

70-15,006

CAREY, Terrence Joseph, 1923-
EDUCATIONAL PATTERNS AND REACTIONS OF
MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS
DENIED ADMISSION TO MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

EDUCATIONAL PATTERNS AND REACTIONS OF
MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE
STUDENTS DENIED ADMISSION TO
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By ⁰⁵⁴h
Terrence J. Carey

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL PATTERNS AND REACTIONS OF MICHIGAN PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS DENIED ADMISSION TO MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Terrence J. Carey

The Problem

The rapid growth of the community college on the American higher education scene has created the problem of providing for the continuing education of community college students following the completion of their two year programs.

Admissions officers are deeply concerned with the need for improved articulation between community colleges and four year institutions so that students are able to achieve the best possible "fit" as they seek to transfer from the two year colleges to four year colleges and universities. In order to accomplish this, a better understanding of the requirements of the four year institutions by community college counselors and students, a better knowledge by all concerned of the types of higher education available in Michigan and the proper placement of students are necessary if Michigan is to realize its educational objectives. This paper was written in an effort to promote that knowledge and understanding.

Methods and Procedures

A study was made of all Michigan residents who both sought admission as transfer students from the public community colleges to Michigan State

University in the fall of 1968 and who were denied admission. The study sought to determine whether most of these students do find a place in Michigan's system of higher education and are able to complete their baccalaureate degrees in one of the other four year institutions in the State.

Background information for these students was obtained from the admissions folders providing academic records, credits, recommendations, and some aptitudinal information in the form of test scores and high school ranks. Attitudinal information was obtained through a questionnaire sent to all of the 209 students in the study. This questionnaire provided information about student reaction to their community college preparation, the counseling they received, both at the community college and from Michigan State admissions officers and the effects on their educational objectives of a negative admission by Michigan State.

An additional questionnaire was sent to the community colleges requesting information on the educational status of the nonrespondents to the student questionnaire.

Findings and Recommendations

The results were heartening. Over 76 percent of the students responded and the responses proved that most of these students (over 80 percent) were indeed continuing their education after our not admit decision, and over 70 percent were enrolled in one of the public four year colleges or universities. The responses also showed that there was a definite need for a better understanding of requirements of and levels of competition in the four year colleges and for improved articulation between the community colleges and the four year institutions if the proper "fit" in Michigan's system of higher education is to be achieved by transfer students.

Comments made by the students also proved helpful and have caused some immediate changes in procedures by the Office of Admissions and Scholarships at Michigan State University. Among these are: (1) a definite attempt will be made to clarify the type of decision rendered and its meaning; (2) students in both high school and community college will be apprised of the need to complete two full years in community college before seeking transfer to a four year college or university.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all those who helped make possible the completion of this thesis.

My Doctoral Committee has been more than anyone could ask for, especially Dr. Edward Blackman, who provided so much assistance with the writing of this document.

To my colleagues in the Office of Admissions and Scholarships and to Dr. Gordon Sabine, my deepest thanks. Without their assistance and cooperation I could not have found the time to do the research and the writing.

I am deeply indebted to my secretary, Mrs. Jean Witherill, for the many hours she spent typing and retyping the material in this study. It is impossible to imagine the completion of this thesis without her help.

Lastly, my everlasting thanks to my understanding wife, Trix, and the boys, who have patiently borne with me during what must have seemed like an endless ordeal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
--------------------------	---

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Significance of the Problem	7
Historical Background	7
The Admissions Process	11
Student Aptitude, Preparation, Socio-economic Factors, and Goals	16
Academic Success - Failure	23
Articulation	28
III. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY	33
The Not Admit Transfer Student	34
A. General Background Information	35
B. Aptitude and Preparation	36
C. Attitudes	37
D. Effects	38
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	41
A. General Background Information	42
B. Aptitude and Preparation	44
C. Attitudes	50
D. Effects	55
V. RECORDED COMMENTS	60
A. Effect of Commuting, Work and Home Environment	60
B. Reactions to Community College	61
C. Reactions to MSU's Method of Rejection	62

V.	RECORDED COMMENTS (Continued)	
D.	Wrong Decision, Feeling that the Student Could Have Made the Grade at MSU.	63
E.	Campus Unrest	65
F.	Dissatisfaction with Counseling	66
G.	Appreciation of Our Interest, Planning to Reapply in the Future	69
H.	Correct Decisions	71
I.	Stimulus for Future Success	71
VI.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	73
	Recommendations.	76
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIX A:	Exhibit of Questionnaire Sent to Not Admit Michigan Community College Students, Fall Term, 1968	83
APPENDIX B:	Exhibit of First and Second Letter to Not Admit Transfer Students From Michigan Community Colleges.	85
APPENDIX C:	Exhibit of Third Letter to Not Admit Transfer Students From Michigan Community Colleges	86
APPENDIX D:	Exhibit of Letter Sent to Community Colleges Requesting Information About Students.	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Aptitude Test Scores	45
2. Comparison of High School Ranks.	46
3. Community College Records of the Transfer Applicants and the Type of Not Admit Decision Received.	48

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When an admissions officer at Michigan State University finds it necessary to render a not admit decision to a prospective student, it is highly desirable to have some positive alternate course of action to which he may counsel the applicant. The concerned admissions officer must have all possible information relative to these educational alternatives if he is to properly carry out his counseling function.

The high school senior who is denied admission to Michigan State is urged to enroll in his community college or another accredited college, but how does the admissions officer counsel the transfer student seeking admission to MSU from community college? Hopefully, this study will provide some of the information necessary to help counsel such students and to improve articulation between those counseling in the community colleges and counselors in the four year institutions.

The purpose of this study is to determine what happens to those prospective transfer students from Michigan's publicly supported community colleges who were denied admission to Michigan State University. Hopefully, the study will show that this denial of admission to one university does not terminate the academic ambitions of these students, and that they are able to find a place elsewhere in Michigan's system of higher education to continue their educational endeavors.

The better understanding of the requirements of the four year institutions by community college counselors and students and a better knowledge

by all concerned of the types of higher education available in Michigan are needed if students are to achieve the best possible "fit" in that system of higher education. It is hoped that this paper will help promote that understanding and knowledge.

The growth of the community college is one of the most important trends in American higher education in this century. The state of Michigan has played a prominent role in this growth.¹⁴ Today there are 29 public community colleges in the State with 24 of these already sending transfer students to Michigan State University. It is apparent that two year institutions, particularly community colleges, will absorb an increasing percentage of students who continue their education beyond high school.^{10:iii} The rapid growth of this segment of our state system of higher education (from 1960 to 1969, enrollments in Michigan public community colleges have increased from 27,229 to well over 100,000), coupled with increased selectivity on the part of the four year colleges, at all levels, creates a transfer problem. To solve the problem of proper placement of transfer students, it becomes mandatory that admissions officers do everything possible to keep the transfer students and the community colleges continually informed of any changes in the four year programs of the University, including changes in the quality of our "native" lower division students.

One of the tragedies of higher education today is the unrealistic choice of a college, or sometimes even a major within a college, by many prospective students. This is true at both the freshman and transfer levels. It is tragic because, with better counseling and improved articulation between the community colleges and the receiving institutions, much of the frustration and failure might be eliminated. Unfortunately, there are still too many students seeking admission to colleges or programs for which they are ill prepared.²

If an admissions office is to fulfill its responsibilities to its constituents, it must render the most honest decision possible after all criteria have been examined, provide proper counseling, and work as closely as possible with the community colleges. If the admissions office is to play a professional part in the college-to-college educational process, then admission research activity and data are, and must be, a constant and pressing responsibility of the admissions office.^{22:349}

This study will concern itself with all Michigan students who sought transfer to Michigan State University from Michigan public community colleges in the fall of 1968 and who were denied admission.

The study should provide a better knowledge of the "not admit" transfer student and in turn enable admissions officers to do a better job of counseling, aid them in the decision-making process, and also serve as a basis for improved articulation between the community colleges and the four year institutions.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The following definitions of terms are used frequently in this study. In an effort to make the reading of this work more understandable, a short explanation of their meaning is included.

Admission: Acceptance of an applicant for enrollment in a school or other educational institution.

Admissions Officer: A college or university officer who approves or disapproves the applications for enrollment of new students, in accordance with policies established by the faculty.

Admission Policy: The school policy that controls the standards for admission into school.

Admission Requirements: Specification of the educational and other experiences required of new students for admission to college; usually stated in terms of pattern and amount of credits, scores on standardized psychological and achievement examinations, age, and sometimes length of residence.

Community College: An educational institution offering instruction for persons beyond the age of the normal secondary school pupil, in a program geared particularly to the needs and interests of the local area; credit courses rarely extend beyond the level of the second year of college; extensive offerings of a noncredit character are usually provided; control and support are preponderantly local.

