

# AGENDA

## UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, 12 December 2001, 3:00 p.m.

**Phoenix Room C**, University Union

Presiding Officer: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

### AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. [Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, November 14, 2001](#) (attached)

### CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

#### ACTION ITEMS

1. [Policy for Granting B.A. and B.S. Degrees](#) (attached)

Presented by Professor David Littig

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Proposed Policy Revision on Double Counting of Upper-Division Credits Required for Graduation](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig
2. [Proposal on Admission Standards for New Freshmen](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig
3. **Report of the Provost** Presented by Interim Provost Carol Pollis
4. **University Committee Report** Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

#### NEW BUSINESS

#### ADJOURNMENT

**MINUTES 2000-2001**

**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4**

**Wednesday, November 14, 2001**

**Rose Hall 250, 3:00 p.m.**

Presiding Office: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

**PRESENT**

Clifford Abbott

Greg Aldrete

Derryl Block

Francis Carleton

James Coates

William Conley

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

Andrew Kersten

Theodor Korithoski

Sylvia Kubsch

David Littig

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

Joseph Mannino

John Mariano

Jennifer Mokren

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

Kevin Roeder

William Shay

W. Bruce Shepard

**NOT PRESENT:** John Katers, Brian Merkel, Robert Nagy

**REPRESENTATIVE:** Robert Skorczewski, Academic Staff Committee

**GUESTS:** Interim Deans Cheryl Grosso and Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Professors Jerry Dell and Jeffrey Entwistle

Speaker Lyon announced that the Senate meeting would adjourn automatically at 3:50 to permit the gathering of faculty for a General Meeting at 4:00 p.m. in this chamber.

### AUTOMATIC CONSENT

#### 1. **Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 1, September 19; Meeting No. 2, September 26; and Meeting No. 3, October 17, 2001**

The minutes were approved without change.

### CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

Speaker Lyon welcomed the Chancellor to his first Senate meeting. He was greeted with applause. He expressed pleasure on the occasion because he “grew up academically in a faculty senate.” He looked forward to his role in talking about a wonderful institution and reporting on recent developments and future issues. The warm welcome that he and his family received in coming to Green Bay had deeply impressed them. He reciprocates the enthusiasm he has found in this welcome.

The Chancellor reported on several **searches** underway:

- **Athletics Director.** The search, ably directed by Professor Donna Ritch and supported by university and community Search Committee members, has concluded with an appointment. Four strong, but very different, finalists forced the institution to focus on its priorities. The consensus choice was Ken Bothof, from St. Louis University. The Chancellor checked with the community to see how this appointment would be received, given two very good local candidates. We and the community are looking for new vision in the program.
- **Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.** The Search Committee is being formed. A search firm will be engaged, because the position is so important and because this kind of administrative position is becoming difficult to fill because of a national supply and demand problem caused by administrative retirements and reduced interest in pursuing administrative tracks in higher education.
- **Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.** This will be scheduled to conclude about a month after the Provost search to enable the new Provost to take part in the decision. Both Provost and Dean searches should be concluded by the end of the academic year.

We have pulled back from our initial attempt to treat **Campus Life in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century** projects as a single package. Our priorities need to be clear. The **Union and the Phoenix Sports Center** are first on the list. Those facilities are inadequate. Students have agreed to tax themselves significantly to improve them. The Sports Center is an embarrassment. Many high schools have better facilities. Sports facilities are important for recruiting students and faculty. The current locker rooms and training facilities, moreover, do not support a Division One athletics program.

The **Events Center** is controversial. Our proposal was seen in the community, justifiably, as competing with the Resch Center. We don't want to compete. We didn't have a business plan in our initial proposal to operate an Events Center. The only way to have operated the Center would have been to compete directly with the Resch Center to bring events to the campus. We have a continuing need for community support, and this would discourage it. We do need a facility to accommodate our commencements, and students want a place for concerts. We need a facility for women's basketball and other sports. We don't need a 7,500 seat arena. Our new plan will call for an Events Center with 3-4,000 movable seats. The Chancellor invited comments and suggestions.

