

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES
CONCERNING THE RELEASE OF
STUDENT INFORMATION

By

ROBERT GENE BOYD

Bachelor of Science in Education
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri
1957

Master of Science in Education
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri
1960

Education Specialist
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri
1966

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1973

Thesis
1973 D
B789C
Cop. 2

FEB 15 1974

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES
CONCERNING THE RELEASE OF
STUDENT INFORMATION

Thesis Approved:

Kenneth H. Clair

Thesis Adviser

Ivan Chapman

Ralph G. Braun

Thomas C. Coenen

D. N. Suttam

Dean of the Graduate College

873226

PREFACE

This investigation is concerned with the analysis of college administrator attitudes regarding the release of student information from the office of the registrar. The primary objective is to determine if differences in attitudes concerning the release of student information exist among registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors.

The author wishes to express his indebtedness to the members of his Advisory Committee: Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, Chairman, Dr. Ralph Brann, Dr. Ivan Chapman, and Dr. Thomas Carman for their invaluable guidance and counsel.

A note of thanks is given to Dr. Willard North, Director of Research and Computer Services at Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, Missouri, for his advice and statistical assistance. Thanks are also extended to members of the Central Missouri State University Computer Services staff for key punching the data.

Gratitude is expressed to all of the college administrators who gave their time in providing the data used in this study.

A special expression of appreciation is extended to my wife, Sue, and our children, Marilyn, Phil, Alan, and Kathy, for their understanding, patience, and encouragement throughout the doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Significance of the Problem	2
Statement of Hypotheses	5
Assumptions Underlying the Investigation	8
Limitations of the Study	9
Definition of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Research Studies Related to Confidential Information	13
Legal Implications Regarding Confidential Information	22
Privacy, Technology, and Ethical Considerations	33
Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Student Information	38
Summary	40
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	46
The Research Instrument	46
Sample Selection	48
Collection of Data	49
Statistical Methodology	50
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	55
Internal Consistency of the Instrument	55
Problems Encountered in Analyzing the Data	58
Attitudinal Comparisons of Registrars, Student Personnel Administrators and Directors of Counseling Centers Concerning the Release of Student Information	64

Chapter	Page
Attitudinal Comparisons of College Administrators Occupying Positions in Different Geographic Regions of the United States	68
Attitudinal Comparison of College Administrators Occupying Positions in Public and Private Institutions of Higher Education	71
Attitudinal Comparisons of College Administrators Occupying Positions in Men's, Women's, and Coeducational Institutions	73
Attitudinal Comparisons of College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Offering Two Year, Four Year, and Graduate or Professional Programs	76
Attitudinal Comparisons of College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Categorized By the Number of Students Enrolled	80
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	85
Summary	85
Conclusions	87
Recommendations	95
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	99
APPENDIX	109
A. Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance, and Dissemination of Student Information	109
B. Survey Instrument, Letter to Participants, and Follow-Up Letter	141
C. Correlations Between Items and Total Scores Obtained on Usable Survey Instruments	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Instruments Mailed To and Returned By College Administrators	50
II. Means and Standard Deviations of Each Survey Item	57
III. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators . . .	59
IV. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators in Different Geographic Regions	60
V. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators Serving Private and Public Institutions . .	61
VI. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators Serving Men's, Women's, and Coeducational Institutions	61
VII. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators Serving Two Year, Four Year, and Four Year Institutions With Graduate and/or Professional Schools	62
VIII. Instruments Mailed To, Returned By, and Expected From College Administrators Serving Institutions Varying in Student Enrollment	63
IX. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance of the Attitude Scores Obtained by Registrars, Student Personnel Administrators, and Counseling Center Directors	65

Table	Page
X. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by Registrars, Student Personnel Administrators, and Counseling Center Directors	66
XI. F Values Computed by the Scheffé Method for the Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained by Registrars, Student Personnel Administrators, and Counseling Center Directors	67
XII. Geographic Regions of the United States and the States Comprising the Various Regions	69
XIII. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores of All College Administrators Responding According to Geographic Region	70
XIV. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Different Geographic Regions	70
XV. F Values Computed by the Scheffé Method for the Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Different Geographic Regions of the United States	72
XVI. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Private and Public Institutions	73
XVII. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Private and Public Institutions	74
XVIII. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Men's, Women's, and Coeducational Institutions	75

Table	Page
XIX. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Men's, Women's, and Coeducational Institutions	75
XX. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Offering Two Year, Four Year, and Graduate or Professional Programs	77
XXI. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Offering Two Year, Four Year, and Graduate or Professional Programs	78
XXII. F Values Computed by the Scheffé Method for the Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Offering Two Year, Four Year, and Graduate or Professional Programs	79
XXIII. Data Used to Calculate the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Categorized by the Number of Students Enrolled	80
XXIV. Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the Attitude Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Categorized by the Number of Students Enrolled	81
XXV. F Values Computed by the Scheffé Method for the Comparison of Mean Scores Obtained by College Administrators Occupying Positions in Institutions Categorized by the Number of Students Enrolled	82

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of guidelines to be utilized in the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information is a major problem confronting college and university administrators. The development or refinement of student information systems often elicits serious questions of an ethical, moral, or legal nature. The following questions posed by a conference on public school record keeping (modified by the writer to fit institutions of higher education) indicate issues which often evolve:

1. Should colleges and universities be required to obtain parental and/or student permission before collecting certain kinds of information about students or their families? If so, what kinds of information?
2. Should colleges and universities be required to obtain parental and/or student permission before releasing certain information about students to parties outside the institution? To which kinds of information and which outside parties should this apply?
3. Should college and university personnel, especially counselors, be protected legally from subpoena by a third party of information collected in the course of a professional relationship with a client (i.e., a student)?
4. What rights should students and/or their parents have regarding access to information about the student possessed by the institution? Do college and university personnel

have any obligation (right?) to withhold such information (for example, an intelligence test score, disciplinary or medical information) when, in their professional judgment, its release to the student or parent would be harmful to the client?

5. What rights, if any, do students as distinct from their parents, have with respect to information about them? Should a student, for example, have the right to deny his parents access to information about him, such as an intelligence test score, disciplinary or medical information? (83:7-8)

Statement of the Problem

Some educators believe that much discrepancy exists concerning the release of student information. One research study indicated a significant difference in attitudes of counselors, student personnel administrators, and college registrars regarding the release of confidential information obtained by counselors during hypothetical counseling situations (27). The purpose of the current investigation was to determine whether the attitudes of college registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors differed concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Significance of the Problem

Recent trends indicate that student complacency no longer exists. Court cases regarding student rights have been increasing and are almost an everyday occurrence in

some geographic locations. Although there has been very little litigation directly concerned with student information systems and the handling of student information, this area could become a prime target for future litigation. Most college administrators do not want to be confronted in the courts. The primary concern, however, is not one of avoiding the courtroom but one of creating a college environment which encourages favorable student attitudes and facilitates learning.

Personnel practices, rules and regulations, teaching methods, study requirements, features and facilities, and the complete network of events and relationships to be found on a college campus constitute a system of influences or pressures which define the psychological educational character of the college environment (75:90).

The rapid growth in college and university enrollments has forced many administrators in higher education to focus their attentions toward finance, physical facilities, the recruitment of faculty, and attainment of adequate non-instructional personnel. Administrators in the area of student affairs have been overburdened with problems concerning admissions, student housing, food services, medical services, traffic, student government, and student discipline. Many registrars have experienced difficulty in finding available time for educational planning. Counselor-client ratios have increased. Little time has remained for the evaluation of procedures and

practices concerning the dissemination of student information.

Guidelines concerning the confidentiality of student records and the release of student information have been prepared by various professional associations. These guidelines and recommendations are quite helpful, but are often too general, and may not represent a consensus of opinion.

Instruments have been devised to measure and describe various aspects of the college environment, but these instruments have not been primarily concerned with the student information system.

A review of previous research indicated that at the time of this writing no studies had been undertaken to compare the attitudes of registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. The release of student information may have harmful consequences for students and their families. Employment, further educational opportunities, and credit ratings may be affected. The release of confidential information may subject the student to legal action. If students or their families believe the institution has released information without considering their interests or that unethical practices exist, unfavorable relationships may arise.

College registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors, because of their educational backgrounds and experiences, should be knowledgeable in regard to student information. This study's significance lies in its attempt to assess the attitudes of three groups of personnel so that a further basis for assessment and future research may be established.

Statement of Hypotheses

The researcher's rationale for comparing the attitudes of three specific administrator groups (registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors) toward the release of student information is given as follows:

1. Most registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors are members of professional organizations expressing an interest in the manner in which student information is collected, maintained, and disseminated. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, the American Personnel and Guidance Association, and the American Psychological Association have developed statements and guidelines regarding the confidentiality of student information (see Appendix A). As members of these professional organizations registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors should be aware of problems associated with the release of student information and

should have attained a level of expertise in the development, maintenance, and refinement of student information systems.

2. Because of the nature of their positions registrars, student personnel administrators, and directors of counseling centers are often delegated the responsibility of developing, maintaining or modifying student information systems. The registrar's office maintains records on all students and is constantly besieged with requests for information concerning students or former students. The responsibility of providing for the welfare of all students is a primary function of the principal student personnel administrator. Directors of college counseling centers are responsible for developing the confidentiality practices of counseling centers.

3. Because of their educational preparations, backgrounds, and experiences registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors should be able to recognize and understand the problems associated with the release of student information. Therefore, their attitudes toward the release of student information should be investigated.

4. A review of the literature indicated that many of the articles written about confidentiality practices and the release of student information were written by registrars, student personnel administrators, and counselors. Since these three groups are responsible for releasing

student information and have expressed an awareness of the problems associated with the release of student information the researcher believes their attitudes have special significance.

In order to determine whether or not the attitudes of college registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors differed concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar, a survey instrument was developed by the researcher. The attitudes measured were utilized in testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

2. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and college counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

3. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of student personnel administrators and college counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

The preceding hypotheses were stated in null form for two reasons:

1. Although the investigator had some basic ideas regarding attitudinal differences and similarities of the

three administrator groups he believed that stating them in hypothesis form could possibly bias the investigation.

2. Since the statistical tests employed in the investigation were designed to test null hypotheses (statements of no significant difference) the researcher believed it would be more convenient to state the hypotheses in null form.

The investigator realizes that factors other than administrative positions occupied may influence attitudes toward the release of student information. The data was also examined in order to determine if administrator attitudes toward the release of student information differed according to geographic region, institutional control, student clientele, number of years of schooling offered, and the number of students enrolled.

Assumptions Underlying the Investigation

The investigation of attitudes was based on the following assumptions:

1. It was assumed that the attitudes of college registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors toward releasing student information from the office of the registrar could be measured by the instrument developed.

2. It was assumed that the respondents reacted with honesty to the hypothetical set of incidents selected for investigation.

3. It was assumed that each hypothetical incident was of sufficient interest to college registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors to elicit their agreement or disagreement with the action taken by the registrar in the incident.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited as follows:

1. The hypothetical set of incidents utilized in the study was representative, but not all-inclusive, of situations occurring in which student information may or may not be released from the office of the registrar.

2. The attitudes of the respondents are relevant only to the specific set of hypothetical incidents used in the collection of data.

Definition of Terms

In order to maintain the terminology used by most school administrators, the publication Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education (67) was used as a major source of reference. The following terms are defined within the context of their usage:

Attitude Score

The score obtained for each respondent by summing the respondent's rating for each incident utilized in the survey instrument. Possible scores range from fifteen through sixty. A high score indicates an attitude toward retaining student information and a low score indicates the converse.

College

An institution offering educational programs above the level of secondary school, specifically, 2-year, 4-year, and professional schools in higher education.

Confidentiality

The responsibility (ethical, moral, and often legal) not to divulge information of a personal nature that has been obtained in the course of a professional relationship except: (1) when necessary to prevent an individual's serious injury to himself and/or to another person, and (2) when ordered by competent judicial authority to release such information when the applicable laws do not grant the immunities of privileged communication.

Counselor

A person whose principal task (usually through confidential interviews with individual counselees or a small

group of counselees) is to help students make choices which lead to solutions to their educational, vocational, social, and personal problems.

Director of Counseling Center

The individual whose major responsibility is to direct and coordinate the activities of a college counseling center.

Privileged Communication

Information about a student in an official file which has been given in confidence and which is to be treated with discretion in accordance with ethical, moral, and legal considerations.

Record, Official Disciplinary

A record of disciplinary proceedings involving a student of the institution. Depending upon the policy of the institution, an entry may or may not be made on the student's official educational record.

Record, Official Educational

The official document on which is listed the courses attempted, grades and credits earned, and status achieved by a student. The official educational record is commonly referred to as the permanent academic record.

Record, Student Personnel

A file which may contain the following: a record of the student's scholastic progress, his extracurricular activities, personal characteristics and experiences, family background, secondary school background, aptitudes, and interests.

Records, Confidentiality of

The right of the student not to have his official educational record or other records released except through his consent or through legal processes.

Registrar

The chief administrator of the office supporting the educational process through academic record keeping.

Student Personnel Administrator

The vice president of student affairs, dean of students, or a closely related administrative officer devoted to directing the non-academic services for student development at a college.

Student Rights

The rights of a student to protection by university policy against abridgment of his academic freedom, improper disclosure of his records, social discrimination, and violation of his civil liberties and rights of citizenship.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Individual privacy has been increasingly affected by the structural changes which have been taking place in American society. Urbanization, mobility, and the changes in family structure have altered individual relationships (82:211). "Society is experiencing an information, as well as a population, explosion" (64). Student rights, individual privacy, and the release of confidential information have become primary topics of concern.

This chapter has been organized into five parts: research studies related to confidential information; legal implications regarding confidential information; privacy, technology, and ethical considerations; guidelines for the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information; and a summary.

Research Studies Related to Confidential Information

A study designed to determine how psychologists would react to a set of ambiguous ethical incidents was conducted by Wiskoff (105) in 1960. A set of twenty-six incidents was developed. The psychologist in each

incident was confronted with the problem of remaining loyal to his client and refusing to release information, or releasing information needed by others. The research instrument was sent to Associates and Fellows of the American Psychological Association. Results indicated that psychologists who belonged to different sub-groups within the Association had different attitudes regarding the release of information. More client information was released by psychologists employed in business or education than by those who were self-employed or employed in government. Psychologists holding the Master's degree released more confidential information than those who had earned a Ph. D.

Reiske (79) conducted a study in 1962 to determine if significant attitudinal differences existed between counselor educators and student personnel administrators regarding certain counseling issues. A thirty-three item questionnaire was developed and administered to selected members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association. The final sample was separated into three groups (counselor educators, student personnel administrators trained in counseling, and student personnel administrators not trained in counseling). It was concluded that counselor educators believe training is more important than experience for success in counseling, are more non-directive in a number of counseling situations, and are

more prone to let the student take the initiative for counseling than student personnel administrators. It was also determined that some difference in attitude existed between the trained and untrained student personnel administrators, and that the attitude of the trained student personnel administrators was more like that of counselor educators than was that of the untrained student personnel administrators.

Significant differences in the attitudes of college counselors and deans of women toward students were reported by Reeves and Arbuckle (78) in 1963. Deans of women were found to be more authoritative, less sympathetic, less understanding, and more persuasive than the counselors in the study. The researchers theorized that differences in attitudes may have occurred because counselors perceive their primary loyalty as being to the student and the primary loyalty of deans may be to the institution.

An investigation to determine the attitudes of three different groups of students toward the release of confidential information obtained in counseling situations was conducted by Lewis and Warman (54) at Iowa State University in 1964. The student groups surveyed included students who had received personal counseling, students who had received vocational counseling, and students who had received no form of counseling. The researchers concluded that students who received personal counseling

were more reluctant to give permission to release confidential information than those who had received vocational counseling. Students who received no form of counseling were in between the counseled groups regarding the granting of permission to release confidential information.

A questionnaire concerning confidentiality practices in counseling centers was sent to all four-year colleges and universities listed in a national directory in 1968. This survey conducted by Nugent and Pareis (72) provided 461 usable returns. Forty-one percent of the respondents indicated that information was released without student permission, 21 percent indicated that information was made available to administrative heads for use in recommendations and disciplinary action, 10 percent stated that information was made available to the Dean of Students, 5 percent made information available to the faculty, and 2 percent made information available to prospective employers.

An investigation to measure, compare, and analyze the attitudes of Colorado State College students, their parents, faculty, and student personnel workers toward college policies and procedures which govern students was conducted by Arneson (8) in 1967. The survey instrument was administered to 227 students, 210 parents of students, 42 full-time teaching faculty, and 49 student personnel workers. Two findings have implications regarding student information. Students, parents, and student personnel

workers were in agreement that no one, except personnel employed in the college registrar's office, should be permitted access to a student's educational record without permission from the student. Faculty members believed they should have access to educational records without receiving student permission. Students, parents, faculty, and student personnel workers were opposed to the proposed policy of entering student disciplinary information on the student's permanent educational record.

Simmons (87) conducted a study in 1968 at Oregon State University to determine client attitudes toward releasing confidential information obtained during the counseling process without student consent. Forty-six counselees were divided into three groups. The groups were: students who had received counseling for vocational-educational problems, students counseled for personal-adjustment problems, and students who had problems that appeared to present a danger to themselves or society. The counselees were asked their opinions regarding the release of confidential information to parents, dean, or other counseling centers. Two-thirds of the students were in favor of releasing information without their permission. The investigation was conducted with a small sample of college students from small towns who were in attendance at a large western university. Therefore the validity of generalizing from this study

would appear to be doubtful. The researcher suggested further investigations in metropolitan areas.