Four Year College: A college offering a four year curriculum above the high school level.

Interview: A consultation or face to face meeting.

Native Student: A junior or senior student in a university who has spent his freshman and sophomore years in that same university; a term used for purposes of comparison in studies of the success of former junior college students (transfer students) enrolled in the upper divisions of universities.

Questionnaire: A list of planned, written questions, related to a particular topic, with space provided for indicating the response to each question, intended for submission to a number of persons for reply.

Selective Admission: Admission of applicants to an educational institution by selection on the basis of legal residence or of predictive measures, or other criteria of scholastic aptitude, personal fitness, and probable future success.

Transfer Student: (1) a student who has withdrawn from one college and applies for admission to another; sometimes applied to students moving from one college to another within a university; syn. migrant student; (2) a junior college student who transfers to a four year college or university during or at the completion of his junior college course; the term is used in studies of the success of transfer students as opposed to native students.

Withdrawals: The act of a pupil leaving a school permanently. [This definition is somewhat severe; today many students withdraw and return to the same school at a later date.]

All of the above terms or definitions were taken from the same source:

Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1959.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Significance of the Problem

Very little has been written relative to what happens to the students denied admission to varying types of institutions. Consequently, much of the literature deals with areas related to the problem of the not admit transfer student but not with the basic problem itself. The writer feels that this study will provide a much needed insight into the problem and will improve articulation in an area where it is sadly lacking.

Frances DeLisle, in her study of transfer students, states:

The four year colleges and universities in Michigan have recently been reminded of their obligation to serve in "a partnership in education." Reference was made in particular to the necessity for providing readily available opportunities for transfer to upper divisions for the increasing numbers of students in the junior-community colleges. In essence, it was claimed that it makes little sense to promote educational programs, close to the home communities, unless the accommodations in the four year institutions kept pace. Paradoxically, as the need increases, the four year institutions have difficulty responding to unlimited and unpredictable numbers of applications especially those inflating the junior year enrollments. Consequently, some institutions have already established quotas for transfer students in order to maintain manageable totals. Moreover, more stringent requirements are in effect than were previously applied. The approach thus far has been that of temporary expedience with no resolution of the overall basic issues involved.^{5:1}

Historical Background

The community college is relatively new to the American educational scene. There were sporadic attempts to establish some type of education beyond high school, other than the existing four year institutions, in the

latter part of the 19th Century. University of Chicago President William Rainey Harper is credited with strongly influencing the foundation of several of the public junior colleges and obtaining the addition of two years to the high school program in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901. The Joliet Junior College is thus the oldest extant public, junior college.^{24:47} In the state of Michigan the first community-junior college was established in Grand Rapids in 1914. Growth of community colleges in Michigan was rather gradual from that point, with Highland Park Junior College being established in 1918, Flint Junior College and Port Huron Junior College entering the scene in 1923.²¹ The earlier colleges offering two years of education beyond high school were usually called "junior colleges." Today's two year colleges with their emphasis on serving all needs of the community are generally called "community colleges." Several of the early junior colleges in Michigan have later been established as separate community college districts and have dropped the junior college name and become community colleges. In this paper, the terms "junior college" and "community college" are used synonymously. The decades of the '50's and '60's have seen a rapid expansion both in enrollments and in the numbers of community colleges in Michigan to our present 28 community colleges. Today, the community colleges in Michigan enroll 32 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment for the entire state.¹⁴

The number of students enrolled from Michigan community colleges at Michigan State University has increased steadily during this same period, with phenomenal growth taking place during the last decade. In the fall of 1961, 491 new students from Michigan community colleges enrolled at MSU. This figure has continued to rise with 721 enrolling in 1962, 740 in 1963, 707 in 1964, 787 in 1965, 803 in 1966, 746 in 1967, and 901 in 1968.¹⁹ Since its foundation over a century ago, Michigan State University has

honored its commitment to the young people of the State by extending the opportunity for higher education to all who, in its judgment, have demonstrated the qualities necessary to benefit from it.^{3:11} The question of who has the ability to benefit from the type of education offered at Michigan State provides much of the reason for this study.

It is safe to assume that the number of students seeking admission from Michigan community colleges will continue to increase in future years. It is also the University's responsibility to work in the closest fashion with these community colleges to aid in making the transition of their students to four year institutions as smooth as possible. However, Michigan State does not plan to become essentially an upper-division and graduate university, like Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, Florida. The report of the Committee on Undergraduate Education at M.S.U. states, "The Committee neither envisages nor recommends the conversion of Michigan State University into a largely upper-level and graduate institution." ^{3:18} The Committee summarized its recommendations on transfer students as follows:

The Committee therefore recommends the continued development of the University's relationships with the two-year colleges in the State, accompanied by an organized effort to attract more of the very able transferring students.^{3:19}

While growth in enrollments in community colleges throughout the nation has been nothing short of phenomenal (presently around 800, with an addition of one new community college each week), this does not necessarily mean that the same growth will be reflected in the enrollments of the upper division of the four year institutions. Gleazer points out that while two thirds of the entering community college students indicate an intention to transfer, actually only one third transfer within a four year period. The numbers of community college students who transfer will likely

be large, but not nearly as large as the enrollment increases in the junior colleges.^{6:76} Mr. Gleazer's findings support the recommendations of the Committee on Undergraduate Education at Michigan State and serve to refute the idea put forth by Russell Lynes, that the community colleges will ultimately take over entirely the first two years of the four year colleges. There are a few schools currently accepting only upper division students, such as Florida Atlantic mentioned above and the University of Michigan's Dearborn campus. Their students will all be transfer students. At the time of this writing, however, this approach to higher education appears to be still in the experimental stage.

Thresher points out that the American colleges and universities began the 20th Century with a rather restricted concept of the forces that did or should regulate admission to college. He also states that it was not until the development of the land-grant colleges and state college and university system that the true genius of the American version of higher education began to manifest itself.^{23:7} The position of Michigan State University relative to the admission of both freshmen and transfer students is ably set forth by Thresher when he states:

The land grant colleges and the state universities were the unique and characteristic contribution of America to the stream of higher education in the Western world. These, from the start, represented a philosophy, social and educational, and wide variance with the colonial college tradition. Theirs was much more nearly an "open door" policy, tempered by the common sense provisions to exclude those clearly unsuited or unready for higher education. That universities of great distinction and the highest intellectual standards have sprung from this tradition is by itself enough to give pause to those who have pushed selectivity in admission to even greater extremes.^{23:8}

The practice of designating an administrative officer to be concerned with admissions is also relatively new to the American education scene. Not until the 1930's were such officers at all prevalent, and their appearance on the scene coincided with the beginnings of selective admissions.

The growth of community colleges has been paralleled by the increase in selective admissions policies for many institutions. In the interest of the general welfare, it is very desirable that admissions officers and community colleges work together so that the American dream of providing an education for all capable of achieving its benefits may be realized.

The Admissions Process

Admission to a college or university is in large measure a subjective business. While it might be convenient to have rather arbitrary guidelines for community college counselors to follow, it must be remembered that admissions officers are dealing with individual human beings who do not neatly fit into rigid patterns.

While the Illinois Statewide Articulation Conference recommends that admissions standards should be stated in such a way that community college students would know at any time whether they would be eligible to transfer when they complete their lower-division program, such procedures are not very practical. The Commission goes on to suggest that a specific grade-point average for transfer should be stated by receiving institutions, as well as any subject matter and unit requirements which must be met.^{9:41}

Unfortunately, the publishing of a specific grade point average does not solve the problem; it only increases problems for both the sending and receiving institutions. Some years ago, as a general guideline, Michigan State University actually did put in print by a newsletter to community college counselors a minimum threshold of 2.5 for entering transfer students. This was met with all types of protest by the community colleges and was badly misinterpreted as being an arbitrary cut-off point. Admissions officers have learned that there is a vast difference in the quality of program and the competition for grades in the various community colleges

throughout a state. Other factors such as the trend in the grades of the student involved, the student's maturation, factors influencing his academic progress, and his inherent abilities must all be taken into consideration when admission is considered.