He put off remarks on the **Learning Experience** until the Faculty Meeting that would follow the Senate's session, but he wanted to raise two issues that were emerging from discussions he has had on campus as he seeks to meet and talk individually with everyone:

- **General Education.** We lack a coherent program. We have some skills courses and a breadth requirement. We need to take a comprehensive look at this. As a faculty that prides itself on a commitment to innovative undergraduate instruction, we have to ask if this General Education program is worthy of our aspirations. The faculty needs to come together and ask basic questions about what outcomes we expect for our graduates. What, given our academic objectives, is best for our students? There may be fear that such a question could threaten resources in some academic programs. To head off such a concern we should begin with the ground rule that no academic program would lose regular faculty positions as a result of the development of a new General Education Program. The Senate should begin this review with an enabling resolution to create a body with a charge to carry it out. The faculty needs to take ownership of this.
- **Governance.** A general review is in order here as well. We have a very complicated system. It can be hard to address issues, especially those that cut across the interests of Academic Staff and Faculty. Should we have an integrated assembly including staff and faculty? Or separate governance bodies? He has worked in institutions with both models. The question is posed. The answer is not. There are also questions about the reporting relationship between major committees and councils and the Faculty Senate. Additionally the ways we are organized at disciplinary and interdisciplinary levels may not be optimal. These issues suggest that it would be valuable to undertake a constitutional level review of governance.
- 

## ACTION ITEMS

### 1. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees

Senator Heuer moved and Senator Galt seconded a resolution to grant degrees to the students who have completed their programs in time for the Winter 2001 Commencement. The motion passed unanimously.

### 2. Changes in Requirements for Honors Presented by Professor David Littig

A resolution prepared by the University Committee had been distributed. Littig summarized its purposes. There is no change in *cum laude* or *magna cum laude* criteria. The *summa cum laude* designation is changed. At the present time students graduate *summa cum laude* when they have a 3.75 GPA and have completed an honors project. The honors project requirement will be eliminated. The GPA is raised to 3.85. (Part A of the resolution). Because honors projects are currently conducted within interdisciplinary programs some students have felt themselves unqualified to carry them out when they have only minors in these programs. Hundreds of students who qualified by virtue of GPAs in recent years did not undertake honors projects. The new criteria for cumulative GPA will require 60 credits in residence and no longer exempt UW Colleges transfers from this standard (Part B of the resolution). Honors projects for distinction in the major will be retained, to be renamed "honors in the major," and criteria for this are provided (Part C of the resolution).

### Senator Abbott moved and Senator Heuer seconded adoption of Parts A and B.

Senator Galt wanted to make sure that students will be adequately recognized for honors work. Will it be announced at graduation and included in transcripts? We shouldn't do anything to discourage student honors projects. These are extremely valuable. Senator Furlong was concerned that raising the GPA standard for *summa cum laude* would limit our ability to recognize some of our best students. Couldn't we modify the proposal to 3.85 or 3.75 with honors in the major? Senator Kubsch agreed. Abbott spoke against this, saying that the GPA criterion was clear and sufficient, and honors projects in the major provided an adequate opportunity for recognizing exceptional students.

Furlong moved to **amend the resolution**, adding the phrase “or 3.75 with successful completion of honors in the major” after “3.85 or higher” in bullet three of Part A of the resolution. Galt seconded the amendment. Put to a vote, the **amendment carried 15 in favor, 11 opposed, with no abstentions**.

The **amended resolution carried, 15 in favor, two opposed, with four abstentions**.

Parts A and B having been adopted, Abbott **moved adoption of Part C**, seconded by Senator Mannino. Senator Aldrete suggested that, because such projects are important and we should encourage students to do them, perhaps the GPA should be lowered. No one responded to the suggestion, the vote was taken, and the **resolution carried, 24 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions**.

