could be some mutually beneficial exchanges that could occur," because when groups are too alike, controversial "topics really doesn't get broached." Once again, the discussion of topics from varying points of view are not only part of a strong mentoring environment but are also key to the development of self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Parks, 2000).

As the new Ohio Fellows program was put into effect, the responsibility of putting the principles into practice through member selection and curriculum fell to the Faculty Fellows. For Dean Seaman, the Faculty Fellows play a crucial role in the operations of the Current Fellows program. In his mind, the Faculty Fellows were

> the experts and really being able to identify the students and guide them through that maturation process, being able to make sure that the students are being challenged … in a way that isn't way over their head … that the discussions are productive and not just circles. So it's really the faculty who are, in my mind, running the program.

Similarly, Dr. Descutner believed "the more that we give [the Faculty Fellows] a chance to push students and engage students and ask them tough questions and have the deeper conversations, the better off the program is going to be." When it came to the new program, especially in the year of its inception, Faculty Fellows played a critical role in deciding on how best to run meetings. Debbie described the operation of the Ohio Fellows as "a hybrid of seminars … we tried to teach in a way that wasn't like a standard class … based on our areas of expertise and … it was important obviously to have role for the original fellows." Apparent is the desire to create a proper mentoring community where students can develop personally, professionally, and academically, based on Dean Seaman's and Dr. Descutner's ideas of how the Faculty Fellows should interact with students. We can further see the want of the Faculty Fellows to present content to the students from those who are experts in those areas. But, as with the Original Fellows, what is proposed and what actually occurs may not be the same.

In the succeeding sections, I examine how the Current Ohio Fellows and those who stepped into administrative and faculty roles after the initial inception of the Fellows interpret the modern-day program in relation to my research questions.

Table 2

Current Ohio Fellows Participants

Name	Major/Discipline	Role in Program
Caleb	Biology	Fellow
Dr. Fowler	Advising	Director
Debbie	Political Science	Faculty Fellow
Dr. Descutner	Administration	Administration
Faith	Communications	Fellow
Lee	English	Fellow
Lori	Business	Faculty Fellow
Mackenzie	Psychology/Biology	Fellow
Dr. Miller	Communications	Faculty Fellow
Dr. Pillay	Counseling	Faculty Fellow
Dean Seaman	Administration	Administration
Sydney	Studio Art	Fellow
Zak	Engineering Physics	Fellow

Research question one: Current Ohio Fellows and defining the mission. As presented in Case One, there was no consensus among the Original Fellows in terms of the mission of the program. And though when the program was being re-established there were ideas on what was hoped to be accomplished by bringing the Fellows back, speaking with the Current Fellows, Faculty Fellows, and administration, there once again did not appear to be a formal agreement on the objective of the program. In answering

Research Question One regarding case two, the Current Fellows, I gained an insight into how they perceive the mission of the Ohio Fellows program. Through careful analysis of the interviews with the modern-day participants, faculty, and administration within the program, three themes emerged in regard to the mission of the Ohio Fellows program.

Leadership. The first reoccurring theme centered around leadership. Based on Dr. Pillay's expectation of the program developing leaders, it makes sense others would see this as the mission of the program, as I assume seminars on this topic would have taken place. Lee seems to confirm this expectation in saying "development of leadership was very much one of the focal points" and believed the program sought to determine "how [to] build people up to be leaders." Specifically, Lee spoke of learning "how group leadership could take place [and] how everybody could contribute and help steer." Examining Lee's interpretation of the mission, we may interpret that the Ohio Fellows has taken a more modern approach to leadership, with a move from an individualistic method to a multi-perspective method of leadership. Caleb also spoke of the Fellows as desiring to create leaders but was specific as to who would benefit most from the program.

Caleb believed it was vital to find students who were "diamond[s] in the rough … and then to give them resources and experiences that will help them to mature into leaders." He also spoke of the importance of selecting "people who want those opportunities that the Ohio Fellows are willing to give them, not only want those opportunities but want to capitalize on them" (Caleb). Caleb discussed the importance of the mission of the program guiding careful selection of students who will actually take

advantage of what the program is offering. Being selected to join an organization should be seen as just the beginning of the process of becoming completely affiliated with a program. It makes sense to expect accomplishing the mission of any university or co-curricular program can only be done by the work of both the students themselves and the educators. Part of this work is the ability of the participants to become aware of their shortcomings and work towards fixing them.

Mackenzie emphasized the significance of a willingness to take charge of decision-making, even when some research and analysis is necessary, to describe aspects of the mission of the Ohio Fellows. Like Lee and Caleb, Mackenzie mentioned the program intended to "create open-minded future leaders" but also stressed Fellows must "have the initiative and drive to say, 'I don't know as much about this, but I would like to,' or, 'I've never done this before, but I would like to try and figure out how I can.'" As represented by Caleb and Mackenzie, it is more than just having the opportunity to participate in the Fellows program or serve as a leader, it is vital to demonstrate the initiative to take advantage of what you have learned. The next theme present when discussing the mission of the program was creating a desired to make a contribution to society.

Social change. In addition to leadership development, several individuals associated with the program grew to view the mission of the Ohio Fellows as developing civic-minded citizens. Dr. Descutner, who played a role in the development of the new program, believed through participation in the program, students could begin to see "how they could make contributions to society … their role in society, and what ultimately they

would like to get done." Dr. Miller, who is a current Faculty Fellow, echoed Dr. Descutner's point, saying he wants students "[t]o get involved in the community in purposeful ways," but also believed it should be "some kind of sustained relationship."

To this point, some of the Current Fellows spoke of the eye-opening experience of participating in flood relief efforts in West Virginia with one of the Original Fellows, Bill. These types of experiences proved to be poignant for students who, in a sense, became secluded in Athens, Ohio while in school. Reflecting on his time doing flood remediation in West Virginia, Zak said he found this trip to be "really impactful … [and] realized that, no one even in Athens, right next door had even heard about the fact that there was this devastating flood in this West Virginia area." Events of this nature also have the potential to create a deeper understanding of what students may perceive the mission of a program to be. For instance, Zak described the mission of the Fellows as wanting "to help foster a group of change agents." While not specifically mentioning contributing to society, I inferred based on his reaction to working with flood victims he sees working with the community as part of being an effective change agent. Zak's participation in the program, as Dr. Descutner hoped, allowed him to see the benefits of working toward a better society. The final theme which emerged from the examination of the interview data was related to student development.

Student development. The final, and most prevalent, theme which occurred when discussing the mission of the Ohio Fellows revolved around student growth and development. As simply stated by Debbie, the program was a "pathway to self-growth … and lifelong learning." These feelings were also present in Dr. Descuter's

conversation on the mission, as he thought "it's to provide equipment for living for students develop some confidence in their ability to think creatively and analytically about themselves." The current director of the Ohio Fellows program, Dr. Fowler, also expressed that those involved in the program "encourage students to push themselves to reach their full potential." One of the more crucial messages extracted from Debbie's, Dr. Descutner, and Dr. Fowler's defining of the mission is the desire for students to be cognizant of their personal development, not just as students, but also as they move into their careers. Of course, it is not surprising those involved with the administrative side of the program would see student growth as a priority, while current members also talk of growth in their own ways.

Mackenzie believed part of the Fellows' mission was to encourage students to seek out new experiences. She said Fellows were taught to "not be afraid of failure or a topic that they don't know about … to actually embrace it and figure out how I can have an opportunity to do that." I sense Mackenzie has internalized the concept that her potential to grow and learn requires her to step out of her comfort zone occasionally. The idea of personal development through sustained and quality interaction with those different from ourselves was reported as being fundamental to the mission of the Ohio Fellows. Sydney, a Current Fellow, and Lori, a Faculty Fellow, both mentioned this facet of the program, with Sydney finding "it is learning to listen and learning how to interact with people who are different from yourself in thought," and Lori stating when participating in the program "you're going to meet people from all over the university, not just your own kind with your own thought box." Interactions with diverse groups further

helped to develop confidence levels and gave Fellows the ability to grow and align themselves with one perception of the mission of the Fellows.

When examining how those involved with the Ohio Fellows viewed the mission of the program there were three distinct themes: leadership, social change, and student growth. Interestingly enough, one student did not view the program as having a specific goal. Faith described the program as a "choose your adventure type of thing," clarifying that it "is what you make of it." And, although Lori did express specific details about her vision of the mission, she also admitted the Fellows "will be what you make out of it." These responses are not surprising, as those affiliated with the program had difficulties defining the mission. As I did with the Original Fellows, I established my own definition of the program based on the themes I encountered. Integrating the three themes, I developed the following mission for the Current Ohio Fellows program: *To provide multidisciplinary experiences where socially aware leaders are created through exposure to diverse perspectives and sustained personal development.* Establishing this understanding of the mission based on this research allowed me to view how the Ohio Fellows program may have aided student success through meeting the expectation of said mission. Like the Original Fellows, the Current Fellows described their take on success to further help make this possible connect between success and the Fellows.

Research question two: Current Ohio Fellows and their perspective on success. In reviewing conversations I had with the Current Fellows and others associated with the program, I learned the concept of success varies across individuals, while there

were also some shared commonalities. From the data emerged three areas where individual understandings of success converged.

Career success. When speaking on successful careers, it is hard to also not speak of the financial aspect of a career; however, for most of the Current Fellows I spoke with, financial success was not an expressed desire. For some, career success was as simple as "try[ing] to work your way up the ladder" (Faith), but for others the establishment of a successful career appeared to be more about self-fulfillment and happiness. The focus on self-actualization can be seen in Caleb, who "want[ed] to get this PHD … and then tak[e] a swing at the career I've always wanted, which is to be a university professor … it's a hard path to walk and I wanna take a swing at it." Acknowledging the difficult road ahead of him, Caleb still seemed motivated to persist towards this career path because he perceived it as a measure of success. I also saw this desire for self-accomplishment in Lee who described success as "getting published and getting my second book in print, continuing to put forth books to have published material that I can point to and say, Yes, I wrote that." Once again, I saw someone who viewed career success through personal triumphs. Because of the existing relationship between career and financial gain, it is not surprising a student included thoughts on financial success.

Zak, who spoke of success from varying perspectives, believed "being financially well-off is a version of success," but cautioned "if you end up using that money for purposes that aren't positively impactful in the world, then you get that success revoked." While Zak accepted the idea of financial success, he also has opinions on how wealth should made and spent. On being financially successful, he said, "I want to make a lot of

money of course … but I want to do that through a positive way, and then use that money

for positive things later." His ideas on success further served as a reminder of the

fulfillment of the program's missions. Furthermore, this spoke to Dr. Pillay's version of

success for Fellows, as he hoped "they engage in a way that will really be of service to

others," which is what I interpreted Zak as wanting to do with any financial gains he is

able to make. Past the expected career focused ideas on success, Current Fellows and

others involved with the Ohio Fellows also characterized success in a more personal

manner.

Meaningful relationships. Establishing meaningful relationships was another

theme I noticed when speaking with those affiliated with the Ohio Fellows. Sydney

noted that her ideal vision of future success was centered on her ability to have a positive

influence on those around her. In speaking on her perception of success Sydney said

> Success for me is the impact that I have on my surroundings and the people who
>
> make up my community, my friends, my family, and so forth. And I think that
>
> success for me is if I'm putting that good energy out there and I'm having a
>
> positive impact if I'm bringing happiness to other people's lives or creating a
>
> change and making the world more just in whatever way I can … being part of a
>
> community that values each other and the potentials of our crafts and knowledge.

It is obvious Sydney found success through relationships where she could not only find

happiness but have the potential to create it for others through her passion for creating

positive societal change. Zak similarly spoke of success in how others view you.

Specifically, he "believe[d] that the biggest thing is leaving a positive legacy when you're

all said and done" (Zak) which can be accomplished through "raising a kid, volunteering at your local school, tutoring people in math and science, or coming back to the Fellows years later and giving back to this program" (Zak). Although Zak was not explicit in mentioning relationships, from his examples of how a good legacy is left, he expressed an understanding that building relationships is part of his ideal of success. Caleb also spoke of relationships in conjunction with success as proof of the nature of personal growth and an evolution of personal beliefs.

Caleb, before speaking on any other measures of success, expressed that one "metric of success for me will always be the connections I build in my life and the friends I maintain." This understanding of success developed because of time spent away from family and friends. He said this distance helped him "realize how valuable friends and family are, aside from your career and money and things and how important it is to have connections and be able to have conversations with people." Caleb's conception of success was significant as it demonstrated a person's vision of success as not stagnant but evolving, and how events throughout our lives have the potential to shape the way we see ourselves and how we live our lives. Developing an understanding of how a person sees their life can change depending on current circumstances and events lead to the last theme in defining success.

Living life on your own terms. A reoccurring theme I discovered when speaking with those affiliated with the Ohio Fellows program was the idea of living life on your own terms. Aware that success "[v]aries with all of us" (Debbie), when explaining what they considered Fellow success to look like, Debbie stated "[t]hat they're doing what they

wanted to do." Speaking with individuals about success, it becomes apparent that ideas

surrounding what and which accomplishments are to be celebrated is based on a personal

belief system. Therefore, when Dr. Fowler, the current director concluded, "I think if

you're happy with yourself, then you have success," it seems she wanted the Current

Fellows to know that because you are pursuing something you are passionate about you

have found the route to success. Mackenzie did a good job explaining this approach to

success by stating

> I would say success comes from being able to give yourself the lifestyle that
>
> brings new opportunities and new lessons and not just being financially
>
> comfortable or having a certain job title. But having a lifestyle that you feel your
>
> unique beliefs and kind of natural tendencies can be carried out in your own life,
>
> while also having room or opportunities, whether that be a social network or a
>
> financial means to try new things and … have a system set up to better yourself
>
> however that is you see fits.

The idea she presented with living a life suited to one's own thinking is resonates with

how Debbie and Dr. Fowler saw success being played out with the Current Fellows.

Sydney also spoke of the importance of the relationship between success and self when

she said, "[s]uccess, for me, is continuing to grow and learn and actualize." This self-

awareness that success is something personal was present in all the themes, but in this

case, it was also related to a sense of inner peace and contentment.

In speaking of the mission and the conceptualization of success, I have mentioned

varying members of those affiliated with the Ohio Fellows community. By exploring my

conversations with the Current Fellows, I gained more insight into what constitutes the community of the re-established program.

Research question three: Current Ohio Fellows and their community.

Establishing a community within the reestablished Ohio Fellows program was a priority, according to Debbie. Speaking of the Faculty Fellows, Debbie felt it was their responsibility "to establish an identity for the group, and a sense of community … an intellectual community, but at the same time, a community where we were connected to each other, and we knew each other." Specifically, the Faculty Fellows wanted "[a] community that ran certainly deeper than what you'd get in a classroom … [where] we would also connect with them through different experiences, different ideas" (Debbie). By creating such a community, students had the opportunity to grow and gain insights from many people. Exploring the answer to my third research question allowed me to understand who those associated with the current Ohio Fellows program viewed as part of their community.