For prospective students, it is necessary to have an understanding of the academic characteristics of the college, including the level of competition, the severity of grading practices, the nature of academic probation and dismissal policies.^{8:4} The Knoell-Medsker reports indicate that more than half of the participating institutions in their study reported a significant change in the quality of the transfer students. In some cases this was a result of higher admissions standards in the four year colleges.^{10:78} The report further states that there are a variety of admissions thresholds for institutions, again making it mandatory that prospective students be well aware of these requirements at the time they seek admission. This report goes on to say that changes in admissions standards for transfer students are usually based on findings from local studies in which success after transfer was related to junior college grades, the number of units earned in junior college, and the eligibility for university admission at the freshman level.^{10:79}

As the quality of incoming freshmen students at the four year colleges improves, it is necessary to improve the quality of transfer students if these students are to compete successfully at the upper level. This means, then, that some students will be denied admission to a college or university simply because this is the only honest decision possible. With increased selectivity on the part of the four year colleges, we find entering the admissions scene the new position of college counselor in the community colleges. These counselors are given the responsibility of providing advice for students seeking to transfer to four year institutions and facilitating

such transfer. Such counseling should always be as objective as possible with the student's best interests the primary concern. Unfortunately, in some cases guidance counselors seem to have been forced into a role of facilitators in getting youngsters into the college of the parents' choice.^{16:289} This often is the case where students have been denied admission to the university at the freshman level and, because of parental pressures, seek admission as transfer students even though they may not yet be qualified.

The counseling function for the transfer student is well summed up by O'Connor when he states that:

The transfer student, in many cases, profits from guidance in selecting a college to continue his upper division study. The counselor will be asked to help him make the selection. All transfer students reasonably expect counselors to interpret the four year colleges in terms of admissions requirements, philosophy, prerequisites and subject matter.^{17:20}

O'Connor goes on to state that:

Vocational guidance is only as effective as it is realistic, current and meaningful to the student. A great many high school students enter junior college with hazy concepts of their vocational goals. Many of them who are not qualified will indicate intent to transfer to a four year college because they feel vocational programs lack prestige. They need realistic counseling and orientation to the world of industry and business which will help them discover their potential and reassure them of their worth to society and a non-professional career.^{17:20}

The number of students denied admission from the community college is actually smaller than one would imagine. This is probably due in part to the fact that as Thresher indicates, the colleges telegraph their "punches" by making known their standards and preferences. Potential applicants take these factors into account. Guidance counselors anticipate college action by steering elsewhere those likely to be marginal.^{23:39}

Thresher also states:

The moral for the admissions policy seems to be this: as a practical matter some floor has to be put under the level of preparation and apparent intellectual aptitude, in order to avoid tragic misfits. Even if the educational process is all wrong, we can't change it overnight.^{23:57, 58}

Thresher is also critical of the primitive device of application and reply. He advocates greater guidance and redirection in an effort to bring about the regrouping and classification of students.

Knoell and Medsker report an increase in pre-admissions testing of transfer students, but they feel that the test results will be used more for advisement and placement rather than for denying admission to students with normally satisfactory junior college records.^{11:22}

As four year colleges become more selective at the freshman level, they are also becoming aware of the necessity for examining their policies for admitting transfer students along at least two lines:

1. When should a junior college student be permitted to transfer to a four year college if he was not eligible for freshman admission? After one semester? After one year? After receiving his associate in arts degree? Or not at all?
2. What grade point average should the junior college transfer student be required to earn if the four year college is selective at the freshman level? Should the required average be tied to the grade point differential between the junior college and the first term grades after transfer? To a probability level of success after transfer? To native student performance?^{11:45}

All of these items come into play in making the admission decision and, unfortunately, there is no clear, concise answer.

The importance of proper counseling and selection is further brought out by Knoell and Medsker when they report that:

Although junior college students had fairly complete freedom in 1960 to choose among the public four year colleges to which they might want to transfer, a considerable amount of self selection took place in several states as a result of good counseling, articulation of programs and communication among the colleges about student performance. In some states even students with low junior college averages (between 2.0 and 2.2) were able to achieve their degree objectives, provided they chose a four year college which had a near zero differential with their junior college.^{11:56}

They further report that Michigan provides one such example. The mean junior college grade point average for all Michigan transfer students was among the lowest for the ten states included in the study. However, the average grades earned by transfer students in the Michigan universities were the highest among the ten states. Michigan also achieved the second best state record based on graduation and its attrition rates.^{11:56} Knoell and Medsker also deplore the policy of state universities of admitting transfer students on the basis of barely satisfactory junior college grades on the ground that all such students must be given an opportunity to attempt programs of their own choosing. They advocate higher or more selective admissions standards for transfer students, or more effective admissions counseling, or both. They feel that it will be short-sighted to expand junior colleges which are committed to an open door policy and then fail to take whatever steps are necessary to insure that transfer students from these colleges are admitted to institutions in which they can fulfill their degree goals.^{11:90}

The admission function is well summed up by Spence when he states that:

As colleges develop some degree of admissions selectivity, they have a concomitant responsibility to persuade unqualified students from applying as much as to encourage those with reasonable prospects of being admitted. The admissions office will develop and sharpen the descriptions of acceptable qualifications of applicants and communicate these to the guidance counselors for use with their students.^{22:352}

Thornton in The Community Junior College further amplifies the need for better counseling:

Until effective counseling procedures are developed to enable students to choose a college objective much more intelligently than they do, a large part of the efforts of the community junior colleges will be dissipated on students with unrealistic objectives.^{24:152}

The techniques of recommending transfer students require additional study. There is evidence that transfers with marginal grade records in junior college are often unable to succeed in large universities, even though similar students succeed in other institutions. Longterm persuasive counseling might help students to become aware of the differences between colleges, and aware of their own characteristics, so that they may make their choices much more realistically.^{24:282}

The preceding statements verify the fact that there is increasing selectivity on the part of four year institutions. The need for more and better admissions counseling by both the sending and receiving colleges becomes apparent as do the positive results that may be obtained when good counseling exists.

Student Aptitude, Preparation, Socio-economic Factors, and Goals.

In From Junior to Senior College, Knoell and Medsker make two assumptions that are important to this study:

1. Students going to junior college are probably different from those attending four year institutions as freshmen in their socio-economic characteristics, intellectual disposition, occupational interests, and ability to do college work;
2. Junior college grading standards may (and perhaps should) be different from those of many four year colleges because of differences in the students whom they serve and in the objectives they are expected to achieve.^{11:4}

Test results showed that although there was considerable overlap in the test scores of the native and transfer students, the high school graduates

who begin their work in the university as freshmen seem to have more academic aptitude and a greater readiness to undertake college work than those who entered a two year college.11:20

Admission experience indicates that past performance is by far the best predictor of academic success for all kinds of students. Since the vast majority of Michigan State University freshmen graduate in the top quartile of their high school class, it is important to compare this type of aptitude with that of students coming from community colleges. The latter are much more likely to have been in the second or third quartiles of their high school graduating class. Lavin asserts in The Prediction of Academic Performance:

Of all the measures used in these prediction batteries, the one that consistently emerges as the best single predictor is the high school average or high school rank. Illustrative is a study by Swenson. He found that students in the upper two-fifths of their graduating class in high school received significantly higher grades at the end of the first semester of college than students who graduated in the lower three-fifths of their high school class, even though these two groups did not differ on standard aptitude tests.12:52

Until community college students begin to produce academically at a much better level than they did in high school, they still should be considered as poor academic risks in a major university.

It is not the writer's intention to foster the idea that community colleges are easy to get into and easy to graduate from. According to B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education at U.C.L.A., and one of the authoritative voices in junior college education:

From two thirds to three quarters of the students who enter our junior colleges announce their intention to transfer to senior institutions, whereas less than one third actually continue their education beyond junior college graduation. Part of the explanation of this was given to me by a student: "Colleges like this are easy to get into, but its just as easy to get thrown out." 13:55

Lynes also states in this article that most of those students who have transferred to four year colleges do as well as the average four year college student and a few are among the best students wherever they go. He also adds, however, that they are not likely to transfer to the colleges for which there is still competition, and are more inclined to go to state colleges, teachers colleges, technical schools, and small liberal arts colleges--that is, the less competitive institutions.