A study concerning knowledges and attitudes regarding the legal aspects of student-institutional relationships was conducted in 1969 by Marsh (59). The subjects of the investigation were four groups at Colorado State College. Group one consisted of student personnel workers; group two consisted of undergraduate students; group three consisted of faculty members; and group four consisted of graduate students in college student personnel work. The instrument contained twenty-four items selected to measure knowledge and another twenty-four items to measure attitude. The results of the study indicated that 36 percent of the student personnel workers, 33 percent of the undergraduate students, 30 percent of the faculty, and 68 percent of the graduate students majoring in student personnel work were knowledgeable of the legal aspects concerning the confidential relationship between a counselor and client; that is, communications between a counselor and a student are not confidential and the counselor may be required to reveal them as a witness in court. Only 9 percent of the student personnel workers, 18 percent of the undergraduate students, 14 percent of the faculty, and 12 percent of the graduate students majoring in student personnel work believed a counselor should be required to reveal information obtained in a counseling situation in court. Marsh referred to the

distance between knowledge of what the law is and belief of what it ought to be regarding confidential information as the "confidentiality gap."

Anderson and Sherr (6) conducted a study at the University of Missouri in 1969 to determine student attitudes toward the release of confidential information from college and university counseling centers. Two hundred thirty-nine psychology students were asked to respond to a questionnaire regarding the release of confidential information. The results of the study indicated that students discriminate among types of information they want released and among persons and agencies they believe access should be given. The students were reluctant to allow information collected by their counselor to be made available to other counselors.

Selected attitudes of chief student personnel administrators were investigated by Birch (15) in 1969. A questionnaire was sent to chief student personnel administrators of the 715 colleges and universities holding membership in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Sixty-four percent of the members participated in the study. Two of Birch's conclusions pertained to confidential information. Ninety percent of the chief student personnel administrators strongly agreed that there is no justification except for considerations of safety for violating the confidentiality of a counseling relationship and 89 percent agreed that

provision for privacy for the individual student is essential to personalization in higher education. Student personnel administrators representing southern institutions were stronger in agreement with the item advocating privacy than other institutional representatives (94.4 percent agreed with the statement).

A study to determine if Michigan community colleges had a statement on confidentiality, if a need for a statement existed, and if a statewide code of confidentiality was needed was conducted by Warner and Evangelista (98) in 1970. A questionnaire concerned with the types of information considered confidential, the people and organizations that had access to confidential material, and the confidentiality procedures and policies practiced was sent to deans of student personnel. Eighteen of twenty-four Michigan community colleges responded to the questionnaire. The institutions responding seemed to be in agreement concerning the types of material classified as confidential and the personnel which should have access to confidential information. Fifteen or more deans stated that permanent records, cumulative records, counseling records, high school and college transcripts, recommendations, and health records were confidential. Fourteen or more deans stated that administrators, faculty, and counselors had access to confidential information. Deans were almost evenly divided as to whether secretaries had access to confidential material. Six to eight deans

stated that no information from permanent records, cumulative records, counseling records, or disciplinary records was released to law agencies, government agencies, employers, and families without student permission, but about the same number of deans reported such information was released without student permission. Ten or more deans stated that information from permanent and cumulative records was released to the faculty, students, and other educational institutions with or without the attainment of student permission. Information released from disciplinary and counseling records was a little more restrictive, with nine deans releasing this information to the faculty and only four to six deans releasing this information to students and other educational institutions. No information was released to credit bureaus by fifteen deans. Ten or more deans allowed students to examine transcripts, test scores, permanent records, and cumulative records; two deans allowed students to examine college recommendations and discipline records; and one dean allowed counselees to examine high school recommendations. None of the deans allowed counselees to examine counseling records. Seventeen of the eighteen institutions believed that a need for a definite policy on confidentiality existed, but at the time of the survey only five institutions had developed a statement on confidentiality. Ten of the deans believed the state should establish a definite policy or at least propose

definite guidelines regarding confidentiality. The researchers stated that procedures concerning confidentiality of records at Michigan community colleges ranged from "released only on student's request to none."

Campbell (27) conducted a study in 1970 to determine whether or not agreement existed between the attitudes of college counselors and administrators concerning the release of confidential information from counseling centers. A survey instrument consisting of twelve hypothetical incidents was developed and mailed to random samples of individuals belonging to the American College Personnel Association and to college administrators selected from a national directory of institutions of higher education. Campbell (27) concluded that college counselors were more retentive of information obtained in counseling situations than were student personnel administrators and that student personnel administrators were more retentive of such information than college registrars.

Legal Implications Regarding Confidential Information

Both law and education wrestle with some of the deep philosophical issues upon whose resolution the advancement of civilization depends. This is one reason why they should be approached broadly in a comparative and reflective mood, rather than in a "cookbook" spirit of finding cut and dried answers. The real questions are those of farsighted social theory. They relate to what is right and what is wrong; what is just and what is inequitable; how to enlarge the freedom of the

individual as society grows more efficient and humane. (29:182)

Although there has been very little litigation concerning the release of student information in higher education, an overview of legal considerations appears to be in order.

The courts do not agree on the question of whether student records are public records. An early Iowa case, *Valentine v. Independent Sch. Dist.*, 187 Iowa 555, 174 N.W. 334, 6 A.L.R. 1525 (1919), considered this issue and the school board was ordered to issue a diploma and a transcript of grades to a high school senior who had violated the board's rule requiring the wearing of a cap and gown at graduation. It was maintained by the superintendent of schools that grades were the property of the school. The court said the board had a legal duty to issue both the diploma and grades. They further stated that grades were not the property of the school, but were "public records" within the meaning of the law. Nolte (70) has examined the issue and stated that some states do not require public schools to collect information by statute. If records are legally required they would come under the common law rule permitting the public the right to inspect public records kept for a public purpose. The inspection of a public record requires an individual wishing to inspect the record to show that he has an "interest" in the record and that he has sufficient standing as a

taxpayer, citizen, or parent to warrant inspection. The custodian of the records must have a corresponding duty to produce them for inspection and assurance that the law or public policy will not be violated must exist. In the case considered, it must be kept in mind that the court was referring to only one kind of record, that of a permanent or objective nature. Much information collected on today's students is of another nature, being temporary, personal, or confidential in nature. Everyone should not have access to information which might be damaging or detrimental to students. School records are not, however, the exclusive property of the faculty or the school. The courts have considered student records to be "quasi-public" in that parts of student records may be considered private and other parts considered public.

In the case, *Basket v. Crossfield*, 228 S.W. 673 (Kentucky, 1920), a male student was charged with indecent exposure and this fact was communicated to his parents by university authorities. The school authority who released the information (to the parents) was sued for libel. The court held that communication to the parents was privileged communications with no liability attached (51:429).

In *Kenney v. Gurley*, 208 Ala. 623-95 S. 34 (1923), a female student was sent home from Tuskegee Institute because she had a venereal infection. The medical director wrote a letter informing the student's mother of the circumstances and the dean of women wrote a letter

refusing permission for the student to return to college because her condition "seems to indicate that Velma has not been living right." The remark was considered libellous by the mother and daughter and they sued to recover damages. The defendant (dean of women) pleaded that since her letter bore no malice against the student, it should be considered a privileged communication. The trial court awarded damages but the appeal court ordered a new trial, stating:

A personal, authoritative letter addressed . . . and sent to the parents or guardian of a dismissed student relating the reason for the student's dismissal or for the denial of readmission is a privileged occasion. Whereas here, the evidence descriptive of the occasion is undisputed, the inquiry whether the occasion was privileged is a question of law to be decided by the court, not by the jury. (19:122)

A hospital psychologist called a nine-year-old girl a "high-grade moron" in a report requested by and sent to a school. In the case, *Iverson v. Frandsen*, 237 F. (2d) 898 (Utah, 1956) (CA10), the court held he was not liable because he gave his best professional judgment. Ware (97) notes that the report was sent to school officials with an interest in and responsibility to the student.

In the case of *VanAllen v. McCleary*, 211 N.Y.S. 2d 501 (New York, 1961), the court held, as a matter of law, that a parent was entitled to inspect all of his child's records. The court ordered a school board to produce records, despite the policy of the board that records

should be safeguarded and interpreted by a professional to the parents (97:306).

In another case, *Johnson v. Board of Education of City of New York*, 220 N.Y.S. 2d 363 (New York, 1961), the board was ordered to permit the inspection of a student's records prior to a particular trial. The trial concerned another court action regarding brain damage to the child which was not school-connected. The board stated that the student's records were confidential, that the parents should use their right of subpoena to inspect the records, and refused permission to inspect the records. The court held that the parents had the right to inspect the school records before trial (51:426-427).

Damages are provided for the student by California law if a school improperly releases information concerning the student. In the case, *Elder v. Anderson*, 23 Cal. Rptr. 48 (1962), a court granted damages to the plaintiffs when a school board improperly released disciplinary information about students in the public schools (70:58).

In the case, *Morris v. Smiley*, 378 S.W. 2d 149 (1964), the dean of students at the University of Texas was sued by the plaintiff to let him inspect and copy records kept by the dean relating to the plaintiff. Permission turned on whether the records kept by the dean were public. The court defined public records as follows:

It is said that a public record is one required by law to be kept . . . to serve as a memorial and evidence of something written, said,

or done, . . . but this is not quite inclusive of all that may properly be considered public records. For whenever a written record of the transactions of a public officer is an . . . appropriate mode of discharging the duties of his office, it is not only his right, but his duty, to keep that memorial whether expressly required to do so or not; and when kept it becomes a public document which belongs to the office rather than to the officer. (19:121-122)

The plaintiff in the preceding case (Morris), a former student at the University of Texas, sued the university psychiatrist alleging that the psychiatrist had improperly diagnosed his condition and that a damaging report had been placed in his file. The court held that the psychiatrist had not placed false information in the plaintiff's file and had not acted in a malicious manner (19:122).

In 1968, Bates College was required by a court to release certain documents from its admissions file to a student who had been denied admission. The student wanted the records for another court action involving a high school counselor. The student believed adverse evaluations were made by the counselor and that these evaluations were causing him to be rejected for admission by several colleges (97:305-306).

Improper release of the contents of student records may result in personal liability for defamation of the student or the invasion of his civil rights. Essentially, the issue concerns respect for individual privacy versus the needs of the public to know matters of record (51:423).

Any statement (spoken or written) intending to harm a person's reputation, so as to lower him in the estimation of the community or to deter others from associating with him, is defamatory. Oral or written communication is called publication. Spoken words intending harm are called slander; written words, libel. Slanderous words must be of a certain nature before a court action will stand. Libel is more easily redressed in the courts than slander and is often actionable even though the same words, if spoken, would not be actionable unless special damage occurred. No injury to reputation need be proven when the words are written. Words considered slanderous are those imputing: the commission of certain crimes; certain diseases and contagious disorders; a person's reputation or skill in his business, office, trade, profession, or occupation so as to cause his position to be prejudicially affected; and unchastity to a woman. Special injury does not have to be proven if one of the preceding slanderous conditions existed. Special injury must be proved if the defamation does not fall into one of these classes. The primary defense to any libel action is truth without malice. A second defense of the accused slanderer is that the communication was privileged (97:307-308).

Privilege is the legal term upon which the quasi-legal concepts of confidentiality and privacy rest. Privilege may be simply defined as the immunity from criminal and/or civil action for what one says or refuses to say. (59:363)

Two degrees of privilege exist--absolute and conditional. Absolute privilege is unconditional and can be established only by legislative or constitutional action. Certain conditions must be met and the court must agree that they have been met before conditional privilege is granted. Judicial and legislative agencies are granted absolute privilege. Psychologists and guidance counselors, if granted privilege, would receive conditional privilege, subject to existing conditions in each and every situation (59:363).

Provisions for privileged communication for guidance counselors can be based on statutory provisions in only three states: Michigan, North Dakota, and Indiana. Licensed psychologists are awarded privilege in seventeen states (18). No legal privilege is provided in any state for private communications between a student and members of the faculty and administration (55:126).

The extension of privilege for those possessing it does not provide blanket protection from disclosure. There are several exceptions that require disclosure of information in a court of law: knowledge of a planned crime or fraud requires disclosure by the professional afforded privilege; privilege is an extension of the Fifth Amendment and belongs to the client, not to the professional, therefore the professional can be compelled to testify if his client or ex-client waives his privilege and so desires; if the client has participated in an

illegal activity and communicated this information to the professional (although the information is hearsay and does not establish truth or falsity) the professional can be required to present the information; and a psychologist or counselor can also be required to testify as an expert witness, and his opinion (determined by information obtained in privilege) might be required (18:277-278).

Arguments in favor of extending privilege to the counselor-client relationship include: counselees would put more trust in guidance counselors who have privilege; counseling sessions may be identical or similar to those held by psychologists who have privilege; and other professionals enjoy the privilege in confidential relationships. Arguments against extending privilege to guidance counselors include: privilege is not necessary because it is doubtful if the majority of clients give any consideration to the fact of privileged communication and requests for information are easily refused. Parents, employers, administrators, and others, are usually willing to abide by the confidential relationship of the counselor-counselee relationship if they are reminded of it (10). Goldman (41) believes that we have lost sight of the meaning of privileged communication:

The privilege is the client's. It is he who is protected by law, not the person to whom he spills the beans. It is he who owns the information and has the right to say who shall have access to it and who shall not.

Only a few states have attempted to spell out the exact legal status of public school records (70:58). An Indiana statute states that any "counselor" is immune from disclosing privileged or confidential information contained in a student record and any communication made to such counselor by any student in the school (70:58). A Michigan statute prohibits teachers, guidance officers, school executives or other professional persons from disclosing any information obtained from student records or communications by students, except with the consent of the person so confiding or to whom such records relate (70:58). Oklahoma law makes it a misdemeanor for any teacher to reveal any information concerning any student obtained by the teacher in his capacity as a teacher except as may be required by his contractual duties (70:58). A California statute provides for the inspection of cumulative student records during consultation with a certificated employee of the school record (51:430). A state statute in New Jersey directed the state board of education to establish rules governing the public inspection of student records and the furnishing of other information relating to students and former students. Under this directive the state board adopted rules providing that parents and guardians may inspect student records if the student is under 21 years of age. After that age, only the student may inspect his records. The state board of education provided, however, that a board of education

may refuse to release confidential information (51:430). A Montana statute provides that anyone teaching psychology or acting as a psychology teacher engaged in child study shall not testify in a civil lawsuit as to any testimony obtained unless the child's parent or guardian has given consent (51:430). Few state statutes concerning student records are specific and clearly defined. The courts will have to determine their applicability to higher education.

Whereas the laws of libel and slander seek to protect an individual's character and reputation against false accusations, the legal right to privacy seeks to protect an individual's place of mind, sensibilities, spirits, and feelings from unwarranted intrusions. (85:86)

The right of privacy emerged by judicial decision in the latter part of the nineteenth century on essentially constitutional grounds. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness includes the right of a person to be free from the unauthorized exposure of his affairs in which the public has no legitimate interest. The right of privacy has been defined as the right of an individual to be left alone. It is important to note that the truth or falsity of the publication of intimate details of an individual's life or activities is not the element of the cause of action. Also, the establishment of physical or monetary injury is not necessary because damages may be recovered as a result of mental anguish alone. Since the invasion of privacy is regarded as a relatively new tort,

the extent to which the concept will be applied cannot be clearly determined from the reported cases (85:86-87).

Privacy, Technology, and Ethical Considerations

Modern science has introduced a new dimension into the issues of privacy. There was a time when among the strongest allies of privacy were the inefficiency of man, the fallibility of his memory, and the healing compassion that accompanied both the passing of time and the warmth of human recollection. These allies are now being put to rout. Modern science has given us the capacity to record faithfully, to maintain permanently, to retrieve promptly, and to communicate both widely and instantly, in authentic sound or pictures or in simple written records, any act or event or data of our choice. Technology can now transform what participants believed were private experiences into public events. (81:5-6)

Structural changes in American society have profoundly affected and altered individual privacy. Anything that happened in a small town immediately became public knowledge. Increased mobility, urbanization, and changes in the family structure (including the decreased amount of time families spend together) have depersonalized society. These changes have increased personal privacy because fewer people are concerned about the personal affairs of others. Depersonalization, however, has been accompanied by a tremendous increase in the recording of information about individuals. The recording of information concerning an individual begins at birth and continues until death. Many records are public records and are available

to anyone wishing to consult them. The existence of numerous records has produced feelings of individual insecurity. People are afraid that information, or even more important, misinformation, may be released without their knowledge (82:211-212). Increasing quantities of information have been elicited and recorded ever since the federal government entered the taxation and social-welfare spheres. Recently access to governmental services has required an increasing willingness to divulge private information (64:1103). If we stop to consider the result of a potential merger of information collected about an individual by banks, credit bureaus, governmental agencies, public schools, and colleges, the ideas concerning personal privacy can be placed in a framework of reality. Would any secrets remain (34:423)?

Godwin and Bode (40) believe "datamania" exists in the schools and with the advent of computers and other technological aids we can expect a form of Parkinson's Law to apply: "Data needs will expand to fill the available data-collection and data-storage facilities." The following problems in record-keeping have arisen because of the development of computerized personal information systems:

1. As storage and retrieval systems become steadily more efficient, it becomes less important to restrict the quantity of the data that are collected. Incentives to gather only essential data grow progressively less persuasive. As a consequence, more information than is immediately, or even prospectively, necessary, is often collected.