### DISCUSSION ITEM

#### 1. **Policy for Granting B.A. and B.S. Degrees** Presented by Professor David Littig

The matter had been discussed previously as an information item. The University Committee revised the proposal on the basis of that discussion. The faculty of major programs will be given responsibility to assign a degree title to their graduates, subject to Senate approval. The B.A. degree will be the default if the program does not make a recommendation. Programs may also request the Senate to permit students to choose their own degree titles, subject to the approval of an advisor. Students with two majors will choose which is their first major and that will determine the degree title. Littig was asked to clarify several matters and did so. Students who receive two degrees will have separate designations for each.

Senators were invited to pose additional questions with the promise that the University Committee will obtain answers for the next Senate meeting when the item will appear for action.

### INFORMATION ITEM

#### 1. **Report of the Provost**

Provost Pollis summarized recent highlights from the **Student Affairs area**, including sponsorship of an expanded Leadership Series. Applications for admission of new freshmen are up 10 percent with a record number of housing contracts. Transfer applications have been closed, the earliest ever. The number of judicial affairs cases is up. Student Support Services has obtained additional grant funding. The women’s basketball team has been ranked number one nationally in Division One for its grade point average (3.48). The Student Government Association has appointed a committee to study our needs for a Child Care Center and identify our options. The Provost also mentioned the appearance of the report of a study conducted by the American Association of Higher Education on **Post-Tenure Review**. We were one of the institutions studied. The report shows we lack clarity about the purposes of post-tenure review and its outcomes since it was adopted here in 1993. It is a sobering report and a good starting point for us to reexamine this issue.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by the Speaker at 3:58 p.m. in order to convene the general meeting of the faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

---

Faculty Senate Action Item #2, 11/14/01; Approved as Amended, Document #01-03, 11/14/01

## CHANGES IN REQUIREMENTS FOR HONORS

A proposal to change criteria for honors designation is as follows:

Part A: Honors requirements for students who earn baccalaureate degrees are:

- Cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average from 3.5 to 3.749 *[unchanged]*
- Magna cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average of 3.75 to 3.849 *[unchanged]*
- Summa cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average of 3.85 or higher **or 3.75 with successful completion of honors in the major** *[changes from 3.75 or higher; eliminates requirement of successful completion of a senior honors project (the xxx-484 course number is thus eliminated) in an interdisciplinary program]*

Part B: The cumulative grade point average must be achieved on the basis of a minimum of 60 regularly graded (not P/NC or audit) credits taken in-residence at UW-Green Bay. *[eliminates a special provision for students with associate degrees from UW-Colleges]*

If the above proposal is approved, then a further proposal is

Part C: *“The title of all xxx-478 courses be changed from ‘Distinction in the Major’ to ‘Honors in the Major’ and the prerequisite is a minimum GPA of 3.5 for all courses required for the major, and a minimum of 3.75 for all upper-level courses required for the major.”*

---

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 12/12/01

## **POLICY FOR GRANTING B.A. AND B.S. DEGREES**

The Faculty Senate of University of Wisconsin-Green Bay endorses the following:

The faculty of each major shall transmit to the Faculty Senate for its approval the title of the degree to be awarded upon completion of each of their approved programs of study.

If the faculty of a major does not specify their choice of the degree to be awarded upon completion of one of their approved programs of study, the Registrar shall assign a B.A. to that program of study.

The faculty of a major may request permission from the Faculty Senate to allow its students a choice of the title of the degree with approval of their faculty advisor.

If a student completes the requirements for two or more majors, the student shall select one of the majors as his/her first major. The title of their degree shall be that of the first major.