The Original Fellows. One segment of the community mentioned by many of the Current Fellows was that of Ohio Fellows alumni, particularly the Original Fellows. Current Fellows realize without the generous donations from the alumni Fellows "this program would have never come back" (Zak). Beyond their financial contribution, students found the ability to interact with the alumni of the program an essential aspect of the community experience of the Fellows.

Mackenzie spoke of these interactions with the Original Fellows in detail and explained why she finds their role in the community vital:

I really love getting to interact with the alumni. They are so interesting. They're

so intimidating at first because some of these people are unbelievably successful

… [but] [t]hey want to hear more about us and are more impressed with us than

they are with just coming and showboating about their careers … the reason they

brought the program back is to try and foster these relationships with us and how

can they help us in any way possible.

Caleb echoed Mackenzie's feelings on the alumni, appreciative of the fact they take their

"time to mentor students" and "that you get to kinda pick the brains of people who

walked down different lines and paths and been successful at it." For Caleb, the alumni

served as an example of how following your aspirations is one factor which can lead to

success. Others expressed how the Original Fellows could also serve as a networking

community. Sydney saw the alumni as "trying to put out a little olive branch … trying to

establish those connections … especially for people who were coming from a first-

generation college experience." Although the alumni were mentioned as being seen as

part of the Ohio Fellows community, participants in the program also believed more time

with them would have been beneficial.

Sydney, while reflecting on her interactions with the Original Fellows, believed

the relationships should "be on a more consistent basis," because without more

exchanges amongst the generations of fellows, it could be "uncomfortable to reach out to

[the Original Fellows]," even when they want to provide mentoring and other

opportunities. Faith also expressed a lack of established connection with the alumni

"except for Bill, who is here the most often because he lives the closest." Zak

additionally said he would "want more of the alum interactions and a mentorship from them with current fellows," because these collaborations allowed the Current Fellows "'a feeling of importance' and allow[ed] them to see we could actually be something because these people are doing it." What Zak expressed is similar to what I heard from Caleb in the respect that the Original Fellows served as an example of going out and accomplishing your dreams without fear of failure.

Although the distance between many of the alumni Fellows and Current Fellows was great, those alum who could participate made an impact on the newer generations of Fellows through their interaction, even though they were limited. Within the community of the Ohio Fellows existed other aspects where a more sustained relationship could exist.

Faculty Fellows. When the Ohio Fellows spoke of the community, one of the first components mentioned was that of the Faculty Fellows. Discussing their role with the Fellows, I was presented with differing perspectives of the faculty. First was a less personal, more managerial type role. Faith described the faculty as "more of like you're an administrator to the Fellows … You're an honorary fellow;" since they did not go through the process of being selected, they "simply work with [the Fellows] … [and] there's a different type of relationship there" than between student Fellows. In contrast, Mackenzie saw the role of a Faculty Fellow as a more dynamic role as "not just our mentors, but sometimes our parents and sometimes our professional academic advisors and our boss." Of the two descriptions, however, the one which seemed to align with other students' thoughts more was Faith's.

Most of the Current Fellows saw the Faculty Fellows as serving in a guidance of program activities and mentoring role. In reference to the faculty, Zak found, "[t]hose are the people guiding and putting in the work to make the Fellows what it is." Lee further explained the Faculty Fellow role during meetings as being

> to shape the program and help us to get conversations started, get thought going, gave us a fair amount of direction especially early on, and then as time went on they stepped back into participate roles and allowed us to do even more in the steering.

For other Fellows, the possible mentoring role was the importance of the faculty.

Regarding mentoring, Faith found it more natural to connect with faculty who were in her major because "I feel like he could help me a little bit more just because he is in my college." Moreover, Caleb believed "faculty [has] an opportunity to ... make mentorship of this group what they wanted it to be [and] … did that in different ways." As Lee mentioned happening as time goes on, Caleb also said "when all of the Fellows come together … you have less direct interaction with the Faculty Fellows." The evolution of relationship between the Current Fellows and Faculty Fellows was not surprising to faculty because they "find that certain students aligned with certain faculty because of the disciplinary interest" (Pillay), and "a lot of that has to do with whether you could help them" (Debbie). Overall, while interaction amongst Fellows and faculty was beneficial, Sydney explained she "[thought] there's still that sort of professor and student relationship [and] I don't think that we really established the same types of relationships as I did with some of my Fellows." The relationship in the Ohio Fellows between peers,

mentioned by Sydney, was brought up most frequently when discussing the community created within the program.

Peer Ohio Fellows. Because this is a student group, it is obvious one of the main components of the program's community would be found in the contact among the Fellows. These interactions were not simply focused on the Ohio Fellows, but also allowed participants to get to know each other's academic interests and about them personally, with bonding occurring on campus and during trips. Faculty Fellow Lori said, "the students, when they go on the experiences, when they participate regularly, whether it be attending the class, doing the volunteer work, doing something fun, they get a good social support structure." Students involved with the program backed up Lori's assertion.

Seminars, when many of the Fellows were in the same room, were "an opportunity to get a bunch of intelligent people together and have a conversation" (Caleb). Furthermore, when students led discussions, they were able to learn about each other "because it was just smart people in college having fun and talking about what they were doing research on or what they were interested in" (Caleb). Ignoring academic interests, students like Zak were able to connect with other Fellows on a personal level during certain activities in meetings. One such incident occurred when Zak was able to help a student visit his mother who they had not seen in years. Of the experience Zak said, "I can't even put into words …to have my eyes open[ed] to someone else's life like that, and then to feel like I can make a difference." These types of events in college are the ones which leave lasting impacts on students. For other students, the sense of

community and camaraderie was built further on trips the Fellows took throughout the year.

Each year students are provided an opportunity to take trips with the Ohio Fellows program. The students discussed the value of these trips in creating deeper bonds with the other Fellows. Lee, a non-traditional student who sometimes found it difficult to relate to the younger students found the trip to New York helped break down some of these barriers. Speaking of time spent with other Fellows in New York Lee said

> We'd been very much in the classroom setting, and thinking of each other as students … while we'd been friends before that's where we became good friends. We had experiences together, we explored together, sometimes we would go out for drinks together … have a lot of casual conversation. I have the feeling that there was a good deal more of that beforehand with the younger Fellows.

During Lee's trip to New York, the out-of-class events helped to bridge the gaps which may have existed prior due to age difference. Sydney had a similar experience on her trip to the Grand Tetons in Wyoming, where students found themselves in an unfamiliar environment. Being in a "space that is not native to us," part of what she and the other students had to learn together was "how are we going to take care of each other and have a holistic relationship with the space around us and animals and all of that" (Sydney). These trips were particularly impactful for those who spoke about them, as unlike seminars or meetings, time away from the university meant "we were in it for a longer period of time and experimenting and learning through different avenues (Sydney)" which assisted in strengthening bonds amongst the Ohio Fellows.

The ability to surround themselves with their peers and have intelligent conversations was vital to building the Ohio Fellows community. Coming from a wide variety of disciplines around Ohio University, students were able to learn about and from each other. Further, some students like Mackenzie believed "the bonds I formed [will be] just life-long … I know that whichever direction individual fellows go post-graduation, I know that I'm always able to reach out to them," while others such as Caleb admitted of the Fellows "I never became all that close friends socially with them." No matter whether established friendships were created, all the Current Fellows spoke of the influence other members had on them personally and academically.

Exploring my third research question, there are three major aspects of the Ohio Fellows community: Fellow alumni, Faculty Fellows, and peers. Each piece of the community played a critical role in creating the Ohio Fellows experience. In talking of the community as a whole, Zak said, "you're talking to people who care and have opinions and aren't afraid to share and … to hear other people's opinions … the students, the faculty fellows and the alum and they've all just been incredibly impactful." An environment was created where all community members contributed without fear and aided in the students' ability to grow as individuals. In answering my final research question, I hope to establish any connections the Ohio Fellows program may have to success of students in and out of college.

Research question four: Current Ohio Fellows and creating success. When talking with the Current Ohio Fellows, either still working through their degree programs or freshly out of college, they spoke of some aspects of the Fellows program they

connected with, assisting them in be successful both in school and later in life. Below are the two areas the Current Fellows most associated with the program and success.

Peer Ohio Fellows. The first place students mentioned the Ohio Fellows in regards to creating an environment which could aid in success regarded peer interaction. Particularly, Current Fellows alluded to an increased ability to relate to those with differing perspectives and a growth in confidence through in-depth dialogue with each other. Mackenzie, recollecting her time with the Fellows and how it had provided skills necessary for success, said of being around a diversity of thoughts

> So many things are subjective, and there's no universal truth about things. And so that kind of changes your perspective if something is disappointing to you or something happens that you think is wrong … It kind has taught me to say, "Well, maybe it's just, in my own perspective" … And so that kind of overall philosophy change has taught me how to step back and kind of not get as upset about things or not view things in a way that would be limiting to me, I guess.

Mackenzie's reflection is an illustration of the development of resilience or the ability to move past situations which may not be ideal. To be successful when pursing one's goals, students should begin to understand success usually comes with some level of failure. This idea of resilience is important attribute both in- and outside the classroom as it allows students to learn to cope with difficult situations (Ceary, Donahue, & Shaffer, 2019; Hartley, 2011; Ng, Ang, Ho, 2012; Rahat & Ilhan, 2016). For Mackenzie, these discussions "definitely changed me as a student ... I've seen serious improvement in my writing skills … because I'm able to ... articulate my viewpoint on things." The potential

to express your opinions and discuss with others how they see the world in a judgement-free atmosphere also led to Fellows growing in confidence.

For some, the ability to live our authentic selves is seen as a form of success. Lee, who identifies as (gender) non-binary, found the Ohio Fellows "was also influential in understanding myself and accepting myself a bit better." As the program was established as one where students could be safe to share without fear of judgement, Lee confided in the Fellows:

> That group was one of the first people that I told, "I'm actually going to be changing my pronoun. I'm thinking about changing my name and using my middle name." That was the first unblinking acceptance that I received, and that was very reassuring, and I felt much safer, and it certainly gave me the courage to be now an out trans educator as well as student so that was very influential on me

The inability to live life as who we are or pursue our passions has the potential to hinder people from finding success in life. Lee represented someone who developed a comfort with their self and acceptance through peers in a program. This growth in confidence, and confidence in general, is vital in taking any risk associated with becoming the most successful version of ourselves. In the last theme, students expressed how this confidence in their ability to take risks had helped their thinking on what it means to be successful and evolve.

There are varying measures of success. As the literature shows, there are varying measures of life success (Frost, 2018; Heath, 1991), although it makes sense for students coming to college to view success through grades and possible future financial

earnings (Oeherlein, 2009). Caleb was a student who appeared to develop and grow through experiences with and without the Fellows. Speaking on success, he found interaction with the Original Fellows exceptionally meaningful in relation to how success is manifested within us as individuals. Reflecting on his time in the program and his interactions with one of the Original Fellows, Caleb said,

> what the Ohio fellows did for me and what can be very impactful for everybody ... is having that conversation where … the ability to switch career paths and do different things, use your intelligence and your skillset to do different things [is important].

He further stated

> seeing people who have been successful in life by walking down a bunch of different things and tripping over things has allowed me to become okay with the idea that success can look like a lot of different things. (Caleb)

The realization that what defines success evolves throughout our lives can be a turning point for students who come to this realization early on in their careers as students, especially those who tend to be high achievers academically. Mackenzie was one of these students who the Fellows aided in gaining more insight into what success looked like beyond the classroom.

Seeing herself struggling in classes academically, The Ohio Fellows meetings became a respite from the stress of college for Mackenzie. She found time with the Fellows every week allowed her to understand how "I don't have to be just a walking brain of people trying to cram information in my head," but above all she learned,

"there's more to character development that's important for being a future leader than just having the grades." Through interactions with other Fellows, Mackenzie was able to end her focus on success relating to grades and come to the realization in order to be successful in the future there are other areas which are equally, if not more, important than being academically successful. This epiphany also occurred for Sydney who is an artist. She attributed her increased awareness future possibilities to the guidance of the Fellows. Contemplating how the program may be connected to success, she said, "[a]s an artist, there's so many things that I can do, and that's very overwhelming sometimes." Through her relationships with the Fellows, her thinking on her art began to evolve and changed to knowing "there are a trillion things that you can do, and that is beautiful and you are totally capable of doing them … It felt like the future was a bit less daunting or intimidating" (Sydney). By allowing herself to understand her own expansive potential towards creating art, Sydney also permitted herself to be successful. Because she started to become less discouraged by her future, she opened herself up to realize her interpretation of success.

For many of the students associated with the Ohio Fellows program, connections were made between what the program offered them and how this could be translated to success, either immediately or later in life. Based on responses from the Fellows I spoke with, they at least minimally credited aspects of the program with providing them some skills necessary for success. However, Zak, like others, felt it was too soon for him to think of himself in terms of being successful. He said

the Fellows at least aimed to find the people who are going to be successful on

their own … they just help you move at a quicker pace, give you the resources

and the prodding a little bit that you need to do what you want to do.

Zak suggested that some students are going to be successful no matter where life takes

them. Faith was also hesitant to associate the Ohio Fellows with providing much

guidance in the way of success other than possible networking opportunities. She

admitted her own lack of participation may have had something to do with the lack of

connection, saying

I feel like this comes back to my lack of investment this year, engagement which

is a better word, because there are a lot of things that I could have done this year

that would help me past graduation [regarding success], but it just wasn't there.

But helping me outside of college, and I really hate to stress this point, but

networking seems to be the one that's going to help me the most beyond college.

(Faith)

Though from my perspective, this should not be viewed in a negative light, as my data

reveal the Original Fellows have been more than forthcoming in offering support and

assistance to the Current Fellows in a myriad of ways. Success, as I have come to

understand from the Fellows, is what we make of it and how one gets to become their

idea of success is a personal journey.

Summary: Current Ohio Fellows

This segment of Chapter Four was focused on Ohio Fellows program as it

operates in the modern day. Like the original program, there was a lack of clarity in

regard to how to define the mission of the program. As such, based on interview data I created the following mission for the current incarnation of the Ohio Fellows program: *To provide multidisciplinary experiences where socially aware leaders are created through exposure to diverse perspectives and sustained personal development*. Based on my interactions with the Current Fellows, the program appeared to focus its attention on most of these areas. For instance, students were chosen from disciplines from around the university. This not only ensured differing academic interests but perspectives on a wide range of topics. Moreover, there were students from varying ethic and socioeconomic backgrounds who brought experiences unique to themselves.