2. Data that might once have been discarded because of the inconvenience and expense of their storage may now be more easily retained.
3. The new data systems permit more complete use of the information they include. . . . Very large data collections may be accurately searched even for relatively low priority purposes.
4. It is now possible to disseminate materials quickly to widely scattered groups of interested recipients. National systems for the exchange of data, linking thousands of remote terminals, will shortly become commonplace.
5. Information received through these systems may seem to its recipients enhanced in value or reliability simply because of its source. . . . The oldest and most obsolescent data may as a consequence seem new with each new computer print-out.
6. The improved performance of these data systems compounds the harm caused by inaccurate and incomplete information.
(56:209)

Hearings on the proposal for a National Data Center were conducted by the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Congress (96) in April, 1966. A large amount of controversy arose during and after the hearings. Advocates for a National Data Center present the following arguments:

First, the existing situation is one in which there has been a substantial encroachment on individual privacy by many public and private organizations. Second, much of the failure of our social and economic institutions to cope with the major problems facing the nation is directly attributable to the inadequacy of the information relating to our society. Third, a continuation of the present highly decentralized information system will not cure present abuses, but will prevent the integration of information

required for future social and economic development. Finally, an independent non-operating institution should be developed which is charged with the proper development of economic and social information and with protection of individual privacy through restricting access to information and the elimination of improper information. (82:220)

Opponents of a National Data Center believe it is a risky proposition because too much information about individuals would be brought together in one location.

Godwin and Bode (40) present the following suggestions for reducing or eliminating the threat to individual privacy presented by the collection of information:

1. The existence of information can be held secret, so that few will realize its potential for gain.
2. The expense and/or risk involved in acquiring information can be made sufficiently great to offset the gain.
3. Information can be rendered useless to others, so that they no longer see any gain in acquiring it.
4. Information can be destroyed. (40:303)

Lister (56) recommends the following guidelines in order to lessen the hazards that large-scale personal data systems create for individual privacy:

1. . . . no information concerning an individual should be collected, retained, disseminated, or employed without his prior and informed consent. . . .
2. It is important that restrictions be placed upon the quantity and character of the information which these systems may properly collect and retain. . . .

3. Rigid limitations should be placed upon the persons to whom and purposes for which data may be released. . . .
4. Those who are the data's subjects should ordinarily be permitted to examine their files and to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the files' contents. . . .
5. More effective civil remedies should be given to those who are injured by the negligent or willful misconduct of the data system or its employees. Such persons should be permitted to recover compensatory damages.
6. Criminal penalties should be imposed upon those who willfully misuse the data system or the information it contains. . . .
7. Where programs of research are to be conducted, five general principles should be followed. First, prior and informed consent should, wherever possible, be obtained from the subjects or their appropriate representatives. Second, the respondents' anonymity should be regarded as a characteristic of good research, and their identities should be divorced as fully and as effectively as possible from the data furnished. Third, officials of the data system should permit programs of research only if they are first convinced both of the qualifications of the proposed researchers and of the social utility of the project itself. Fourth, vigorous efforts should be made to protect the security of the research data. Fifth, data obtained for one research purpose should not be used for another or later purpose without renewed satisfaction of the conditions listed above.
8. Even privately operated data systems should recognize that they are public service corporations, with the highest obligations of good faith both to the general public and to their data's subjects. Comprehensive systems of licensing and public regulation should be created in each state to assure observance of these obligations. (56:210-211)

There are no easy solutions regarding the invasion of privacy dilemma. The problem involves both legal and ethical considerations and is social in nature. The following quotation is fruit for thought:

Recent revelations that organizations, both public and private, have been assembling dossiers on large numbers of individuals with the aid of computer storage and retrieval systems have led to fears of an eventual Big Brother watching over the land like an omniscient electronic god, recording our most trivial transgressions against some judgment day. Big Brother may indeed come, and may even arrive by 1984. The question is whether he will be human or whether Big Brother will be machine. (40:299)

Guidelines for the Collection,
Maintenance, and Dissemi-
nation of Student
Information

Guidelines for the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information in higher education have been prepared and distributed by various educational organizations. Some of the guidelines are very general, others are more specific, and some aspects of certain guidelines disagree with other guidelines. Some of the major guidelines concerning college student records and information are presented in Appendix A.

Soto (89) made an extensive study of existing guidelines and has presented the following recommendations for refinement:

1. All college regulations, including those pertaining to student records should be dynamic, flexible, and subject to change. . . .
2. The guidelines should define the role of the teachers in handling information that they obtain in their contacts with students in and out of the classroom.
3. As a rule, institutions of higher learning should cooperate with professionals engaged in bona fide educational research in which student records and information are necessary. However, unless it is authorized by the students, their names should not be disclosed in the research reports.
4. The guidelines should indicate the types of records kept by the institution . . . [and] . . . should indicate the member of the staff in charge of each file or record; it should also keep at a minimum the number of records and should avoid unnecessary duplication of such records.
5. The information to be recorded about the student should be determined in advance. Only that information essential for the accomplishment of the institution's educational goals should be collected.
6. Records should be classified according to categories of confidentiality. Where the distinction between matters of public record and confidential information are not very clear it would be to the advantage of all members of the academic community to classify all doubtful records within the confidential category.
7. The guidelines should identify specifically the official or officials who will be in charge of recording and safeguarding records. . . .
8. It would be advisable that the institution make a list of individuals and organizations who are entitled to receive information about students. . . .
9. The guidelines should define clearly the rights of the parents or guardians relative

to the records and information about their children.

10. Provision should be made for the keeping of a log on the information disclosed: date, person requesting the information, what information was released, to whom it was released, and for what purpose. When information is released, the student should be notified.
11. It should be clear whether the student has, or has not, the right to inspect his records. It is recommended that students be informed about all the information included in their files. Students should not be allowed to examine letters of recommendation. However, the material which has not been classified as strictly confidential should be subject to examination by the student, under proper supervision.
12. Academic and disciplinary records should be separate. . . .
13. Each institution of higher education should have a carefully considered policy of retention and destruction of student records. . . .
14. Institutions should provide a training program to insure that the personnel who work with student records are well aware of their responsibilities. (89:218-226)

Summary

Research studies concerning student information indicate that differences of opinion exist regarding the collection, maintenance and dissemination of student information.

The results of one study indicated that more confidential information was released by psychologists employed in business or education than by those who were

self-employed or employed by government agencies. The amount of education completed by psychologists also made a difference in that psychologists who had completed Ph. D. degrees released significantly less information than those who had completed Master's degrees.

Another study indicated that counselor educators believe training is more important than experience for success in counseling, are more nondirective, and are more prone to let the student take the initiative for counseling than personnel administrators although trained student personnel administrators were more like counselor educators in their attitudes than untrained student personnel administrators.

Two researchers concluded that deans of women were more authoritative, less sympathetic, less understanding and more persuasive than counselors. They theorized that differences in attitude may have occurred because counselors perceive their primary loyalty as being to the student and the primary loyalty of deans may be to the institution.

Another researcher found that 90 percent of a group of student personnel administrators surveyed strongly agreed that no justification existed for releasing confidential information except for considerations of safety and 89 percent agreed that provision for individual privacy was essential to personalization in higher education.

A recent study concluded that counselors were more retentive of confidential information obtained in counseling situations than student personnel administrators and that student personnel administrators were more retentive of information received in a counseling setting than college registrars.

Studies involving students indicate that students do discriminate among types of information they want released and the individuals and agencies they want to receive confidential information; that students who had received personal counseling were more reluctant to give permission to release information than those who had received vocational counseling; and that students believed students and professors should have more voice in administration while parents and alumni should have less voice in control.

A comprehensive study conducted in 1968 indicated that 41 percent of 461 college and university counseling centers sampled released student information without obtaining student permission.

Another study indicated that only 36 percent of the student personnel workers, 33 percent of the undergraduate students, 30 percent of the faculty, and 68 percent of the graduate students majoring in student personnel work sampled at a state university were aware of the fact that confidential relationships between counselor and client (in Colorado and most states) is not privileged communication. Less than 19 percent of each of the four groups

surveyed believed confidential relationships should not be privileged.

One study concluded that students, parents, and student personnel workers agreed (faculty members disagreed) that no one except personnel in the registrar's office should be permitted access to student educational records without student permission. Each of the four groups agreed that disciplinary information should not be recorded on students' permanent educational records.

A statewide community college study indicated that only a small number of the institutions surveyed had a written policy regarding confidentiality practices. A majority of the deans of the institutions surveyed believed the state should establish a definite policy on confidentiality or at least propose guidelines.

A review of the legal literature indicated very little litigation concerning student information. Student records are "quasi-public" in that parts may be considered public and other parts private. If a state requires a record to be kept, common law rule permits public inspection for public purposes. The inspection of a public record requires the individual wishing to inspect the record to show an "interest" in the record and prove that he has sufficient standing as a taxpayer, citizen, or parent to warrant inspection. The custodian of the records must have a corresponding duty to produce them for inspection and assurance that the law or public policy

will not be violated must exist. State statutes concerning student records and the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student records are either non-existent or extremely vague.

Courts have generally held that a student has the legal right to inspect his records and that parents have the right to inspect student records if the student is under twenty-one years of age.

Legal experts agree that the improper release of student information could result in personal liability for defamation (libel or slander) or the invasion of privacy. Defenses against defamation suits include showing that the action was truthful without intended malice or that the communication was privileged information. Educators should keep in mind that privilege belongs to the client and not to the professional. Provisions for privileged communications for guidance counselors can be based on statutory provisions in only three states. No legal privilege is provided in any state for private communications between students and members of the faculty and administration. The lack of litigation concerning the release of confidential information indicates that the primary concern should be that of protecting the rights of students rather than fearing the courtroom.

The development of the computer and increased technology have simplified the task of collecting, maintaining, and disseminating student information. Many people fear

an erosion of individual privacy. Some lawyers and legislators are advocating the establishment of a National Data Center, others believe pooling large amounts of individual data would create an element of risk to individual privacy. Some legal experts believe laws must be passed to regulate the collection and handling of confidential information. There are no easy solutions, but solutions must be found.

Guidelines for the handling of student information have been developed by various professional organizations. A review of guidelines indicates that unneeded information should not be collected, students and parents should know what information concerning them is being collected, students should have the right to inspect information concerning them and the right to request changes if errors occur, parents should have the right to inspect their children's records if the student is not of legal age, student information should not be released without the consent of the student or the parent (if the student is not of legal age), and records should be destroyed when they have served their purpose and are no longer needed.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether the attitudes of college registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors differed concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. This chapter presents the methods and procedures selected to accomplish the purpose of the study. Chapter subsections include: the development and preparation of the research instrument, sample selection, collection of data, and a discussion of the statistical methodology utilized in analyzing the collected data.

The Research Instrument

A search of the literature failed to reveal the availability of an instrument which could be utilized to obtain attitudes concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. An instrument comprised of fifteen hypothetical incidents concerning the release of student information was developed by the researcher (Appendix B). In each incident a college registrar was faced with the decision of either releasing

or retaining certain student information. The incidents were based on the researcher's experiences as a college academic adviser and registrar; a review of the literature regarding confidential information; and interactions with other college registrars, student personnel administrators, and college counseling center directors. A coin was flipped to determine whether or not the registrar released or retained student information in each of the incidents. The order in which the incidents occurred was randomized as an attempt to prevent any biases that might arise because of the sequence in which incidents were presented. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the registrar's action in each incident by checking a four-division Likert-type scale.

A tentative instrument comprised of twenty-four incidents was constructed and field tested in the state of Missouri during the summer of 1972. Seven registrars, six counseling center directors, and five student personnel administrators participated in the pilot study. Criticisms and suggestions gained from the field test were utilized in the refinement of the final instrument. An item analysis utilizing intercorrelation techniques was conducted by the Central Missouri State University Research Center to determine the discriminating power of each of the twenty-four original items. Coefficients of correlation were computed between individual item responses and total scores for each item. These

correlations ranged from $r = -0.0695$ to $r = 0.7151$. The item analysis revealed two items which correlated negatively with the total score for all items and seven items which correlated less than 0.40 with the total score for all items. These nine items were eliminated from the final instrument leaving a total of fifteen incidents having positive correlations greater than 0.40.

Sample Selection

The samples for the study consisted of registrars, student personnel administrators and counseling center directors selected from the 1971-72 Education Directory published by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The directory lists 2608 institutions of higher education in the United States and includes all types of institutions (public, private, men's schools, women's schools, co-educational, two year colleges, four year colleges, and universities). All types of institutions of higher education were included in the investigation since it was assumed that similar problems exist concerning the release of student information.

All institutions of higher education in the United States as listed in the directory were consecutively numbered. Three series of random numbers, each representing a ten percent sample of all institutions of higher education in the United States, were generated by the

Central Missouri State University Computer Center. A list of institutions corresponding to each series of random numbers was compiled. Therefore, the population from which the samples were drawn consisted of all the institutions of higher education in the United States listed in the Education Directory and the samples consisted of a ten percent randomized sample of registrars, a ten percent randomized sample of student personnel administrators, and a ten percent randomized sample of counseling center directors.

Collection of Data

The final instrument, a cover letter explaining the purpose of the investigation, and a self addressed stamped envelope to return the completed instrument was mailed to each participant in the study on October 2, 1972. The initial mailing totaled 783 instruments of which 261 were sent to registrars, 261 were sent to student personnel administrators, and 261 were sent to counseling center directors. Copies of the final instrument and the original cover letter are included in Appendix B.

A follow-up letter and a second instrument was mailed to administrators who did not respond to the initial mailing approximately two weeks after the first mailing. The follow-up letter is illustrated in Appendix B.

Table I lists the number of instruments mailed, the number returned, the number of usable instruments, and the percentage of usable instruments received.

TABLE I
INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO AND RETURNED
BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS

Sample	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Usable	Percentage Usable
Registrars	261	238	216	82.8
Student Personnel Administrators	261	209	200	76.6
Counseling Center Directors	261	201	196	75.1
Totals	783	648	612	78.2

Statistical Methodology

The criterion utilized in scoring the responses to each item in the instrument was whether or not student permission was obtained before student information was released by the registrar. If information was released without obtaining student permission, the response

strongly agree was given a score of one; agree was given a score of two; disagree was given a score of three; and strongly disagree was given a score of four. If student permission was obtained before student information was released, the response strongly agree was given a score of four; agree was given a score of three; disagree was given a score of two; and strongly disagree was given a score of one. Since the final instrument contained fifteen items the maximum score possible was sixty and the lowest score possible was fifteen.

Information identifying the occupational positions of the participants in the study, the characteristics of the institutions of higher education represented, scores obtained on each item, and the total score for each respondent was punched into IBM cards and verified by key punch operators at the Central Missouri State University Research Center located at Warrensburg, Missouri.

Upon the recommendation of the Director of Research and Computer Services at Central Missouri State University, and with the approval of the Thesis Adviser, it was decided to use a one-way analysis of variance to determine whether or not significant differences existed between the mean scores of the groups analyzed. Multiple comparisons utilizing the Scheffé method were then made to determine the nature of any differences existing between treatment means.

The F test, analysis of variance, can be used to test the significance of the differences between two or more means. Edwards (37:121) states that the F test is a robust test because it is relatively insensitive to violations of the assumptions of normality of distribution and homogeneity of variance.

F is defined as the between treatment mean square divided by the pooled within treatment mean square and is stated in formula form as follows:

$$F = \frac{MS_T}{MS_W}$$

The between treatment mean square (MS_T) is calculated by dividing the between treatment sum of squares by the appropriate degrees of freedom (number of treatments minus one). The pooled within treatment mean square (MS_W) is calculated by dividing the pooled within treatment sum of squares by the appropriate degrees of freedom (total number of observations minus one minus the number of degrees of freedom associated with the between treatment mean square) (37:118-120).

If the obtained value of F is greater than the tabled value for some defined level of significance we may regard it as being an improbable value if the null hypothesis is true and may reject the null hypothesis (37:121).

Although an analysis of variance can be used to determine if means differ significantly, the F test does

not show how the means differ. This study utilized the F test to determine if the means of the groups observed were significantly different. The .05 level of significance was used in determining whether or not the obtained Fs were significant. If significant Fs were obtained, multiple comparisons between means were computed using the Scheffé method.

The Scheffé method has been discussed by Ferguson (38) as follows:

The Scheffé method is more rigorous than other multiple comparison methods with regard to Type I error. It will lead to fewer significant differences. It is easy to apply. No special problems arise because of unequal n's. It uses the readily available F test. The criterion it employs in the evaluation of the null hypothesis is simple and readily understood. It is not seriously affected by violations of the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance, unless these are gross. It can be used for making any comparison the investigator wishes to make. (38:271)

The Scheffé method appeared to be an appropriate statistical test for this investigation because it was necessary to use unequal n's in making comparisons. The procedure involves the following steps (38:270):

1. Calculate F ratios using the formula:

$$F = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)^2}{MSw/n_1 + MSw/n_2}$$

In the preceding formula \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 are the means of the groups to be compared, MSw is the error mean square

obtained in the analysis of variance, and n_1 and n_2 represent the number of observations in each group.

2. Consult a table of F and obtain the value of F required for significance at the .05, .01, or any desired level, for $df_1 = k - 1$ and $df_2 = N - k$.

3. Calculate a quantity F^1 , which is $k - 1$ times the F required for significance at the desired significance level; that is, $F^1 = (k - 1) F$.

4. Compare the values of F and F^1 . For any difference to be significant at the required level, F must be greater than or equal to F^1 .

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter contains the tabulated results of the investigation and an analysis of the collected data. Chapter subsections discuss: the internal consistency of the survey instrument; problems encountered in analyzing the data; and attitudinal comparisons of college administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Internal Consistency of the Instrument

The research instrument was comprised of fifteen hypothetical incidents concerning the release of student information by a college registrar (Appendix B). Respondents agreed or disagreed with the registrar's action in each incident by checking a four-division Likert-type scale. If information was released without obtaining student permission, the response strongly agree was given a score of one; agree was given a score of two; disagree was given a score of three; and strongly disagree was given a score of four. If student permission was obtained before information was released, the response strongly agree was given a score of four; agree was given a score

of three; disagree was given a score of two; and strongly disagree was given a score of one. Since scores for each incident ranged from one to four the minimum score possible was fifteen and the maximum score possible was sixty. Six hundred twelve administrators returned usable survey instruments (answered all items).

