

Troy University Undergraduate Academic Council

Memorandum of Record: Non-binding vote regarding undergraduate entrance requirements

TO: Members, Undergraduate Academic Council

FROM: Donna Schubert, Undergraduate Catalog Editor

SUBJECT: Results of non-binding vote of opinion regarding changes to undergraduate entrance requirements

DATE: May 3, 2010

This memorandum serves as record of the Undergraduate Academic Council's non-binding vote of opinion regarding changes to undergraduate entrance requirements.

On April 28, 2010, UGAC Chair Chris Shaffer distributed the attached proposal from the Enrollment Management Committee. This proposal documents the Enrollment Management Committee's recommendations for increasing undergraduate admission requirements. These changes would be effective fall 2011. Shaffer requested that the UGAC offer an opinion (a non-binding vote) regarding the proposal.

On April 30, 2010, Shaffer reported the following to the chair of the Enrollment Management Committee: "The UGAC has taken a non-binding vote and supports the general idea of raising entrance requirements. There are some concerns about the 4th point in the plan, and I will be forwarding those emails to you."

A Study of Potential Changes in Admission Criteria

Proposal I:

Change minimum ACT required for admission as a “conditional” freshman from 16 to 17 (ACT) and from 780 to 830 (SAT)

Analysis:

865 students enrolled as conditional freshmen in the fall of 2008 (T1 and T2 included)
126 were admitted with an ACT of 16 (the current minimum) on the Troy Campus.
Taking a sample of 100 of the 126, 63 (63%) are not currently enrolled.

The data on conditionally enrolled freshmen with an ACT of 16 on the campus of Montgomery, Dothan, eCampus and global campus are as follows:

Dothan-4
Montgomery-5
eCampus-1
Global Campus-0

The numbers for the other campuses are insignificant.

Impact:

The Impact in terms of loss in enrollments: Less than 150 students. It is estimated that we would have lost 63% of these within two semesters under the current minimum 16 ACT requirement anyway.

Proposal II:

Change the **unconditional** ACT requirement from 19 to 20 (SAT from 910 to 950)

Analysis:

Based on fall 2008 data, 32% (60) of the 186 students entering the Troy campus with a 19 ACT scored less than a 2.00 within their first academic year and could have benefited from support services normally provided conditional students.

Of the 186 students identified entering with a 19 ACT: 16 enrolled at Dothan (7 earned under a 2.00) and 13 enrolled at Montgomery (8 earned under a 2.00). Interestingly, no freshmen with a 19 ACT were identified for eCampus.

Impact:

We do not anticipate losing any students, because those making a 19 ACT would still be admitted as conditional students.

Proposal III:

Eliminate conditional enrollment for transfer students. Currently, transfer students can be admitted conditionally with a 1.70-1.99 GPA at their prior institution. This change would require a 2.00 GPA or better on all college/university work attempted to be admitted to Troy University.

Analysis:

There is the necessity for an objective and a subjective analysis of this change.

Objectively, 228

of the 716 conditionally admitted transfer students for Fall 2008 (T1 and T2) did not continue their enrollment of beyond two semesters (five terms). Of the 488 remaining conditionally admitted transfers 142 (30%) had less than a 2.00 GPA. In total, 370 (52%) of the 716 transfer students admitted conditionally for Fall 2008 (T1 and T2) were either not enrolled or achieved less than a 2.00 GPA as of Fall 2009.

Subjectively, we find among this group students who have attended two or three other institutions and appear to be “financial aid hopping”. Additionally, we note that students who are on the verge of being suspended from Alabama State and Tuskegee (and therefore are on the verge of losing their financial aid) can and do enter Troy University under our current transfer student admission policy and are therefore able to continue their financial aid. Additionally, there is a philosophical point that must be made here: If students cannot make a minimum of a 2.00 GPA at a junior college or at another university, what is it that makes us think that they can make a 2.00 GPA at Troy University?

Impact:

The estimate for loss of new enrollments based on fall 2009 (T1 and T2) enrollments with a transfer GPA of 1.70-1.99:

Troy Campus	70 (1% of total new enrollments)
Dothan	29 (1% of total new enrollments)
Montgomery	95 (1% of total new enrollments)
Phenix City	11 (0% of total new enrollments)
eCampus	146 (2% of total new enrollments)
Global Campus	73 (1% of total new enrollments)
Total estimated loss-	424 (5% of total new enrollments for the fall 2009)

Exceptions to the proposed transfer admissions policy: Transfer students who are age 25 or older and who have not attended a college or university in the past three years may be admitted under the “Adult Student” admission policy as outlined below.

Proposal IV:

Change the Adult Student admission policy from an age requirement of 21 to 25 with a requirement of a 2.00 high school GPA or a score of 500 on the GED. No SAT or ACT scores will be required. Note the exception to this policy listed below:

Analysis:

There is some evidence that younger students simply wait until age 21 and with only a 2.00 high school GPA, enter Troy University for the purpose of accessing financial aid. We see this pattern primarily at the Montgomery campus. As it relates to the GED score, 450 is the minimum passing score. A score of 500 is used by a number of our sister universities such as USA. We believe this additional requirement will assist in improving the quality of students admitted under the GED criteria.

Impact:

In the fall of 2009, 966 students between the ages of 21 and 24 were admitted under the current adult admission policy. Since we do not usually require a specific GED score, we do not know the number that would be lost by requiring a GED score of 500. We do know that fewer than 10 students between the ages of 21 and 24 were admitted on the basis of a GED score. Of the 966 students enrolled, 146 (15%) would have qualified under the proposed military exemption. Of the original 966 students included in this data segment, 282 (29%) did not persist longer than the first semester (Fall 2009, T1 and T2 included) and 360 (37%) of these students reflect below a 2.00 GPA for their last TROY GPA.