Faculty Senate Information Item #1, 12/12/01

## **Proposal to Revise the Policy on the Double Counting of Upper-Division Credits and Establish a Minimum Number of Upper-Level Credits**

The University Committee received a memorandum dated October 16, 2001, from Interim Provost Pollis recommending a change to UW-Green Bay's policy on double counting of credits and establishing a minimum number of upper-division credits required for graduation. The recommended change of the double counting policy reflects the desire to eliminate administrative and student tracking of credit requirements for the fulfilling of major and minor degrees. Whereas the University Committee achieved consensus with regard to the above change (Part A of the proposal below), there was considerable debate regarding changes in the minimum number of upper-division credits required for graduation. Arguments ranged from having no requirements to the recommended 30 credits, to a graduated system that increases the number of upper-division credits based upon the number of majors and/or minors selected by the student. The rationales spanned the desire to offer students maximum flexibility to holding degree requirements to high standards. Thus, Part B of this proposal has several options.

### **Part A:**

“For the purpose of satisfying course requirements for all majors, minors, and certificate programs there shall be no restrictions on how any course can satisfy multiple requirements.”

### **Part B:**

**Option a:** “There shall be no minimum number of upper-division credits required for graduation. All students must complete 120 credits in order to graduate.”

**Option b:** “All students will complete a minimum of 30 upper-division credits of the 120 credits required for graduation.”

**Option c:** “The number of upper-division credits required to graduate is dependent upon students' choices of major/minor combinations. Students must take a least one interdisciplinary major or minor or professional major to fulfill the requirements toward graduation. All students must complete 120 credits in order to graduate.

**Students who take a single major:** 30 upper-division credits with a minimum of 24 credits in the major.

**Students who take one major and a minor:** 36 upper-division credits within the major and minor.

**Students who take two majors:** 42 upper-division credits within the majors.

## **EXPLANATION OF CURRENT DOUBLE COUNTING POLICY**

**Support level:** Supporting credits/courses between a major and a minor may not be duplicated unless they exceed the minimum of six unduplicated credits for each major or minor. In other words, there must be at least six unique credits in both programs for a total of 12 unique credits. The same is true of supporting credits between two minors (6 each) and between two majors (6 each)

• between major and major: 12 unduplicated credits

• between major and minor: 12 unduplicated credits

ÿ between minor and minor: 12 unduplicated credits

Example:

**Minor in Environmental Sciences:**

**Minor in Psychology**

Required:

Required:

362-102 Intro to Environ Science – 3 credits 820-102 Intro to Psychology

600-260 Introductory Stats – 4 credits 600-260 Introductory Stats **or** 255-204

Assuming a student with both minors wouldn't want to take both math and social science statistics, they would have to add one more support course to either one of the minors to reach the double counting rule. Similar problems exists between minors in Env Science and Sociology, and also with minors in Psychology and Sociology. There exists the *potential* for problems between minors in Geography and Urban & Regional Studies, History and Humanistic Studies, History and SCD, Sociol and SCD and Political Science and Public Administration.

I found only one potential problem at the support level with a major and minor (see example below) and NO problems between majors and majors.

**Psychology Major**

**HUD Minor**

Required 820-102

Choose One: 481-210 or 820-102

Choose one: 255-205 or 600-260

Choose One: 156-100, 478-102 or 900-202

Choose one: 478-102 or 478-313

**Upper-Level:** Within the minima, upper-level credits between a major and minor may not be duplicated. The major requires 24 unduplicated upper-level credits. The minor requires 12 unduplicated upper-level credits for a total of 36 unique upper-level credits. Upper-level credits in excess of 24 minimum for a major and 12 for a minor may be duplicated.

Example:

Major in Biology requires 24 upper-level credits which is the minimum.

Minor in Environmental Science requires 12 credits which is the minimum.

Although 362-363 meets a requirement in both the major and minor above, it can't be double counted because both programs are at the university minimum.

·Within the minima, six upper-level credits may be duplicated between two majors.

Example:

Major in Political Science requires 24 upper-level credits (minimum).

Major in Public Administration requires 24 upper-level credits.

A student could use the following two courses for both majors.

835-406 State and Local Government

835-378 Environmental Law

- Within the minima, upper-level credits between minors may not be double counted. In other words, there must be 12 unique upper-level credits in each minor.