Although an item analysis was conducted using the information obtained in the pilot study, the researcher conducted a second item analysis utilizing intercorrelation techniques on all data collected. Coefficients of correlation were computed between individual item responses and total scores for each item. These correlations ranged from $r = 0.3046$ to $r = 0.6791$. A complete correlation matrix showing correlations between individual item responses and total scores for each item is presented in Appendix C.

An estimate of the reliability of the instrument using the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 was conducted by the researcher on the data obtained from the 612 usable survey instruments.

The Kuder-Richardson formula 20 is a measure of the internal consistency, or homogeneity, or scalability, of the test material. In this context these three terms may be considered synonymous. If the items on a test have high intercorrelations with each other and are measures of much the same attribute, then the reliability coefficient will be high. (38:368)

The Kuder-Richardson formula 20 is stated as:

$$r = \frac{n}{n-1} \left(\frac{s_x^2 - \sum s_i^2}{s_x^2} \right)$$

In the preceding formula n equals the number of items, s_x^2 equals the total variance of the test scores defined as $\sum (X - \bar{X})^2 / N$, and s_i^2 is the variance of each item.

The total mean score obtained on the 612 survey instruments was 44.0605 and the total variance was 37.0845. Table II shows the means and standard deviations for each individual item.

TABLE II
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF
EACH SURVEY ITEM
(N = 612)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	2.6225	.9163
2	3.1732	.7250
3	3.6356	.5684
4	2.4624	.8876
5	3.1650	.7904
6	2.8758	.8675
7	2.9248	.9080
8	3.0539	.7830
9	2.9183	.7900
10	2.2745	.8144
11	3.1912	.6723
12	2.7565	.7990
13	2.7157	.8110
14	3.2843	.6111
15	3.0131	.7604

Substituting the above data in the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 the estimated reliability of the survey instrument was calculated as 0.8015.

Problems Encountered in Analyzing the Data

One problem encountered by the investigator was whether or not to use the conventional weighted-mean procedure in calculating the between group sum of squares in the analysis of variance. Winer (104) states the following:

If . . . the n 's are in no way related to the hypothesis being tested and it is desired to give each treatment mean a numerically equal weight in determining SS_{treat} , then the latter source of variation may be defined as $SS_{treat} = \tilde{n} \sum (\bar{T}_j - \bar{G})^2$, where $\bar{G} = \frac{\sum \bar{T}_j}{k}$. (104:103)

In the preceding formula \tilde{n} equals $\frac{k}{(1/n_1)+(1/n_2)+\dots+(1/n_k)}$ and \bar{T}_j equals the mean of each treatment group. The investigator used the unweighted-mean approach as defined by the formula, $SS_{treat} = \tilde{n} \sum (\bar{T}_j - \bar{G})^2$, in computing the between group sum of squares in applying an analysis of variance to the groups analyzed.

The design of the investigation made it necessary to compare administrator groups varying in size. Departure from an equal number of observations or from proportionality of numbers will introduce some bias in the F test (38:240).

In order to determine whether or not the number of returns was a function of some factor other than the number of instruments mailed to each group, chi square tests to determine proportionality were computed. Tables III through VIII illustrate the necessary data.

TABLE III
INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY,
AND EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE
ADMINISTRATORS

Sample	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
Registrars	261	216	204
Student Personnel Administrators	261	200	204
Directors of Counseling Centers	261	196	204
Totals	783	612	612

Calculated X^2 with 2 degrees of freedom = 1.098.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 9.210.

TABLE IV
 INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY, AND
 EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

Region	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
New England	67	50	52.37
Mideast	153	110	119.59
Southeast	172	144	134.44
Great Lakes	128	99	100.04
Plains	94	72	73.47
Southwest	47	43	36.74
Rocky Mountains	19	14	14.85
Far West	103	80	80.50
Totals	783	612	612.00

Calculated X^2 with 7 degrees of freedom = 2.716.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 18.475.

TABLE V
 INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY, AND
 EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 SERVING PRIVATE AND PUBLIC
 INSTITUTIONS

Sample	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
Private Institutions	442	315	345.47
Public Institutions	341	297	266.53
Totals	783	612	612.00

Calculated X^2 with 1 degree of freedom = 6.1708.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 6.635.

TABLE VI
 INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY, AND
 EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 SERVING MEN'S, WOMEN'S, AND CO-
 EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Sample	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
Men's	31	14	24.23
Women's	48	29	37.52
Coeducational	704	569	550.25
Totals	783	612	612.00

Calculated X^2 with 2 degrees of freedom = 6.893.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 9.210.

TABLE VII
 INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY, AND
 EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 SERVING TWO YEAR, FOUR YEAR, AND
 FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS WITH
 GRADUATE AND/OR PRO-
 FESSIONAL SCHOOLS

Sample	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
Two Year Institutions	294	242	229.79
Four Year Institutions	224	181	175.08
Four Year Institutions With Graduate and/or Professional Schools	265	189	207.13
Totals	783	612	612.00

Calculated X^2 with 2 degrees of freedom = 2.436.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 9.210.

TABLE VIII
 INSTRUMENTS MAILED TO, RETURNED BY, AND
 EXPECTED FROM COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 SERVING INSTITUTIONS VARYING IN
 STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Institutional Size	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Number Expected
0 - 999	346	244	270.44
1000 - 4999	313	264	244.64
5000 - 9999	65	63	50.80
10,000+	59	41	46.12
Totals	783	612	612.00

Calculated X^2 with 3 degrees of freedom = 7.6132.

Value of X^2 necessary for significance at the .01 level = 11.341.

The formula, $X^2 = \sum \frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$, was used to compute chi square tests for the data illustrated in Tables III through VIII. In the formula, o equals the number of instruments returned in each category and e equals the number of expected returns. The expected return (e) was calculated by dividing the number of instruments mailed in each category by the total number mailed and multiplying this proportion by the total number of instruments returned.

The calculated chi square values were contrasted with tabled values at the .01 level of significance with degrees of freedom equivalent to the number of categories minus one. None of the calculated chi square values were significant at the .01 level. Since the chi square tests were not significant it was assumed that the number of returns in each category was not a function of some factor other than the number of instruments mailed to each group. Therefore, attitudinal comparisons using unequal numbers seemed justifiable.

Attitudinal Comparisons of Registrars,
Student Personnel Administrators and
Directors of Counseling Centers
Concerning the Release of
Student Information

The primary purpose of the study was to compare the attitudes of three groups of administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. The measured attitudes were used in testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.
2. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and counseling center

directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

3. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of student personnel administrators and college counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

In order to determine if attitudinal differences existed, a one-way analysis of variance was computed for the data illustrated in Table IX.

TABLE IX

DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS
OF VARIANCE OF THE ATTITUDE SCORES
OBTAINED BY REGISTRARS, STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, AND
COUNSELING CENTER DIRECTORS

Respondent	Number of Returns (n)	Mean (\bar{X})	$\sum X$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}$
Registrars	216	43.39	9372	414208	7567.38
Student Personnel Administrators	200	44.00	8801	394167	6879.00
Counseling Center Directors	196	44.86	8792	402372	7988.00

The analysis of variance for the attitude scores obtained by registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information is summarized in Table X.

TABLE X
SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED BY
REGISTRARS, STUDENT PERSONNEL
ADMINISTRATORS, AND
COUNSELING CENTER
DIRECTORS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	222.32	2	111.16	3.02
Within Groups	22434.38	609	36.84	
Total	22656.70	611		

Calculated value of $F = 3.02$ which is significant at the .05 level.

The value of F obtained in Table X indicated a significant difference in the mean scores obtained by registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the registrar's office. In order to

determine how the means differed, multiple comparisons between means were computed using the Scheffé method. Table XI summarizes the comparisons.

TABLE XI
F VALUES COMPUTED BY THE SCHEFFÉ METHOD
FOR THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES
OBTAINED BY REGISTRARS, STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS, AND
COUNSELING CENTER DIRECTORS

Comparison	F
Registrars vs. Student Personnel Administrators	1.05
Registrars vs. Counseling Center Directors	6.03
Student Personnel Administrators vs. Counseling Center Directors	1.99

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .05 level = 6.04.

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .10 level = 4.70.

Table XI indicates the following:

1. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

2. A statistical significant difference (.10 level) existed between the attitudes of registrars and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. The survey instrument indicated that counseling center directors were more retentive of student information than registrars.

3. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of student personnel administrators and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Attitudinal Comparisons of College
Administrators Occupying
Positions in Different
Geographic Regions
of the United
States

Attitudinal comparisons of all respondents were conducted to determine whether or not attitudes toward the release of student information differed in the various geographical regions of the United States. Table XII shows the classification system used by the researcher.

An analysis of variance was computed for the data presented in Table XIII.

The analysis of variance for the scores obtained by all college administrators responding to the instrument according to geographic region is summarized in Table XIV.

TABLE XII
 GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES
 AND THE STATES COMPRISING THE
 VARIOUS REGIONS

New England Connecticut Maine Massachusetts New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont	Plains Iowa Kansas Minnesota Missouri Nebraska North Dakota South Dakota
Mideast Delaware District of Columbia Maryland New Jersey New York Pennsylvania	Southwest Arizona New Mexico Oklahoma Texas
Southeast Alabama Arkansas Florida Georgia Kentucky Louisiana Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee Virginia West Virginia	Rocky Mountains Colorado Idaho Montana Utah Wyoming
Great Lakes Illinois Indiana Michigan Ohio Wisconsin	Far West Alaska California Hawaii Nevada Oregon Washington

TABLE XIII

DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OF
ALL COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
RESPONDING ACCORDING TO
GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Region	Number of Returns (n)	Mean (\bar{X})	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{n}$
New England	50	43.30	2165	95427	1682.50
Mideast	110	45.11	4962	227854	4022.75
Southeast	144	42.98	6189	270739	4741.00
Great Lakes	99	45.12	4467	204251	2694.69
Plains	72	44.56	3208	145404	2469.81
Southwest	43	41.77	1796	77490	2475.69
Rocky Mountains	14	45.64	639	29567	401.21
Far West	80	44.24	3539	160015	3458.50

TABLE XIV

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED BY
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS OCCUPY-
ING POSITIONS IN DIFFERENT
GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	573.46	7	81.92	2.25
Within Groups	21946.15	604	36.34	
Total	22519.61	611		

Calculated value of $F = 2.25$ which is significant at the .05 level.

The value of F obtained in Table XIV indicated a significant difference in the mean scores obtained by college administrators occupying positions in different geographic regions. Multiple comparisons between means were then computed using the Scheffé method in order to determine how the means differed. Table XV summarizes these comparisons.

The computed values of F illustrated in Table XV indicate no significant differences in the attitudes of the three administrator groups occupying positions in different geographic regions toward the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Attitudinal Comparison of College
Administrators Occupying Posi-
tions in Public and Private
Institutions of Higher
Education

An analysis was conducted in order to determine if a significant difference existed concerning the release of student information between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in private institutions and administrators occupying positions in public institutions. Table XVI illustrates the data for which an analysis of variance was computed.

A summary of the analysis of variance for the attitude scores obtained by administrators occupying positions

TABLE XV
 F VALUES COMPUTED BY THE SCHEFFÉ METHOD
 FOR THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES
 OBTAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN
 DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC
 REGIONS OF THE
 UNITED STATES

Comparison	F
New England vs. Mideast	3.10
New England vs. Southeast	1.05
New England vs. Great Lakes	3.03
New England vs. Plains	1.29
New England vs. Southwest	1.49
New England vs. Rocky Mountains	1.95
New England vs. Far West	0.75
Mideast vs. Southeast	7.79
Mideast vs. Great Lakes	0.00
Mideast vs. Plains	0.36
Mideast vs. Southwest	9.49
Mideast vs. Rocky Mountains	0.10
Mideast vs. Far West	1.13
Southeast vs. Great Lakes	7.39
Southeast vs. Plains	3.30
Southeast vs. Southwest	1.33
Southeast vs. Rocky Mountains	2.48
Southeast vs. Far West	2.25
Great Lakes vs. Plains	0.36
Great Lakes vs. Southwest	9.26
Great Lakes vs. Rocky Mountains	0.09
Great Lakes vs. Far West	0.94
Plains vs. Southwest	5.77
Plains vs. Rocky Mountains	0.38
Plains vs. Far West	0.11
Southwest vs. Rocky Mountains	4.35
Southwest vs. Far West	4.70
Rocky Mountains vs. Far West	0.64

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .05 level = 14.21.

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .10 level = 12.39.

TABLE XVI
 DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS OF
 VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES
 OBTAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINIS-
 TRATORS OCCUPYING POSITIONS
 IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC
 INSTITUTIONS

Classifi- cation of Institution	Number of Returns (n)	Mean (\bar{X})	$\sum X$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}$
Private	315	44.43	13997	633491	11535.50
Public	297	43.66	12968	577256	11030.38

in private and public institutions of higher education is presented in Table XVII.

The calculated value of F illustrated in Table XVII indicates no significant difference in the attitudes of the three administrator groups occupying positions in private and public institutions concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Attitudinal Comparisons of College
 Administrators Occupying Posi-
 tions in Men's, Women's, and
 Coeducational Institutions

The collected data was analyzed in order to determine if a significant difference existed in attitudes concerning the release of student information of

TABLE XVII
 SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
 FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED
 BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN
 PRIVATE AND PUBLIC
 INSTITUTIONS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	90.80	1	90.80	2.45
Within Groups	22565.88	610	36.99	
Total	22656.68	611		

Calculated value of $F = 2.45$ is not significant at the .05 level.

administrators occupying positions in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions. An analysis of variance was computed for the data presented in Table XVIII.

The analysis of variance for the scores obtained by the college administrators occupying positions in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions is summarized in Table XIX.

The F value calculated in Table XIX indicates no significant difference in the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions concerning the release of student information from the registrar's office.

TABLE XVIII

DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OB-
TAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN MEN'S,
WOMEN'S, AND COEDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS

Type of Institution	Number of Returns (n)	ΣX	ΣX^2	$\Sigma X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{n}$
Men	14	606	26590	358.86
Women	29	1293	58837	1187.04
Coeducational	569	25066	1125320	21095.00

TABLE XIX

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED
BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN
MEN'S, WOMEN'S, AND
COEDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	23.76	2	11.88	0.32
Within Groups	22640.90	609	37.17	
Total	22664.66	611		

Calculated value of $F = 0.32$ is not significant at the .05 level.

Attitudinal Comparisons of College
Administrators Occupying Posi-
tions in Institutions Offer-
ing Two Year, Four Year,
and Graduate or
Professional
Programs

An analysis was conducted in order to determine if a significant difference existed in attitudes concerning the release of student information of administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year, four year, and graduate or professional programs. An analysis of variance was calculated for the data presented in Table XX.

A summary of the analysis of variance for the attitude scores obtained by administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year, four year, and graduate or professional programs is presented in Table XXI.

The value of F obtained in Table XXI indicated a significant difference in the mean scores obtained by college administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year, four year, and graduate or professional programs. In order to determine how the means differed, multiple comparisons between means were computed using the Scheffé method. Table XXII summarizes the comparisons.

TABLE XX

DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES
OBTAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINIS-
TRATORS OCCUPYING POSITIONS
IN INSTITUTIONS OFFERING
TWO YEAR, FOUR YEAR,
AND GRADUATE OR
PROFESSIONAL
PROGRAMS

Type of Institution	Number of Returns (n)	Mean (\bar{X})	$\sum X$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}$
Two Year	242	42.78	10353	451033	8121.44
Four Year	181	44.49	8052	365044	6841.25
Four Year With Graduate or Professional School	189	45.29	8560	394670	6979.00

Table XXII indicates the following:

1. A statistical significant difference (.10 level) existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year programs and four year programs concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. Administrators occupying positions in four year institutions were more retentive of student information than those occupying positions in two year institutions.

TABLE XXI

SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED
BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN
INSTITUTIONS OFFERING
TWO YEAR, FOUR YEAR,
AND GRADUATE OR
PROFESSIONAL
PROGRAMS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	419.19	2	209.60	5.82
Within Groups	21941.69	609	36.03	
Total	22360.88	611		

Calculated value of $F = 5.82$ is significant at the .01 level.

2. A statistical significant difference (.05 level) existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year programs and those offering graduate or professional programs. Administrators occupying positions in four year institutions offering graduate or professional programs were more retentive of student information than administrators of two year institutions.

3. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying

TABLE XXII

F VALUES COMPUTED BY THE SCHEFFE METHOD
 FOR THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OB-
 TAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN INSTI-
 TUTIONS OFFERING TWO YEAR,
 FOUR YEAR, AND GRADUATE
 OR PROFESSIONAL
 PROGRAMS

Comparison	F
Two Year vs. Four Year Institutions	8.40
Two Year vs. Institutions Offering Graduate or Professional Programs	17.82
Four Year vs. Institutions Offering Graduate or Professional Programs	1.64

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .05 level = 9.32.

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .10 level = 4.70.

positions in four year institutions not offering graduate or professional programs and administrators of four year institutions with graduate or professional programs concerning the release of student information.