By joining together a wide array of students, it is possible, as my mission statement for the Fellows suggests, to give them the opportunity to not just be around those different from themselves but also create a safe space where an exchange of opinions and ideas can occur. Establishing these relationships further afforded students the opportunity to become introspective, as I saw with several of the students. Through thoughtful reflection and interchanges with the community, students' mindset on topics such as success and career evolved throughout their participation with the Ohio Fellows. Furthermore, as I will expand upon in the next chapter, these relationships were instrumental in the students' personal growth and development. The one area I felt my mission statement was lacking support was in terms of leadership. Though students mentioned one of the focuses was on leadership, other than the occasional seminar, I did not hear many students discuss this aspect of the program.

Conclusion

In this chapter we explored the two cases of the Ohio Fellows, the original program dating back to the 1960's and the current program which was re-established in the 2010s. Extensive research in the archives allowed me to piece together the creation of the Ohio Fellows in the 1960s as well as identify the reasons and goals behind the establishment of such a program. With strong ties to President Alden and Dean Rollins, it was not shocking the Ohio Fellows became defunct shortly after their departure from the university.

Being heavily regarded by alumni who participated in the program, it reemerged in 2013 with the help of Dean Seaman and Dr. Descutner. From interviews with them and the Faculty Fellows at the time of the recreation of the program, I was able to interpret their vision for the new Ohio Fellows. Subsequently, through data collected over interviews with the Original Fellows, the Current Fellows, the Faculty Fellows, and administrators, I familiarized myself with varying aspects of the Ohio Fellows program. Specifically, I learned how each case defined the mission of the Ohio Fellows, their perspectives on success, what constitutes the community, and how participation in program may create experiences which may be beneficial to success as a college student and beyond. In Chapter Five I will discuss the findings as a comparison between the two cases with a discussion on the evolution of the Ohio Fellows and the implications for practice regarding the creation of a similar co-curricular experience with a look at the sustainability of such a program.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative historical case study was to examine a co-curricular program's potential to assist students in success during and after college. Utilizing the Ohio Fellows program at Ohio university, I explored two cases for my research. Case One was that of the Ohio Fellows during the mid- to late-1960s, comprised of 10 Fellows. The second case centered around the Ohio Fellows as they have existed since the reestablishment during the 2010s, consisting of 6 Fellows, 3 administrators (including the director), and 4 Faculty Fellows. Through inspection of the archives at Ohio University and interviews with participants, I explored the answers to the research questions as well as learned the history behind the development of both incarnations of the Ohio Fellows program. In this chapter, I discuss the findings through the lens of the theoretical perspectives of Baxter Magolda's theory of self-authorship, Park's mentoring community, and Tinto's theory of social integration.

Comparative Case Analysis

The mission of the Ohio Fellows. Prior to beginning my research there was minimal information to be found about the Ohio Fellows program. During preliminary talks with some of the Original Fellows, defining the program and its mission was not easily done. There was a shroud of mystery surrounding the program, which may have added to the allure for some members. Because of this, I had participants in my study describe their understanding of the program's mission. From each incarnation of the Fellows, three themes arose. The Original Fellows saw the engagement of multidisciplinary students, bringing in outside perspectives, and helping students reach

their potential as the main mission of the program. On the other hand, the Current

Fellows pointed to leadership development, being socially aware and active, and student

development as key components of the mission. While themes from each case were not

identical, there was some overlap.

Multidisciplinary. As mentioned by many of the Original Fellows, its

multidisciplinary nature was seen as an influential aspect of the program's mission.

Baxter Magolda (2008) and Parks (2000) highlight the relevance of student interactions

with those different from themselves. By gathering a diverse student population, it is

possible to allow for differing perspectives and the development of critical thinking

(Baxter Magolda, 2008; Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017; Parks, 2000). Although the

1960s cohorts mention this explicitly as being a goal of the Fellows, the modern-day

Fellows did not. While the Current Fellows referenced the interdisciplinary nature of the

program, they did not identify it as being connected to the mission of the program,

although they did discuss its significance regarding other areas of my research.

Desire for social change. The next theme of bringing in the outside world shared

some connections with the Current Fellows' theme of creating students interested in

social change. From a modern-day lens, it may be difficult to understand what it means

to bring in the outside world. With the internet, information from around the world is

dispersed at a much quicker rate than it was during the 1960s. Bringing in well-regarded

individuals from around the country helped to keep students aware of what was going on

in the world around them and provided varying perspectives on those events. By creating

opportunities where students learned how to interact with those different from

themselves, the Ohio Fellows program of the 1960s created a mentoring community and encouraged self-authorship. Invited speakers allowed for students like Polly to better define their identities and beliefs, while also giving students like Robert an opportunity to understand how it is possible to learn from those different from yourself (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Parks, 2000). These encounters cultivated a desire to give back to society, which many of the Original Fellows do and the Current Fellows see as a purpose of the current program.

As established in Chapter Two, co-curricular programs with an emphasis on service-learning can pique a student's interest in social change (Keen & Hall, 2009; Knight & Novoselich, 2017; Samuelson et al., 2013; Suskie, 2015). While the Ohio Fellows program is not a service-learning based program, Zak and Faith's time spent doing flood relief in West Virginia is an instance of an event which not only gave students a view of the world going on around them but also had the potential to raise their interest in contributing more meaningfully to society (Keen & Hall, 2009; Knight & Novoselich, 2017; Samuelson et al., 2013). Dr. Descutner, who played a role in reestablishing the Fellows, believed this was a vital component of the program. Having spent time with the Original Fellows and witnessing the contributions they were making to society, Dr. Descutner recognized the program's value in creating an environment where students were encouraged to be civic leaders and create creative solutions to societal problems.

Effective student development. The final theme regarding the mission of the Original Fellows' of assisting students to reach their potential is directly related to the

student development theme of the Current Fellows. In both cases there is a desire for students to personally reflect and become confident in themselves. An effective mentoring community is one where Parks (2000) sees encounters with otherness as a method to create critical thinkers who are also effective communicators (Baxter Magolda, 2008; Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017). This idea of establishing relationships with those different than ourselves relates back to the Original Fellows' first theme, which shows the significance of the interaction amongst peers to accomplish the program's mission. Moreover, by creating a space where students are allowed to express and debate ideas freely, an environment is created where the development of self-authorship occurs over the three dimensions: epistemology, understanding of self, and understanding of relationships. The Fellows Program breeds encounters with diverse thought, and builds self-confidence among members (Baxter Magolda, 2008; King et al., 2009). The final theme mentioned by the Current Fellows related to leadership.

Based on the literature, co-curricular programs have potential to support the development of leadership skills, which can further help students when they enter the workforce (Knight & Novoselich, 2017; Suskie, 2015). This was particularly true when different leadership styles were modeled or taught. For example, Lee mentioned the Faculty Fellows included content on group leadership. This focus on working as a team to make decisions is one area where Samuelson et al. (2013) said students may benefit from in participating in service-learning programs. Cultivating a willingness to take charge was also emphasized, even in situations where one may not be as experienced, and wanting to learn from these events. Research has shown co-curricular activities

encourage autonomous learning, which is a crucial skill for leaders (Elias & Drea, 2013).

If, as Dr. Pillay said, the program was created with the intent of helping to rear future

leaders, it was important for students to be introduced to varying styles of leadership and

gain confidence to step outside their comfort zone.

      Defining success. With this research centered around the ability of the Ohio

Fellows program to create conditions for students to be successful in college and beyond,

it was valuable to determine how both the Current Fellows and Original Fellows viewed

personal success.

      Financial responsibility. In the scope of the existing research, I found an

alignment with both the Original and Current Fellows' reported ideals of success. Many

of the Original Fellow participants echoed the sentiments of White (2015), who believed

a focus on obtaining wealth was more appropriate as a personal goal than a societal one.

For the Original Fellows, financial success was not just about the ability to live a

comfortable lifestyle but was also associated with the ability to give back. Whether it

was Ralph and his donations to educational causes or Terry's ability to help fund medical

research, these participants discussed directing their financial gain to aid society. Zak,

one of the Current Fellows who mentioned the idea of financial success, also appeared to

believe those with great wealth had a responsibility to use it to make a positive impact on

the world. Moreover, my results seemed to match those of Heath (1991) who found

people who perceived themselves as successful were more likely to have traits which

encouraged them to help others in society, such as being caring and compassionate and

having honesty and integrity.

Healthy relationships. While there were mentions of financial success similar to the focus of Oehrlein's (2009) study, it was not the main identifier of success, even for those who mentioned it. For instance, both generations of Fellows identified relationships with friends and family as keystones of success. And although the Association for Public and Land-Grant Universities (2015) asserts areas such as civic engagement are hard to measure when they relate to success, this was an area of significant importance to many of the Fellows, who spoke in detail about the necessity of giving back to society and having positive influence on peoples' lives. Also evidenced through the definition of success is presence of the development of Baxter Magolda's (2008) theory of self-authorship.

Success and self-authorship. The Fellows' articulation of "success" signaled how self-authorship manifests in the personal development of the Fellows from the 1960s. Explicitly, the Fellows' beliefs and identity become more discernable when examining how they define success. For instance, in further examining Craig's ideas on success, specifically relating to how he is intent on providing patients with the knowledge and tools to assist them in making the right decisions for their health, I can infer he thrives in the three dimensions described by Baxter Magolda (2008): cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. Craig's ability to provide care without judgement shows his willingness to establish relationships with patients who may come from backgrounds different from his own, which, in turn, helps cement his identity as a professional concerned about helping patients make a "positive difference" in their health. Moreover, when examining the Three Meaning-Making Elements of Baxter Magolda's (2008)

theory (trusting the inner voice, establishing an internal foundation, and securing internal commitments), it is clear to see how these are necessary to view success as being willing to take risks and fail.

As described in Chapter Two, Baxter Magolda's (2008) three meaning-making elements similarly revolve around the premise of developing a confident and secure individual. What I saw in Bill and, especially, Mike were these elements working in conjunction with each other. By having confidence in themselves, understanding why they make certain decisions, and holding the belief that everything would work out, Bill, Mike, and the other Fellows have the ability to take risks because they trust in themselves and know what can and cannot be controlled in various situations. I also saw this same willingness to take risks with the some of the Current Fellows. Caleb, who spoke of going after his dreams of being a college professor, is aware of the challenges which lie before him, but knows it is worth taking these risks. His experiences with the older generation of Fellows showed him it is okay to face uncertain challenges which, in turn, aided him in the ability to trust his inner voice and understand the reasons behind the decisions he makes without fear of failure (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Viewing the idea of success as the ability to take risks and fail through the lens of Baxter Magolda's theory gives further meaning and insight into the definition of success.

Robert's words, "success is in the eye of the beholder," not only summed up the myriad of definitions I received about success, but also echoed the sentiments of Heath (1991) and Frost (2018), who found success to be intrinsic and defined by how you perceive it, not by others' perceptions. The Current Fellows, including administration

and faculty, were quick to also see success as doing what makes you happy. This open-ended vision of success allows individuals to pursue it through what provides them happiness, unlike finite ideas of success which place confines on what it constitutes. Furthermore, it backs up the assertion that generalizing success is a difficult endeavor for researchers due to a diverse student body with a wide range of interests (Guess, 2008; Kuh et al., 2006). Finally, it is critical to remember attitudes towards what makes one a success generally change as one progresses through life, further complicating the ability of anyone to provide a definitive answer about what success truly is.

The community of the Ohio Fellows. Tinto's (1987) theory on social integration defines student interaction outside the classroom as occurring with peers, professors, and other professionals. Building these connections outside the classroom setting can help support student performance within it (Tinto, 1987). Moreover, co-curricular experiences which take place in a mentoring community are predicted to benefit students as they cause them to become more introspective and obtain guidance that may assist the students in navigating both professional and personal issues (Parks, 2000).

An examination of Parks' (2000) theory behind mentoring communities reveals a unique perspective on what mentoring looks likes, which may be why it aligns itself so well with the Ohio Fellows' community. Like most mentor relationships, the basic idea of mentoring exists where someone with knowledge and experience has the potential to help guide someone who lacks the appropriate knowledge and experience. Where Parks (2000) differs is in the idea that the community and all members of said community have

the potential to serve as mentors for one another and provide each other with the gifts of

mentoring. This is not simply a typical one-on-one mentoring situation. Features such as

support, recognition, and challenge are gifts of mentoring each member of the community

has the potential to provide one another. Furthermore, there is a celebration of

differences amongst the community as varying perspectives help students think more

critically about themselves and the world around them (Parks, 2000). The Ohio Fellows

serves as an example of this type of community, as there were a variety of community

members who served as mentors with a clear willingness to learn from each other.

Peer Fellows. Exploring both cases of the Ohio Fellows' community, many of

the participants found a space with other people they could interact with without fear of

judgement. In line with Park's (2000) theory, the participants of the Ohio Fellows

created a mentoring community. While it does not strictly adhere to her theory in the

sense that activities occur amongst people interested in the same or similar profession

(Parks, 2000), I saw a supportive environment where people could converse on a myriad

of topics. If one further keeps in mind that during the 1960s students' attendance at Ohio

University there was much societal and political unrest, the ability to be open to and

debate differing opinions surely assisted in the growth of critical thought amongst

students (Parks, 2000). Additionally, interaction with those different from ourselves is

essential in the process of identity development and self-authorship, as it helps students

work through their own belief system and assists in cultivating a deeper understanding of

ourselves and the world around us (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

Lee and Mackenzie provided an example of how an effective mentoring community can assist students in further developing self-authorship. Lee was able to speak of being non-binary with the other Fellows and come away with further self-confidence in identifying this way, while Mackenzie, who spoke to the Fellows in her cohort about struggling academically, came to understand she was more than her grades. Even the inability to connect with the Ohio Fellows community due to a lack of shared interests could be argued to have helped some further realize their identity. Joel joined the Fellows in hopes of finding others to support causes he was passionate about, but when this failed, it did not deter him from continuing his anti-war protests, instead making him more resolute in his beliefs. As King et al. (2009) pointed out, negative experiences aid in assisting students to build their internal foundation and begin trusting their inner voice. Whether through positive or negative experiences, the Ohio Fellows community of peers helped students purse a greater understanding of themselves.

Guest speakers. Although long-term guidance was not expected of guests of the Ohio Fellows' program, the speakers brought in to interact with the Original Fellows left a lasting impact on most of those who interacted with these leaders in their career fields. For instance, Polly's meeting of Huston Smith inspired her to begin to question herself and her beliefs. While not a mentor in the traditional sense, Huston Smith was able to fulfill this role according to Parks (2000), because although his role as a member of the Ohio Fellows' community was limited, he was able to bestow upon Polly one of the gifts of mentorship: inspiration. Similarly, Craig's encounter with Robert Greenleaf further inspired his interest is social responsibility. On the other hand, we have Robert who

thoughts and beliefs about Robert McNamara were challenged by meeting and interacting with him. While Robert may have not changed his mind about how he felt about the war, his perception of McNamara as a person was changed by this interaction. Parks (2000) sees this challenge of being around others different than ourselves as essential in a good mentoring community. The mentoring gifts of inspiration and challenge brought to the Fellows through guest speakers served as one of the most impactful features of the Ohio Fellows' community.

