

**RECEIVED**

MAY 14 1976

*Office  
of the Provost*

May 14, 1976

MEMORANDUM

To: George T. Matthews, Chairperson, University  
Senate Steering Committee

From: Ronald Swartz, Chairperson, Admissions Committee *RS*

Subject: 1975-76 Annual Report from the University Senate  
Admissions Committee

Attached is the annual written report on the 1975-76 activities of the Admissions Committee. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this report.

Thank you for your help in appointing new members to the Admissions Committee and I hope we get to work together in the future.

RS/cls

cc: David Beardslee  
Thomas Church  
Peter Evarts  
Damon Frezza  
Moon J. Pak  
Manuel Pierson  
Gladys Rapoport  
Jerry Rose  
Joan Rosen  
Ronald Swartz  
Diane Tate  
Gertrude White  
Jack Wilson  
Donald Young

1975-76 ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

by

Ronald Swartz  
Outgoing Chairperson  
of the Admissions Committee

May 14, 1976

OUTLINE

for

1975-76 ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

- I. Introduction to Report and Overview of the Committee's Change
- II. Work Done During Committee Meetings and a Word on the Presentations Made by Speakers
- III. List of Questions that the Committee Would Like to have Answered by the End of the 1976-77 Academic Year
- IV. Some Comments About the Organization of Senate Committees
- V. A Concluding Remark

1975-76 ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

by

Ronald Swartz,  
Outgoing Chairperson  
of the Admissions Committee

May 14, 1976

I. Introduction to Report and Overview of the  
Committee's Charge

The Admissions Committee scheduled regular meetings about once every three or four weeks throughout the 1975-76 academic year. At our meetings we always remembered that our charge was the following: To consider, recommend, and evaluate recruiting policies and standards and requirements for admission to undergraduate programs of the University and to evaluate such individual applications for admission as may be referred to it by the Director of Admissions.

II. Work Done During Committee Meetings and a Word on the  
Presentations Made by Speakers

After careful consideration this year's Admissions Committee decided to direct most of its attention towards trying to figure out how best to evaluate whether Oakland University has a successful or unsuccessful admissions program.

The Committee seemed to agree that the actual standards for admissions, although they are somewhat vague, do not have to be changed at this time. Rather than attempt to create new standards for admissions, the Committee decided to see if it could gather information and data that would allow Oakland University to evaluate its present admissions policies and procedures.

In order to understand how best to go about evaluating present admissions policies at Oakland, the Committee arranged to have Jerry Rose, Dave Beardslee, and Peter Evarts speak before the Committee. Mr. Rose made a presentation early in the year and he spoke about the difficulties of gathering data about students who have left the University before graduating. It was pointed out that sometimes a student who leaves the University before graduating is one of our successes. That is, students may leave before graduation because they wish to go to another school, or because Oakland has exposed them to certain ideas which they wish to follow up in the world outside of the University. In addition, it is important to know the reasons

why a student leaves Oakland and often a low grade point average does not adequately explain or demonstrate that Oakland has an unsuccessful admissions program.

Despite all the difficulties involved with getting information about those who leave before graduation, it was decided that Oakland should attempt to give admitted students a fair chance to stay at the University. Although some students may leave before graduation for positive reasons, the Committee seemed to think that a major part of any evaluation of admissions procedures should entail data about the number of students who leave before graduation. In order to get the kind of data that might be necessary to evaluate admissions procedures, the Committee decided to ask Dave Beardslee to make a presentation about the kinds of students that are presently attending Oakland. Mr. Beardslee spoke before the Committee on November 17, 1975 and March 1, 1976. Between these two dates Mr. Beardslee sent a number of reports to the Committee; most of these reports were very helpful because they made it possible for the Committee to have a clearer idea about the problems that confront us.