Attitudinal Comparisons of College
Administrators Occupying Posi-
tions in Institutions Cate-
gorized By the Number of
Students Enrolled

The collected data was analyzed in order to determine if a significant difference existed in the attitudes concerning the release of student information of administrators occupying positions in institutions categorized by the number of students enrolled. An analysis of variance was calculated for the data presented in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII
DATA USED TO CALCULATE THE ANALYSIS OF
VARIANCE FOR THE ATTITUDE SCORES OB-
TAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN INSTI-
TUTIONS CATEGORIZED BY THE
NUMBER OF STUDENTS
ENROLLED

Institu- tional Size	Number of Returns (n)	Mean (\bar{X})	$\sum X$	$\sum X^2$	$\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}$
0 - 999	244	43.47	10606	469416	8402.81
1000 - 4999	264	44.20	11670	525378	9511.00
5000 - 9999	63	44.03	2774	124682	2537.94
10,000+	41	46.71	1915	91271	1826.50

A summary of the analysis of variance for the attitude scores obtained by college administrators occupying positions in institutions categorized by enrollment size is presented in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV
SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
THE ATTITUDE SCORES OBTAINED BY COL-
LEGE ADMINISTRATORS OCCUPYING
POSITIONS IN INSTITUTIONS
CATEGORIZED BY THE NUM-
BER OF STUDENTS
ENROLLED

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	516.74	3	172.25	4.70
Within Groups	22278.25	608	36.64	
Total	22794.99	611		

Calculated value of $F = 4.70$ is significant at the .01 level.

The value of F obtained in Table XXIV indicated a significant difference in the mean scores obtained by college administrators occupying positions in institutions differing by the number of students enrolled. Multiple comparisons between means were computed using the Scheffé

method to determine how the means differed. Table XXV summarizes the comparisons.

TABLE XXV
 F VALUES COMPUTED BY THE SCHEFFÉ METHOD
 FOR THE COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OB-
 TAINED BY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS
 OCCUPYING POSITIONS IN INSTI-
 TUTIONS CATEGORIZED BY THE
 NUMBER OF STUDENTS
 ENROLLED

Comparison	F
0 - 999 vs. 1000 - 4999	1.84
0 - 999 vs. 5000 - 9999	0.43
0 - 999 vs. 10,000+	10.06
1000 - 4999 vs. 5000 - 9999	0.04
1000 - 4999 vs. 10,000+	6.10
5000 - 9999 vs. 10,000+	4.87

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .05 level = 7.86.

Value of F^1 necessary for significance at the .10 level = 4.70.

Table XXV indicates the following:

1. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying

positions in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students concerning the release of student information.

2. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students concerning the release of student information.

3. A statistical significant difference (.05 level) existed between the attitudes of administrators in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students. Administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 0-999 students.

4. No statistical significant difference existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students and institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students.

5. A statistical significant difference (.10 level) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students. Administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students.

6. A statistical significant difference (.10 level) existed between the attitudes of administrators in institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students. Administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings and conclusions derived from the investigation and to make recommendations concerning future research.

Summary

This investigation was an attempt to determine if the attitudes of three groups of college administrators (registrars, student personnel administrators, and directors of counseling centers) differed concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

The following hypotheses were proposed:

1. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.
2. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of college registrars and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

3. There will be no significant difference in the attitudes of student personnel administrators and college counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

The collected data was also examined in order to determine if administrator attitudes toward the release of student information differed according to geographic region, institutional control, student clientele, number of years of schooling offered, and the number of students enrolled.

A survey instrument was developed by the researcher and field tested in the state of Missouri. The instrument was revised and mailed to nation-wide samples of registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors. Seventy-eight percent (612) of the administrators selected for inclusion in the investigation returned usable survey instruments.

The Kuder-Richardson formula 20 was used to estimate the reliability of the survey instrument. The estimated reliability of 0.80 indicated that the final survey instrument possessed a high degree of internal consistency.

Chi square tests were computed to determine whether or not the number of returns was a function of some factor other than the number of instruments mailed to each group. The chi square tests indicated that the number of returns was not a function of some factor other than the number of instruments mailed.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to compare mean scores of the groups analyzed. If significant differences were obtained at the .05 level, multiple comparisons between means were computed using the Scheffé method.

Conclusions

The findings of the investigation supported the following conclusions regarding the attitudes of registrars, student personnel administrators, and counseling center directors:

1. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

2. A significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of registrars and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. Counseling center directors were more retentive of student information than registrars.

3. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of student personnel administrators and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Comparisons of the attitudes of college administrators indicated no significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) in the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in different geographic regions of the United States toward the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

No significant difference (.05 level, analysis of variance) existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying positions in private and public institutions concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Attitudinal comparisons of college administrators indicated no significant difference (.05 level, analysis of variance) in the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

Comparisons of the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year, four year, and graduate or professional programs indicated the following:

1. A significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year programs and four year programs concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. Administrators occupying positions in four

year institutions were more retentive of student information than those occupying positions in two year institutions.

2. A significant difference (.05 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of college administrators occupying positions in institutions offering two year programs and those offering graduate or professional programs. Administrators occupying positions in institutions offering graduate or professional programs were more retentive of student information than administrators of two year institutions.

3. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in four year institutions not offering graduate or professional programs and administrators of four year institutions with graduate or professional programs concerning the release of student information.

Attitudinal comparisons of administrators occupying positions in institutions varying by the number of students enrolled indicated the following:

1. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

2. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.

3. A significant difference (.05 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 0-999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students. College administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 0-999 students.

4. No significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students and institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students concerning the release of student information.

5. A significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students. Administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 1000-4999 students.

6. A significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students and institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. Administrators associated with institutions enrolling 10,000 or more students were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with institutions enrolling 5000-9999 students.

Discussion

The purpose of the investigation was to determine whether or not three groups of college administrators differed in their attitudes concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. The study was exploratory in nature and attempted to help establish the groundwork for future research. The investigator believed it was necessary to determine whether or not the attitudes of registrars, student personnel administrators, and directors of counseling centers differed before an attempt could be made to assess the reasons for attitudinal differences. This study did not attempt to determine why attitudes differed.

Although the investigation did not attempt to determine the reasons underlying the differences and similarities existing among the three administrator groups

concerning the retention or release of student information the researcher proposes the following possible explanations which may warrant further investigation.

No significant difference existed between the attitudes of registrars and student personnel administrators concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar. In many instances the student personnel administrator is responsible for the development of guidelines concerning the release of student information and in some institutions registrars are directly responsible to the principal student personnel administrator. Since registrars must work closely with the principal student personnel administrator in the development of student information systems, similar attitudes toward the release of student information may emerge.

A significant difference (.10 level, Scheffé method) existed between the attitudes of registrars and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information. Directors of counseling centers were more retentive of student information than registrars. Three possible explanations warrant consideration:

1. The counselor's role may encourage or require an orientation toward students, but the role of the registrar may or may not require student orientation.

2. The educational preparation of counselors stresses student orientation. Registrars, however, may

or may not have educational preparation stressing student orientation.

3. The demands of the position require registrars to release student information. Attitudes of registrars toward the release of student information may be determined in part by what they are required to do. Counselors are probably not requested to release as much information or to release information as often as registrars, therefore their attitudes may not be as greatly influenced by job requirements.

No significant difference existed between the attitudes of student personnel administrators and counseling center directors concerning the release of student information. Two possible explanations occurred to the researcher:

1. Student personnel administrators and counselors are expected to maintain student oriented roles.

2. Many student personnel administrators have received their educational preparation in the area of counseling. Since student personnel administrators and counselors may have received similar educational preparation, their attitudes (if influenced by educational preparation) may be similar.

No significant difference existed between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in different geographic regions of the United States toward the release of student information. This finding may be due to

increased mobility within our society and/or rapid means of communication.

Analysis indicated no significant difference between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in private and public institutions concerning the release of student information and no significant difference was found between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions. Perhaps the philosophies of administrators serving in private and public institutions and those serving in men's, women's, and coeducational institutions are becoming more and more alike.

Administrators occupying positions in four year institutions and institutions offering graduate or professional programs were more retentive of student information than administrators associated with two year institutions. Administrators in four year institutions or institutions with graduate or professional schools may have received more formal education stressing the importance of the confidential nature of student information than administrators associated with two year institutions.

A significant difference was found to exist between the attitudes of administrators occupying positions in smaller institutions and administrators occupying positions in larger institutions. Administrators in institutions enrolling larger numbers of students were found to be more retentive of student information than

administrators associated with smaller institutions. Since institutions enrolling large numbers of students are required to release more student information more often than smaller institutions, administrators in larger schools may exert more caution in releasing student information. Another explanation may be that administrators in smaller institutions know more students on a personal basis and may not be as concerned with repercussions concerning the release of information because they know the students. The researcher believes that what we do may determine what we believe and vice versa.

Recommendations

The review of the literature and the conclusions derived from the investigation suggest the following:

1. The investigation should be duplicated using a different survey instrument.
2. Investigations should be undertaken to determine the attitudes of students, parents, and faculty members concerning the release of student information from the office of the registrar.
3. Investigations should be conducted to determine reasons for attitudinal differences existing among college administrators concerning the release of student information. Factors which could be considered for investigation include educational training (pre-service and in-service),

educational experiences, sex, age, and level of educational attainment.

4. Institutions of higher education differ in terms of student clientele and kinds of services offered. Since colleges and universities are confronted with different kinds of problems concerning the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information this researcher does not believe a model student information system can be developed to serve the needs of all colleges and universities. Each institution should examine and if necessary modify its student information system to suit the needs of students, parents, faculty, and administrators.

5. Provisions should be provided for a periodic review of student information systems. If a review committee is utilized administrators, students, faculty, and parents should be represented on the committee or appropriate means for providing input should be established.

6. Student information should be classified according to categories of confidentiality. Confidential student information should not be released unless student permission is obtained.

7. The kinds of information collected regarding students and their families should be carefully reviewed. Information which is not needed for accomplishing necessary institutional tasks should not be collected.

8. Student information that has served the purpose for which it was collected and is no longer needed should be destroyed. Institutions of higher education should develop policies regarding the retention and destruction of student records.

9. Students should be given the opportunity to inspect their records in order to determine their accuracy. Students should not be allowed to examine letters of recommendation concerning them which have been provided in a confidential relationship.

10. Colleges and universities should develop their own guidelines for the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information. Personnel who work with student information must be carefully selected. Institutions should develop inservice training programs for personnel who work with student records.

Significance of the Investigation

The review of the literature indicated that the collection, maintenance, and dissemination of student information may result in unpleasant or damaging consequences. Students, parents, faculty members, and administrators are affected by the student information system. The investigator believes all persons affected by a student information system should have some input in the development or modification of the system.

Whether or not administrator attitudes should or should not differ may be an "it-depends" situation. If attitudes toward the release of student information differ at a particular institution and channels to provide in-put for system development or refinement do not exist, a chaotic situation may develop.

The investigation indicates that differences in administrator attitudes toward the release of student information from the office of the registrar do exist. It is hoped that part of the groundwork has been established for further investigation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. A Guide to An Adequate Permanent Record and Transcript. Menasha, Wisconsin: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1971.
- (2) American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Report of Credit Given by Educational Institutions. Menasha, Wisconsin: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1971.
- (3) American Council on Education. "Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, XXXI (Fall, 1967), 45-47.
- (4) American Jurisprudence. 2nd ed. Volume 50. San Francisco, California: Bancroft-Whitney Company, 1970.
- (5) American Personnel and Guidance Association. "Ethical Standards." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XL (October, 1961), 206-209.
- (6) Anderson, W., and S. Sherr. "Confidentiality Expectations of College Students: Revisited." Journal of College Student Personnel, X (July, 1969), 264-269.
- (7) "Areas of Legal Responsibilities for the Admissions Officer and the Registrar: Cautions and Guidelines." College and University, XL (Summer, 1965), 402-406.
- (8) Arneson, John R. "A Comparative Study of Student, Parent, Faculty, and Student Personnel Administrator Attitudes Toward College Rules and Regulations." (Unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, Colorado State University, 1967.)

- (9) Baker, R. W. "Students, Parents and the College: Responsibilities and Prerogatives in Grade-Reporting." Liberal Education, LIII (October, 1967), 325-335.
- (10) Bangs, Arthur J. "Privilege and the Counseling Profession." Personnel and Guidance Journal, L (December, 1971), 272-274.
- (11) Baran, P. "Problem of Privacy." College Management, V (February, 1970), 12-13.
- (12) Bevan, J. E., and others. "Privacy and Confidentiality of Student Records; A Legal View." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 645-653.
- (13) Beymer, L. "Indiana School Superintendents View the Counselor Immunity Law." Teacher's College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1966), 195-197+.
- (14) Biggs, D. A., and C. E. Vaughan. "Some Parents' Attitudes Toward Campus Dissent." Journal of College Student Personnel, XII (September, 1971), 347-352.
- (15) Birch, Edward E. "An Investigation of Selected Assumptions and Beliefs of Chief Student Personnel Administrators." (Unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.)
- (16) Bogue, E. G., and others. "Who Controls Student Data?" College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 701-717.
- (17) Boruch, R. F. "Educational Research and the Confidentiality of Data: A Case Study." Sociology of Education, XLIV (Winter, 1971), 59-85.
- (18) Boyd, Robert E., and R. D. Heinsen. "Problems in Privileged Communication." Personnel and Guidance Journal, L (December, 1971), 276-278.
- (19) Brubacher, John S. The Courts and Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971.
- (20) Bruyn, H. B. "Confidentiality in the Use of Health Records." Journal of School Health, XXXVII (April, 1967), 161-165.
- (21) Burianek, E. T. "Confidentiality of Student Records; A Counselor's Point of View." N.E.A. Journal, LV (January, 1966), 28+.

- (22) Burianek, E. T., and R. O. Fitzsimmons. "Confidentiality of Student Records; Opinions Differ." N.E.A. Journal, LV (January, 1966), 28-30.
- (23) Burns, Kenneth Dean. "A Study of Information Value Change in the Conversion from Confidential to Non-Confidential Recommendations." (Unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.)
- (24) Burns, K., and E. F. Carnes. "Confidentiality of Recommendations; Is It Really Necessary?" Journal of College Student Personnel, X (November, 1969), 370-372.
- (25) Butler, H. E., Jr., K. D. Moran, and F. A. Vanderpool, Jr. Legal Aspects of Student Records. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1972.
- (26) Caldwell, W. F. "Changing Legal Relationships Between Students and Universities." College and University, XLV (Spring, 1970), 245-265.
- (27) Campbell, Harold Gordon. "Attitudes of College Counselors and Administrators Concerning Confidential Information." (Unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Arizona, 1970.)
- (28) Caruso, L. R. "Privacy of Students and Confidentiality of Student Records." Case Western Reserve Law Review, XXII (April, 1971), 379.
- (29) Chambers, M. M. "Courts and the Colleges Since Mid-Century." Educational Record, XLV (Spring, 1964), 182-189.
- (30) Child, D., and others. "Parents' Expectations of A University." Universities Quarterly, XXV (Autumn, 1971), 484-490.
- (31) Clark, C. M. "Confidentiality and the School Counselor." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (January, 1965), 482-484.
- (32) Commission on Student Records and Information. Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education. "Student Records; Their Collection, Use, and Protection; Report." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, XV (November, 1970), 27-28.

- (33) "Credit Investigations and the Right to Privacy: Quest for A Remedy." Georgetown Law Journal, LVII (February, 1969), 509.
- (34) D'Andrea, J. E., and A. D. Lynn, Jr. "Release of Student Information: Damned If You Do and Damned If You Don't." College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 421-430.
- (35) deBruin, H. C. "Confidential Information Protected by Indiana Law." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (September, 1965), 76-77.
- (36) Dunham, S. "Some Legal Decisions Which Have Influenced American Collegiate Admissions." College and University, XLI (Fall, 1965), 49-60.
- (37) Edwards, Allen L. Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- (38) Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1971.
- (39) Garber, L. O. "Boards Can't Be Forced to Show Personnel Records." Nations Schools, XXCII (September, 1968), 72.
- (40) Godwin, W. F., and K. A. Bode. "Privacy and the New Technology." Personnel and Guidance Journal, L (December, 1971), 299-301.
- (41) Goldman, L. "Privilege or Privacy." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVIII (October-November, 1969), 88.
- (42) Goldman, L. Reply to "Safeguarding Student Records." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (February, 1968), 605-606.
- (43) Goslin, D. A. "Ethical and Legal Aspects of School Record Keeping." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Russell Sage Foundation Report, LV (May, 1971), 119-126.
- (44) Goslin, D. A. "New School Record-Keeping Guidelines Protect Student/Parent Privacy." Nations Schools, XXCVI (July, 1970), 46-47.

- (45) Graham, J. G. "Legal Problems Surrounding Recommendations of Students." Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, XIV (September, 1969), 20-24.
- (46) Grover, A., and others. "Emerging Trends in Admissions Data Systems." College and University, XLIII (Summer, 1968), 426-444.
- (47) Gunnings, T. S. "Counselors and Confidentiality." School Counselor, XVIII (January, 1971), 153-156.
- (48) Hardin, P. D., and others. "Transcripts and Disciplinary Actions: Are We Practicing What We Preach?" College and University, XLIII (Summer, 1967), 562-566.
- (49) Heayn, M. H., and H. L. Jacobs. "Safeguarding Student Records." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVI (September, 1967), 63-67.
- (50) Kiell, N. "Student Counseling and the Law." Improving College and University Teaching, XVIII (Winter, 1970), 34-36.
- (51) Killian, J. D. "Law, the Counselor, and Student Records." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVIII (February, 1970), 423-432.
- (52) Kohr, R. L. "Item Analysis and Scoring Program for Summated Rating Scales; Attitude Scale of the Likert-Type." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXI (Autumn, 1971), 769-770.
- (53) Lacognata, A. A. "Student Privacy Erosion." Improving College and University Teaching, XVIII (Winter, 1970), 32-33.
- (54) Lewis, E. C., and R. E. Warman. "Confidentiality Expectations of College Students." Journal of College Student Personnel, VI (October, 1964), 7-11.
- (55) Lippe, Richard A. "The Student in Court." Student Protest and the Law. Ed. Grace W. Holmes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1971.
- (56) Lister, C. "Privacy and Large-Scale Personal Data Systems." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIX (November, 1970), 207-211.