Beyond the mentoring community aspects, meetings with leaders in industry allowed for an expanded understanding on topics with varying viewpoints and perspectives. This allowed students to begin to evolve regarding self-authorship. Furthermore, interactions with guest speakers allowed for students to have their thoughts and ideas challenged, which can aid in the development of critical thinking, effective communication skills, and a further understanding of self, specifically in relation to Baxter Magolda's (2008) three dimensions. From the comments made by those who took part in these events, it is evident the speakers caused many of the students to reflect on themselves, resulting in them shaping and gaining confidence in their beliefs (Baxter Magolda, 2008; King et al.,2009). Regarding Polly, by allowing herself to question her own beliefs, she began to further establish her own identity through a willingness to be open to multiple cultural frames (Baxter Magolda, 2008). This openness to other's perspectives was a key component in the ability to have meaningful discussions with speakers of a high magnitude.

Parks' (2000) emphasis of being around diverse thought is highlighted with the guest speaker community of the Fellows, although the reactions from the members of the program connecting with these individuals were different. Joel was particularly skeptical about associating with certain people. Although he found some guests to be well-spoken and captivating, he was also critical of their work with the U.S. government in the turbulent 1960s. Robert, by meeting someone he thought he despised, came to realize that who we are professionally may not be the same as who we are on a personal level, and learned he had the ability to listen to and understand someone different from himself.

I also argue these experiences helped Robert with various aspects of self-authorship, especially in the cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions (Baxter Magolda, 2009). His attempt to learn from another's perspective was key to furthering his self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008). In Joel's case, some guests reinforced his awareness of his beliefs and identity as an anti-war activist as he, according to Baxter Magolda's (2008) theory, appeared to have already established an internal foundation allowing him to trust his internal voice. This was evidenced through the fact that, although he was impressed by meeting a man of such stature, it did not change his opinion on how he viewed that man in his professional capacity. For the Current Fellows, the Original Fellows, having achieved considerable success themselves, filled the role the famous leaders filled for the 1960s cohort.

When looking at the types of guests the 1960s program was able to attract, such as Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara, it is not surprising that today the potential to have such high-level government or business leaders speak to a small select program of

students is minimal. Zak, Caleb, and Mackenzie described how the Original Fellows actually filled this role for them. Because the alums provide an example of people who have changed careers or started businesses, when students are able to see themselves in others, they are also able to gain confidence they can accomplish their goals.

The Ohio Fellows furthered the ideals of a mentoring community when the Original Fellows helped the modern cohort understand what it takes to be successful in a profession through speaking of their own experiences (Parks, 2000). Participation in the Fellows, specifically interaction with some of the Original Fellows, ensured students became more aware of skills dissimilar from their own which are necessary for future success (Keen & Hall, 2009). Furthermore, the confidence gained allowed students to trust themselves more and not worry so much about outside factors they do not have control over (Baxter Magolda, 2008). Confidence allows students to take responsibility for their actions when the inability to do so can possible hinder self-authorship (Pizzolato & Ozaki, 2007). So, although the modern-day cohorts may not be speaking with guests with the same recognition as the 1960s cohort had the privilege to speak to, what was learned and gained from meeting with the Original Fellows was just as significant.

Mentors. According to Park's (2000) theory on mentoring communities, mentors play a significant role as they provide encouragement, recognition, and challenge. From my conversations with the Fellows from the 1960s, I can see how, even within the same community, mentoring styles manifested in wildly different ways. I would contend, based on interviews, that Dr. Chandler was particularly proficient at providing students encouragement, recognition, and challenge. Particularly, he aligned with Park's (2000)

ideal of the impact a strong mentoring relationship can have on leading students to develop meaningful careers and personal lives. Polly reminisced about a meeting with Dr. Chandler later in life and hearing him mention having read several of her books and being proud of her. He was proud of what the Ohio Fellows was able to help her accomplish. In comparison, Dean Rollins was good with support and challenge, but possibly not as good with recognizing student accomplishments. I find this evidenced in Dean Rollins' lack of enthusiasm with Craig's acceptance to medical school and further demonstrated by Tom when he said Dean Rollins "[n]ever said, 'Good job.'" Tom nevertheless followed this up by saying "at the same time, [Dean Rollins] was always there to help you." It is apparent Dean Rollins had his own method of motivating students and some students responded to it. Obviously, Joel found Dean Rollins' methods off-putting, but also felt he was equally objectionable as an individual.

The Current Fellows, who associated with the Faculty Fellows as somewhat fulfilling this mentoring role, seemed to be lacking in regard to strong mentoring relationships. While not true of all the Fellows, Faith spoke of having an easier time establishing a relationship with faculty in her department. This is due to the fact that she saw it as a more beneficial relationship. While, I would normally view this as cause for alarm in respect to an effective mentoring community, I believe other components of the community more than made up for the lack of strong mentoring we saw with the Original Ohio Fellows.

When Parks (2000) discussed the idea of long-term guidance, I am hesitant to believe she means actual interaction with mentors, but instead the ability of the mentor(s)

to have provided a depth of mentorship which can stay with students over time. Only time will tell if this occurred with the Current Fellows. But with the Original Fellows, the influence of Dean Rollins and Dr. Chandler was obvious. While both men created a lasting impression on students, Dean Rollins seemed to have the most effect on the Fellows. Students like Tom and Terry both mentioned this idea of always thinking toward the future, which was something Dean Rollins encouraged. Regardless of leadership or mentoring style, what is important is how both Dean Rollins and Dr. Chandler and the current Faculty Fellows provided an environment where students could fail without judgement and were insistent on Fellows expanding their understanding of the world around them (Parks, 2000). Emphasizing the importance of expanding one's worldview is just one of the areas in which the administrators of the program were assisting students in success and developing their self-authorship.

   The Ohio Fellows' contribution to participant success. In Chapter One, I discussed the history surrounding the creation of co-curricular programming in the early American colonial colleges. Rudolph (1990) explained how establishing these programs gave students the opportunity to think and interact in ways unique from the confines of the rigid classroom setting. Today, we view programs produced in supplement to the academic classroom as a way to enhance academic and student development, increase student persistence and sense of belonging, and provide a non-familiar support system for students (Geiger, 2015; Karp, Hughes, & O'Gara, 2010; Rudolph, 1990; Suskie, 2015; Tinto, 1987; Voges & Lyons, 2017). In addition, Dean (2015) reminded us that

measuring the effectiveness of these types of programs can be difficult due to a lack of a cohesion between programs and determining what exactly we would measure.

Multidisciplinary peers. In reviewing the current literature on student success, one of the areas essential to post-collegiate success was critical thinking (Miller, Dumford, & Johnson, 2017; Raile at al., 2017). According to Scheffer and Rubenfeld (2000), critical thinking requires the skills of analyzing, applying standards, discriminating, information seeking, logical reasoning, predicting, and transforming knowledge. The assumption exists that these skills will be indirectly learned through coursework while in college; however, this is not always the case. Terry lamented "that classroom education was not sufficient" and OF4 explained "the level of debate and discourse was elevated" with the Original Fellows when compared to that offered within the classroom setting. These comments by the Original Fellows mimic results found by Landrum, Hettich, and Wilner (2010), who found some colleges lack high expectations when it comes to student performance. For the participants in the Fellows it can be said that, while the classroom may have not been influential in helping them challenge their thoughts and introducing them to differing viewpoints, the program helped to fill this gap. This is significant given the importance of students' needs in the academic setting.

Based on Tinto's (1987) theory of social integration, because there appeared to be a lack of interest in the classroom, some of these students were probably struggling to integrate into the formal academic setting of Ohio University. This lack of integration can be detrimental to student persistence, as students do not create a bond with the university. Just as the Fellows were able to find a connection with peers and professors

outside the confines of the classroom, Tinto (1987) found the social setting of the university to have the ability to positively impact retention. This is what I saw with the Fellows from the 1960s in terms of graduation (nine of the ten interviewed graduated on-time), and the willingness to associate with others who held differing perspectives further created the capacity for critical thinking essential in and out of the classroom.

Because of their participation in the Ohio Fellows program, skills necessary for critical thinking developed. Being around those with differing points of view was essential, but paramount to this experience was the capacity of the Fellows to debate and talk about difficult topics. We see this discussed by one of the Current Fellows, Mackenzie, who came to the realization through interaction with her peer Fellows that "there are no universal truths about things [and] … everything is subjective." Both Baxter Magolda (2008) and Parks (2000) spoke of the necessity of students to interact with those different from themselves. This serves as an example of Parks' (2000) ideal mentoring community where everyone has the ability to serve as mentoring agents. Regarding self-authorship, this interaction allows students to begin to develop within the three dimensions discussed earlier relating to comprehending multiple cultural perspectives which, in turn, assists in permitting people to define who they are while also establishing relationships with diverse groups (Baxter Magolda, 2008).

From the Original Ohio Fellows' responses, I saw these diverse relationships in the form of social status, gender, and major discipline as possibly being influential in the growth of self-authorship. With the Current Fellows, diversity is expanded to include race, gender identity, and sexuality. Examining mentoring communities, Parks (2000)

stated effective mentoring communities are ones in which a judgment-free environment exists and conversations concerning a variety of topics can be had. Lee, who came out as trans non-binary first to peer Fellows, shows how the Fellows fits within the confines of a strong mentoring community encouraging self-authorship, as Lee's news was welcomed, giving them further confidence to live authentically. These components, along with a diverse group of students, aid in the development of critical thought and a deeper understanding of the world (Parks, 2000). The development of self-authorship and an effective mentoring community was essential in the next area where Fellows felt their successes lie, confidence.

Mentors and internships. Parks' (2000) theory explains how an influential mentoring community can help introduce students to their profession, while also playing a role in student behavior concerning seeking out a meaningful life in- and outside of their career. Within the Original Ohio Fellows community, Deans Rollins played a vital role for many students regarding career choice and authentication. For instance, Ralph credits Dean Rollins with having a great influence of his decision to change his career path. Mike, on the other hand, who was interested in a career in art, believed his interaction with those affiliated with the program provided him with the confidence to pursue this field. Mike and Ralph's experiences support Dumford and Miller's (2015) findings which see the necessity of career advisement, as they found alumni point to lack of career advising as a hinderance in success after college. Moreover, Landrum, Hettich, and Wilner (2010) identified the ability to work closely with mentors as having the potential to increase success outside of college.

In addition to having a functioning mentoring community, studies have also shown alumni value experiential learning, as it assists in students acclimating to their careers and with success post-college (Dumford & Miller, 2017; Lamdrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010; Raile et al., 2017; Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). Terry, Polly, and Tom spoke of experiences they had with their internships as providing them opportunities to establish connections, ask questions, and build confidence. For Tom and Polly, in particular, the ability to work with others who they viewed in high esteem gave them the assurance they could do this beyond college, as well. The Original Fellows' comments on the influence of internships mimics findings in the research, which shows alumni find these events as important to a well-rounded college career (Dumford & Miller, 2017; Lamdrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010; Raile et al., 2017; Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). By providing internships for students, the Ohio Fellows provided another avenue toward success the participants.

Guest speakers. For the Original Fellows, guest speakers served as a way for students to gain exposure to leaders in a myriad of career fields. These experiences not only gave students the confidence to be able to interact with others, but also provided them with perspectives that may have differed from their own. The Original Fellows filled this role for the modern cohort of Fellows. This exposure to those different from ourselves helps us to not only further understand our beliefs (Baxter Magolda, 2008), but also creates situations where we learn how to interact with those who we may not agree with, which can be part of finding success in your career (Parks, 2000). In Parks' (2000) mentoring community model, these types of mentors are vital as they provide mentees with an understanding of the practices necessary to be successful within their chosen

career path. With respect to Mike, they gave him the confidence to purse his passion in art. Caleb and other Current Fellows also mentioned they learned through interaction with the Original Fellows that part of cutting your own path requires taking risks and being confident in doing so. Additionally, I saw how meeting with guest speakers can help to build self-authorship.

This development of self-authorship occurs within the three meaning-making elements where people become more confident in the self and begin to trust themselves to the point where they do not worry about the unknown (Baxter Magolda, 2008). This is explicit in Tom, Mike, and Polly, who reported building confidence in themselves through the ability to interact with those who they admire or see as influential. With Mike, I additionally saw how the guest speakers allowed him to trust his inner voice, giving him the confidence to pursue the career he wanted, which aligns with King, Baxter Magolda, Barber, Brown, and Lindsay's (2009) study.

Evolution of the Ohio Fellows. Originally created in the 1960s, the Ohio Fellows program ceased operations in the Spring of 1970 and was reborn in 2013. After an over forty-year hiatus, it should come as no surprise the Fellows program had evolved. Utilizing information gathered about both incarnations of the program from the archives and interviews, I explore how the Ohio Fellows program has changed over time. As well as being centered around researcher observations, discussion of the evolution of the Ohio Fellows is centered mostly around my research questions as they provide insight into the central theme of collegiate and post-collegiate success.

Mission. Examining the missions I created: *To engage students from a multitude of academic interests in order to develop successful and passionate future leaders in their field through a variety of exceptional educational opportunities* and *To provide multidisciplinary experiences where socially aware leaders are created through exposure to diverse perspectives and sustained personal development* for the Original and Current Fellows, respectively, while I cannot say that the mission of the program has changed substantially over the years, based on themes garnered from interviews what is emphasized in the mission has. For instance, many from the cohort from the 1960s spoke about the program bringing together a multidisciplinary student population for the program. Created to supplement the academic experience of students (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990) co-curricular programs were originally attended by those with similar academic interests, so it is not a reach to assume this was still a dominant practice in the 60s. Today, with the sheer number of academic- and non-academic-based co-curricular programs housed on many college campuses, convening a group of students from varying academic disciplines is not a special feat. This may have not been the case during the 1960, so the idea of creating a program which intended this as a goal may have been unique for the time. The ability to more easily interact with those who have different academic interests in the modern college setting may explain why the Current Fellows did not place as much emphasis on this aspect when speaking of the mission of the program. The next area where I see a disconnect is bringing the outside world to students in Athens.

Something mentioned by the Original Fellows was the idea of broadening students' horizons, through exposing students to what was going on around the country and providing varying perspectives, generally done through guest speakers. As I discuss in further detail concerning community, this was a vital component of the Original Fellows community. Modern-day Fellows did not mention the program allowing them to gain a further understanding of what was going on in the world. Although the Current Fellows believed it was important to be aware of social injustices, with technology, it is almost impossible to not stay abreast of current events. With Athens, Ohio being relatively secluded, even today, and many of the Original Fellows being first-generation college students, Dean Rollins saw a gap in knowledge which needed to be filled. While today's Fellows may also need to be introduced to differing perspectives not found amongst each other, the internet provides a platform where ideas can be found in a multitude of formats.

