THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN-FLINT

Admissions Committee

Minutes of the September 18, 2014 meeting

Present: D. Baird (At large), K. Moreland (SOM), J. Kelts (CAS), Christine Kenney (SEHS), D. Adams (International Center, ex office), J. Davidson (Admissions, ex officio), F. Skarsten (Institutional Analysis, ex officio), D. Getty (Institutional Analysis, ex officio)

1. Fawn presented the data from the Transfer Retention Analysis study, pointing out the pertinent and/or interesting data from the packet.
   a. Nothing was overly surprising in this study, but it includes four years of incoming data so is more inclusive than the FTIAC (First time in any college) study was. This study had 3528 students and focused only on what was known about the students at the time of admission.
   b. 2.0 GPA after the first semester was used as the measure of success.
   c. Most incoming transfer students are of sophomore and junior standing.
   d. Clarification—on Figure 10—FTIAC transfers are students that are readmitted after having left in their first 1-2 semesters. These are no longer being coded this way.
   e. 63% of these students don’t have degrees when they transfer
   f. Findings
      i. Full time vs. part time has the biggest impact on success. Full time does better. More part timers don’t return after the first semester.
      ii. First semester GPA has a large impact on whether students return or not. Average GPA of those not returning is 1 full point lower than the average of those that did. 42% of those that did not return were not successful.
      iii. Whether students transfer in as juniors or seniors, it still takes around 2.3 years to complete their degree. The committee discussed that this is likely due to those coming in with senior standing still needing to take upper level courses in the correct sequence.
   g. ANOVA analysis to determine factors that correlate with first term success
      i. Data on pg. 16 of report. Does not include 2nd and 3rd degree seeking students.
      ii. The significant factors are full time (vs. part time), transfer GPA, Class level (and also credits transferred in, which is similar), whether they have a prior degree, gender, age, and high school GPA (which was analyzed for those transferring in a low number of credits).
   h. Binary Correlations for predictors of first term success
      i. Graphical representation of those factors that predict greater or lesser success after the first term
      ii. Data shown on page 17 of packet.
iii. Some of the factors from ANOVA were also important here, namely full time status, previous college GPA, and having a sophomore or higher class standing (all of which improved chances of success) and gender or challenge admit (female gender and challenge admit resulted in lower chances of success).

i. Correlation and Regression Tree Analysis
   i. Formation of the “decision tree” by splitting the population into branches at nodes. The most predictive factors are split first.
   ii. First split is GPA – is it higher or lower than 2.98.
   iii. Second split is class standing – Senior and Junior vs. Freshman and Sophomore
   iv. The committee examined the decision tree (a full size pull out version is found at the back of the information packet).
   v. What are the attributes of the students with less than a 60% chance of success? (60% success was the admission threshold used for FTIAC students in a previous study)

j. Next questions for the committee
   i. Where do we draw the admissions line? Or do we? Are the current admissions standards for transfer students acceptable? Over the last four years there were some students admitted that were between 50-60% likely to be successful, but only 10 students out of the 3528 were admitted with less than 60 likelihood of academic success

2. There was a discussion about what data we have about students that leave us (Darryl inquired what we knew about them).
   a. There is a national clearinghouse of student data used sometimes by institutional analysis and financial aid
   b. It can be used to see where students went next (if they did)
   c. It can be used to see where our freshman recruits went

3. There was discussion of enrollment numbers being down in CAS and SEHS and also at Mott. We discussed what is advertised to students vs. the reality of college. Jon pointed out that he believes that the expectation vs. reality gap at UM-Flint is actually quite small at the moment. There was discussion of enrollment management.

4. Jon brought forward a proposal to use weight averages for HS GPA for student applications
   a. This is a proposed change from the current method of using unweighted GPA, or if an unweighted GPA is unavailable, truncating GPAs at 4.0 without recalculating GPA from HS transcripts
   b. Some HS no longer report an unweighted GPA
   c. Large Universities (UM-AA, MSU) recalculate all GPAs.... But 10 of the 15 public institutions in Michigan use the weighted GPA
d. The recommendation is that we no longer truncate and record the weighted GPA (the highest GPA)

e. GPAs would only be recalculated for scholarships and other situations where it could matter (not during admissions)

f. We are currently not accurately comparing the upper-achieving students.

g. This change could make scholarship decisions easier but is not likely to change scholarship eligibility.

h. Of concern this committee is that those on the cusp of eligibility for admission are not the students likely to have a significantly different weighted vs. non-weighted GPA. Weighted GPAs occur only in the cases of advanced coursework and cause GPAs to be higher than the non-weighted GPA.

i. No one on the committee had any objections to this change and gave Jon our endorsement.

5. No one else volunteered to be chair of the committee, so Jessica will continue to be chair for another year.

6. Action item – think about the report and whether we think we should make any recommendations for changes to the current admission policy for transfer students. Another meeting will be called for mid-October.