- (57) Litwack, L., and others. "Testimonial Privileged Communication and the School Counselor." School Counselor, XVII (November, 1969), 108-112.
- (58) Livingston, I. B. "Is the Personnel Worker Liable?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (January, 1965), 471-474.
- (59) Marsh, J. J., and B. C. Kinnick. "Let's Close the Confidentiality Gap." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVIII (January, 1970), 362-365.
- (60) Matell, M. S., and J. Jacoby. "Is There An Optimal Number of Alternatives for Likert Scale Items? Study I: Reliability and Validity." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXXI (Autumn, 1971), 657-674.
- (61) McClintock, D. H. "New Directions in Handling Disciplinary Records." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, XXXII (Spring, 1969), 106-109.
- (62) McMahan, I. "School Records: Invasion of Privacy?" Education Digest, XXXVI (December, 1970), 5-7.
- (63) Meldman, J. A. "Centralized Information Systems and the Legal Right to Privacy." Marquette Law Review, LII (Fall, 1969), 335.
- (64) Miller, Arthur R. "Personal Privacy in the Computer Age: the Challenge of A New Technology in An Information-Oriented Society." Michigan Law Review, LXVII (April, 1969), 1091-1103.
- (65) Missouri Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Records Confidentiality and Security. Special Projects Committee. Unpublished report, 1970.
- (66) Mueller, Kate (Hevner), and C. Gilbert Wrenn, eds. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- (67) National Center for Educational Statistics in Cooperation with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Definitions of Student Personnel Terms in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

- (68) National Education Association Committee on Professional Ethics. "Ethics Opinion 51: Exchanging Confidential Information." N.E.A. Journal, LV (September, 1966), 54.
- (69) Noland, R. L. "Damaging Information and the College Application." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIX (March, 1971), 544-554.
- (70) Nolte, M. C. "Are Student Records Public?" American School Board Journal, CLIII (December, 1966), 57-58.
- (71) Nolte, M. C. "Required Photograph Discriminatory." American School Board Journal, CLIV (May, 1967), 12.
- (72) Nugent, Frank A. "Confidentiality in College Counseling Centers." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVII (May, 1969), 872-877.
- (73) Nussbaum, Michael. Student Legal Rights. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- (74) O'Neill, F. L., and others. "What Should Our Records Say and To Whom?" College and University, XLIII (Summer, 1968), 538-546.
- (75) Pace, C. Robert. "Five College Environments." Learning and the Professors. Eds. Ohmer Milton and E. J. Shoben, Jr. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968.
- (76) "Problems of Confidential Information." Journal of School Health, XXXVIII (September, 1968), 474-475.
- (77) "Records Management and Transcript Adequacy: Release of Student Information." College and University, XLI (Summer, 1966), 449-455.
- (78) Reeves, M. E., and D. S. Arbuckle. "The Counseling Attitudes of Deans of Women." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (January, 1963), 438-441.
- (79) Reiske, Jack Henry. "Attitudinal Differences of Counselor Educators and Student Personnel Administrators in Higher Education." (Unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962.)

- (80) Ross, Margaret Ann. "Administrators, Faculty and Student Personnel Workers Evaluation of Student Personnel Functions." (Unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Ohio, 1967.)
- (81) Ruebhausen, Oscar M. Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance and Dissemination of Public Records. Conference Report on the Ethical and Legal Aspects of School Record Keeping, Convened by Russell Sage Foundation. Hartford, Connecticut: Connecticut Printers, Inc., 1970.
- (82) Ruggles, Richard. "Symposium: Computers, Data Banks, and Individual Privacy." Minnesota Law Review, LIII (December, 1968), 211-245.
- (83) Russell Sage Foundation. Guidelines for the Collection, Maintenance and Dissemination of Pupil Records. Conference Report on the Ethical and Legal Aspects of School Record Keeping, Convened by Russell Sage Foundation. Hartford, Connecticut: Connecticut Printers, Inc., 1970.
- (84) Schmidt, L. D. "Some Ethical, Professional, and Legal Considerations for School Counselors." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIV (December, 1965), 376-382.
- (85) Shevlin, M. B. "Guidance Counselor and the Law; Libel and Slander." The Catholic Educational Review, LXV (February, 1967), 73-91.
- (86) Shevlin, M. B. "Privileged Communication and the Counselor." The Catholic Educational Review, LXV (March, 1967), 176-194.
- (87) Simmons, D. D. "Client Attitudes Toward Release of Confidential Information Without Consent." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXIV (July, 1968), 364-365.
- (88) Smith, E. D. "Who's On First? Problems of Accurate Student Identification." College and University, XLII (Fall, 1966), 74-77.
- (89) Soto, José I. "The Development of Guidelines for the Handling of College Student Records and Information." (Unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1971.)

- (90) Stewart, J. T., and others. "What and Why of Records Retention." College and University, XLVI (Summer, 1971), 364-372.
- (91) Tautfest, P. B., and F. C. Young. "Student-Parent Attitudes Toward College Regulations." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, XXXIII (Spring, 1970), 105-111.
- (92) Teitelbaum, V. S. "School Records Can Be An Invasion of Privacy." Today's Education, LX (May, 1971), 43-45.
- (93) Tennyson, W. W., and others. "Student Personnel Records: A Vital Tool but A Concern of the Public." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (May, 1964), 888-893.
- (94) Thomas, E. C., Jr. "Confidential Information." N.E.A. Journal, LIV (October, 1965), 41.
- (95) Todd, Will R. "A Study of Student Perception of the Effectiveness of Student Personnel Services At A Large State University and A Small State College." (Unpub. Ed. D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968.)
- (96) United States. Congress. House. Committee on Government Operations. The Computer and Invasion of Privacy. Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1966.
- (97) Ware, Martha L. "The Law and Counselor Ethics." Personnel and Guidance Journal, L (December, 1971), 305-308.
- (98) Warner, A. P., and S. Evangelista. "Confidentiality: Statewide Michigan Study." Junior College Journal, XL (June, 1970), 21-23.
- (99) Weaver, Gary R., and James H. Weaver, eds. The University and Revolution. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.
- (100) Weil, R. A. "College Youth Attitudes Today." School and Society, LXLIX (April, 1971), 246-247.
- (101) West's General Digest, 1956-72. 3rd Series, Vol. I. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company.

- (102) Whittaker, V. J. "Rights of the Student As Related to the Protection of His College Transcript." College and University, XLII (Fall, 1966), 78-87.
- (103) Williamson, Edmund Griffith. Student Personnel Services in Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- (104) Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.
- (105) Wiskoff, M. "Ethical Standards and Divided Loyalties." American Psychologist, XV (October, 1960), 656-660.

APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR THE COLLECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND DISSEMINATION OF STUDENT INFORMATION

RELEASE OF INFORMATION ABOUT STUDENTS: A GUIDE

Developed By The Committee On Records
Management And Transcript Adequacy
Of The American Association Of
Collegiate Registrars And
Admissions Officers
October, 1969

INTRODUCTION

Each institution of higher education should have a carefully considered policy regarding the information which becomes a part of a student's permanent educational record and governing the conditions of its disclosure. This policy should reflect a reasonable balance between the obligation of the institution for the growth and welfare of the student and its responsibilities to society.

Transcripts of educational records should contain only information about academic status, except that disciplinary action which affects the student's eligibility to reregister should be recorded if in accordance with institutional policy. If it is the institution's policy not to record such actions, however, this policy should be indicated on the transcript.

The institution must make every endeavor to keep the student's record confidential and out of the hands of those who would use it for other than legitimate purposes. All members of the faculty, administration and clerical staff must respect confidential information about students which they acquire in the course of their work. At the same time, the institution should be flexible enough in its policies not to hinder the student, the institution, or the community in their legitimate pursuits.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Disclosure to the Student Himself

1. A student should be entitled to an official transcript of his academic record. However, a student is not entitled to access to other records in his file which contain confidential information.
2. A student has the right to inspect his academic record (from which transcripts are made) and is entitled to an explanation of any information recorded on it. When the original is shown, examination should be permitted only under conditions which will prevent its alteration or mutilation.
3. Documents submitted by or for the student in support of his application for admission or for transfer credit should not be returned to the student, nor sent elsewhere at his request. For example, a transcript from another college, or a high school record, should not be sent to a third institution. The student should request another transcript from the original institution. In exceptional cases, however, where another transcript is unobtainable, or can be secured only with the greatest difficulty (as is sometimes true with foreign records), copies may be prepared and released to prevent hardship to the student. The student should present a signed request. Usually the copy, marked as a certified copy of what is in the student's file, is released. In rare instances the original may be released and the copy retained, with a notation to this effect being placed in the file.

B. Disclosure to Faculty and Administrative Officers of the Institution

1. Faculty and administrative officers of the institution who have a legitimate interest in the material and demonstrate a need to know should be permitted to look over the academic records of any student.
2. The contents of the official folder of a student should not be sent outside the Office of the Registrar or other records office except in circumstances specifically authorized by the registrar or the custodian of the other records. Normally a permanent record card should never

leave the Office of the Registrar since copies can readily be prepared.

C. Disclosure to Parents, Educational Institutions and Agencies

1. Transcripts or grade reports may be released to parents or guardians without prior approval from the student unless the student is over 21.
2. A request for a transcript or other academic information from another institution of learning indicating the reason therefor may be honored as a matter of inter-institutional courtesy. Normally there is no need to secure prior approval from the student.
3. Requests from a philanthropic organization supporting a student should be honored without prior approval from the student.
4. Requests from research organizations making statistical studies may be honored without prior approval of the student provided no information revealing the student's name is to be published.

D. Disclosure to Government Agencies

1. Properly identified representatives from federal, state, or local government agencies may be given the following information if expressly requested:
 - a) verification of date and place of birth
 - b) school or division of enrollment and class
 - c) dates of enrollment
 - d) degree(s) earned, if any, date, major or field of concentration, and honors received
 - e) home and local addresses and telephone numbers
 - f) verification of signature
 - g) name and address of parent or guardian
2. Concerning release of further information, it should be noted that government investigative agencies as such have no inherent legal right to access to student files and records. When additional information is requested, it normally should be released only on written authorization from the student. If such authorization is not given, the information should be released only on court-order or subpoena. If a subpoena is served, the student whose record is being subpoenaed should be notified and that subpoena should be referred to the institution's legal counsel.

3. Institutions should supply student deferment certificates to the Selective Service System only with the written permission of the student.

E. Disclosure to Other Individuals and Organizations

Information furnished to other individuals and organizations should be limited to the items listed below under "Telephone Inquiries" unless the request is accompanied by an information or transcript release signed by the student.

F. Disclosure in Response to Telephone Inquiries

1. Only those items determined by the institution to be matters of public record should be released in response to telephone inquiries. Such items usually include:
 - a) whether or not the student is currently enrolled
 - b) the school or division in which he is or was enrolled and his class
 - c) dates of enrollment
 - d) degree(s) earned, if any, date, major or field of concentration, and honors received
2. Release of addresses or telephone numbers should be consistent with institutional policy governing distribution of student directories.
3. Urgent requests for student information, e.g. address, telephone number, or immediate whereabouts, based upon an apparent emergency, should be handled by the registrar, including reference to the dean of students or other appropriate officer or individual.

G. Student Directories

If student directories are published for general distribution, each student should be given the opportunity to direct that his address and telephone number be omitted.

H. Disclosure by Other Offices of the Institution

1. The foregoing guidelines are applicable to handling any request for academic information about students or former students received by any member of the faculty, administration, or clerical staff. The guidelines are intended to protect the individual's right to privacy and the

confidentiality of his academic records throughout the institution.

2. All institutional personnel should be alert to refer promptly to the Office of the Registrar or other appropriate office requests for transcripts, certifications or other information which that office typically provides. Faculty members and the various institutional offices should restrict their responses to acknowledging when appropriate, the receipt of requests for student information, or limit their response to that information germane to their sphere of responsibility or their relationship to the student, e.g. faculty adviser, major professor, etc.
3. Since the material in a student's placement file (should one exist) has been submitted by the student for the purpose of employment, it obviously may be released to anyone for this purpose. Whenever there is need for the institution to issue a transcript of the student's educational record in connection with employment, it should be specifically requested of the Office of the Registrar by the student.

I. Withholding Information

There may be conditions such as unmet financial obligations, violations of non-academic regulations, etc., under which an institution will withhold grade reports, transcripts, certifications, or other information about a student. In such instances the policy should be clearly stated in an appropriate institutional publication.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION STATEMENT
ON CONFIDENTIALITY OF STUDENT
RECORDS, 1967

In the summer of 1966, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued subpoenas to obtain from two leading universities the membership lists of campus organizations known to oppose the present policies of the United States in Southeast Asia. The institutions in question complied. Thus far, the information obtained by the Committee has not been publicly released.

Although educational institutions, like others, have an obligation to cooperate with committees of the congress, they also have an obligation to protect their students from unwarranted intrusion into their lives and from hurtful or threatening interference in the exploration of ideas and their consequences that education entails. The American Council on Education therefore urges that colleges and universities adopt clear policies on the confidentiality of students' records, giving due attention to the educational significance their decisions may have.

RESIST INTIMIDATION

For educational reasons, our colleges typically favor the forming by students of organizations for political activity and the consideration of politically relevant ideas. For instance, space is regularly provided such groups for offices and meetings. In such circumstances, it seems only appropriate for students to expect their institutions to resist intimidation and harassment.

Where particular persons are suspected of violating the law or are thought to possess information of value to an investigatory body, they can be directly approached in properly authorized ways. There is no need to press the college or university into the doubtful role of informant.

The maintenance of student records of all kinds, but especially those bearing on matters of belief and affiliation, inevitably creates a highly personal and confidential relationship. The mutual trust that this relationship implies is deeply involved in the educational process.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY

Colleges acquire from students and other sources a great deal of private information about their enrollees for the basic purpose of facilitating their development as educated persons. This purpose is contravened when the

material is made available to investigatory bodies without the student's permission. Thus, although a student may not require that his record be withdrawn, improperly altered, or destroyed, he may appropriately expect his institution to release information about him only with his knowledge and consent. Without that consent, only irresistible legal compulsion justifies a college's indicating anything more about a student than his name, dates of registered attendance, the nature of any degrees granted, and the dates on which degrees were conferred.

The educational concept of a confidential relationship between the student and his college or university is supported here by the legal principles of freedom of association and the right of privacy. Like other citizens, students are entitled to engage in lawful assembly; if they are to learn true respect for the Constitution, they must learn from their own experience that that entitlement is never abridged without serious reflection, due cause, and profound reluctance. Similarly, at a time when every individual's privacy is subject to serious erosion, each new invasion should be strongly resisted.

Except in the most extreme instances, a student's college or university should never be a source of information about his beliefs or his associations unless he has given clear consent to its serving this function.

FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

Finally, requests for information about a student's beliefs and associations inevitably imply the spectre of reprisals. To the extent that they do, they put at hazard the intellectual freedom of the college and the university. This dampening of free inquiry and expression may affect faculty members and administrative officers as well as students. It is therefore in the interests of the entire academic community to protect vigilantly its traditions of free debate and investigation by safeguarding students and their records from pressures that may curtail their liberties. America cannot afford a recurrence of the incursions made on intellectual freedom in the 1950's.

In the light of these considerations, the American Council on Education offers four recommendations to institutions of higher learning.

1. Mindful of the principle that student records should be held in a relationship of confidentiality between the student and the institution, each college and university should formulate and firmly implement clear policies to protect the confidential nature of student records. Such policies should reflect a full understanding of

the intimate connections between this relationship and the historic traditions of freedom of association, of the right of privacy, and of intellectual liberty.

2. When demands which challenge the fundamental principle of confidentiality are made for information about students' beliefs or associations, no response, beyond the reaffirmation of the principle, should be made without consultation with attorneys. Counsel for the institution should be asked not merely to advise a prudent course, but to prepare every legal basis for resistance.
3. Institutional policy should pay proper respect to the interests of research and scholarship to insure that the freedom of inquiry is not abridged. Neither investigators seeking generalizable knowledge about the educational enterprise, historians examining the background of a deceased alumnus who became a publicly significant figure, nor other legitimate scholars should be unduly restricted in their pursuits. The confidentiality of the individual student's record is paramount, however. When there is any doubt about its being safeguarded, the person's consent to its use should be formally obtained, and the same general principles should be applied to the preservation of records as are recommended here with respect to the maintenance of records.
4. Colleges and universities should discontinue the maintenance of membership lists of student organizations, especially those related to matters of political belief or action. If rosters of this kind do not exist, they cannot be subpoenaed, and the institution is therefore freed of some major elements of conflict and from the risks of contempt proceedings or a suit. To communicate with a campus group, the institution needs only to know its officers, not its entire membership. Whatever may be the advantages of more comprehensive listings, they must be considered, in the determination of policy, against the disadvantages and dangers outlined here. In addition, it must be remembered that the surrender of membership rosters to investigative bodies carries no guarantee that they will not be reproduced and fall eventually into unfortunate hands. The use of blacklists, limited neither in time nor by honor, is a practice to which no college or university wishes to be, even inadvertently, an accessory.

ETHICAL STANDARDS
American Personnel and Guidance
Association, 1961

Preamble

The American Personnel and Guidance Association is an educational, scientific, and professional organization dedicated to service to society. This service is committed to profound faith in the worth, dignity, and great potentiality of the individual human being.