Community. The community of an institution of higher education and its corresponding co-curricular programs has the potential to impact a student in a variety of areas. From a social integration standpoint, Tinto (1987) found students who are able to establish connections with professors, students, and other university personnel in academic, social, or both settings are more likely to persist. Moreover, Parks (2000) identified an effective mentoring community as one where students interact with mentors willing to push students outside their comfort zones, provide professional insight, and provide support when necessary. No matter the lens, it is important to remember the

significance of those who are part of the community. For the Ohio Fellows program, what constitutes the community shifted somewhat over the years.

One of the constants regarding the Ohio Fellows community, and any co-curricular community, are the peers that comprise it. Yes, students have evolved over time, but with both incarnations of the program, peers are an essential factor, as they bring differing life experiences and points of view. Where there has been a change in the make-up of the community is with guest speakers. For the Original Fellows, students had the opportunity to have small one-on-one visits with important government officials, authors, and other well-known pioneers in their field. Arising from these interactions was an increase in confidence and even further development of self-authorship. Having well-connected individuals, such as Dean Rollins and President Alden, affiliated with the program made it less complicated to invite these types of guests to either meet exclusively with the Fellows or meet in a more intimate setting after giving a university-wide lecture. As many Fellows from the 1960s cohorts indicate, these experiences were very influential as they gave them a view into how successful people think and operate. Today's Fellows, however, are not as fortunate when it comes to speaking with these types of guests.

Arranging notable guest speakers at a university today is not an easy task. From those who may oppose their presence on campus to providing a forum where open dialog can occur, inviting well-known guests to the university can be a complicated process. Also, it is vital to keep in mind the appearance of asking an individual to donate their time to a small select group of students. While I do not argue this is an impossible act,

there are probably concerns about displaying blatant preference to one student group over another.   Because of this, it stands to reason no one student organization is granted access to invited guests for more intimate meetings. Yet many of the Current Fellows believe they have the ability to interact with guests who are just as significant.

Speaking with the modern-day Fellows there was a belief that the people who could provide an understanding of what success looks like in practice were the Original Fellows. As I heard from several of the Current Fellows, the original cohorts have provided them with examples of people who have made career changes or been highly successful in their field. By speaking with alumni about their experiences, like themselves, the Current Fellows gained confidence and a deeper awareness of what it means to flourish in your career. So, while many of the Original Fellows believed they gained confidence because of the people who they were speaking with, the Current Fellows gained confidence by learning and hearing about the experiences of the 1960s cohorts. Knowing someone else took a leap of faith and survived allowed the modern Fellows to believe they can also do the same. The final piece of the community I see an evolution was with the administration.

During the Original Fellows' time in the program, the two most influential members of the community were Dr. Chandler and Dean Rollins. When interviewing participants, either one or both names were always mentioned. Beyond providing access to people they would have never dreamed of meeting, both men also provided students with travel and internship opportunities. What is more, Dean Rollins inspired students to continually push themselves to do bigger and better things with their lives. Today,

although students did mention the role of Faculty Fellows and the director, how they spoke of this part of the community lacked the passion and excitement I received when hearing about Dean Rollins or Dr. Chandler. Whether comments were positive or negative, I always had a sense of the critical role they played not only in the program, but also in students' lives. This is probably why Joel did not share the same enthusiasm for Dean Rollins as some of the others. Although I do not see the Current Fellows' lack of a substantial administrative influence as detrimental to the community as a whole, it was a vital aspect of the Original Fellows program.

Creating success. Across both cohorts, success attributed to the Ohio Fellows was due in part to the community established within program. For instance, both the Original and Current Fellows spoke of the influence their peers had on their ability to be successful. By being around those who hold opposing opinions, students learned not only to have civil debates about controversial topics, but maybe more importantly that we can establish relationships with individuals different from ourselves. The Original Fellows were also able to develop these skills through interaction with guest speakers. For the Current Fellows, however, the guests they found most significant were the Original Fellows.

One area where the Current Fellows diverged regarding the connection to the program and success was coming to an early understanding that there are various ways to view success. Being able to comprehend how success comes in varying forms allowed for several of the modern-day Fellows to really focus on what was important to them. This was accomplished through relationships with the Original Fellows and

administration of the program. This sense of awareness may be similar to the confidence

the Ohio Fellows program was able to instill in the 1960s participants through Dean

Rollins, Dr. Chandler, and experiences such as internships. But, based on my perception

of Dean Rollins from interviews, much of this confidence building related to having

students learn to take risks career-wise and lacked focus on other domains of success.

This career-driven focus on success may have been a generational concept as the students

I spoke with from the Fellows emphasized the importance of work, but also knew

relationships were just as much, if not more, of a critical component of success.

In the passing of 40 years, the Ohio Fellows program has evolved to better reflect

our ever-changing society. Although the most obvious change has occurred with those

who comprise the community, this has not had a negative impact on the mission of the

Fellows, which is viewed similarly by both incarnations of the program. For those who

see value in the program, there is a desire for it to not meet the same fate as the original

did. To determine how to sustain the Ohio Fellows or even create a similar program

elsewhere, in the following section I discuss aspects of the program that should be

considered for future practice.

Implications for Practice

In consideration for the sustainability of the current program and/or the creation

of one similar, I discuss certain features of the program. These areas include the further

diversification of the Fellows, the appearance of elitism, the financial aspect, and how to

sustain the program.

Diversity. Ignoring the desire to attract academically impressive students, colleges and universities around the United States strive to increase the diversity of their student population. A recent study on the sense of belonging and culturally engaging campuses found that colleges and universities which provide a "cultural familiarity, collectivist cultural orientations, and holistic support might be especially important in providing the conditions to maximize belonging among students in college regardless of racial background" (Museus, Yi, & Saelua, 2018, p.470). Like social integration, establishing a sense of belonging has been shown to increase persistence among college students (Museus, Yi, & Saela, 2018; Tinto, 1981). With an increased focus on accountability in higher education regarding retention and persistence through graduation of students, this was an area I saw as important to emphasize regarding the Ohio Fellows. As Johnson and Peacock (2019) pointed out, classroom and co-curricular activities give students the opportunity to learn about and discuss the differences that exist between us. Though I share a similar belief, it was necessary to gain the perspective of the participants of the Ohio Fellows program.

Many of the Fellows interviewed seemed to agree the program should be diverse, but how to go about it and what diversity meant depended on who I was interviewing. Reflecting on time spent in the program Lee believed the Fellows "could have definitely been more racially diverse [and] … I think that it would be good if the net could be cast wider to include more leaders of color, more leaders of marginalized, any marginalized persons or forces." This is something Dr. Fowler, the current director, is attempting to do as she says they

look at individual students and cohorts when selecting the new group of Fellows

and how they may bring something unique to the group. Diversity for the Fellows

can include: gender, sexual orientation, race, discipline, cultural status, economic,

ethnicity, and other differences.

But what I noticed about the Fellows was their want for diversity went beyond the

obvious identifiers of race, gender, and sexual orientation, but additionally focused on the

significance of diversity of thought gained through personal experiences.

Speaking on the importance of diversity of thought, Tom said

you could learn people's viewpoints. I looked at things as a journalist. You may

look at things as a politician. You may look at something as a researcher. You

may see it as an artist. But we saw things differently, and we could share that. I

thought that was a real advantage.

This opinion was not unique to Tom, as Mackenzie found the ability to talk about topics

from various perspectives as "the one thing that was really impactful for me." No matter

the type of diversity, Fellows were wary about it being forced.

Those affiliated with the Ohio Fellows program all seemed to be positive about

diversifying the program but were cautious about how this should occur. As Terry

explained, while "the diversity criteria shouldn't be used to exclude anyone but shouldn't

be the determinant for including someone." Both Dr. Descutner and Ralph spoke

negatively about selection of students simply for traits such as race. Lee accurately

stated, "you don't want to tokenize [students]" and selecting based on specific diversity-

related criteria would do just that.

Dr. Descutner believed to attract to diverse group of participants those selecting new Fellows should "cast the net as wide as you can, and then pick the best students," but the diversity "has to happen organically." Zak was of this mindset, maintaining "I would suspect that those in charge of selecting the fellows are very interested in diversity, wanted to happen, but more than that, they want to pick the right people." Research by Ford and Patterson (2018) found as universities attempt to give the illusion of diversity through a focus on specific student populations in enrollment numbers, they are ignoring and not attending to the intricate realities regarding access to education. This problem occurring at universities around the United States is one which those involved with the Fellows is trying to avoid. While they see the need for diversity, using it as a tool to satisfy the desires of those outside the program would only be a detriment to the Ohio Fellows. Finding those who fit within the ideals of the program while also diversifying can be done if, as others suggested, the program does more effective and wide-spread recruitment.

Because students tend to sort themselves into homogenous groups, is it vital they be exposed to outside opinions in order to be successful when working with those with differing views (Johnson & Peacock, 2019). This may be viewed as especially necessary in the modern university, where the 2016 class of Freshmen were the most politically divided in the history of the The American Freshman: National Norms report (Eagan et al., 2017). From interview data of both Ohio Fellows programs, we see how influential experiences with those different from themselves was for the participants in relation to how the program fostered their success. Many students do not realize the information

bubble they live in until they go to work and encounter those who think and act differently (Johnson & Peacock, 2019). At this point, learning how to interact with these people becomes a difficult and steep learning curve. Co-curricular programs, like the Ohio Fellows, have the potential to create opportunities where a student can practice speaking with people with differing opinions than their own in a safe environment.

Elitism. Defined as being "considered superior by others or by themselves, as in intellect, talent, power, wealth, or position in society" (Elitist, n.d.a), "elitist" emits a general negative connotation. In the world of higher education, the word "elitist" seems to be a designation colleges and universities either embrace or attempt to avoid being labeled as. Having become synonymous with Ivy League schools, elitism is something most public universities try to circumvent by at least giving the appearance of overall acceptance.

Many universities express openness to all by an overemphasizing of marginalized populations either through pictures or enrollment data featured prominently on the university's website (Ford & Patterson, 2018). Unfortunately, such efforts lead to tokenizing these students as real issues behind the recruitment and retention of this population of students are ignored. For a program such as the Ohio Fellows, whose mission is centered around creating socially-conscious leaders, it is important to determine if this type of program is elitist by nature, and if this label can be overcome. By coming to a further understanding of how those affiliated with the program view the prospect of the program being elitist, I hoped to establish if this characterization is detrimental and necessary to avoid.

Most of the those who I spoke with, when confronted with the idea that the program could be viewed as elitist, readily agreed with that assessment. But their take on why the label exists and how they perceived it varied among participants. I found the Original Fellows made some good points in reference to whether the program was for elite students and whether this was a good or bad label. Mike thought "there's a big difference between elitist and snobbery and non-inclusiveness," and "there are elite individuals in terms of their abilities, their talents, their skills, but without humility, then they're crippled," because "they're missing out on deep relationships and openness to change, openness to learning, openness to stronger, deeper relationships." I interpret what Mike is saying as being good at something does not innately make you elite in the negative sense; the attitude you have about your abilities can impact this, however.

Others like Craig and Ralph did see the program as elitist, but more so based on who is chosen to fulfill the mission of the program. Using a farm analogy Craig spoke of the selection of students:

On this farm, right now we have just field crops, but through the years, there have been animals raised for production. You do not breed the runts. You breed the animals that are going to give you more meat, more fur, more milk, okay? I think the plan was that they were trying to find the people that were going to have more fleece, more meat, and more milk.

Terry's view was somewhat similar to that of Craig's, saying:

Often, when you think of the term elitist, you think of people who want to preserve a certain status … In terms of the kind of intellectual or work-centered

meritocracy, we just, we tried to pick people who were to make the most difference. And not make sure they thought our way. And not choose them off the basis of their own ideology but recognize who they were 'cause they were the people who were going to make changes. And try to provide the best leadership they've seen. And is that elitist? Yeah, it's kind of elitist … but not in the usual sense.

As Mike pointed out, "any organization that has a selection process can be accused of elitism," so what Terry and Craig said makes sense as most programs are going to attempt to recruit who they view as top prospects for their organization. But should this alone be viewed negatively? According to some of the Current Fellows, it can.

From my interviews, it was revealed that the first couple cohorts of the modern day Fellows were also part of the Honors Tutorial College at Ohio University. Consequently, Caleb believed "my year, I did feel like it was pretty elitist in a negative way … we were all elite students …we all ... for the most part were high achievers." Lee additionally agreed with Caleb, saying "it was very egalitarian in that elitism of intellectualism, perhaps." Here, two Current Fellows willingly admit the elitist nature of the program, but solely based on intelligence. When examining other programs on the Ohio University campus, such as the Honors Tutorial College and Margaret Boyd Scholars, both programs focus on intellectually superior and curious students, so any program in which people of above-average intelligence congregate may be characterized as elitist. With the Fellows, the particular idea of intellectual elitism is problematic because it is critical to remember that those originally involved with the Ohio Fellows are

not keen to it being described as a honors program. With that said, Caleb found "[t]he program felt less and less [elitist] as I think the diversity improved," while Zak said of the Fellows "[i]t's becoming more diverse and because of that, I believe that we're in a good way losing a little bit of that elitism vibe." The question is, does diversifying a program alleviate it of the notion that it is elitist?

The current Ohio Fellows director, Dr. Fowler, is very intentional about seeking diverse students for the program. While a quota system is non-existent, the Fellows program has had a good track record of recruiting students who they feel not only fit the program but would benefit from it. If the worry is that other students around the university do not get to share the same experiences as Ohio Fellows, as Dr. Fowler mentioned "[t]here are many programs throughout the university that give students opportunities that other students don't have." But with the Fellows, even going back to the 1960s, there are many first-generation students like Polly, Mackenzie, and Lee who were provided experiences through the program that would have otherwise been unobtainable. This is an area where it could be argued that making sure the program is diverse regarding socioeconomic status pushes back against the program being elitist in the negative sense.

Recent news has highlighted the ugly side of admission into the United States' elite universities. From bribing coaches to paying off exam administrators, many wealthy parents are being caught up in what is reported as the biggest college admissions scandal in US history (Morales, 2019). Furthermore, a study found that the chance of admission for legacy students could be as high as 15.69 times the odds of admission for non-legacy

students (Hurwitz, 2011) at Ivy League universities. Incidents such as these make programs viewed as exclusive susceptible to backlash from those who see them as unfairly providing resources to already advantaged students. Preventing a program being identified as elitist and catering to a certain crowd is impossible, but the Ohio Fellows believes it takes measures to not appear as such.