Example:

### **Upper-level Psych minor- 15 crs**

820-306 Psych of Perception

820-330 Social Psych

481-331 Infancy & Early Childhood

820-435 Abnormal Behavior

820-401 Psych of Women

### **Upper-level Hum Dev minor-12 crs**

481-331 Infancy & Early Childhood

481-332 Middle Childhood

481-343 Adulthood & Aging

481-345 Human Sexuality

In the above example, it is permissible to have 481-331 count in both minors because 12 unique credits exist in both.

In summary:

University minimum requirements at the upper level:

ÿ major and a minor: 36 unduplicated upper level credits

ÿ major and major: 42 unduplicated upper level credits

minor and minor: 24 unduplicated upper level credits

### *Attachment A*

## **Upper-Level Credit Requirement to graduate from other Universities**

UW-Stevens Point – 40 credits required at the 300-400 level

UW-LaCrosse – 40 credits .....

UW-EauClaire – 43 credits .....

Central Michigan University – 40 .....

UW-Madison – 60 credits at the intermediate, advanced or intermediate/advanced level. (note: this does not exclude 100 and 200 level courses)

University of Minnesota – None

St. Norbert College– None

DePaul University – None

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill – None

Northern Michigan- None, however they do have the following double counting rule.....

## Double Counting Rule

Students cannot use the same course to fulfill a requirement in more than one major, or a major and a minor, or in more than one minor.

1. If a course is required for both a major and a minor, the major requirement will take precedence over the minor and an appropriate substitution must be made in the minor with the written approval of the minor department.
2. If a course is required in two majors or two minors, the first designated major or minor will take precedence over any subsequent major or minor and appropriate substitutions must be made with the written approval of the head of the second major or minor department.

## Upper-level credit total from May 2001 grads with selected interdisciplinary majors

(no minors)

HUD – 37

HUD – 63

HUD – 34

HUS – 52

Individual Major – 37

Individual Major – 30

Info Sci – 48

SCD – 46

SCD – 32

COA – 39

COA – 42

Env Sci – 45

Urban & Reg - 38

## Research on Double Counting

Institute Research, 9/13/2001

In May 2001, UW-Green Bay graduated 258 undergraduate students who started in Fall 1996 or later and who completed the great majority of their course work at this campus. Students who transferred more than 6 credits in to UW-Green Bay have been excluded from this summary. Those 258 students completed 302 majors. That is, 44 students, or 17% of the 258 students, completed a double major. The following five tables summarize information about the 302 majors completed by this relative select set of students (e.g. largely “traditional” freshmen).

Table 1 shows that the average student in this study completed 55.9 upper division credits, which represented 42% of all of the credits they completed. Upper division credits completed range

from a low of 25 to a high of 100. Students who complete a single interdisciplinary major have the lowest average number and percent of upper division credits. Students who earn a major and one or more minors complete more upper division credits. Within this category, there is almost no difference in the credit-completion patterns between disciplinary and interdisciplinary majors. Students who complete two majors, with or without additional minors, complete the most upper division credits.

**Table 1 [Number of Upper Division Credits by Type of Major/Minor]**

Type of array completed	Majors in this type	Percent of all majors	Upper Division Credits Completed			
			Mean Number	Minimum Number	Maximum Number	Mean Percent
Single interdisciplinary major	48	16%	43.8	25	100	33%
Single interdisciplinary major and one or more minors	111	33%	57.7	30	90	43%
Single disciplinary major and one or more minors	55	18%	55.3	30	86	41%
Two majors, with or without additional minors	88	29%	60.8	45	86	46%
Total	302	100%	55.9	25	100	42%

If UW-Green Bay decided to set a minimum requirement for upper division credits, the number of students impacted would, of course, depend on where the University established the minimum (see table 2). A minimum requirement of 30 or more credits would impact 1% of graduates under our current policies. A minimum requirement of 40 or more credits would impact 9% of graduates. The majority (75%) of students who would be negatively impacted would be those who have completed a single interdisciplinary major. They would be required to complete more of their electives in upper level courses whereas they currently have greater latitude when deciding how to complete those electives.