Baird's study reveals that many students planning to transfer will be unable to do so simply because more than a fourth of them have grades less than a C. This suggests that many students have not begun to think realistically about some of the alternatives they will very probably have to face. Perhaps two year colleges could perform a needed service by helping these students consider other alternatives when they enter, rather than when they leave college.^{2:13}

Differences in grading systems are pointed out by Knoell and Medsker. The grades of the native students were found to improve steadily as they progressed through degree programs. Although the junior college grades of transfer students were higher than the freshman and sophomore grades of the natives, the junior college students experienced a drop in grades after transfer which placed them at an academic disadvantage in the upper division. It was also pointed out that the pattern of native-transfer differences was less likely to occur in teachers colleges than in the major state universities.^{11:20}

Additional evidence of the difference in grading standards and aptitude of students between the four year institutions and the community colleges is given in an article by Meadows and Ingle. They found that students who had done poorly in four year institutions and transferred back to community colleges did quite well, two thirds of these students

successfully completing junior college. On the other hand, junior college students transferring with poor academic records to another junior college did not show any appreciable degree of academic improvement. This would suggest that they have not experienced the decrease in the level of competition and possibly grading standards as their senior college counterparts.^{15:53}

Knoell and Medsker report that several studies of diversity in higher education make it quite clear that students who enter public community colleges as freshmen have less academic aptitude, as determined by aptitude tests, as a group, than freshmen in four year colleges and universities. A considerable amount of diversity has also been found among four year colleges of different types, in different regions of the country, and under different types of control. There is, of course, a very considerable amount of overlap in the distribution of scores of the freshmen entering the various two and four year colleges, particularly in the public institutions. The junior colleges tend to attract a larger percentage of freshmen from the lower ranks of ability and a smaller percentage of high ability students than the four year colleges, but a majority of the students in both types of colleges come from the middle ranks.^{10:51} Several statistical analyses have led to the general conclusion that graduates who begin their degree work in the universities as freshmen have somewhat greater academic aptitude and ability than those who begin their work in a two year college.^{11:29}

In a study by Harold Seashore entitled "Academic Abilities of Junior College Students," he finds that the median score on the CQT for junior college freshmen is near the 25th percentile for the senior college freshmen. About 24 percent of junior college men and about 20 percent of junior college women are above the respective medians for freshmen in four year colleges. Seashore also states that there is considerable overlap in scores.

These distributions suggest that there are many junior college students whose scores would be considered superior in senior colleges and many low scoring senior college freshmen who would also rate low in junior college.

The complete distribution (of test scores) would show that many individual students do have scores above the average of college freshmen generally; for them one can predict the probability of success upon transfer with some assurance. But for the great majority of junior college students, upon transfer, their abilities will probably be below the average abilities of students in the typical senior college. Since senior colleges also show great differences in the average ability level of their students, at least theoretically, even the below average junior college student probably can find a senior college where he will be above average upon transfer. 20:74-80

In an effort to better determine the aptitude of prospective transfer students, much thought has been given to the possibility of more extensive testing of such students. At Michigan State in 1967, an attempt was made to do just this. Students with very borderline records were offered an opportunity to take admissions testing and, if they scored well enough on these tests, they were then offered regular admission. Most community colleges accepted this proposal in the spirit in which it was intended-- that is, an expansion of opportunity for transfer students. However, there were some who looked upon this as yet another hurdle for transfer students as compared to the "native" students. As a result, while there is still some admissions testing done for transfer students, it is not done on as wide-spread a basis at Michigan State as was proposed two years ago. Now that Michigan State University is requiring the Scholastic Aptitude Test for entering freshmen, additional thought may be given to the possibility of requiring this test for transfer students sometime in the future.

Knoell and Medsker report that transfer students who were tested as juniors tended to earn scores which were as high as those earned by the native students as freshmen, but the quality was probably the result of

their having had two years of college before taking the test. Analyses of native and transfer students who were identified as having high ability and good potential for graduate work showed that most students who attended junior colleges for their lower division work were not handicapped, at least in earning upper division grades which would qualify them for graduate study. 10:74

Knoell and Medsker are quite positive in their belief that:

A very clear implication from the findings is that a junior college average of only C should not be regarded as adequate and sufficient evidence of the student's ability to do satisfactory work at the upper division level at all institutions, even in the public sector of higher education, nor in all major fields. However, at present there appears to be at least one public four year institution in each state where junior college students with C averages have a fair chance of achieving their degree objectives. At the same time the number of universities where this is true is decreasing rapidly, particularly for students who enroll in engineering and business administration programs. 11:40

Transfer students tend to earn their lowest grades in the four year institution where the quality of the native students is highest, except in the few institutions which also selected their transfer students with great care. 11:50

One of the most important reasons many students attend two year colleges is that they cannot afford to go to four year colleges. Many of these same students must work to attend even the less expensive two year college. However, Baird's study shows that the extent of work and the number of hours worked were almost completely unrelated to the student's plans, academic and non-academic achievement, participation in campus activities, or in his satisfaction with the community college program. 2:21

James W. Thornton, Jr., in The Community Junior College, points out that the socio-economic background of community college students largely follows that of the community in which the college is located. Students attending community colleges in large metropolitan areas are more apt to

come from immigrant families where the parents were engaged in the "lower levels" of occupations. Collective studies show that about one third of the students came from skilled labor backgrounds, but only one tenth came from families in professional categories.^{24:155}

Lavin has found that students from urban areas have higher levels of academic performance in college than students from less populated areas. However, as the urbanism increases, where we have major metropolitan areas of 500,000 or more, the reverse is true. This, of course, is quite common with programs at the high school level from these same areas also. Lavin also found that the size of the high school had little or no bearing on academic performance in college, except where differences could be traced to lack of facilities and teachers salaries and the like. It is relatively safe to assume that these same differences would hold true at the community college level.^{12:132, 133}

In another study made by Leonard Baird, "The Degree Goals of College Applicants," he summarizes the characteristics of students who originally had career goals that were less than a bachelor's degree. The fact that many of these students at a later date seek admission as transfer students to the major universities is important in this study. Mr. Baird finds that:

Students who had planned some level of education less than a bachelor's degree were more likely to come from a rural background and a family with lower income than their classmates. In high school they obtained lower grades and had lower ACT test scores. They did not have quite as many academic achievements in high school as their classmates. Their choice of college was relatively less influenced by intellectual reasons and more influenced by the proximity of the college to their home. They are more likely than other students to plan to live at home. They place somewhat more emphasis on increased income as a goal of college attendance than did other groups.^{1:322}

These studies suggest that there is a difference in aptitude of students beginning programs in the two year and four year colleges and that

these differences are vital in the admissions process. It also becomes obvious that an awareness of background factors, grading policies, and the type of preparation and ultimate goals must be considered in the admissions decision.

Academic Success - Failure

As one studies the academic success and/or failure of transfer students one fact seems to be commonly agreed upon: students have a much better chance of success if they complete two full years in the community college rather than one prior to their transfer to the four year institution. Gleazer strongly recommends that most students should be urged to remain in junior college until they can transfer with full upper-division standing.^{6:80} Studies made in California institutions also have tended to show the superiority of students who transfer after two years of junior college over that of students who transfer after only one.^{10:16} The Knoell-Medsker study shows that most of the withdrawals who re-entered junior colleges have transferred to the four year institutions at the sophomore level. Many of these students have withdrawn of their own accord, sometimes anticipating failure if they persist further. This early withdrawal also enabled them to earn additional junior college credit if they withdrew before completing the sophomore year in a four year college. Of the group of students who re-entered junior college after having transferred as juniors, the majority had been dismissed for poor scholarship from the four year institutions. Nearly half of the students transferring at this level had been enrolled in major state universities, only 20 percent in other state universities, and the remainder in about equal numbers of the other three types of colleges.^{10:23}

In From Junior to Senior College, Knoell and Medsker report that:

1. Junior college students usually experience some drop in grade point average in their first term after transfer, below the accumulative average they earned in junior college. The grades of the students who persist in the four year colleges generally improve in successive terms after transfer.
2. Junior college students often do less well than native students in their first term in the upper division, but the differential between the two groups decreases in successive terms.^{11:6}

Follow-up studies conducted by the Office of Admissions and Scholarships at Michigan State show that the average grades from every community college in the State show a drop from the community college average and the first term MSU grades. At the end of the third term on campus, grades were still below the community college average in every instance, but the difference was much less. In a typical study done in 1966, the grade differential averaged .43 at the end of the first term and .23 at the end of the third term.

A fact that is often forgotten in studies supporting the second quotation above is that often times students who have dropped out of college are no longer included in the grade point averages of community colleges making such studies. This was supported by a study conducted by Arland L. Grover at the University of Wyoming.^{7:207} In fact, admissions officers at Michigan State University have encountered this same problem in dealing with some of the community colleges in the State. Occasionally, our follow-up studies and those conducted by the community colleges have shown a high degree of discrepancy due to the fact that the community colleges were using grade point averages of the students who were still enrolled, whereas Michigan State had used the grade point averages of the entire group entering in a given fall term.

Another problem related to academic success or failure of transfer students is the fact that most receiving institutions do not allow entering

transfer students to transfer honor points. A student entering a four year college with a 2.5 grade point average and 90 term hours would have 45 honor points above a C average. The credits all transfer, but not the honor points. His grade point average is based solely on his work at the receiving institution. These same institutions normally allow only one or two terms in which to achieve at least a 2.0 average and thereafter students falling below this average are dismissed. The community colleges often protest that such treatment is not fair and that the "native" students have an advantage in that they are allowed to build up their honor points during the first two years, providing them with this academic "cushion."