The marks of a profession, and therefore of a professional organization, can be stated as follows:

1. Possession of a body of specialized knowledge, skills, and attitudes known and practiced by its members.
2. This body of specialized knowledge, skills, and attitudes is derived through scientific inquiry and scholarly learning.
3. This body of specialized knowledge, skills, and attitudes is acquired through professional preparation, preferably on the graduate level, in a college or university as well as through continuous in-service training and personal growth after completion of formal education.
4. This body of specialized knowledge, skills, and attitudes, is constantly tested and extended through research and scholarly inquiry.
5. A profession has a literature of its own, even though it may, and indeed must, draw portions of its content from other areas of knowledge.
6. A profession exalts service to the individual and society above personal gain. It possesses a philosophy and a code of ethics.
7. A profession through the voluntary association of its members constantly examines and improves the quality of its professional preparation and services to the individual and society.
8. Membership in the professional organization and the practice of the profession must be limited to persons meeting stated standards of preparation and competencies.

9. The profession affords a life career and permanent membership as long as services meet professional standards.
10. The public recognizes, has confidence in, and is willing to compensate the members of the profession for their services.

The Association recognizes that the vocational roles and settings of its members are identified with a wide variety of academic disciplines and levels of academic preparation. This diversity reflects the pervasiveness of the Association's interest and influence. It also poses challenging complexities in efforts to conceptualize:

- a. the characteristics of members;
- b. desired or requisite preparation or practice; and
- c. supporting social, legal and/or ethical controls.

The specification of ethical standards enables the Association to clarify to members, future members, and to those served by members the nature of ethical responsibilities held in common by its members.

The introduction of such standards will inevitably stimulate greater concern by members for practice and preparation for practice. It will also stimulate a general growth and identification with and appreciation for both the common and diverse characteristics of the definable roles within the world of work of Association members.

There are six major areas of professional activity which encompass the work of members of APGA. For each of these areas certain general principles are listed below to serve as guidelines for ethical practice. These are preceded by a general section which includes certain principles germane to the six areas and common to the entire work of the Association members.

SECTION A

General

1. The member exerts what influence he can to foster the development and improvement of the profession and continues his professional growth throughout his career.
2. The member has a responsibility to the institution within which he serves. His acceptance of employment by the institution implies that he is in substantial agreement with the general policies and principles of the institution. Therefore, his professional activities are also in

accord with the objectives of the institution. Within the member's own work setting, if, despite his efforts, he cannot reach agreement as to acceptable ethical standards of conduct with his superiors, he should end his affiliation with them.

3. The member must expect ethical behavior among his professional associates in APGA at all times. He is obligated, in situations where he possesses information raising serious doubt as to the ethical behavior of other members, to attempt to rectify such conditions.
4. The member is obligated to concern himself with the degree to which the personnel functions of non-members with whose work he is acquainted represent competent and ethical performance. Where his information raises serious doubt as to the ethical behavior of such persons, it is his responsibility to attempt to rectify such conditions.
5. The member must not seek self-enhancement through expressing evaluations or comparisons damaging to other ethical professional workers.
6. The member should not claim or imply professional qualifications exceeding those possessed and is responsible for correcting any misrepresentations of his qualifications by others.
7. The member providing services for personal remuneration shall, in establishing fees for such services, take careful account of the charges made for comparable services by other professional persons.
8. The member who provides information to the public or to his subordinates, peers, or superiors has a clear responsibility to see that both the content and the manner of presentation are accurate and appropriate to the situation.
9. The member has an obligation to ensure that evaluative information about such persons as clients, students, and applicants shall be shared only with those persons who will use such information for professional purposes.
10. The member shall offer professional services only, through the context of a professional relationship. Thus testing, counseling, and

other services are not to be provided through the mail by means of newspaper or magazine articles, radio or television programs, or public performances.

SECTION B

Counseling

This section refers to practices involving a counseling relationship with a counselee or client and is not intended to be applicable to practices involving administrative relationships with the persons being helped. A counseling relationship denotes that the person seeking help retain full freedom of choice and decision and that the helping person has no authority or responsibility to approve or disapprove of the choices or decisions of the counselee or client. "Counselee" or "client" is used here to indicate the person (or persons) for whom the member has assumed a professional responsibility. Typically the counselee or client is the individual with whom the member has direct and primary contact. However, at times, "client" may include another person(s) when the other person(s) exercise significant control and direction over the individual being helped in connection with the decisions and plans being considered in counseling.

1. The member's primary obligation is to respect the integrity and promote the welfare of the counselee or client with whom he is working.
2. The counseling relationship and information resulting therefrom must be kept confidential consistent with the obligations of the member as a professional person.
3. Records of the counseling relationship including interview notes, test data, correspondence, tape recordings, and other documents are to be considered professional information for use in counseling, research, and teaching of counselors but always with full protection of the identity of the client and with precaution so that no harm will come to him.
4. The counselee or client should be informed of the conditions under which he may receive counseling assistance at or before the time he enters the counseling relationship. This is particularly true in the event that there exist conditions of

which the counselee or client would not likely be aware.

5. The member reserves the right to consult with any other professionally competent person about his counselee client. In choosing his professional consultant the member must avoid placing the consultant in a conflict of interest situation, i.e., the consultant must be free of any other obligatory relation to the member's client that would preclude the consultant being a proper party to the member's efforts to help the counselee or client.
6. The member shall decline to initiate or shall terminate a counseling relationship when he cannot be of professional assistance to the counselee or client either because of lack of competence or personal limitation. In such instances the member shall refer his counselee or client to an appropriate specialist. In the event the counselee or client declines the suggested referral, the member is not obligated to continue the counseling relationship.
7. When the member learns from counseling relationships of conditions which are likely to harm others over whom his institution or agency has responsibility, he is expected to report the condition to the appropriate responsible authority, but in such a manner as not to reveal the identity of his counselee or clients.
8. In the event that the counselee or client's condition is such as to require others to assume responsibility for him, or when there is clear and imminent danger to the counselee or client or to others, the member is expected to report this fact to an appropriate responsible authority, and/or take such other emergency measures as the situation demands.
9. Should the member be engaged in a work setting which calls for any variation from the above statements, the member is obligated to ascertain that such variations are justifiable under the conditions and that such variations are clearly specified and made known to all concerned with such counseling services.

SECTION C

Testing

1. The primary purpose of psychological testing is to provide objective and comparative measures for use in self-evaluation or evaluation by others of general or specific attributes.
2. Generally, test results constitute only one of a variety of pertinent data for personnel and guidance decisions. It is the member's responsibility to provide adequate orientation or information to the examinee(s) so that the results of testing may be placed in proper perspective with other relevant factors.
3. When making any statements to the public about tests and testing care must be taken to give accurate information and to avoid any false claims or misconceptions.
4. Different tests demand different levels of competence for administration, scoring, and interpretation. It is therefore the responsibility of the member to recognize the limits of his competence and to perform only those functions which fall within his preparation and competence.
5. In selecting tests for use in a given situation or with a particular client the member must consider not only general but also specific validity, reliability, and appropriateness of the test(s).
6. Tests should be administered under the same conditions which were established in their standardization. Except for research purposes explicitly stated, any departures from these conditions, as well as unusual behavior or irregularities during the testing session which may affect the interpretation of the test results, must be fully noted and reported. In this connection, unsupervised test-taking or the use of tests through the mails are of questionable value.
7. The value of psychological tests depends in part on the novelty to persons taking them. Any prior information, coaching, or reproduction of test materials tends to invalidate test results. Therefore, test security is one of the professional obligations of the member.

8. The member has the responsibility to inform the examinee(s) as to the purpose of testing. The criteria of examinee's welfare and/or explicit prior understanding with him should determine who the recipients of the test results may be.
9. The member should guard against the appropriation, reproduction, or modifications of published tests or parts thereof without express permission and adequate recognition of the original author or publisher.

Regarding the preparation, publication, and distribution of tests reference should be made to: "Tests and Diagnostic Techniques"--Report of the Joint Committee of the American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Association, and National Council of Measurements used in Education. Supplement to Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 2, 1-38.

SECTION D

Research and Publication

1. In the performance of any research on human subjects, the member must avoid causing any injurious effects or after-effects of the experiment upon his subjects.
2. The member may withhold information or provide misinformation to subjects only when it is essential to the investigation and where he assumes responsibility for corrective action following the investigation.
3. In reporting research results, explicit mention must be made of all variables and conditions known to the investigator which might affect interpretation of the data.
4. The member is responsible for conducting and reporting his investigations so as to minimize the possibility that his findings will be misleading.
5. The member has an obligation to make available original research data to qualified others who may wish to replicate or verify the study.

6. In reporting research results or in making original data available, due care must be taken to disguise the identity of the subjects, in the absence of specific permission from such subjects to do otherwise.
7. In conducting and reporting research, the member should be familiar with, and give recognition to, previous work on the topic.
8. The member has the obligation to give due credit to those who have contributed significantly to his research, in accordance with their contributions.
9. The member has the obligation to honor commitments made to subjects of research in return for their cooperation.
10. The member is expected to communicate to other members the results of any research he judges to be of professional or scientific value.

SECTION E

Consulting and Private Practice

Consulting refers to a voluntary relationship between a professional helper and help-needing social unit (industry, business, school, college, etc.) in which the consultant is attempting to give help to the client in the solving of some current or potential problem.

1. The member acting as a consultant must have a high degree of self-awareness of his own values and needs in entering a helping relationship which involves change in a social unit.
2. There should be understanding and agreement between consultant and client as to directions or goals of the attempted change.
3. The consultant must be reasonably certain that he or his organization have the necessary skills and resources for giving the kind of help which is needed now or that may develop later.
4. The consulting relationship must be one in which client adaptability and growth toward self-direction are encouraged and cultivated. The

consultant must consistently maintain his role as a consultant and not become a decision maker for the client.

5. The consultant in announcing his availability for service as a consultant follows professional rather than commercial standards in describing his services with accuracy, dignity, and caution.
6. For private practice in testing, counseling, or consulting the ethical principles stated in all previous sections of this document are pertinent. In addition, any individual, agency, or institution offering educational and vocational counseling to the public should meet the standards of the American Board on Professional Standards in Vocational Counseling, Inc.

SECTION F

Personnel Administration

1. The member is responsible for establishing working agreements with supervisors and with subordinates especially regarding counseling or clinical relationships, confidentiality, distinction between public and private material, and a mutual respect for the positions of parties involved in such issues.
2. Such working agreements may vary from one institutional setting to another. What should be the case in each instance, however, is that agreements have been specified, made known to those concerned, and whenever possible the agreements reflect institutional policy rather than personal judgment.
3. The member's responsibility to his superiors requires that he keep them aware of conditions affecting the institution, particularly those which may be potentially disrupting or damaging to the institution.
4. The member has a responsibility to select competent persons for assigned responsibilities and to see that his personnel are used maximally for the skills and experience they possess.

5. The member has responsibility for constantly stimulating his staff for their and his own continued growth and improvement. He must see that staff members are adequately supervised as to the quality of their functioning and for purposes of professional development.
6. The member is responsible for seeing that his staff is informed of policies, goals, and programs toward which the department's operations are oriented.

SECTION G

Preparation for Personnel Work

1. The member in charge of training sets up a strong program of academic study and supervised practice in order to prepare the trainees for their future responsibilities.
2. The training program should aim to develop in the trainee not only skills and knowledge, but also self-understanding.
3. The member should be aware of any manifestations of personal limitations in a student trainee which may influence the latter's provision of competent services and has an obligation to offer assistance to the trainee in securing professional remedial help.
4. The training program should include preparation in research and stimulation for the future personnel worker to do research and add to the knowledge in his field.
5. The training program should make the trainee aware of the ethical responsibilities and standards of the profession he is entering.
6. The program of preparation should aim at inculcating among the trainees, who will later become the practitioners of our profession, the ideal of service to individual and society above personal gain.

STUDENT RECORDS--THEIR COLLECTION,
USE, AND PROTECTION
Report of the Commission on Student
Records and Information of the
Council of Student Personnel
Associations in Higher
Education, 1969

To assist member associations and their member institutions in the formulation of adequate policies, the Council on Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education offers the following guidelines:

1. No record of information should be made or retained unless there is a demonstrable need for it which has reasonably substantial relevance to the educational and related purposes of the institution.
2. Academic, medical and counseling and disciplinary records of a student should be kept separately and should not be disseminated outside of the institution without his consent except under legal compulsion.
3. A definite time limit should be specified for maintenance of non-academic records beyond a student's graduation or after a non-graduate withdraws from the institution. It should also be recognized that certain records must be retained permanently.
4. Duplication of records should be kept at a minimum.
5. A student should have the right to inspect his academic record. He should also have the right to discuss with appropriate personnel reports and evaluations of his conduct. The confidentiality of necessary professional evaluations of students as well as all letters of recommendations should be maintained.
6. Within the institution, staff members who have a legitimate interest and need should be allowed information concerning the record of any student. Such use should be limited to specific needs to provide for student services and welfare.
7. Placement records are created, maintained and used to assist in the student's education, development and employment not only as an

undergraduate but throughout his lifetime. It is recommended that the credentials provided by the institution contain chronological listings of the study and employment of the candidate with confidential references written by faculty and employers designated by him, and released only with his permission. They shall provide no information in conflict with fair employment legislation, nor any information whose release is the responsibility of other administrative offices of the institution. The records should be retained during the lifetime of the graduate.

8. Disciplinary records are for internal use and as such should not be made available to persons outside the institution except on authorization of the student, or under legal compulsion. Intra-institutional use should be restricted to the professional student personnel administrator, who may disclose and interpret the record to other officials in the institution when necessary for the discharge of their duties. Non-current disciplinary records of a student should be periodically destroyed, with the exception of those records which would prevent his enrollment or release of transcript.
9. Official academic records, including transcripts thereof, should be an unabridged and chronological record of all courses undertaken with grades received and status achieved. Academic and disciplinary records should be kept separately. Transcripts of academic records should contain only information about academic status. Except for intra-institutional use, academic records and transcripts should be made available only with the formal consent of the student involved.
10. Financial records concerning a student, including those related to the granting of scholarships and other assistance based on financial need, should be strictly confidential between the student and the institution.
11. Medical records should be under the direct supervision of a member of the medical profession in order to insure the special legal protection which is assured communications between physician and patient.
12. Since the right of privacy belongs to the person, he may relinquish the right as he chooses. When a request for confidential information concerning

a student or graduate has been made by a proper agency and he has formally authorized the release of that information, the institution is obligated to respond.

13. There are certain parts of a student's record which are not confidential. This includes matters of public record such as information that has appeared in university publications, directories, commencement programs, and in newspapers. This might include such things as the fact that a person has attended the institution; the dates of attendance; whether or not he received a degree, the degree or degrees he received, if any, and the dates they were conferred.
14. Policies should recognize the responsibility of institutions to be responsive to bonafide inquiries when national security or the safety of individuals or property is at issue.
15. In releasing data for research the institution should take due care to protect the identity of the student. Before submitting information from student records to a researcher, the institution should be assured that the research agency will follow acceptable standards of confidentiality. Whenever the limits of confidentiality are in question, the institution should obtain the formal consent of the student prior to using information about him for research purposes.
16. Except under legal compulsion, the institution must protect the student against disclosure, without his consent, of personal information relating to personal values, beliefs, memberships or political associations which is not a matter of public record.
17. Student personnel records, which typically contain a student's extra-curricular activities, personal characteristics and experience, family background, standardized test results, any records of psychological counseling contact, etc., should be considered as current educational and/or therapeutic tools and be available only for use as such, and with limited retention value.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
CODE OF ETHICS, 1963

Confidentiality. Safeguarding information about an individual that has been obtained by the psychologist in the course of his practice or investigation is a primary obligation of the psychologist. Such information is not communicated to others unless certain important conditions are met.

- a. Information received in confidence is revealed only after most careful deliberation and when there is clear and imminent danger to an individual or to society, and then only to appropriate professional workers or public authorities.
- b. Information obtained in clinical or consulting relationships, or evaluative data concerning children, students, employees, and others are discussed only for professional purposes and only with persons clearly concerned with the case.
- c. Clinical and other case materials are used in classroom teaching and writing only when the identity of the persons involved is completely disguised.
- d. The confidentiality of professional communications about individuals is maintained. Only when the originator and other persons involved give their express permission is a confidential professional communication shown to the individual concerned. The psychologist is responsible for informing the client of the limits of the confidentiality.
- e. Only after explicit permission has been granted is the identity of research subjects published. When data have been published without permission for identification, the psychologist assumes responsibility for adequately disguising their sources.

Client Welfare. The psychologist respects the integrity and protects the welfare of the person or group with whom he is working.

- a. The psychologist in industry, education, and other situations in which conflicts of interest may arise among varied parties, as between

management and labor, defines for himself the nature and direction of his loyalties and responsibilities and keeps these parties informed of these commitments.

- b. When there is a conflict among professional workers, the psychologist is concerned primarily with the welfare of any client involved and only secondarily with the interest of his own professional group.
- c. The psychologist attempts to terminate a clinical or consulting relationship when it is reasonably clear to the psychologist that the client is not benefiting from it.
- d. The psychologist who asks that an individual reveal personal information in the course of interviewing, testing, or evaluation, or who allows such information to be divulged to him, does so only after making certain that the person is aware of the purpose of the interview, testing, or evaluation and of the ways in which the information may be used.
- e. In cases involving referral, the responsibility of the psychologist for the welfare of the client continues until this responsibility is assumed by the professional person to whom the client is referred or until the relationship with the psychologist making the referral has been terminated by mutual agreement. In situations where referral, consultation, or other changes in the conditions of the treatment are indicated and the client refuses referral, the psychologist carefully weighs the possible harm to the client, to himself, and to his profession that might ensue from continuing the relationship.
- f. The psychologist who requires the taking of psychological tests for didactic, classification, or research purposes protects the examinees by insuring that the tests and test results are used in a professional manner.
- g. When potentially disturbing subject matter is presented to students, it is discussed objectively, and efforts are made to handle constructively any difficulties that arise.
- h. Care must be taken to insure an appropriate setting for clinical work to protect both client and psychologist from actual or imputed harm and the profession from censure.