Besides the intentional selection of diverse students as Ohio Fellows, Dean Seaman contended "[y]ou don't get into the Ohio Fellows because of a pedigree. You get into it because of a certain set of characteristics, just the way you would get into the military or into the CIA." Similarly, Tom saw the Ohio Fellows program as placing more emphasis on individual accomplishments and not those of the family, stating the program is concerned with "what have you done," seeing this as "the counter to elitism" because "elitism is when you're given something just because you're smart … not because you've done anything." Basing entrance into a program on certain attributes and what a student can contribute both to the program and to others is one way I see the Fellows as attempting to tamper down the label of "elitist."

As I and others I spoke with have stated, any program which has requirements for entrance can be considered elitist. As mentioned by Mike, the word "elitist" can have both negative and positive connotations. When I think of elitism in a negative light, I refer back to the Hurwitz (2011) study where he justifies admission to specific students through potential future financial contribution to the university:

> these gifts preserve and grow endowments, ensuring academic excellence for
>
> future generations of students … [and] I urge readers to consider that donations

from alumni are increasingly important to the well-being of this paper's sampled

colleges … alumni have helped to grow these endowments for generations. (p

491)

This is the type of toxic elite mentality which continues to permeate higher education and

robs students of places at universities across the county. Though Fellows admittedly

believe the program is elite, it is only so based on selecting students who they feel will

most benefit from it and can best be described as an intellectual elitism. Like any

organization, through careful recruitment and selection of participants, it is possible to

create a program which may be viewed as elite from the outside while being the

antithesis of it at its core. Because the Ohio Fellows is donor-funded, which may also

contribute to it being viewed as elitist I next look at the financial realities of this co-

curricular program.

Financial realities. Financial accountability is essential in a time when

universities are experiencing cuts to funding from the state and federal level. And,

although the Ohio Fellows is a donor funded program, it is still significant to examine the

costs of operating the program. By completing this analysis, it was my hope to ensure

those alumni who donate are happy with how their contribution to the program is spent,

while also addressing the contention that donor-funded programs can potentially be elitist

due to overfunding.

To make the comparisons and analysis as fair as possible, I looked at another

program similar in terms of a focus on creating confident leaders and some reliance on

donor finding. Budgets gave insight into the total operational costs of each program and

were broken down into categories including, but not limited to, travel expenses, promotional materials, staff costs, and guest speaker costs. With this information, I decided to base my financial analysis on an examination of the cost per student, which was determined through taking the average of three years of expenditures and dividing it by the average number of students in each program during this time frame. I believed by focusing on cost per student there is the advantage of seeing what the program has the potential to spend on each student without focusing on specific aspects of the budget which may have higher costs, especially as each program has a different number of students and different budgetary needs, allowing the truest comparison possible.

Looking at the Ohio Fellows, there was a three-year (2014-2017) average total expenditure of $89,275. With the average number of participants hovering around 42, the three-year average cost per student works out to be around $2125.60. Examining the other similar program, there was a three-year (2016-2019) average total expenditure of $21,295.18. Having an average of 80 students during the school year this means the three-year average cost-per-student is $266.19. A quick visual comparison of this data shows a large difference in average budgetary expenditures, which in turn means a larger cost-per-student. According to a simple calculation, the Ohio Fellows spend approximately 7.98 times more per student each year than the similar program at Ohio University. Due to this large difference is expenditures, a closer look into where the budget goes is necessary.

Examining the budgets, both organizations report expenditures on similar items, although my discussion focuses on the three areas where there are the highest

expenditures. For instance, both organizations have expenses related to providing students with out-of-classroom experiences, such as conferences and trips to Washington DC. Using the same three-year average, I found about 16.6% of the Ohio Fellow's budget goes towards these events, which are classified as field experiences, while the other organization uses 29.28% of their budget for this. This makes sense in the regard that these programs are for the benefit of students and therefore much of the budget should be allotted to providing them with experiences to enhance their college careers. The second place which used the most budget was gatherings.

Labelled as monthly gatherings for the Ohio Fellows, on average 7.5% of the budget went towards these expenses. While not broken down explicitly, I assume this cost includes any supplies or food necessary for these events. It is made obvious that the cost of guest speakers was included in this total. Listed as business meals, refreshments, and entertainment with the other program, I assume these expenditures went towards meetings with students; this came out to 22.1% of the budget. Similar to the Ohio Fellows, this was another area where we see a larger percentage of the overall budget going, and as with the field experiences, it is understandable that this money is spent for the student. The final aspect of the budget I discuss is one specific to the Ohio Fellows as it is not presented in the budget of the similar program.

The last, and one of the largest expenditures by the Ohio Fellows program goes toward the staff and faculty who help operate the program, which hovers around 35% on average. While this number may appear to be high it is important to remember the director and Faculty Fellows play a role in shaping the program, providing students with

mentoring opportunities, and creating a space where students can have experiences not found in the classroom setting. Curiously, information regarding staffing costs did not appear to be present in the operations budget of the other program I used for comparison. Because of my limited knowledge of the budgeting at Ohio University, I can only speculate that staff costs are not associated with the operations budget of this other program. The inclusion of these figures would possibly dramatically impact the numbers presented above and present a more evenly matched picture regarding cost per student.

Examining the finances of the Ohio Fellows in relation to other similar programs was valuable in not only determining how donor funds are spent, but also in addressing the idea that the Ohio Fellows may be elitist because of how it is funded. Looking at the data respecting the financials I presented, it is easy to express dismay how, regarding three-year average expenditure, the Fellows spend 7.98 times more per student each year than the similar program. Seeing this, I can understand why there would be accusations of the program being elitist. Questions such as why these students should benefit from a well-funded program where they have the potential to receive opportunities well above what other students in the university do not are valid. But, delving deeper into the budgets it is significant to keep some things in mind.

As mentioned when discussing staff costs, the amount spent to supervise the other program was not reported in the information I received. I can only assume these costs, if provided, would somewhat level the huge discrepancy in cost per student amongst both programs. Also, it is my understanding the Ohio Fellows relies on full-time faculty and staff to operate the program who, I assume, receive a small stipend for their work with

the Fellows. This may also be true of the other program discussed as their director also

has a full-time position with the university, but this is not directly apparent from their

budgetary disclosures. Furthermore, with an average of 42 students versus 80 students,

the Ohio Fellows would not need to be staffed as well as the other program. And finally,

there has been some interaction amongst these two programs with a donor for the Fellows

providing funds for students participating in the other organization to join them on one of

their summer field experiences. While the use of the donation for this trip is reflected in

the Ohio Fellows budget, I cannot be certain it is in the other program's budget. The

sharing of donor funds so participants in another program get to share in a once in a

lifetime opportunity appears to be contrary to elitist behavior.

Upon first glance, it appears the Ohio Fellows is operating a program with fewer

students and a much bigger budget than a similar program with more students and a

significantly lower budget. When calculating this data, I was shocked at the large

difference in expenses and questioned if the program was, in fact, extremely elitist in the

fact that these donor funds have allowed for experiences far out of reach for most of the

Ohio University population. But studying the budgets more closely, I noticed one of the

larger components of the Fellow's budget was not something reported by the other

program. Staffing a program can be costly, especially with double the number of

students than in the Fellows, so this missing information is significant as the cost-per-

student can change dramatically depending on these costs. In conjunction with the fact

that donor funds for the Fellows have been used in the past to assist students from another

program attend a Fellows' trip, it is difficult to accurately conclude that the Ohio Fellows

is providing experiences other similar programs cannot due to their funding being solely from alumni funders.

In general, universities are happy when alumni are willing to give back to their alma mater; however, I believe those donating should have some control over where and how their donations are spent. While this practice can be elitist in the sense that extremely wealthy donors have the potential to provide funds above and beyond what other organizations on campus have access to, by comparing the Ohio Fellows to another program similar in goals which also receives donor funding, we see this may not be the case with the Fellows. Though at first glance it appears the Fellows spend more per student, the lack of staffing costs of the other program and the sharing of donations is something to consider when making this comparison. Does this mean the program is not somewhat elitist? No, but as I discussed in the previous part of this paper, any entity which excludes someone based on some arbitrary barrier to entry can be labelled as elitist. And while over-the-top funding from wealthy donors to one program could also be viewed as elitist, it was not the perception I developed after fully viewing the financial situation of both programs. In the final section of the implications for practice, I explore how the program can sustain itself in the years to come.

Recommended practices for program longevity. Although the Ohio Fellows dates back to the 1960s, the program is still relatively new when taking into consideration its 40-year hiatus. So, when speaking with participants, I wanted to examine the areas where today's program could make practical changes in the operation of the program. Some suggestions such as inviting well-known individuals to speak exclusively with the

Fellows or the hiring of a full-time director were not considered. Not only does it not make sense financially for a program currently relying on donor funding, I also have to take into consideration the role elitism plays in providing a small select student population access to individuals the student body as a whole would benefit from meeting in a more intimate setting. The two facets focused on I see as possible without creating budgetary issues or charges of preferential treatment.

Structure. The first feature of the program where those currently involved with the Ohio Fellows program felt needed refinement was in structure. Early on in my interviews, I learned the program did not require student attendance at meetings. From Caleb, who said, "I think more organization and more stringent guidelines for the program couldn't hurt," to Dr. Miller who would like to see "more consistent meeting times," Fellows and Faculty Fellows alike believed the program could use more consistency. Zak, who also believed more regular and consistent meetings were necessary was also forthcoming with the reality of trying to mandate attendance, believing "you're not gonna be able to require attendance … this is not what the Fellows is about." For students extremely active on campus or deeply involved in their studies, this may be seen as a benefit to joining the Fellows, as you can come and go as you please but still potentially make important connections. But I would argue students are not fully benefitting from the program if they are absent from programming and are, additionally, taking away an opportunity from someone who may fully reap the benefit of a program like the Ohio Fellows.

While I do not see 100-percent participation as a feasible goal, Nancy's idea of "implement[ing] a rule like we've done here on our board of trustees [where] if trustees don't come for a certain percentage of the meetings, then they're gonna be asked to leave" makes sense as it does not require every meeting to be attended but still encourages active participation. Furthermore, Zak thinks, "if you can make the events and the things that we do so interesting that people could not come" attendance could potentially rise at meetings. Faith also mentioned an end-of-year event where a conversation was had about what topics students would like to discuss the following year. Unfortunately, though a good idea, Faith said "we haven't really done [the things discussed the year prior], which I would like to see us actually do things that we want to do … that's what originally The Fellows was about … getting what the students need." Mike agreed with Zak and Faith regarding letting students retain some power over program activities, reasoning "if they're willing to really engage in the program, they can make it very special."

Evidenced by the interviews with the Fellows is the need for a more structured program. This includes more concrete meeting times as well as some method of accountability towards participation in the program. With that said, I also saw the need for the Fellows to be more student-centered and focused around their needs. While I believe obtaining input from students is necessary, if that information is not used, it makes sense as to why students would stop attending events. The reality is, though, students are probably going to be more willing to attend an activity they had a hand in creating. Moreover, as King et al. (2009) pointed out, development of self-authorship through co-curricular programming is truly accomplished when students have control

over their activities and learning experiences. One area where both Original and Current Fellows saw improvement could be made was interaction with alumni Fellows.

Alumni Fellows. A recurring theme throughout this study was the significance of the alumni Fellows. Although these discussions have previously focused specifically on the Fellows from the 1960s, here "alumni Fellows" also refers to recent graduates of Ohio University. When asked what something was which could be incorporated to ensure longevity of the Fellows, the alumni of the program were unanimously mentioned. Past their usefulness as providing feedback to the university, active alumni participation can allow service as mentors and provide for assistance in areas where universities are lacking, such as experiential learning experiences and career advising (Dumford & Miller, 2015; Raile et al., 2017; Rathbun-Grubb, 2016; Volkwein, 2010a). There were a few further areas the Fellows saw the need for more active participation of alumni Fellows.

From interviews with the Current Fellows and administration of the program, it was discovered there is much value in the interactions between Original Fellows and the current program members. As well as serving as mentors, the 1960s alumni brought years of work experiences with them. These experiences gave students an understanding of what it takes to survive in the workplace and examples of people who have persevered when taking career-related risks. Valuable as the Original Fellows are, there was also the belief more recent graduates of the Ohio Fellows should play a role in the program. Current director Dr. Fowler thought "continuing to have relationships with alumni and

broadening those experiences to more and involving recent graduates" needed to occur for the future of the program. Tom saw this as necessary too, explaining

> I think we need to incorporate young alumni, because we baby-boomers are going to [be] gone in 10, 15 years or whatever, but if you don't have an ongoing alumni base of people who've been out five years, people who've been out 10 years, people in their early 40s, mid-40s. If you don't have their involvement, then you're going to have a program that doesn't succeed.

This is because while what has happened with the Original Fellows is important, students would also benefit hearing about various stages of one's life after college. Besides, time away from the program allows for reflection and critical thought on how the program was and can improve. Sydney saw benefit in finding "ways for us new post-grad baby Fellows to be involved and … talk about what the Fellows was and what it is now and what it can be." But in order to reap the benefits of alumni involvement, communication amongst the current program and its graduates needs to be strengthened.

Everyone I spoke with indicated they believed the alumni of the Ohio Fellows program were a significant part of the community and had the potential to play a role in it. However, Terry lamented "I don't think anybody's reaching out to them [Fellow alumni] to say, this is a program that's valuable. It was valuable to you. Pay it back." Though he was speaking specifically of the original cohorts, Lee shared similar feelings, stating:

> there's been a distinct lack of continuing connection despite our best efforts. I very much wanted to be able to continue to associate with the program … I wish

there wasn't that barrier to involvement. I wish that I was being bombarded with,

"Hey, come see us. Come hang out with the new class. Come talk with us.

Come sit in on sessions."

As much emphasis has been placed on the substantial role alumni may play in the

continuing success of the program, the lack of communication is surprising. In order for

the role of the Fellow alums to continue to be properly utilized, a better method of

communication seems appropriate.

Summary. Reviewing the comments on how to improve and sustain the program

I was reminded of Craig saying, "I wonder if the program were not a unique feature of its

time and the need today is different." We see this in various respects, from the large

increase in student-focused programs on campus to the concern with funding. While still

attending to matters of diversity and elitism, the Ohio Fellows program should

continually work on providing experiences students are interested in order to keep

attendance up past the first year. Moreover, with such a great emphasis being placed on

the involvement of the alumni, it makes sense to develop a plan to keep alumni more

abreast of what is going on with the Ohio Fellows and how they can participate if they

choose to do so. And while it may not be financially feasible to invite guest speakers of a

certain caliber to campus, there are leaders who work for the university and in the Athens

area and beyond who can provide students with a similar experience as the Original

Fellows.

Finally, while not widely mentioned by other Fellows, Terry mentioned the

importance of providing students with internships. From information gathered from

alumni surveys, we know students believe these serve as seminal events during college and those who were not afforded them wish they were (Dumford & Miller, 2015; Landrum, Hettich, & Wilner, 2010; Raile et al., 2017; Rathbun-Grubb, 2016). While strengthening and addressing facets of the program mentioned in this section, building contacts to provide internships to Fellows is also essential. In the final section of this paper I address the potential role the co-curriculum plays in student success through the focal point of my research, the Ohio Fellows.