The consensus of the Illinois Articulation Conference on this subject was:

On the significance of junior college grades. The junior college must, if it is to fulfill its responsibility, be dedicated to opportunity for all. The baccalaureate institution, on the other hand, may, and it usually does, select students on the basis of academic ability. Because the pace and standards of any college reflect average ability of its students, the challenge to freshmen and sophomores of a junior college can be significantly lower than in some baccalaureate institution. As a result, it might be quite normal for a given grade earned in a junior college to represent lower achievement than the same grade earned in the freshman and sophomore years of a baccalaureate institution; at the same time a native student who has survived the first two years with a bare C average is very likely to raise his grade average at least slightly during his junior and senior years.

It follows that a native student who has accumulated a surplus of quality points in his freshman and sophomore years seldom or never uses his "cushion" to counterbalance lower grades in the junior and senior years. Meanwhile, the native students who would have earned less than a C average in the junior and senior years have been eliminated. If "equal treatment" of junior college students and native students is one of the purposes of articulation programs, a "cushion" of higher grades in a junior college used to supplement lower grades in the junior and senior years, might represent favored treatment of junior college transfers over native students. This argues that the custom of accepting credit and ignoring grades in a transfer record is essentially sound.^{9:34}

Other studies show that there was less tendency for teachers colleges to dismiss students automatically after two poor semesters as was true

of the major state universities.^{10:27} This only further supports the need for proper counseling and selection of the four year institution on the part of the transfer student.

Another interesting result of the Knoell and Medsker study on articulation was the fact that transfer students experienced a large portion of their failing grades in general education courses, or in other courses offered at the freshmen-sophomore levels. In two universities, about half the poor grades were in courses normally taken by freshmen and sophomores, which the drop-outs took after transferring as juniors. The findings seemed to show that students who planned a junior college program with enough care to be able to start their upper division work immediately after transfer, without making up deficiencies, were more likely to succeed than students who had to compete with native students in lower division courses.^{10:30, 31}

Another mark of success of transfer students who transferred with junior standing was the fact that a higher percentage of these students completed their baccalaureate programs on time.^{11:19}

Knoell and Medsker report that attrition among students who transferred from junior colleges in 1960 was 29 percent. This figure may seem rather high, considering that most of the students had already completed two full years of college. However, the finding is tempered by the fact that only 10 percent of the transfer students (or about one third of the drop-outs) were required to withdraw because of unsatisfactory grades. However, while only one third of the drop-outs were dismissed for poor scholarship, another third were earning grade point averages of below C when they withdrew. Undoubtedly some of these students would have been subject to dismissal had they persisted longer. In some instances their grade point deficiencies were so great that it would have been almost impossible, both mathematically and academically, for them to achieve an overall average of C during the

remainder of their degree programs. Thus, about 20 percent of the total transfer group dropped out after failing to perform at the minimally acceptable level required by the degree-granting institutions.^{11:25, 26}

A comparison of native and transfer students who were actually granted degrees revealed small differences in grades earned in both the upper and lower divisions. However, the pattern of differences was reversed for the two levels. The junior college grades of the transfer students were often higher than the lower division grades of the natives but the native students often earned higher grades than the transfer students in the upper division when the two groups were in direct competition for grades. Native students as a group bettered their own record as they moved through the lower division into the last two years, as they began to take a considerable amount of work in their major field. The transfer graduates did not show the same steady pattern of improvement in grades because of the drop they experienced when they began their studies in the four year institutions.^{11:29}

Knoell and Medsker again support the need to complete two full years in the community college when they found that the attrition in the transfer group which was granted only sophomore standing was 45 percent, compared with only 26 percent in the group of junior level transfers. Furthermore, only 35 percent of the sophomores graduated within three years after transfer. Since only 20 percent of the group was still enrolled and expected to graduate during the fourth year after transfer, the total percentage of graduates is probably no more than 55, compared to at least 75 percent of the students who completed two years in junior college.^{11:37}

Patterns of academic success and failure have been repeated time and again in these writings. There seems to be ample evidence supporting the need for completion of a full two years before transfer as well as an awareness of a probable drop in grades upon transfer.

Articulation

Because of the variety of factors involved in the admissions decision-making process, a degree of confusion exists. Consequently, the admissions function should properly also include a provision for and can best and most logically serve, the colleges concerned with articulation and attrition. The location of this function in the admissions office is a direct result of the trend toward centralizing the admissions function on all campuses.

Dorothy M. Knoell in addressing the Illinois Statewide Articulation Conference made the following statement relative to articulation:

We might point out that articulation involves at least three distinct processes, any one of which can spell success or failure for the transfer students. The three which are most critical in their affect on student performance are: 1. the good matching of transfer student and institution through counseling, information, and admissions procedures; 2. the provision of appropriate personnel services including orientation, financial aid, and counseling; and 3. the articulation of curriculum offerings and requirements in the two and four year colleges in such a way that the student is able to progress through his degree program without undue loss of time and credit.^{9:10}

As a part of the articulation process, Spence recommends that:

As colleges develop some degree of admissions selectivity, they have a concomitant responsibility to dissuade unqualified students from applying as much as to encourage those with reasonable prospects of being admitted. The admissions office will develop and sharpen the descriptions of acceptable qualifications of applicants and communicate these to counselors for use with their students.^{22:352}

The usual methods of articulation presently employed between two and four year colleges include reports of academic achievement by the transfer students compiled by the four year institution, follow-up conferences in which the community colleges have an opportunity to interview their former students, newsletters from the four year colleges to the community colleges, and visitation programs in the community colleges. Personal interviews both on campus and as a part of a visitation program are another means of articulation.

Transfer students have stressed the need for more and better information

about the colleges to which they are transferring. Apparently they found pre-transfer visits very helpful in becoming acquainted with the campus of the four year colleges, particularly when they could talk with advisors in their field of interest. These same students also indicated that wrong or poor information often resulted in considerable hardship such as failure to complete lower-division requirements which could and should have been met before transfer, lack of realistic information about costs of attending, and failure to realize when they were in academic difficulty.^{11:85}

O'Connor feels that successful preparation for students for upper division work requires a knowledge on the part of transfer students of:

1. The characteristics of four year colleges to which the students will transfer;
2. The numbers of students who transfer to each college;
3. The major fields in which the transfer students will enroll;
4. The success of previous transfer students in various upper division major fields of study in these colleges; and
5. Problems frequently encountered by transfer students.

When adequate data are collected by the junior college on these points, liaison with the four year college will be strengthened.^{17:16}

With the rapid growth in the number of community colleges in the state of Michigan, it becomes all the more important that articulation between the two and four year schools be improved. One area that needs continual study is that of grading practices employed by community colleges. One way of determining comparability of programs is to compare grade point averages achieved by the same student at the community college and at the receiving college or university. When this grade differential between institutions is very high (over one half a grade point), analysis of the distribution of grades at the junior college is suggested.^{17:31} In cases where grades become meaningless, receiving institutions will be forced to resort

to either very selective standards for admission, or testing programs for transfer students. Hopefully, in a state system of higher education, if we are to retain a certain degree of autonomy in curricular matters, considerable attention must be given to the development of common policies and guidelines for transfer to which the various colleges in each state will subscribe. Unless there is a high degree of articulation, it may be necessary to institute a comprehensive college testing program. The results of such a test might be used to decide which junior college students should transfer to what institutions, what kind of credits they should receive, and when they are ready to graduate.^{11:101} This latter course of action seems highly undesirable at this time.

The Knoell and Medsker study on articulation reports much change and improvement in the articulation between two and four year schools. Some of this has come about through the addition of staff members for liaison with the junior colleges. The duties of these staff members include admissions counseling of community college transfer students, arranging various types of conferences, visitation, and the preparation of materials designed to improve articulation. Informational brochures which include quite often course equivalency lists, guidance materials and reports of studies of junior college transfer students have also been improved during the past decade.^{10:31}

This same study reports that there seemed to be an irreversable trend in 1964 toward increased state-wide coordination of higher education, including the junior colleges, which may eventually have an effect on the flow of transfer students among institutions. Some states, notably California, New York and Illinois, have developed master plans for higher education as one aspect of this coordination.^{10:82}

Here in Michigan, provision has been made in our new constitution for a new state board of education, which has been given responsibility for the general planning and coordination of all public education, including two and four year colleges. The constitution also provides for a state board for public community and junior colleges, to advise the state board of education concerning planning, supervision and the budgetary needs of the locally controlled two year colleges. From this study and the others previously referred to, it becomes apparent that this past decade has witnessed a vast increase in formal coordination of higher education at the state level, with the objective of expanding educational opportunity for all.