JOINT STATEMENT ON RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS OF STUDENTS

In June, 1967, a joint committee, comprised of representatives from the American Association of University Professors, U. S. National Student Association, Association of American Colleges, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, met in Washington, D. C., and drafted the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students.

Preamble

Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students, and the general well-being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Institutional procedures for achieving these purposes may vary from campus to campus, but the minimal standards of academic freedom of students outlined below are essential to any community of scholars.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The freedom to learn depends upon appropriate opportunities and conditions in the classroom, on the campus, and in the larger community. Students should exercise their freedom with responsibility.

The responsibility to secure and to respect general conditions conducive to the freedom to learn is shared by all members of the academic community. Each college and university has a duty to develop policies and procedures which provide and safeguard this freedom. Such policies and procedures should be developed at each institution within the framework of general standards and with the broadest possible participation of the members of the academic community. The purpose of this statement is to enumerate the essential provisions for student freedom to learn.

I. Freedom of Access to Higher Education

The admissions policies of each college and university are a matter of institutional choice provided that

each college and university makes clear the characteristics and expectations of students which it considers relevant to success in the institution's program. While church-related institutions may give admission preference to students of their own persuasion, such a preference should be clearly and publicly stated. Under no circumstances should a student be barred from admission to a particular institution on the basis of race. Thus, within the limits of its facilities, each college and university should be open to all students who are qualified according to its admission standards. The facilities and services of a college should be open to all of its enrolled students, and institutions should use their influence to secure equal access for all students to public facilities in the local community.

II. In the Classroom

The professor in the classroom and in conference should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. Student performance should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards.

A. Protection of Freedom of Expression

Students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled.

B. Protection Against Improper Academic Evaluation

Students should have protection through orderly procedures against prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation. At the same time, they are responsible for maintaining standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled.

C. Protection Against Improper Disclosure

Information about student views, beliefs, and political associations which professors acquire in the course of their work as instructors, advisers, and counselors should be considered confidential. Protection against improper disclosure is a serious professional obligation. Judgments of ability and character may be provided under

appropriate circumstances, normally with the knowledge or consent of the student.

III. Student Records

Institutions should have a carefully considered policy as to the information which should be part of a student's permanent educational record and as to the conditions of its disclosure. To minimize the risk of improper disclosure, academic and disciplinary records should be separate, and the conditions of access to each should be set forth in an explicit policy statement. Transcripts of academic records should contain only information about academic status. Information from disciplinary or counseling files should not be available to unauthorized persons on campus, or to any person off campus without the express consent of the student involved except under legal compulsion or in cases where the safety of persons or property is involved. No records should be kept which reflect the political activities or beliefs of students. Provisions should also be made for periodic routine destruction of noncurrent disciplinary records. Administrative staff and faculty members should respect confidential information about students which they acquire in the course of their work.

IV. Student Affairs

In student affairs, certain standards must be maintained if the freedom of students is to be preserved.

A. Freedom of Association

Students bring to the campus a variety of interests previously acquired and develop many new interests as members of the academic community. They should be free to organize and join associations to promote their common interests.

1. The membership, policies, and actions of a student organization usually will be determined by vote of only those persons who hold bona fide membership in the college or university community.
2. Affiliation with an extramural organization should not of itself disqualify a student organization from institutional recognition.

3. If campus advisers are required, each organization should be free to choose its own adviser, and institutional recognition should not be withheld or withdrawn solely because of the inability of a student organization to secure an adviser. Campus advisers may advise organizations in the exercise of responsibility, but they should not have the authority to control the policy of such organizations.
4. Student organizations may be required to submit a statement of purpose, criteria for membership, rules of procedures, and a current list of officers. They should not be required to submit a membership list as a condition of institutional recognition.
5. Campus organizations, including those affiliated with an extramural organization, should be open to all students without respect to race, creed, or national origin, except for religious qualifications which may be required by organizations whose aims are primarily sectarian.

B. Freedom of Inquiry and Expression

1. Students and student organizations should be free to examine and discuss all questions of interest to them, and to express opinions publicly and privately. They should always be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt the regular and essential operation of the institution. At the same time, it should be made clear to the academic and the larger community that in their public expressions or demonstrations students or student organizations speak only for themselves.
2. Students should be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. Those routine procedures required by an institution before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus should be designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event, and that the occasion is conducted in a manner appropriate to an academic community. The institutional control of campus facilities should not be used as a device of censorship. It should be made clear to the academic and large community that sponsorship of guest speakers does not necessarily imply approval or endorsement of the view expressed, either by the sponsoring group or the institution.

C. Student Participation in Institutional Government

As constituents of the academic community, students should be free, individually and collectively, to express their views on issues of institutional policy and on matters of general interest to the student body. The student body should have clearly defined means to participate in the formulation and application of institutional policy affecting academic and student affairs. The role of the student government and both its general and specific responsibilities should be made explicit, and the actions of the student government within the areas of its jurisdiction should be reviewed only through orderly and prescribed procedures.

D. Student Publications

Student publications and the student press are a valuable aid in establishing and maintaining an atmosphere of free and responsible discussion and of intellectual exploration on the campus. They are a means of bringing student concerns to the attention of the faculty and the institutional authorities and of formulating student opinion on various issues on the campus and in the world at large.

Whenever possible the student newspaper should be an independent corporation financially and legally separate from the university. Where financial and legal autonomy is not possible, the institution, as the publisher of student publications, may have to bear the legal responsibility for the contents of the publications. In the delegation of editorial responsibility to students the institution must provide sufficient editorial freedom and financial autonomy for the student publications to maintain their integrity of purpose as vehicles for free inquiry and free expression in an academic community.

Institutional authorities, in consultation with students and faculty, have a responsibility to provide written clarification of the role of the student publications, the standards to be used in their evaluation, and the limitations on external control of their operation. At the same time, the editorial freedom of student editors and managers entails corollary responsibilities to be governed by the canons of responsible journalism, such as the avoidance of libel, indecency, undocumented allegations, attacks on personal integrity, and the techniques of harrassment and innuendo. As safeguards for the editorial freedom of student publications the following provisions are necessary.

1. The student press should be free of censorship and advance approval of copy, and its editors and

managers should be free to develop their own editorial policies and news coverage.

2. Editors and managers of student publications should be protected from arbitrary suspension and removal because of student, faculty, administrative, or public disapproval of editorial policy or content. Only for proper and stated causes should editors and managers be subject to removal and then by orderly and prescribed procedures. The agency responsible for the appointment of editors and managers should be the agency responsible for their removal.
3. All university published and financed student publications should explicitly state on the editorial page that the opinions there expressed are not necessarily those of the college, university, or student body.

V. Off-Campus Freedom of Students

A. Exercise of Rights of Citizenship

College and university students are both citizens and members of the academic community. As citizens, students should enjoy the same freedom of speech, peaceful assembly, and right of petition that other citizens enjoy and, as members of the academic community, they are subject to the obligations which accrue to them by virtue of this membership. Faculty members and administrative officials should insure that institutional powers are not employed to inhibit such intellectual and personal development of students as is often promoted by their exercise of the rights of citizenship both on and off campus.

B. Institutional Authority and Civil Penalties

Activities of students may upon occasion result in violation of law. In such cases, institutional officials should be prepared to apprise students of sources of legal counsel and may offer other assistance. Students who violate the law may incur penalties prescribed by civil authorities, but institutional authority should never be used merely to duplicate the function of general laws. Only where the institution's interests as an academic community are distinct and clearly involved should the special authority of the institution be asserted. The student who incidentally violates

institutional regulations in the course of his off-campus activity, such as those relating to class attendance, should be subject to no greater penalty than would normally be imposed. Institutional action should be independent of community pressure.

VI. Procedural Standards in Disciplinary Proceedings

In developing responsible student conduct, disciplinary proceedings play a role substantially secondary to example, counseling, guidance, and admonition. At the same time, educational institutions have a duty and the corollary disciplinary powers to protect their educational purpose through the setting of standards of scholarship and conduct for the students who attend them and through the regulation of the use of institutional facilities. In the exceptional circumstances when the preferred means fail to resolve problems of student conduct, proper procedural safeguards should be observed to protect the student from the unfair imposition of serious penalties.

The administration of discipline should guarantee procedural fairness to an accused student. Practices in disciplinary cases may vary in formality with the gravity of the offense and the sanctions which may be applied. They should also take into account the presence or absence of an honor code, and the degree to which the institutional officials have direct acquaintance with student life in general and with the involved student and the circumstances of the case in particular. The jurisdictions of faculty or student judicial bodies, the disciplinary responsibilities of institutional officials and the regular disciplinary procedures, including the student's right to appeal a decision, should be clearly formulated and communicated in advance. Minor penalties may be assessed informally under prescribed procedures.

In all situations, procedural fair play requires that the student be informed of the nature of the charges against him, that he be given a fair opportunity to refute them, that the institution not be arbitrary in its actions, and that there be provision for appeal of a decision. The following are recommended as proper safeguards in such proceedings when there are no honor codes offering comparable guarantees.

A. Standards of Conduct Expected of Students

The institution has an obligation to clarify those standards of behavior which it considers essential to its educational mission and its community life. These general

behavioral expectations and the resultant specific regulations should represent a reasonable regulation of student conduct, but the student should be as free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to his education. Offenses should be as clearly defined as possible and interpreted in a manner consistent with the aforementioned principles of relevancy and reasonableness. Disciplinary proceedings should be instituted only for violations of standards of conduct formulated with significant student participation and published in advance through such means as a student handbook or a generally available body of institutional regulations.

B. Investigation of Student Conduct

1. Except under extreme emergency circumstances, premises occupied by students and the personal possessions of students should not be searched unless appropriate authorization has been obtained. For premises such as residence halls controlled by the institution, an appropriate and responsible authority should be designated to whom application should be made before a search is conducted. The application should specify the reasons for the search and the objects or information sought. The student should be present, if possible, during the search. For premises not controlled by the institution, the ordinary requirements for lawful search should be followed.
2. Students detected or arrested in the course of serious violation of institutional regulations, or infractions of ordinary law, should be informed of their rights. No form of harassment should be used by institutional representatives to coerce admissions of guilt or information about conduct of other suspected persons.

C. Status of Student Pending Final Action

Pending action on the charges, the status of a student should not be altered, or his right to be present on the campus and to attend classes suspended, except for reasons relating to his physical or emotional safety and well-being, or for reasons relating to the safety and well-being of students, faculty, or university property.

D. Hearing Committee Procedures

When the misconduct may result in serious penalties and if the student questions the fairness of disciplinary action taken against him, he should be granted, on request,

the privilege of a hearing before a regularly constituted hearing committee. The following suggested hearing committee procedures satisfy the requirements of procedural due process in situations requiring a high degree of formality.

1. The hearing committee should include faculty members or students, or, if regularly included or requested by the accused, both faculty and student members. No member of the hearing committee who is otherwise interested in the particular case should sit in judgment during the proceeding.
2. The student should be informed, in writing, of the reasons for the proposed disciplinary action with sufficient particularity, and in sufficient time, to insure opportunity to prepare for the hearing.
3. The student appearing before the hearing committee should have the right to be assisted in his defense by an adviser of his choice.
4. The burden of proof should rest upon the officials bringing the charge.
5. The student should be given an opportunity to testify and to present evidence and witnesses. He should have an opportunity to hear and question adverse witnesses. In no case should the committee consider statements against him unless he has been advised of their content and of the names of those who made them, and unless he has been given an opportunity to rebut unfavorable inferences which might otherwise be drawn.
6. All matters upon which the decision may be based must be introduced into evidence at the proceeding before the hearing committee. The decision should be based solely upon such matters. Improperly acquired evidence should not be admitted.
7. In the absence of a transcript, there should be both a digest and a verbatim record, such as a tape recording, of the hearing.
8. The decision of the hearing committee should be final, subject only to the student's right of appeal to the president or ultimately to the governing board of the institution.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT, LETTER TO PARTICI-
PANTS, AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Survey Instrument

Name _____ Title _____

Name of College or University _____

Address of College or University _____

Check the Blanks that Apply to Your Institution

Private Public Co-Educational

Men's School Women's School Junior College

Four Year College Four Year College with Graduate
School or Professional School

Fall 1972 Enrollment _____

Please send summary of results _____

TO BE DETACHED AFTER DATA ARE COMPILED

In each of the following incidents the college registrar has made a decision to either release or retain student information possessed by the registrar's office.

For each incident please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the action taken by the registrar.

1. A high school counselor requests permission from the college registrar's office to use student records (including identifying data) for research on the relation between high school grades and college success. The registrar refuses the request.
 Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

2. University A sends copies of student grade reports (regardless of the student's age or marital status) to parents.
 Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

3. A former student's girlfriend requests a student transcript of her boyfriend's record. She states that her boyfriend works during the time the office is open. The registrar complies with her request.
 Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

4. A student is receiving a scholarship from a philanthropic organization. The organization requests a transcript of the student's record. The registrar's office complies.
 Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

5. Registrar Y telephones Registrar A and requests a copy of a former student's disciplinary file. Registrar A does not comply with the request.
 Strongly agree
 Agree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

6. Professor Y requests permission to examine the disciplinary file of Student A. His request is denied.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
7. The registrar's office is visited by a government agent processing a security clearance check on a former student. The agent identified himself by showing his credentials. He requests permission to examine all available information including disciplinary records. The registrar refuses his request.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
8. A government agency requests a transcript of a student's record. The registrar's office does not comply.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
9. College Z automatically sends copies of freshman student grade reports to the high schools of former students so high school counselors can use them for research purposes.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
10. A 17-year-old freshman boy visits the registrar's office and requests that his grade reports not be sent to his home address. The office complies with his request.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree

11. A married girl's father requests permission to examine his daughter's educational record. When asked if his daughter has given her permission he replied: "---- no!!" "I paid for two years of her college education and I have a right to look at her record!" The registrar refuses his request.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
12. The mother of a former student (now in the military service) telephones the registrar's office and requests that his transcript be sent to University X. The registrar states that he cannot comply with her request, but will send the transcript upon the request of the former student.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
13. The director of admissions at University Z writes a letter to the registrar of College A requesting a transcript of a former student. The registrar of College A sends the transcript.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
14. Student Y visits the registrar's office. He states that he has received a telephone call from his former roommate, an ex-student, requesting him to have the registrar's office send his transcript to a business firm. The registrar's office refuses.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree
15. Professor X requests transcripts of the educational records of the students in all of his classes. The registrar complies with his request.
- ___Strongly agree
___Agree
___Disagree
___Strongly disagree

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Administrator:

I am currently engaged in a research project concerning administrator attitudes toward the release of student information from registrars' offices in institutions of higher education.

The enclosed instrument can be completed in approximately ten to fifteen minutes. Your assistance in completing and returning the instrument will be greatly appreciated. You may be assured that your responses will be kept in "strict" confidence and that identifying information will be destroyed after the data are tabulated. A stamped, self addressed envelope has been included for your use.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Boyd
Registrar
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

enclosures

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Colleague:

Recently you received a short questionnaire concerning administrator attitudes toward the release of student information from registrars' offices in institutions of higher education. The samples for the study were randomly selected and each response adds to the validity of the study.

Your assistance in completing and returning the enclosed instrument will be greatly appreciated. You may be assured that your responses will be kept in "strict" confidence. A stamped, self addressed envelope has been included for your use. If you desire a summary of the results of the study please indicate in the space provided on the survey instrument and I will be happy to comply.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Boyd
Registrar
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

enclosures

APPENDIX C

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ITEMS AND TOTAL
SCORES OBTAINED ON EACH ITEM FOR
THE 612 USABLE SURVEY
INSTRUMENTS

<u>Item</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	<u>Total Score</u>
1		.03	.07	.19	.20	.14	.17	.20	.41	.01	.12	.20	.23	.15	.13	.44
2			.22	.25	.27	.14	.23	.27	.24	.23	.37	.11	.15	.17	.14	.47
3				.16	.10	.08	.14	.24	.12	-.03	.20	.12	.14	.29	.11	.34
4					.26	.10	.25	.36	.29	.14	.20	.20	.33	.13	.20	.54
5						.35	.42	.37	.28	.06	.30	.22	.36	.26	.18	.60
6							.41	.28	.18	.13	.26	.15	.15	.14	.35	.51
7								.52	.23	.15	.31	.25	.37	.24	.21	.65
8									.32	.13	.32	.27	.39	.33	.27	.68
9										.16	.23	.28	.33	.22	.18	.58
10											.17	.06	-.01	.05	.05	.30
11												.27	.23	.27	.19	.55
12													.40	.43	.11	.52
13														.27	.21	.59
14															.16	.50
15																.45

VITA

Robert Gene Boyd

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE
RELEASE OF STUDENT INFORMATION

Major Field: Educational Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Butler, Missouri, March 18,
1935, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. Boyd.

Education: Graduated from Butler High School, Butler,
Missouri, in May, 1953; received the Bachelor of
Science in Education degree from Central
Missouri State University, with a major in
Biology, in May, 1957; received the Master of
Science in Education degree from Central
Missouri State University, with a Secondary
School Principal major, in August, 1960;
received the Education Specialist degree from
Central Missouri State University, with a major
in School Administration, in March, 1966; com-
pleted requirements for the Doctor of Education
degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1973.

Professional Experience: High school science teacher,
Platte City High School, Platte City, Missouri,
1957-58; high school science teacher, Adrian
High School, Adrian, Missouri, 1958-59; high
school principal, Adrian High School, Adrian,
Missouri, 1959-61; academic adviser, Central
Missouri State University, 1961-63; registrar,
Central Missouri State University, since 1963.