Table 3 shows that the types of program options students typically complete are not independent of the academic area of the major. In the Humanities, students are most likely to complete a disciplinary major and a minor. In Natural Sciences, the most common pattern is to complete a single interdisciplinary major. For example, in this particular sample of students, 61% of 18 Human Biology majors and 38% of 16 Environmental Science majors completed no additional majors or minors. In the Social Sciences, the most common pattern is for students to complete two majors. For example, double majors were completed by 59% of the Human Development

**Table 2 [If Minimum Requirement of Upper-Level Credits]**

Type of array completed	Majors in this type	Percent completing 24 - 30	Percent completing 31 - 40	Percent completing 41 - 50	Percent completing 51 - 60	Percent completing 61 - 70	Percent completing 71 - 100
Single interdisciplinary major	48	6%	38%	31%	15%	8%	2%
Single interdisciplinary major and one or more minors	111	0%	4%	19%	37%	26%	14%
Single disciplinary major and one or more minors	55	0%	5%	38%	24%	16%	16%
Two majors, with or without additional minors	88	0%	0%	14%	41%	27%	18%
Total	302	1%	8%	23%	32%	22%	14%

majors, 63% of the Public Administration majors, 63% of the Political Science majors, 75% of the Social Change and Development majors and 76% of the Psychology majors. The most common pattern for the professional programs is completing an interdisciplinary major and a minor. Both the Business Administration major and the Elementary Education major both require that students complete a minor, and those large programs dominate the summary for the Professional Studies area. Interestingly, none of the 22 Elementary Education graduates and only 10% of the 48 Business Administration graduates completed a second major rather than a minor. None of the nursing graduates completed any additional programs. 40% of the Social Work graduates completed an additional minor (and none completed an additional major).

**Table 3 [Type of Degree by Area]**

Area of Major	Students	Percent of majors from this academic area completing:			
		Single interdisciplinary major	Single interdisciplinary major and one or more minors	Single disciplinary major and one or more minors	Two majors, with or without additional minors
Humanities	59	12%	24%	37%	27%
Natural Sciences	61	31%	15%	30%	24%
Social Sciences	83	6%	23%	13%	58%
Professional Studies	97	15%	71%	4%	9%
Individual Major(1)	2	100%	-	-	-
Total	302	16%	33%	18%	29%

- (1) There are no Interdisciplinary Studies graduates from the Extended Degree Program included in this report. They do not typically graduate in five years or less, and very transfer in a large amount of course work.

Table 4 suggests that for all areas except Professional Studies the number of upper division credits a student completes is mostly a function of how many majors and minors are completed. That is, the averages do not vary much between the Humanities, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences. The number of upper division credits completed by students in Professional Studies is, however, much larger in all categories except the Nursing and Social Work students who complete a single interdisciplinary major.

**Table 4 [Upper-Division Credits by Major]**

Area of Major	Average Upper Division Credits, by Area	Average Upper Division Credits, by Area and type:			
		Single interdisciplinary major	Single interdisciplinary major and one or more minors	Single disciplinary major and one or more minors	Two majors, with or without additional minors
Humanities	52.6	39.4	48.0	54.0	60.6
Natural Sciences	50.7	42.3	49.1	54.0	58.4
Social Sciences	54.1	45.2	50.5	50.0	57.4
Professional Studies	63.2	48.3	62.7	82.8 (1)	83.6
Individual Major	35.5	35.5	-	-	-
Total	55.9	43.8	57.7	55.3	60.8

- (1) The only professional program categorized as a disciplinary major is Accounting, which requires 71 upper division credits and an additional interdisciplinary program. The average of 82.8 is what one would expect based on University policy: 71 upper division credits from Accounting and an additional 12 unduplicated upper-division credits from a minor.