Importance of Creating Similar Programs

Although this research was not undertaken to necessarily encourage the expansion of the Ohio Fellows program, especially considering how making the current program too large would defeat the benefits associated with small group interaction, I believe the creation of programs similar in spirit would be beneficial to other universities. I base this assumption on reflection on the evolution of higher education discussed in Chapter One. While early universities had strong ties to churches and were tasked with educating future clergy (Geiger, 2015; Rudolph, 1990), today more emphasis is placed on a holistic learning experience to aid students in becoming employable adults (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019). It is the hope that, through participation in academic and co-curricular activities during college, students will develop skills in critical thinking, sound reasoning and analysis, and social interaction (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019). Scott (2007) argues this best occurs when students are immersed in a community rich with diversity.

When examining the Ohio Fellows program, both incarnations focused on the idea that it was not enough to only develop students academically, but also essential to have students grow personally. This is evidenced in the actions of both Dr. Chandler and Dean Rollins, albeit each had a different focus. Dr. Chandler hoped students would follow an ideology which aligned with Robert Greenleaf and servant leadership. This meant students would develop a desire to give back to their community and be active in civic engagement, which some see as another purpose of higher education (Sutton, 2016). On the flip side, we had Dean Rollins, who nurtured students' employability by always encouraging them to improve themselves and aspire for higher and loftier goals. Today's Fellows, I believe, receive a good mix of both as many not only express lofty career ambitions, but also have a desire to give back.

The Ohio Fellows can be viewed as a specialized, or niche, program. In the 1960s it was developed to identify and nurture future leaders due to the lackluster classroom experience. As Terry explained, the program administrators were not necessarily looking for obvious academic high achievers; they were searching for those who had a variety of talents and thought different from the rest. While the program has evolved since then, it still relies on recruiting students who think outside the traditional academic box. For universities around the country which struggle to maintain enrollment numbers, creating smaller niche programs may help.

Because of the multifaceted program nature there is not a focus on one area. The focus remains on the development of the student into the best version of themselves. This allows for a multitude of experiences, such as internships, the ability research one's

interests, and speaking with current leaders in industry. Students are presented with

opportunities which enhance their ability to be successful outside the confines of the

university. For instance, current and former students spoke of the impact of being around

those from diverse backgrounds. As in Page's (2007) research, these students were also

able to more fully develop opinions and become more confident in their ability to express

them through the interaction with a diverse group. The development of this skill is also

essential to the employability of these students as they are learning to interact socially

and think analytically (Sin, Tavar, & Amaral, 2019). Moreover, students who

participated in service-learning type events, like Zak, developed a deeper understanding

of what it means to be a good citizen, another area significant to attending an institution

of higher education (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sutton, 2016). Beyond the societal

benefits such as employability and creating civic minded individuals, students who

participated in the Fellows grew personally as well.

Though Tinto (1987) discusses the importance of the formal social realm of the

university, he does not go into detail on how this should look. This is also the beauty of

the ambiguity of the Ohio Fellows program. The program is most beneficial when it is

helping students in the areas where they currently need it. Students are not pigeonholed

into doing the same as others. Instead they are encouraged to explore their interests

within the safety of their community. Creating these niche programs allows for Parks's

(2000) idea of a mentoring community to thrive. Students are allowed to experiment and

fail as they are supported throughout the process. Furthermore, they are introduced to a

variety of ideas which they are forced to analyze and discuss. Both areas are not only

hallmarks of a good mentoring community (Parks, 2000), but also help students develop self-authorship (Baxter Magolda, 2008) and fulfill some of the purported aims of higher education (Doscher & Landorf, 2018; Sin, Tavares, & Amaral, 2019). It should be made clear, however, that it is not my intention to put the Ohio Fellows program on a pedestal, but instead to highlight the aspects of it which it gets right regarding co-curricular programming and encourage the creation of similar niche programs at other universities.

Future Research

Thinking about future research, I see the benefit in speaking to those who have not kept in close contact with Ohio University or the Fellows. Speaking with them may bring about more information concerning the importance or, like Joel, criticisms of the program. Any additional information concerning the perceptions of the program would only aid in helping to create more successful co-curricular experiences. Moreover, future research which focuses more generally on aspects of co-curriculars that students find aid in their success in and out of college is imperative. Previously mentioned as it concerned the Ohio Fellows, it is likely there are other features of college programs which further the holistic purpose of higher education. In a time where colleges and universities are being held to a higher standard regarding the education and retention of students, it is essential to determine best practices in and out of the classroom. Finally, it may be of interest for universities to conduct similar studies of other co-curricular programs to see if the programs are meeting their stated goals.

Conclusion

From the outset of this research it was my intention to focus on the role co-curricular programs may play in the success of students in and out of college. Beginning with the history of the extracurriculum, I discovered this component of the higher education experience was created as an avenue for students to discuss and debate topics of their liking outside the highly structured classroom. Today, appropriately implemented co-curricular programs have potential to not only enhance the academic component of college but to also assist students in developing more fully personally and professionally. Mike spoke of programs like the Fellows as having the ability to "supercharge the educational experience." Although he was speaking specifically about the Ohio Fellows, there are pieces of the program which are transferrable to other co-curriculars.

Pondering the college experience, I am reminded of attending class, taking notes, finishing various assignments, and exams. Depending on the major, there are also required field experiences and internships. Ignoring the social aspect of higher education, I argue that for many students, this experience can be mundane, viewed merely as a means to an end. When Mike spoke of supercharging the educational experience, he explained it as allowing "people to excel, find the field of excellence, [and] find the pathway of excellence." Based on discoveries made through speaking with the Fellows, the program accomplished this idea through the creation of an environment where students had the potential to grow and be transformed outside the classroom through

participation in activities designed to leave life-long impacts which could contribute to success.

In the case of the Ohio Fellows, there were two areas I believe the program was exceptional at supercharging the educational experience. First was diversifying the program through the selection of multidisciplinary students. Students coming from various colleges around the Ohio University campus brought with them different academic interests and personal beliefs. Allowing students the ability to interact with those outside their major and with differing views was essential in helping the Fellows learn how to work with others different from themselves while having the capability to discuss controversial topics confidently. A safe, yet challenging, atmosphere created by Faculty Fellows and administrators allowed this to occur. These conditions existing in the Ohio Fellows program also allowed for the next aspect of the program.

Participants in the Ohio Fellows were encouraged to take risks. During their time as undergraduates, Fellows were encouraged to explore their interests. For instance, if a student was particularly enthusiastic about researching a topic in their science field, they were encouraged to complete said research and present it at conferences. With the support of other Fellows and those charged with operating the program, students felt comfortable meeting these types of challenges at an early age. When considering taking risks career-wise, the current cohorts of Fellows have the Original Fellows as examples of those who have taken professional gambles that have paid off. Although for the original cohort, much of this confidence was built through interactions with well-known guest speakers, the result was the same. Students began to understand that success is

only possible through taking risks and coming to understand that failure is part of the equation. Exposing students to failure and risk-taking during their formative years in college provides an opportunity for students to experience these things in a safe, supportive environment. As students become more familiar with the idea that they can pick themselves up after something unexpected has happened, they become more confident in their ability to work past future issues.

Though I only mention the two aspects of the program which stand out to me the most, I am sure there are other parts of the program which have potential to supercharge the educational experience. Additionally, there are areas such as providing or securing internships where the program could use improvement, which would further add to this ideal. What is apparent is the significance in adding to the classroom experience through co-curricular activities. The Ohio Fellows, like other programs, has the capacity to provide student with experiences which allow them to develop traits necessary for success in the workplace and society. What I see, specifically with the Ohio Fellows program, is the desire to create leaders in their fields, while also opening students' eyes to the realities of our world, instilling a desire in them to work to fix injustices as they find them. Of course, as with any entity, the Fellows has its faults and will not benefit everyone, but that does not erase its perceived value. As I have stated, and evidenced by the Fellows, success is a very individualistic concept. The reason the Ohio Fellows was vital to so many in the 1960s and today is because the goal of those operating the program is to help participants gain the experience and knowledge to become their ideal version of successful.

References

Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. (2015). *Advancing a comprehensive study of post-collegiate outcomes*. Washington, DC.

Banta, T. W. (2002). *Building a scholarship of assessment.* San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.

Baxter Magola, M. B. (2008). Three elements of self-authorship. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(4), 269-284.

Bayer, A. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1976). Trends in attitudes on political social, and collegiate issues among college students: Mid-1960s to mid-1970s. *The Journal of Higher Education, 4*(2), 159-171. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1980419

Bergen-Cico, D., & Viscomi, J. (2012). Exploring the association between campus co-curricular involvement and academic achievement. *College Student Retention, 14*(3), 329-343. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.2190/CS.14.3.c

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ceary, C. D., Donahue, J. J., & Shaffer, K. (2019). The strength of pursuing your values: Valued living as a path to resilience among college students. *Stress and Health*, 1-10. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2886

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.).* India: Pearson India Education Services.

Dean, K. L. (2015). Understanding student success by measuring co-curricular learning.

New Directions for Institutional Research 2014(164), 27-38. doi:

10.1002/ir.20113

Doscher, S., & Landorf, H. (2018). Universal global learning, inclusive excellences, and

higher education's greater purpose. *Peer Review, 20*(1), 4-7. Retrieved from:

https://eds-b-ebscohost-

com.proxy.library.ohio.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=1863c676-

7c7b-45d8-a7aa-22c79173bfdb%40pdc-v-sessmgr06

Dumford, A.D. & Miller, A.L. (2015). Are those rose-colored glasses you are wearing?:

Student and alumni survey responses. *Research & Practice in Assessment, 10*, 5-

14.

Dumford, A.D., Miller, A.L., & Johnson, W.R. (2017). Assessing alumni success:

Income is not the only outcome!. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education,

42*(2), 195-207. doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1098587

Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Zimmerman, H. B., Aragon, M. C., Whang Sayson, H.,

& Rios-Aguilar, C. (2017). The American freshman: National norms fall 2016.

Retrieved from https://www.heri.ucla.edu/briefs/TFS-Brief-Report-2016.pdf

Edwards, R., & Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?.* London:

Bloomsbury.

Elias, D., & Drea, C. (2013). The co-curricular record: Enhancing a postsecondary

education. *College Quarterly, 16*(1), 1-8. Retrieved from

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1016461

Elitist. (n.d.(a)). In *Dictionary.com.* Retrieved from

    https://www.dictionary.com/browse/elitist

Ford, S., & Patterson, A. (2018). Cosmetic diversity: University websites and the

    transformation of race categories. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1-

    16. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000092

Frost, A. (2018). 3 better ways to define success in your life (because it's not always

    about money). *The Muse.* Retrieved from https://www.themuse.com/advice/3-

    better-ways-to-define-success-in-your-life-because-its-not-always-about-the-

    money

Geiger, R.L. (2015). *The history of American higher education: Learning and culture*

    from the founding to World War II. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University

    Press.

Gibson, D. (2017). Living Through 1970 Closure, Campus Riots and Protests. *College*

    of Arts & Sciences Forum. Retrieved from https://www.ohio-

    forum.com/2017/07/living-through-1970-closure-campus-riots-and-protests/

Glass, C. R., Gesing, P., Hales, A., & Cong, C. (2017). Faculty as bridges to co-

    curricular engagement and community for first-generation international students.

    Studies in Higher Education, 45(2), 895-910. doi:

    10.1080/03075079.2017.1293877

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). Boston,

    MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Greenleaf, R. K. "Have you a dream deferred, by Robert Greenleaf, April 19,

1967". *Ohio Fellows Archive.* Retrieved from

https://www.ofparchive.ohio.edu/items/show/11.

Guess, A. (2008, May 20). Defining College Success. *Inside Higher Education.*

Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/05/20/board

Heartly, M. T. (2011). Examining the relationships retween resilience, mental health,

and academic persistence in undergraduate college students. *Journal of American*

College Health, 59(7), 596-604.

Heath, D. H. (1991). *Fulfilling lives: Paths to maturity and success.* San Francisco, CA:

Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers

Higher Learning Commission (HLC). (2014). Policy title: Criteria for accreditation

(CRRT.B.10.010). *Policies.* Retrieved from

http://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html

Hollow, B. (2003). *Ohio University: The spirit of a singular place, 1804-2004.* Athens,

OH: Ohio University Press.

Hoover, T. N. (1954). *The History of Ohio University.* Athens, OH: Ohio University

Press.

Horowitz, H. L. (1986). The 1960s and the transformation of campus cultures. *History*

of Education Quarterly, 26(1), 1-38. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org/stable/368875

Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. Studying student college choice: A three-phase model

and the implications for policymakers. *College and University*, *62*(3), 207-21.

Hurwitz, M. (2011). The impact of legacy status on undergraduate admissions at elite

colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review 30*(3), 480-492. doi:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2010.12.002

Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-Learning Essentials*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley &

Sons, Inc.

Johnson, M. R., & Peacock, J. (2019). Breaking the bubble: Recent graduates'

experiences with ideological diversity. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*.

Advance online publication. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000114

Josselson, R. (2013). *Interviewing for qualitative research: A rational approach*. New

York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Karp, M. M., Hughes, K. L., & O'Gara, L. (2010). An exploration of Tinto's integration

framework for community college students. *Journal of College Student

Retention, 12*(1), 69-86. doi: 10.2190/CS.12.1.e

Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student

outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *The Journal of Higher

Education, 80*(1), 59-79. Retrieved from https://muse.jhu.edu/article/256462.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The Evolving Self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, P. M., Baxter Magolda, M. B., Barber, J. P., Brown, M. K., & Lindsay, N. K.

(2009). Developmentally effective experiences for promoting self-authorship.

Mind, Brain, and Education, 3(2), 108-118.

Knight, D. B., & Novoselich, B. J. (2017). Curricular and co-curricular influences on

undergraduate engineering student leadership. *Journal of Engineering Education,

106*(1), 44-70. doi: 10.1002/jee.20153

Kommers, S., & Pham, D. (2016). How Tinto's theory differs for asian and non-asian international students: A qualitative study. *Journal of International Students, 6*(4), 999-1014.

Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of literature.* National Symposium on Postsecondary Student Success. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/npec/pdf/kuh_team_report.pdf

Landrum, R.E., Hettich, P.I., & Wilner, A. (2010). Alumni perceptions of workforce readiness. *Teaching of Psychology, 37*, 97-106. doi: 10.1080/00986281003626912

McNair, T.B., Albertine, S.L., Cooper, M.A., McDonald, M.L., & Major, T. (2016). *Becoming a student-ready college: A new culture of leadership for student success.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Meents-DeCaigny, E., & Sanders, L. (2015). Framing research and assessment of co-curricular learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research 2014*(164), 15-25. doi: 10.1002/ir.20113

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). (2014). What standards must an institution meet to be accredited? *Middle States Commission on Higher*

Education. Retrieved from

http://www.msche.org/?Nav1=About&Nav2=FAQ&Nav3=Question07

Miller, A.L., Dumford, A.D., & Johnson, W.R. (2017). Music alumni play a different

tune: Reflections on acquired skills and career outcomes. *International Journal of

Education & the Arts*, *18*(29). Retrieved from http://www.ijea.org/v18n29/

Morales, P. (2019, March 18). How some wealthy parents game the college admissions

process. Retrieved from https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/how-some-

wealthy-parents-game-the-college-admissions-process

Museus, S., Yi, V., & Saelua, N. (2018). How culturally engaging campus environments

influence sense of belonging in college: An examination of differences between

white students and students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education

11*(4), 467-483. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000069

National Center for Education Statistics. (1993). 120 twenty years of American

education: A statistical portrait. Retrieved from

https://nces.ed.gov/pubs93/93442.pdf

New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Commision on Institutions

of Higher Education. (2016). Standards (effective July 1, 2016). *Colleges and

Universities (CIHE)*. Retrieved from https://cihe.neasc.org/standards-

policies/standards-accreditation/standards-effective-july-1-2016

Ng, R., Ang, R. P., & Ho, M. H. R. (2012). Coping with anxiety, depression, anger and

aggression: The mediational role of resilience in adolescents. *Child Youth Care

Forum 41*(6), 526-546. doi: 10.1007/s10566-012-9182-x

NguyenVoges, S. R., & Lyons, L. M. (2017). "Being here now" as a first-year student: Cultivating global citizenship and mindfulness on the move in a co-curricular learning adventure. *International Forum of Teaching Studies, 13*(1), 3-10. Retrieved from

http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.ohio.edu/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2 &sid=94781ba6-dced-4137-8bb3-268847b40a7e%40sessionmgr4007.

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). (2010). Accreditation standards. *Accreditation Standards*. Retrieved from

http://www.nwccu.org/Standards%20and%20Policies/Accreditation%20Standards /Accreditation%20Standards.htm

Oehrlein, P. (2009). Determining future success of college students. *The Park Place Economist, 5*(1), 59-67. Retrieved from

https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/uer/vol5/iss1/7.

Ohio University. (2019). OHIO Honors Program.

https://www.ohio.edu/admissions/honors/ohio-honors-program

Ohio University Office of Institutional Research. (n.d.a). Enrollment History-- Institutional Research. https://www.ohio.edu/instres/Factbook/factenrl_hist.html

Ohio University Office of Institutional Research. (n.d.b). Headcount by Race.

https://www.ohio.edu/instres/Factbook/factenrl_hist.html

Page, S.E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Parks, S. (2000). *Big questions, worth dreams.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons,

Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4ᵗʰ ed.)*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pellechia, N. (2013 October 25). The return of the Ohio fellows. *Compass*. Retrived from: https://www.ohio.edu/compass/stories/13-14/10/ohio-fellows-program-reborn.cfm

Pizzolato, J. E., & Ozaki, C. C. (2007). Moving toward self-authorship: Investigating outcomes of learning partnerships. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(2), 196–214.

Rahat, E., & Ilhan, T. (2016). Coping styles, social support, relational self-construal, and resilience in predicting students' adjustment to university life. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 16*(1), 187-208. doi: 10.12738/estp.2016.1.0058

Rathbun-Grubb, S. (2016). End of program assessments and their association with early career success in LIS. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 57*(1), 43-56. doi: 10.12783/issn.2328-2967/57/1/4

Raile, E.D., Shanahan, E.A., Wallner, M.P., Young, L.M., Avonious, A., Young, M., & Tayeb, B. (2017). Using alumni views to connect to the past, present, and future in political science. *PS-Political Science and Politics, 50*(3), 837-841. doi: 10.1017/S1049096517000695

Roberts, D. (2015). Direct measures of co-curricular learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research 2014*(164), 61-70. doi: 10.1002/ir.20113

Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3ʳᵈ

ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Samuelson, B. L., Smith, R., Stevenson, R., & Ryan, C. (2013). A case study of youth participatory evaluation in co-curricular service learning. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(3), 63-81. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1017068.pdf

Scheffer, B.K., & Rubenfeld, M.G. (2000). A consensus statement on critical thinking in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education, 39*, 352-359.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education & the social sciences* (4th ed.) New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sidelinger, R. J., Frisby, B. N., & Heisler, J. (2016). Students' out of the classroom communication with instructors and campus services: Exploring social integration and academic involvement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 47*(2016), 167-171. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2016.02.011

Sin, C., Tavares, O., & Amaral, A. (2019). Accepting employability as a purpose of higher education? Academics' perceptions and practices. *Studies in Higher Education, 44*(6), 920-931. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2017.1402174.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). (2012). Accrediting standards. *Commission on Colleges.* Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp

Success. (n.d.(a)). In *Merriam Webster Dictionary online.* Retrieved from

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/success

Success. (n.d.(b)). In *Oxford English Dictionary online*. Retrieved from

http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.ohio.edu/view/Entry/193306?rskey=LhH0Hm

&result=1&isAdvanced=false#eid

Suskie, L. (2015). Introduction to measuring co-curricular learning. *New*

Directions for Institutional Research 2014(164), 5-13. doi: 10.1002/ir.20113

Sutton, B. Z. (2016, June 20). Higher education's public purpose. Retrieved from:

https://www.aacu.org/leap/liberal-education-nation-blog/higher-educations-

public-purpose

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving College Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition.*

Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Van Dyke, N. (1998). Hotbeds of activism: Locations of student protest. *Social*

Problems 45(2), 205-220. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3097244

Voges, S. R., & Lyons, L. M. (2017). 'Being here now' as a first-year student:

Cultivating global citizenship and mindfulness on the move in a co-curricular

learning adventure. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies 13*(1), 3-10.

Volkwein, J.F. (2010a). Assessing alumni outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional*

Research, *2010*(S1), 125-139. doi: 10.1002/ir.335

Volkwein, J.F. (2010b). Assessing student learning in the major field of study. *New*

Directions for Institutional Research, *2010*(S1), 101-109. doi: 10.1002/ir.333

WASC Senior College and University Commission (WASC). (2013). WSCUC

Standards of Accreditation. *WASC Senior College and University Commission*.

Retrieved from https://www.wscuc.org/resources/handbook-accreditation-2013/part-ii-core-commitments-and-standards-accreditation/wasc-standards-accreditation-2013

White, M. D. (2017, June 21). Defining success for yourself. *Psychology Today*.

Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/maybe-its-just-me/201706/defining-success-yourself

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research designs and methods (4th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Zong, J., & Batalova, J. (2016, May 12). International students in the United States. *Migration Policy Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/international-students-united-states#Economic Impact

Appendix A: IRB Approval

Project Number	18-E-181
Project Status	APPROVED
Committee:	Office of Research Compliance
Compliance Contact:	Rochelle Reamy (reamy@ohio.edu)
Primary Investigator:	Stephen Cocumelli
Project Title:	A Historical Case Study of the Ohio Fellows: A Co-Curricular Program and its Influence on Success
Level of Review:	EXEMPT

The Office of Research Compliance reviewed and approved your amendment of the above referenced research.

IRB Approved:	09/14/2018 1:15:24 PM
Review Category:	1,2

Waivers: No waivers are granted.

If applicable, informed consent (and HIPAA research authorization) must be obtained from subjects or their legally authorized representatives and documented prior to research involvement. In addition, FERPA, PPRA, and other authorizations / agreements must be obtained, if needed. The IRB-approved consent form and process must be used. Any changes in the research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, enrollment numbers, etc.) or informed consent process must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects).

It is the responsibility of all investigators and research staff to promptly report to the Office of Research Compliance / IRB any serious, unexpected and related adverse and potential unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This approval is issued under the Ohio University OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00000095. Please feel free to contact the Office of Research Compliance staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Appendix B: Recruitment Email

Hi, my name is Stephen Cocumelli, I'm emailing you about a study that I'm conducting for my dissertation. The study is about the potential role co-curricular programming may have on success during and after college. I am recruiting individuals to participate in an interview to discuss their experiences with the Ohio Fellows. Participation can be confidential and voluntary. Also, you can withdraw any time if you change your mind. There are no known risks to participation. This study has been cleared by the Institutional Review Board, and the interview will last approximately thirty minutes to an hour. If you choose to participate, I will email you a consent form which will provide you with further information regarding your rights during this study.

If you would like to participate, please reply with some dates and times when you can participate. Remember, that the session will take thirty minutes to an hour. I will send you a follow-up message with to determine an appropriate location.

Thank you for your time,

Stephen Cocumelli

Appendix C: Consent Form

Ohio University Adult Consent Form with Signature

Title of Research: **A Historical Case Study of the Ohio Fellows: A Co-Curricular Program and its Influence on Success**
Researchers: **Stephen Cocumelli**
IRB number: **18-E-181**

You are being asked by an Ohio University researcher to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks of the research project. It also explains how your personal information/biospecimens will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to sign it. This will allow your participation in this study. You should receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Summary of Study

The purpose of the study is to explore the possible impact a co-curricular program has on student success in and out of college. Through a case study of the Ohio Fellows, I intend to examine the programs influence on student identity development through interactions with others affiliated with the program. Moreover, I wish to determine if this further understanding of self plays a role in retention and success in and out of the college setting and if so, why this is.
This study is significant because research shows certain practices, such as participation in co-curricular activities, have the ability to create environments where all students can succeed. Furthermore, as the call for accountability in post-secondary education intensifies, universities must begin to show the value in funded programs.
To conduct this study, participants from the Ohio Fellows will be observed and interviewed. For the cohorts from the 1960s, interviews will be audio recorded and may also be video recorded for archival purposes. Those from the modern-day cohorts will simply be audio recorded. Since I am investigating cohorts from the late 1960s and today, I will not only be able to see how the program has evolved over time, but also how the people and their perceptions of the program have evolved as well.

Explanation of Study

This study is being done because research has shown a connection between higher student retention, persistence, and success while in college for those who participate in co-curricular programs. Though we know, in general, that this relationship exists, few studies examine *why* this is so. Because the Ohio Fellows is a unique program with its roots going back to the 1960s, I am interested in the possible role it plays in the development of those who participate. Specifically, I am focused on how the Fellows may prepare students for success in and out of college.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in an interview.

You should not participate in this study if you no longer participate or plan to resign membership in the Ohio Fellows.

Your participation in the study will last approximately an hour. This does not include time to read over the interview transcript and add any pertinent information, if you choose to do so.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits

This study is important to society because research shows the significance of an educated society, such as lowered crime rates, increased happiness, and higher incomes. As cost of attendance rises while funding of colleges and universities goes down, it is essential to understand the possible value of out of classroom experiences which help develop students personally and academically. With performance-based funding changing its focus to completion rates of students, it is important that colleges are providing all the necessary support to retain students and help them acquire the skills to be successful.

Individually, you may benefit by developing a deeper understanding of yourself as a student.

Confidentiality and Records

Your study information will be kept confidential by changing names during reporting, if requested. Additionally, all data will be secured on a locked computer and original recordings (video and audio) will be destroyed after being transferred to said laptop. Some video recorded data of the Ohio Fellows from the late 1960s and 1970 may be sent to the university for archival purposes. This was suggested due to the unique period of time in which the participants studied at Ohio University and because there is little information on the Fellows currently in the archives. Data, both audio and visual, not archived will be destroyed by May 2019.

Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;
* Dissertation Committee Chair: Dr. Pete Mather

Future Use Statement
Identifiers might be removed from data/samples collected, and after such removal, the data/samples may be used for future research studies or distributed to another investigator

for future research studies without additional informed consent from you or your legally authorized representative.

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator *Stephen Cocumelli at sc418113@ohio.edu* or the advisor *Dr. Pete Mather at matherp@ohio.edu*

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.

By signing below, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Signature_____Date_____

Printed Name_____

Version Date: *08/14/2018*

Appendix D: Interview Questions

Original Fellows
- What was your major in college?
- Talk about what you're doing today.
- Why revive the Ohio Fellows program?
    - When planning, what was your vision for the new program?
- What do you believe to be the mission of the program?
- How would you define the program?
- Who did you see as being an influential part of the program?
- What do you see as your role as an alumnus of the Ohio Fellows?
- Describe the type of student the program is looking for.
    - How do we determine if program has a positive impact on students?
    - What impact did it have on you?
- Talk about the significance of interaction amongst your peer Ohio Fellows.
- Explain the role of guest speakers invited to interaction with the Fellows.
    - Was this a crucial part of the program?
- What role does diversity have in the program?
- Define how you view success.
- What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the program today?
- What can be done to ensure a long future for the Ohio Fellows?

Current Fellows
- What was/is you major?
- Why did you decide you wanted to take part in this program?
- What do you believe the mission of the Ohio Fellows is?
    - How closely does the program align to its mission?
- Describe your experience with the Fellows.
- Past generations seem to feel that the program is designed to produce future leaders. As a result, there seems to be an emphasis on bringing the appropriate people to campus who can help guide the new generation to become future leaders. These interactions were seminal experiences for many of the older Fellows, but for the newer Fellows many point to interactions with students within the program itself as being a significant asset of the program. What is your opinion on this?
- Talk about the relationships you've made/had with other fellows.
    - What roles did these relationships play in your experience at OU?
    - Talk about faculty/alumni.
- How would you define the Ohio Fellows' community?
- What role does diversity play in the Ohio Fellows?
    - Is diversity beyond majors important?
- Is there anything else you'd add about you experiences with the fellow?
    - Would another program have offered you the same experience? Why or why not?
    - Do you believe the program has helped you grow as a person? If so, how?
    - How was it unique in comparison to other activities you were involved with?
- What are your plans when you graduate, and to what extent did your experiences with the Ohio Fellows shape these plans?
    - If it has not shaped your plans, has it shaped how you think about your future?
- How do you define success (in and out of college)?
- What role have the Ohio Fellows played a role your success (past, current, future)?
- There has been talk that the Ohio Fellows is an elitist program. How do you view this charge?
    - What can be done to change this perspective?
- What changes do you believe need to be made to the program?

Administration and Faculty Fellows

- Talk about how and why you decided to be involved with the Ohio Fellows.
- How would you define the program?
- What are the goals/mission of the program?
    - How do you determine if these have been fulfilled?
- Describe the role of the Faculty Fellows.
- Describe the role of alumni from the 60s and 70s
- Define success.
- For a student who has participated in the Fellows, what does their success look like (in and out of college)?
- Discuss the impact (if any) the program should have on students.
- Talk about the community/culture of the fellows.
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of program?
- What impact does diversity have on the Ohio Fellows Program?
- What is your opinion on the program possibly being elitist?
- What impact does your role in the program have on students?