

RECEIVED

AUG 22 1977

*Office
of the Provost*

MEMORANDUM

August 16, 1977

TO: George Matthews, Chairman
University Senate Steering Committee

FROM: Donald C. Young, Chairman
Admissions Committee

SUBJECT: 1976-1977 Annual Report from the University Senate Admissions
Committee

Please find the annual written report of the Admissions Committee, and thank you for your patience in waiting for this report. Please direct any questions to me August 15, or later. I will be on a Departmental study visit until then.

1976-77 Annual Report From the University Senate Admissions Committee

by

Donald C. Young, Outgoing Chairman

August 16, 1977

SUMMARY

The committee suggests legislation to make students aware of the existence of internal admissions criteria.

Attempts to continue the work of the previous committee are described. It is suggested that the issues proposed for study by the previous committee represent a poor investment of time.

The task of countering the anticipated sharp enrollment decline of the 1980's should be the major concern of the Admissions Committee. Direct contact between O.U. faculty and high school teachers is prepared to increase our share of the college-bound high school graduates.

The Admissions Committee is charged 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. Early in the Year Mr. Jerry Rose, Director of Admissions, pointed out a gap in the Senate admissions criteria of May 13, 1970 and April 17, 1975. An accompanying memo describes legislation proposed by the Admissions Committee to recognize that some O.U. programs apply more stringent admissions criteria than those for general admission to the University. The statement we wish adopted and published in the catalog is

Applicants should recognize that some programs require further admission criteria than those for general admission to the University.

This statement should eliminate the need for disclaimers enclosed in some admission letters and, thus, should streamline the admissions process.

Efforts to Mesh with the 1975-1976 Committee.

The 1975-1976 committee decided to emphasize the consideration of standards and requirements for admission to undergraduate programs. It tried to identify and categorize the weak students who are perceived to be admissible under the present criteria but who are unsuccessful at Oakland. The Committee proposed certain questions whose answers would provide information about the weak students. A list of questions appears in the 1975-1976 Admissions Committee Report.

The 1976-1977 Committee reconsidered these questions and decided which questions were most important. However, it appears that gathering such data on a large scale is a formidable task, and it is complex enough that we did not go far in our consideration.

In an effort to get data from a source other than the very busy Office of Institutional Research, some informal contacts were made with individual faculty members who would identify students weak in fundamental skills in non-Learning Skills courses. Unfortunately, none of these contacts resulted in any data.

Discussing these issues is very frustrating to the Committee; we have much trouble agreeing on definitions of success or failure. Gathering

The Admissions Committee is charged 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. Early in the Year Mr. Jerry Rose, Director of Admissions, pointed out a gap in the Senate admissions criteria of May 13, 1970 and April 17, 1975. An accompanying memo describes legislation proposed by the Admissions Committee to recognize that some O.U. programs apply more stringent admissions criteria than those for general admission to the University. The statement we wish adopted and published in the catalog is

Applicants should recognize that some programs require further admission criteria than those for general admission to the University.

This statement should eliminate the need for disclaimers enclosed in some admission letters and, thus, should streamline the admissions process.

Efforts to Mesh with the 1975-1976 Committee.

The 1975-1976 committee decided to emphasize the consideration of standards and requirements for admission to undergraduate programs. It tried to identify and categorize the weak students who are perceived to be admissible under the present criteria but who are unsuccessful at Oakland. The Committee proposed certain questions whose answers would provide information about the weak students. A list of questions appears in the 1975-1976 Admissions Committee Report.

The 1976-1977 Committee reconsidered these questions and decided which questions were most important. However, it appears that gathering such data on a large scale is a formidable task, and it is complex enough that we did not go far in our consideration.

In an effort to get data from a source other than the very busy Office of Institutional Research, some informal contacts were made with individual faculty members who would identify students weak in fundamental skills in non-Learning Skills courses. Unfortunately, none of these contacts resulted in any data.

Discussing these issues is very frustrating to the Committee; we have much trouble agreeing on definitions of success or failure. Gathering

data requires the cooperation of forces outside the committee. Even though faculty complain universally about students who "can't read or write", the situation does not seem sufficiently urgent that we can get hard data with reasonable effort. Therefore, I recommend that the constant examination of Oakland University admissions criteria be tabled until there is some motivation to resume.

The 1976-1977 Committee agrees with the previous Committee in that the present admission policies seem workable and need no obvious change. Furthermore, raising admission standards now, without changing recruitment strategies, can only lead to a premature contraction of the student population.

Issues of Importance for the Future.

The primary task facing the University is to maintain or increase the size and quality of the student body as the number high school graduates decreases. Various scenarios have been proposed for how the college-bound population will be distributed among Michigan colleges and universities in the 1980's. One particularly widely quoted one sees all Michigan universities except Michigan, Michigan State and Wayne State contracting 50% by 1990. With appropriate planning and action Oakland's enrollment should run counter to this prophecy. Recruitment strategies must be evaluated and renewed in order to maintain the size and quality of the student body for the foreseeable future.

One plan is to artificially increase the number of site visits allowed by each high school. Yearly contacts through guidance counselors are limited to two, but if the faculty of various departments could contact their counterparts in the high schools, extra visits might be arranged.

This sort of plan and a variation of it have been tried on a small scale by the Chemistry Department. High School chemistry teachers have been invited to participate in free half-day short courses on various topics. During their visit they have an opportunity to see the department and its facilities. The object is to create an on-going relationship between the teachers and the department. Alternatively, the Chemistry Department has volunteered its faculty to give talks on topics of current

interest at area high schools. While there may be little opportunity to talk individually to the students during one of these trips, the exposure of Oakland's name via the physical presence of a faculty member is viewed as valuable publicity. The Chemistry Department plans to intensify these efforts. A feedback mechanism must be developed to evaluate the benefits of these programs.

The incoming chairman of the Admissions Committee, Christine Sloane, is a member of the Chemistry Department. Thus, I expect innovative recruitment strategies to be the primary concern of the Committee for the coming year.