The Illinois Articulation Conference made special note of the success experienced by transfer students of the state of Michigan. This was in spite of no formal, state-wide machinery but only the result of the articulation practiced by individual state universities. The Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers has been exceptionally strong in Michigan and has devoted considerable time and effort over the years to the solution of articulation problems. The proceedings of this conference go on to say that:

There is (and has been) an awareness of the need to attend to problems of articulation in Michigan which we found lacking in some of the other states. Another factor which we feel may have contributed to Michigan's success is the diversity of offerings in its several state universities, particularly in the occupational-professional fields which are attractive to junior college students. Business administration and engineering--the two fields which draw a very considerable group of males are offered by a number of the state universities, on several campuses located in different parts of the state. The programs differ somewhat in the type and level of offerings and the "climate" varies quite markedly from one campus to another. The remarkable feature of the Michigan story is that communication among transfer students and the institutions including the counselors and instructors was sufficiently good that a majority of the transfer students appear to have found the university and the campus which are best

suited to their needs, interests, and abilities. Some made mistakes, circumstances changed for others. However, most of the drop-outs would have been given a second chance at another university, if they had sought it.^{9:16}

These statements would seem to support the concept that there is, in fact, a working, state system of higher education. They would also seem to support the fact that students who have qualified to at least a reasonable degree, have been able to successfully pursue their career objectives.

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The specific purpose of this study is an investigation of various aspects of the prospective transfer student from Michigan public community colleges who applied to Michigan State University and was denied admission. The knowledge gained through this study should enable this University and the community colleges of the State to do a better job of counseling students and assuring students of the proper "fit" into the state of Michigan education system so that they may achieve a realistic educational goal. Hopefully, the study will support the belief that a system of higher education does exist in the state of Michigan and that this "system" makes it possible for those students who have the ability to benefit from some of the programs offered in the various institutions to complete their education.

The data have been acquired by a detailed analysis of the applications of the 209 Michigan public community college students who were denied admission to MSU for the fall term of 1968, and through the use of a questionnaire directed to these same students. In addition, the writer sent a supplementary questionnaire to counselors in the community colleges in an effort to acquire desired information about those students who failed to respond to the original student questionnaire.

The purposes of the study were to:

1. Give additional insight into the not admit transfer student.

Of particular importance were the grade point average, the

recommendation of the community college counselor, the type of not admit decision rendered, early academic background such as high school rank, previous not admit decisions from either high school or community college or another four year institution, parental education background, and test scores, when these items were available. The amount of community college preparation was also a vital factor as were the educational objectives of the students.

2. Gain attitudinal information relative to the students' community college, the University, counseling--both at the community college and through MSU, and changes in attitude and goals following the not admit decision.
3. Provide more precise information on what happened to the students after being denied admission to Michigan State.

The Not Admit Transfer Student

There are essentially four types of not admit decisions rendered Michigan transfer students:

1. The regular not admit. In this case the student is simply told that he does not qualify for admission to MSU.
2. The qualified not admit ("NA 26," the number of the letter used for this purpose). Students receiving this form of not admit are denied admission for the present, but are told that the Admissions Office will review their applications if later grades rise significantly.
3. Special not admits due to poor preparation in the student's proposed major. Such decisions are presently limited to two fields, Veterinary Medicine and Engineering. In these cases,

students are advised of their inadmissibility to their proposed major but told that the Office of Admissions will reconsider their applications if they care to select a different major.

4. Students denied admission after entrance examinations.

The study attempted to provide answers to the following questions:

A. General Background Information.

1. What percent of the total number of transfer applications for the fall of 1968 resulted in not admit decisions for applicants from Michigan public community colleges? What was the ratio of not admits to admits from the Michigan public community colleges?

The writer hoped to gain some insight into the magnitude of the problem of this group of not admits in comparison to the total number of transfer applications. This material was available through the Registrar's reports and through counts maintained by the Office of Admissions and Scholarships.

2. What types of not admit responses were sent to this group?

The writer hoped to show that the number of regular not admits was actually rather small in comparison to the total number of applications and that for many of the not admit group the door to admission was left at least slightly open. Answers to these questions were retrieved from the applications.

3. What were the reasons for attending community college in the first place?

Community colleges serve a vital function in higher education by providing opportunity for education beyond high school for many who might otherwise not be able to attend college. Students were asked in the questionnaire, "Was your choice to begin your college education at community college due to: Mainly financial consideration? Poor high school preparation? Other?" Responses to this question demonstrated that the

community colleges are fulfilling their role in the higher education system.

B. Aptitude and Preparation.

1. What is the aptitude and preparation of the community college student who is denied admission?

Here, some comparisons with the "native" students were made in an effort to determine whether the not admit decision was made in the best interests of the students involved. An examination of test scores, where available, and high school rank, when available, and community college grades were used to determine the difference in academic background and aptitude. The grade point averages of the applicants were broken down into those below a 1.50, those between a 1.51 and a 1.74, a 1.75 and a 1.99, 2.00 to 2.24, 2.25 to 2.49 and those above a 2.50. The type of not admit decisions for each group were also included. These data were available from the applications.

2. How many credits of transfer work did these candidates present?

This was an attempt to determine whether the number of students who actually completed community college, but with unsatisfactory records, and sought admission to Michigan State were smaller than generally supposed. Most of the students denied admission have not completed community college and, as other studies have shown, this is a vital factor in future academic success in the four year college.

3. What percent of the not admits with higher than a 2.0 grade point average were recommended by their community college and would have completed two full years of work prior to transferring? Were there any particular community colleges who received these not admit decisions to a greater degree than others? If so, why?

Data for responding to this question were collected from the student applications, and by checking patterns of decisions with the Transfer Section of the Office of Admissions and Scholarships. In responding to this question, the writer considered fully recommended students who had completed 67 or more term hours plus final grades, or a total of 90 term hours, as having completed the full two years.

C. Attitudes.

1. What was the attitude of the applicant relative to his community college?

If the community colleges are providing good preparation for four year colleges, the students should have provided positive answers to these questions. The responses to questions 14, 15 and 16 in the questionnaire provided valuable insight relative to student evaluation of community college preparation.

2. Does the not admit student feel that he received adequate advisement from his community college counselor?

Many students apply to a college or university for which they are completely unqualified in spite of counseling against this action by their counselors. Sometimes counselors may not be as up-to-date on academic requirements of four year colleges as they might be. The writer hoped to gain insight as to how well the counseling programs are working in the community colleges, and to determine if there was a need for better articulation in this area. Question number 10 deals specifically with this concern.

3. What effect did the student believe working and/or commuting had on his academic preparation?

Studies have shown that working or commuting have not been major factors in student performance. However, since those receiving the questionnaire were a negative audience, and some of the students were undoubtedly looking for a scapegoat, this might account for some of the negative response and comment.

4. What was the reaction of the student to our not admit decision?

Since these decisions, in the judgment of admissions officers, are made in the best interest of the student, it is important that admissions officers be aware of the response to this decision. Two questions dealt with this attitude, one seeking to find out what the student's real expectations were relative to admission when he first applied and the other asking for a reaction several months after the not admit decision was received.

5. What was the attitude of the not admit student relative to MSU?

This was an effort to determine the effectiveness of admissions counseling by Michigan State admissions officers. Students were asked, "Did you have an opportunity to meet with an admissions counselor from MSU: Individually? In a group setting? Prior to your application? After application? Prior to receiving our decision? After receiving our decision?" The student is also asked if the admissions counselor adequately described admissions requirements to MSU. Responses to these questions give the admissions officer a better idea of how well he is communicating with these students and how many are taking advantage of the opportunity to meet with an admissions counselor, either at the community college or on the MSU campus.

D. Effects.

1. Did students denied admission to MSU continue their education

or did the not admit decision put an end to their educational aspirations?

This was the most crucial question to be answered in the study. In an effort to get as complete a response as possible to this question, the community college counselors were asked to respond to a variation of question number 13 for those students who failed to return completed questionnaires. The question read, "Are you presently enrolled in or admitted to college?" Four sub-questions followed: "a) If the answer is yes, is it the community college from which you applied to MSU?, b) If you are currently enrolled in community college, have you been admitted to another four year college for future enrollment?, c) If yes, please name:, d) If you are currently enrolled in a four year college, please name:"

Responses to this question from either the student or the community college counselor informed the writer if, indeed, those students who have made adequate preparation for some, but not all, four year colleges were continuing their education in spite of an admission denial by MSU.

Students were also asked: "As a result of our decision: Do you plan to complete a bachelor's degree in another college? Have you changed your major?" The answers to these questions gave some positive reactions to our not admit decision.

The questionnaire was made as short as possible in an attempt to get as complete a response as possible. Since the audience involved, by virtue of having received a negative decision, was perhaps somewhat hostile, the percentage of returns could not be expected to be too complete. However, this in itself may have been an important indication of poor articulation and quite meaningful to the study. A further analysis of the applications

of the nonrespondents was made for any significant trends in aptitude and preparation.