Table 5 provides one final piece of information: time to degree. Overall, 56% of the majors included in this analysis were completed in four years or less. Over two-thirds of students who

chose to complete a single interdisciplinary major completed their work in four years. The highest percent is found in the Humanities, where 86% of 19 students in this area and type graduated within four years. Adding a minor to an interdisciplinary major drops the four-year graduation rate from 67% to 59%. In this study, more students who completed double majors got done in four years than students who completed a disciplinary major and a minor (57% versus 38%). The very low four-year graduation rates for the Professional Studies areas in some of the types (25% and 11%) might help explain why relatively few students in that academic areas complete second majors.

**Table 5 [Time of Degree]**

Area of Major	Percent Graduating in Four Years or Less	Four-year Graduation Rate, by Area and type:			
		Single interdisciplinary major	Single interdisciplinary major and one or more minors	Single disciplinary major and one or more minors	Two majors, with or without additional minors
Humanities	53%	86%	57%	36%	56%
Natural Sciences	51%	63%	67%	39%	40%
Social Sciences	63%	40%	58%	45%	71%
Professional Studies	56%	73%	59%	25%	11%
Individual Major	50%	50%	-	-	-
Total	56%	67%	59%	38%	57%

Faculty Senate Information Item #2, 12/12/01

## PROPOSAL

### Admissions standards – New Freshmen

#### *Objective*

*Modify admission standards to refine the admission process targeted toward improved retention.*

#### *Guidelines*

- Admit a percentage based on a combination of factors which, when taken together, indicate a high probability of success. (Regular admission)
- Admit a percentage based on sufficiently strong academic preparation and/or performance indicating a high probability of success. (Priority admission)
- Deny applicants whose academic preparation and/or performance as well as other factors indicates the least likely probability of success.
- Continue to recruit and provide enrollment opportunities for targeted and programmatically desired students.

#### *Standards*

- **17 high school units** of college preparatory or academic coursework.

- **Minimum institutional standards\*** -- Students below either of the academic standards will be denied admission.

High School G.P.A (cumulative) = 2.25

**AND**

ACT score = 17

\* Minimum institutional standards may be waived for students who qualify and participate in the E.O.P. program.

- **Regular admissions** – Create an index based on the factors noted below; admit highest ranking indices based on established targets.
  - Academic preparation (High school G.P.A, test score)
  - Academic challenge (AP courses, Math level, foreign language)
  - Engagement (extra and co-curricular achievement and leadership)
  - Contribution to UW-Green Bay (institutional target groups, interest/motivation)
- **Priority admission** -- Students at or above designated academic standards\*\* will be admitted.

High School G.P.A (cumulative) = 3.25

**OR**

ACT score = 23

\*\* Specific standards for G.P.A and A.C.T. are subject to change by the Assistant Dean for Enrollment Management based on the applicant pool and enrollment circumstances.

*Recommended by the Enrollment Management Committee -- May 31, 2001*

## **A Review of Institutional Research on Admission Standards for New Freshmen**

In the past three years, UW-Green Bay's Enrollment Management Committee (EMC) has explored the implications of relying heavily on applicants' high school class ranks during the admission process. During the past year, the EMC specifically explored the issue of developing admission standards that would support the goals of improved retention and graduation rates. In Spring 2001, the EMC drafted a proposal for a new set of admission standards for new freshmen. This report highlights the research that led to and supports the new standards.

### **Minimum institutional standards**

UW-Green Bay is not in a position to fully meet the needs of all potential students. Students with weak academic preparation are and have been encouraged to attend a UW College.

The comprehensive schools in the UW System publish minimum standards of scholastic achievement

(See: [uwhelp.wisconsin.edu/admin/Rankfram.htm](http://uwhelp.wisconsin.edu/admin/Rankfram.htm)):

1. Seven schools directly admit students based on class ranks (including UW Green Bay)
2. Four schools admit using both high school rank and ACT score
3. UW-Eau Claire, UW-La Crosse and UW-River Falls use both and have some of the highest second year retention rates among the comprehensives school.