Besides hearing from Mr. Rose and Mr. Beardslee, the Admissions Committee also asked Mr. Peter Evarts to discuss some of the issues associated with the reading and writing problems of incoming students. Mr. Evarts explained some of the difficulties involved with standardizing learning skills courses. Also, it was pointed out that the resources available to help students with reading and writing problems may not be adequate to service the present needs of incoming students. That is, if Oakland continues to admit students under its present admissions policies, it may be necessary to shift more resources to the learning skills area in order to solve some of the reading and writing problems of Oakland's students.

All in all the presentations by Messrs. Rose, Beardslee and Evarts greatly helped the Committee better understand the difficulties involved with adequately judging the success or failure of Oakland's admissions policies. Also, all of these gentlemen helped to bring perspective to the Committee's problems. It was helpful to have Mr. Beardslee remind us again and again that Oakland's problems related to its students are not unique and other universities are presently being confronted with students who have the same kinds of learning problems as Oakland's students. Furthermore, Mr. Rose helped the Committee understand the difficulties involved with admitting students based upon their high school or community college grade point average and it was generally agreed that Mr. Rose is doing an excellent job under very difficult circumstances. Finally, Mr. Evarts helped the Committee understand the issues associated with detecting and improving the learning skills of new students.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the Committee's future work will probably have to rely on the background information provided by Messrs. Rose, Beardslee, and Evarts. These gentlemen should be acknowledged for their help in providing the Admissions Committee with a foundation of knowledge to build upon and the Committee will probably call on these individuals in the future.

III. List of Questions the Committee Would Like to have Answered by the End of the 1976-77 Academic Year

On February 9, 1976 the Admissions Committee decided that in order to evaluate the admissions policies at Oakland it would be desirable to have questions such as the following answered:

1. What percentage of first year students (FTIAC) have a GPA of below 2.5?
2. For FTIAC, what is the correlation between high school GPA and Oakland's GPA after two years?
3. Do students who take Learning Skills do as well as those who are exempted from these courses?
4. For transfer students from Community Colleges (under age of 24) what is the correlation between GPA when admitted and Oakland's GPA after two years?
5. What is the correlation between high school GPA and the score one receives on exams such as the A.C.T.?
6. What is the correlation between Oakland GPA after two years and the score one receives on exams such as the A.C.T.?
7. What kind of data do other universities similar to Oakland have available to evaluate admissions procedures?
8. Are any other university committees or groups asking for data similar to the kind of data that the Admissions Committee wants?

The above questions represent a beginning list of problems that the Admissions Committee would like to have answered during the 1976-77 academic year. It is hoped that the Office of Institutional Research will be able to help supply data related to these questions.

IV. Some Comments About the Organization of Senate Committees

Since this is my last report as Chairperson of a Senate Committee, I would like to make a few brief comments related to some difficulties in running a university-wide group.

To begin with, due to the fact that the Senate has a number of Committees, it is not surprising that at times some of the functions of these committees overlap. Furthermore, throughout the year I often heard that another Senate Committee was interested in problems similar to those that were being discussed in the Admissions Committee. This overlap of functions and concerns is not necessarily bad, but what seems to be needed is some kind of coordination between the different committees and the people who chair these committees.

For my part, I would recommend that the Senate Steering Committee consider the possibility of sponsoring at least one and maybe two meetings each year for the chairpersons of the Senate Committees. At these meetings the chairpersons could outline what they are doing in their committees and it may be possible to eliminate much of the duplication that goes on in the different committees.

Finally, I would like to note that I wholeheartedly endorse the idea of having a chairperson give a report before the Senate and I hope this practice will be continued. However, in order to speed matters up and not waste the time of the Senate, it might be worthwhile to consider having written committee reports. If written reports are required, they should be very brief and less than one page.

V. A Concluding Remark

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the fact that a number of committee members showed exceptional concern for admissions problems and issues. Specifically, the following people have helped to make my term as chairperson very interesting and challenging; 1) Thomas Church, 2) Jerry Rose, 3) Joan Rosen, 4) Diane Tate, 5) Gertrude White, and 6) Jack Wilson. I would like to thank all these people and the other members of the Admissions Committee for their help throughout the 1975-76 academic year and I hope that next year's Committee will finish some of the projects that we worked on this year.

RS/cls