Since many of the not admit decisions were not completely final, it is meaningful to inquire as to the future plans of the student, whether they involve MSU or any other institutions of higher learning. An office of admissions should be concerned with what happens to the student who was given an opportunity to further pursue his admission to MSU but fails to take any further action.

After the questionnaires were returned and the applications checked for the information they contained, the data were analyzed on an item-to-item basis. The material is presented in a narrative form with tables utilized where appropriate.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Data for this study were obtained mainly from two sources: the original application submitted by the student, including transcripts of all work done prior to application, and a questionnaire sent to the students who were denied admission to Michigan State for fall quarter, 1968. Information was also obtained through a letter sent to the community colleges seeking information on students who had failed to respond to the original questionnaire.

A total of 209 Michigan residents were included in the study. Since the admissions requirements for out of state students are completely different from those of residents of this state, it was felt that to include non-Michigan students in the study would distort the picture.

All students in this study were sent a letter and a questionnaire. They were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it in a self-addressed envelope at their earliest convenience. After an appropriate lapse of time, students who had failed to respond to the first request were sent a second request with another copy of the questionnaire. Students who failed to respond to the first two requests were then called by telephone and asked to return the questionnaire. Many of these students indicated a willingness to return the questionnaire but had misplaced the original, so new copies were sent. In a final attempt to obtain the most complete return possible, a third letter was sent to those students who by phone had indicated a willingness to reply to the questionnaire, but for whom

responses had not been received. Altogether 159 students or 76 percent returned completed questionnaires.

In addition to these approaches to the students, the community colleges were approached by letter with a request for information on the students who had failed to respond. The names of the students from whom we had not received questionnaires were listed and the community colleges were asked to indicate whether or not the student was currently enrolled in its college. They were also asked to indicate the college currently attended if other than the community college, or the college to which the student had been admitted for future enrollment. Unfortunately, the information received from the community colleges was not as complete as was hoped for and did not fully supply the response that was desired to the critical issue of whether or not the student was continuing his education. In fact, of the 18 community colleges to whom requests were made for this information, only 14 responded, and in some cases the responses were handled by a clerk who had little or no knowledge of the student's whereabouts. Our own experiences with community colleges in the follow-up conferences we host here on campus indicate they are quite familiar with the students who are admitted to one of the four year schools in Michigan, but the results of this questionnaire also would indicate that the student who was not admitted may be the "forgotten man" in the community college picture.

A. General Background Information

For background information, the writer desired to determine what percent of the total number of transfer applications for fall of 1968 resulted in not admit decisions for applicants from Michigan public community colleges. He found that there were 4,401 transfer applications for

admission for the fall of 1968. This figure included transfer students from all types of institutions, both in-state and out-state. In the group denied admission only 209 (or 4.75) percent) were Michigan residents. The writer also wanted to establish the ratio of not admits to admits from Michigan public community colleges. For the fall term of 1968, 901 students were admitted from Michigan public community colleges, providing a ratio of admits to not admits of approximately 4.3 to 1.

The types of negative responses sent to the students in the study reveal a more encouraging picture. Only 98 students in the total group, or 46.88 percent were sent a regular not admit letter. On the other hand, 101 students in the group, or 48.32 percent received a qualified not admit letter, the "NA 26" letter. In addition, 2 applicants were denied admission to a program in Veterinary Medicine but were told that they could be considered for a different major. Likewise, 5 applicants were denied admission to a program in Engineering but encouraged to choose a different course of study. Three applicants were denied admission after admissions testing. This was done when the results of the testing clearly indicated that to begin a program at Michigan State would not have been in the best interests of the student concerned. Students receiving one of these special types of not admit letters amounted to 4.77 percent of the total group.

Students chose to attend community college for a variety of reasons, but by far the most important factor influencing this decision was that of finances. Of those responding, 73.39 percent indicated that the decision to begin their college career in a community college was based on financial reasons. Many students were quite frank in admitting that poor high school preparation also played a major part in this decision. While some checked both finances and poor preparation, a total of 57.29 percent indicated that their

choice to begin their higher education in a community college was due mainly to poor high school preparation. The students were provided an opportunity to give other reasons for attendance at the community college and these included: convenience--living at home, parents' desire, suspension from another college, better student-teacher relationships, desire to take night classes, the desire to work towards a B.S. in nursing, not certain of college, health, and one student chose to attend community college because a European trip prevented his beginning his program in a four year institution. Some students indicated they felt they needed the transition provided by a community college from the high school setting to the four year university setting. A slight majority of the students indicated that community college was their first choice college after finishing high school. The respondents indicated that the community college was first in 55.19 percent of the cases, while the remainder of the students clearly indicated that they did not begin their program in community college by choice. Approximately one third of the students attended community college after attending another college. These students were attempting to clean up their academic records so that they might be able to transfer back to a four year college.

B. Aptitude and Preparation

A simple record of test scores and high school ranks, where available, for these students would have little value to this study. However, a comparison of test scores and high school ranks for the transfer students and incoming freshmen students for the same quarter does provide a valuable tool in judging the aptitude of these students.

Test scores were available for about one fourth of the students in the study and high school class ranks were available for slightly more

than one third of the students. However, the scores and ranks were random and in all probability are quite typical of any group of this nature.

In comparing test scores only the American College Test (ACT) and the College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) were used. Further, only the ACT composite score and the total of the verbal and math portion of the SAT were used in this study. The students in this study averaged 19.05 on the ACT test. The average of entering freshmen students for the same quarter at Michigan State was 24.1. The 19 average scored by these transfer students would place them at the 7th percentile on a Michigan State University norm. On the SAT, the transfer students had an average total of 897.65 as compared with a native MSU freshman student average total of 1082. The 897.65 average obtained by transfer students would place them at the 16th percentile on a Michigan State University norm. A comparison of these test scores appears in Table 1.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF APTITUDE TEST SCORES

	<u>Native Students</u>	<u>Transfer Applicants</u>
ACT	24.10	19.05
MSU Norm		7th percentile
SAT	1082	897.65
MSU Norm		16th percentile

The high school rank for the transfer students where included in their records gave the following information: 7.35 percent graduated in the top quartile of their high school class; 42.65 percent graduated in the second

quartile; 35.29 percent were in the third quartile and 14.71 percent graduated in the bottom quartile of their high school class. It so happened that for those ranked in the study an even 50 percent of the transfer students graduated in the top half of their class, with, of course, the vast majority being in the second quartile. By comparison, the entering freshmen for the fall of 1968 had the following class rank: of the Michigan residents 85.5 percent were in the top quartile. Fourteen and two tenths percent of the Michigan residents were in the second quartile of their high school class. Only .2 of one percent of the Michigan residents were in the third quartile. One tenth of one percent of the Michigan students were in the bottom quartile. As a total group, 99.7 percent of the entering freshmen ranked in the top half, with only .3 of one percent of the students ranking in the lower half of their graduating classes. A comparison of these ranks is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF HIGH SCHOOL RANKS

	<u>Native Students</u>	<u>Transfer Applicants</u>
Top Quartile	85.5%	7.35%
Second Quartile	14.2%	42.65%
Third Quartile	.2%	35.29%
Fourth Quartile	.1%	14.71%

Community college grades for students from the Michigan public community colleges who were denied admission to Michigan State were as follows: 20 students or 9.5 percent of the total group submitted an academic record from community college of below 1.50. Of this group, 13 received a regular

not admit letter, 6 received an "NA 26," and 1 student was denied admission after testing. Twenty-two students, or 10.53 percent of the total group had academic records in the 1.51 to 1.74 range. These students received 18 regular not admit letters, and 4 an "NA 26." Fifty-six students, or 26.79 percent of the group submitted an academic record with a grade point average of between 1.75 and 1.99. In this group, 42 received a regular not admit, 13 an "NA 26" and 1 was denied admission after testing. The largest group, 71 students or 33.97 percent of the total submitted academic records with a grade point average of between 2.0 and 2.24. Twenty-four students received a regular not admit, whereas 45 students in this group received an "NA 26." One student in the group was denied admission after testing and one was sent an Engineering not admit letter. Twenty-three students or 11 percent of the total group were denied admission who had academic records ranging from 2.25 to 2.49. One of these students received a regular not admit, while 19 students received an "NA 26," 1 was denied admission to Veterinary Medicine, and 2 were denied admission to Engineering. There were 17 students with academic records above a 2.5 who were not admitted to Michigan State University in the fall of 1968. None of these students received a regular not admit letter. Fourteen received an "NA 26," 1 was denied admission to Veterinary Medicine and 2 were denied admission to Engineering. In addition, only one of the students receiving an "NA 26" had completed the full two years of community college. This particular student had attended a four year institution in the state earlier in his program and had been dismissed, which undoubtedly was a major factor in the negative decision for him. Table 3 shows the academic records of these students and the type of not admit letter received by each group. It is interesting to note the trend away from a regular not admit towards an "NA 26" as the records of the students improve.