The proposal suggests setting minimum standards for the ACT score (17) and the high school G.P.A.(2.25).

1. Predicting scholastic performance is more effective when using multiple measures.
2. High school G.P.A. has the greatest correlation with retention into the second year.
3. Research shows that students with “imbalances” between their ACT scores and high school G.P.A.s may be at most risk for poor performance, and suggests that evaluating both measures will be useful.
4. The percent of students who are successful in their first semester and who are retained into their second year jumps from 9% for students with an ACT score of 16 to 24% for students with an ACT score of 17
5. NCAA requirements for regular admission for student athletes correspond to an ACT score of 17.
6. In recent years, only about 2% of new students had high school G.P.A.s lower than 2.25. Only 20% of them have been successful in the first semester and retained into the second year, compared to 58% of the students with at least a 2.25.
7. Alternatives:
  - a. Students failing to have both of the minima who qualify for the special services provided by E.O.P. may still be admitted, after that program individually reviews their applications.
  - b. Students who are not eligible for E.O.P. can begin their college careers at a UW college and transfer to UW-Green Bay after proving their abilities.

For additional information see: [www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm](http://www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm).

### **Elimination of use of high school rank**

The proposal moves away from reliance on the high school class rank as an admission criterion.

1. High school rank lacks reliability. (e.g. students with similar preparation and achievement have different high school ranks due to variance in size and quality of schools, not ability).
2. High school rank lacks predictive validity for UW-Green Bay.
3. Many high schools districts no longer rank their students.

For additional information see: [www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCVariableComparison.htm](http://www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCVariableComparison.htm)

### **Regular Admissions -- index**

The proposal suggests creating an index based on four categories of factors: academic preparation, academic challenge, extra- and co-curricular activities, and contribution to UW-Green Bay's campus life and mission.

1. Research revealed that several non-cognitive factors are statistically related to retention here at UW-Green Bay.
2. Inclusion of academic challenge is based on:
  - a. National research has documented that the rigor of a student's high school curriculum is a very important predictor of college success.
  - b. Research on data collected from UW-Green Bay students when they take the ACT exam found that some measures of academic challenge do relate to retention.
3. Inclusion of extra- and co-curricular activities is based on:
  - a. Research on the results from the national survey of non-cognitive factors found significant differences for students with strong leadership experiences and involvement in community service.
  - b. Research on UW-Green Bay students using the ACT survey found that engagement relates positively to performance.
4. The Learning Experience Initiative highlights the connection between academic performance and wider engagement in the campus and Green Bay communities.
5. Inclusion of potential contribution to the campus community reflects the campus's commitment to diversity and other enrollment goals.

One model of assigning students points based on academic challenge, extra-curricular and diversity components showed that these extra factors do relate positively to student performance and retention.

For additional information, see:

[www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCVariableComparison.htm](http://www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCVariableComparison.htm).  
[www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm](http://www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm).

**Answers in the Toolbox: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelor's Degree Attainment**, by Clifford Adelman, June 1999, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

### **Priority Admission**

The proposal suggests that students with high ACT scores or high school G.P.A.s will be admitted on a priority basis, without indexing the additional factors referenced above.

1. Students with high academic achievement have very high levels of retention and academic performance.
2. Evaluating the additional factors will take staff time, especially in the first years.
3. Being able to publish some criteria reflecting a 'guaranteed' admission for high-quality applicants is important, especially in the UW-System.

The proposal suggests initially providing priority admission to students with an ACT of 23 or a high school G.P.A. of 3.25 -- the average values from our recent cohorts of new freshmen. Over time, specific levels used to decide who will receive priority admission will be modified based on research, qualifications of the applicant pool, and enrollment circumstances.

For additional information see: [www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm](http://www.uwgb.edu/iresearch/enroll/EMCWorkingPaper.htm)

08/22/01- DF/SN