Furthermore, we believe as many as half of the remaining students could score at least a 17 on the ACT and be admitted as a conditional student.¹ Therefore we estimate our potential student loss to be around 600, 360 of which we would have lost anyway.

Current Distribution of Impacted Students (966)

Campus/Site	Enrollments
A27 – Atlanta	4
D01- Dothan	102
EA27 – e Atlanta	3
EF20 – e Tampa	7
EF22 –e Orlando	5
EFG1 – e Marianna	3

¹ This policy will likely result in an increased demand for administering the residual ACT to perspective students at our various locations.

EFH1 – e Hurlburt Field	10
EFJK – e Jacksonville	3
EFLW – e Ft. Lewis	4
EFP1 – e Pensacola	8
EFPC – e Panama City/Tyndall	5
EFRO- e Ft. Walton Beach	11
EG01 – e Columbus/Ft. Benning	35
EG02 – e Shaw/Sumter	3
EG03 – e Fayetteville/Ft. Bragg	19
EG04 – e Brunswick	6
EG06 – e Albany	3
EG07 – e Augusta/Ft. Gordon	16
EG08 – e Covington	3
EG09 – e Clarksville	4
EG11 – e Tifton	7
EG14 – e Elizabethtown	3
EIGM –e Heidelberg	21
EJ01 – e Okinawa	2
ET01 – e Troy	93
EV24 – e Norfolk	9
EV28 – e Arlington	4
EV30 – e Exton	7
EW03 – e Davis/Monthan	2
EW04 – e Malmstrom	1
EW06 – e San Antonio	5
FE1 - Eglin	4
FG1 - Marianna	5
FP1 - Pensacola	13
FPC – Panama City/Tyndall	2
FRO – Ft. Walton Beach	6
G01 – Columbus/Ft. Benning	6
G02 - Shaw	3
G04 – Brunswick	8
G06 – Albany	27
G07 – Augusta/Ft. Gordon	10
G08 – Covington	2
IMAU - Malacca	47
ISIU - Saigon	1
ISL - Sharjah	4
IVIU - Hanoi	3
M01 – Montgomery	160
T01 – Troy	183
T02 – Phenix City	54
T04 – Montgomery Nursing	9

Exception to the Adult Admission Policy:

Active duty military, National Guard, Reservist and veterans can be admitted on the basis of the adult student admission policy regardless of age. These students will be required to present a military ID or DD 214 in addition to the high school transcript or GED score.

Proposal V:

Following the example of Ole Miss, we offer the following statement relative to admission criteria and athletes: "Students who are certified as "qualifiers" through the Eligibility Center of the NCAA are eligible for admission. Students who have been certified by the NCAA must submit required test scores and transcripts to the Office of Admissions. Evaluation of credentials determines the enrollment status: unconditional or conditional."

Analysis:

These standards are currently required anyway and the standards are higher in some ways than those we are proposing. The NCAA uses a sliding scale on the ACT in relation to the GPA.

Impact:

This should have no impact on the number of students being admitted since we are required by the NCAA to meet their standards currently.

Proposal VI: **THIS PROPOSAL REJECTED BY ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND IS NOT PART OF THE RECOMMENDATION.**

~~Require faculty to officially monitor class attendance and establish the maximum number or % of classes a student may miss before being assigned a grade of FA.~~

Analysis:

~~In addition to being received very positively by parents, this policy will stop defrauding financial aid students from attending the first class (the current attendance requirement for financial aid recipients) and then not returning to class for the remainder of the semester or term. Under financial aid regulations, we cannot set an attendance policy for financial aid recipients that is different from that which is established for all students. An essential aspect of this recommendation would be to establish a computer based attendance reporting mechanism that would be simple and easy for faculty to use. The reporting system would automatically issue a report to the financial aid office when a student received the maximum number of absences. An appeals process would be available for students to contest the number of absences. Just the mere fact that the~~

~~policy exists would stimulate more attendance by financial aid students or eliminate those that were simply trying to abuse the system in the first place.²~~

Impact:

~~This attendance policy will discourage students from taking financial aid and not attending class. Those who abuse the attendance policy will be dropped from financial aid immediately as opposed to having two full semesters before they are dropped.~~

Proposal VII:

Any conditionally admitted student who has a GPA of 0.0 after attempting six hours or more will be dropped from the program.

Analysis:

Many of the students that are abusing their financial aid, enroll in classes, and then only attend the first class. They receive their financial aid for a full semester and are then put on probation for their second semester. They register the second semester, attend the first class to qualify for financial aid, and sit out the rest of the second semester. Using this procedure, they receive two full semesters of financial aid. Although the committee is not reviewing graduate admissions, it is our understanding that the same process is used at the graduate level, a very lucrative endeavor.

Impact:

This policy, along with the attendance policy, will eliminate the worst financial aid abusers.

Proposal VIII:

In order to obtain more accurate data on our students and to be able to determine the effectiveness of the above recommendations, the following data entry recommendations are made:

- a) HSA Screen- Make "graduation type" a required entry. Graduation type will determine whether the basis for entry is a GPA or GED.
- b) HSA Screen-the high school GPA will be a required entry.
- c) HSA Screen-the GED score will be entered in "Summary Credits" and will be a required entry for those entering on the basis of a GED.

²~~At least two members of our review team believe this would be an unenforceable policy and would result in significant problems in collecting financial aid refunds.~~

- d) Troy University will enter one GED code with no state specificity. State identification is not necessary since it a national exam and by not using the state code we will make room for more meaningful data entry.

The total estimated loss in student enrollments for all proposals is expected to be 1,200 students. Our data indicates that approximately 700 of these students would not have persisted more than two semesters anyway.