TABLE 3

COMMUNITY COLLEGE RECORDS OF THE TRANSFER APPLICANTS
AND THE TYPE OF NOT ADMIT DECISION RECEIVED

Grade Point Average	Number in Range	Regular NA	"NA 26"	Special NA
Below 1.50	20	13	6	1
1.51 - 1.74	22	18	4	0
1.75 - 1.99	56	42	13	1
2.00 - 2.24	71	24	45	2
2.25 - 2.49	23	1	19	3
2.50 and above	17	0	14	3

In considering the preparation of transfer students, in addition to the academic averages submitted by these students, the amount of college level work is a vital factor in the decision-making process. Studies described in Chapter II clearly indicate that students who complete the full two years of community college have a much better chance for academic success after transfer than those who seek admission to a four year institution with less than two years of community college work.

It is interesting to note that the vast majority of transfer students from Michigan community colleges denied admission to Michigan State in the fall of 1968 submitted less than two years of community college work. Since decisions are sometimes made before the last semester or last term of work is available, the writer included in the group having completed the two full years, all students who had 90 or more term hours and those who had 67 or more term hours plus final grades yet to be submitted. There were only 45 students or 21.53 percent of the total group who had completed or might have completed the two full years of work. Fifty-two students or 24.88 percent had completed between 66 and 90 term hours while 42

students or 20.10 percent had completed between 45 and 65 term hours. The largest number, 70 students or 33.49 percent, had completed less than one year's work (less than 45 term hours).

It is also interesting to note that while approximately 78.5 percent of the students sought admission to Michigan State prior to the completion of two full years of community college, 53.62 percent of the students responding to the questionnaire indicated that their community college counselor had encouraged them to complete a full two-year course at the community college prior to transferring. With both the community colleges and the four year colleges and universities recommending and, in some cases, insisting on the completion of two full years of work prior to admission as a transfer student from a community college, we find that too many students are seeking admission earlier than has proven to be academically sound.

A common complaint among many community college administrators and counselors is the denial of admission to their "qualified" students who have completed community college. Since the term "qualified" is subjective, at best, and the aptitudes of the transfer students as compared to the native students has already been discussed in this chapter, an analysis of those students who were denied admission who might be considered to have completed all of the minimum criteria is of importance here. In the entire group of 209 students in the study, only 16 students or 7.65 percent of the total group had completed, or would have completed prior to transferring, their community college programs with an academic grade point average of 2.0 or better and were fully recommended without qualifications by the community college official in charge of such recommendations. Five of the 16 students were denied admission to either Engineering or Veterinary Medicine

but were offered admission to another major leaving only 11 students or 5.26 percent of the entire total who were denied admission and yet had completed all of the minimum requirements.

In analyzing these not admit decisions, the writer found that they were sent to students from ten different community colleges and no community college received more than three of these not admit decisions. Consequently, there seemed to be no pattern to these not admit decisions other than generally poor preparation and no single community college suffered unduly as a result of these decisions.

C. Attitudes

The vast majority of the students in the study have a very positive attitude relative to their community college. In response to the question, "Do you feel that your community college provided you with good preparation for MSU?" 85.61 percent of the respondents to this question answered positively. Most of the students also felt that competition in the community college was rigorous as indicated in their response to the question, "Do you feel that it is easier to earn good grades in your community college than in a major university?" A large majority, 76.47 percent of the students, answered no to this question, demonstrating their belief that good grades were not too easy to come by in the community colleges. This response, of course, might be expected in defense of their grade point averages.

The responses to their attitude toward the community college experience when asked to compare it to a four year college and to compare it to their high school were quite mixed. In a somewhat confusing response, 53.10 percent of the respondents felt that it was similar to a four year college experience while 54.87 percent of the respondents also felt that it was similar to their high school experience. Space was provided for additional responses and in most cases the reply here indicated that the community

college tended to be similar to a four year college academically in the minds of most respondents, but more comparable to the high school setting socially. This probably accounts for a slight majority responding positively to both of these questions.

In an attempt to ascertain the student's attitude toward the type of advisement he received from his community college counselor, four questions were asked in the questionnaire. First, when asked, "Did your community college counselor apprise you of admissions requirements to various colleges?" 59.03 percent of the respondents to this particular question answered positively. The second question asked relative to counseling was, "Did your community college counselor encourage you to apply to MSU?" In this instance the majority of students, 55.71 percent of the respondents, said no, that the community college counselor had not encouraged them to apply to Michigan State. The third question, perhaps the most important of all four, asked, "Did your community college counselor encourage you to complete a full two years at community college prior to transferring?" The majority of students said yes, but the majority was small. Only 53.62 percent of the respondents answered positively to this question. It would seem that here the community college counselors are both neglecting an opportunity to pass on good advice to their counselees, and are failing to point out to these students that most four year institutions require two full years from community college applicants. The fourth question in this series asked, "Did your community college counselor encourage your application to a less competitive four year college?" Unfortunately, here again it would appear that counselors either overlooked this facet of the admissions process or failed to emphasize the varying degrees of selectivity among the four year institutions. A large majority, 72.46 percent of the respondents said no, the counselor did not encourage their application to a less competitive

college. Since all students in the study were denied admission to a selective admission, four year school, it would seem that a more realistic approach to this very important issue could be made by community college counselors.

In a question about the effect of working while attending community college, the students in this study responded in much the same fashion as community college students had in other surveys covered in Chapter II. Among those responding to the question, "Do you feel that working adversely affected your grades?" the yes and no answers were almost equal. Only 51.26 percent of the students felt that working had affected their grades while 48.74 percent felt that this had no negative effect on their grades. When asked what effect being a commuter student had upon their grades, again the students were split almost evenly. Of those responding to this particular question, 50.83 percent felt that commuting might have had a negative effect upon their community college grades while 49.17 percent felt that this was not the case. The community college students were slightly more decisive in their feeling that commuting had made community college a less meaningful experience. In responding to this question, 56.90 percent indicated that they did feel that their community college experience was less meaningful due to the fact that they were commuter students. This again ties in with earlier responses indicating that community college students felt that the big difference between community college and a four year college was the difference in the social life of the community college. Since most commuter students leave the campus following their last class, many of the extra-curricular activities which are meaningful experiences in college were not readily available to them.

As an admissions officer, the writer was very interested in determining the attitude of these students to a negative decision by Michigan

State University. The first question posed was to determine how real the expectations were among these students towards their admission to Michigan State. It is interesting to note that among those responding to this question, 41.56 percent felt that they would be admitted to Michigan State, 44.80 percent were uncertain, and 13.64 actually felt that they would probably not be admitted when they applied to MSU.

Since all decisions are rendered in what is felt to be the best interests of the student involved, the question was asked, "In looking back do you now feel that our 'not admit' decision was in your best interest?" As might be anticipated, the majority of students felt that this decision was not made in their best interest. Some 2 percent were undecided but 61.74 percent of the students responding to this question felt that the Admissions Office at Michigan State was not making the decision with the best interests of the student in mind. However, it is interesting and encouraging to note also that 36.24 percent of the respondents did feel that the decision was made in their best interests and, in fact, many went on to state that our not admit decision was the best thing that could have happened to them. When one considers the fact that this could be considered a hostile audience, a positive response to this question of over one third of the group is heartening and could be considered to indicate a healthy attitude and outlook on the part of the students who so responded.

The last of the attitudinal questions was an effort to determine the effectiveness of admissions counseling by Michigan State admissions officers. Students were asked if they had an opportunity to meet with an admissions counselor from MSU either individually or in a group setting, both prior to and after application, and prior to receiving our decision and after our decision. Unfortunately, the results demonstrate that not as many

students avail themselves of admissions counseling either here on this campus or in a community college setting as we would hope for. Only 25.68 percent of the students indicated that they had met with an admissions counselor from Michigan State on an individual basis, and only 21.54 percent had met with a counselor in a group setting. Unfortunately, since there could easily be some overlap in these two responses this does not mean that 47 percent met with one of our counselors. Slightly more students met with one of our counselors prior to their applications, 25.35 percent of those responding to this question, whereas 23.48 percent indicated that they had met with a counselor after application. The respondents indicated that 31.69 percent had met with a counselor prior to receiving our decision whereas only 10.61 percent met with one of our counselors after the decision was rendered. The very low response to the last question is disturbing in view of the fact that the majority of responses sent to the students were not completely negative and did, in fact, encourage later submission of grades or a later reconsideration of the application. It would appear that too many of the students are either misreading the type of not admit letter they receive or become overly discouraged when they do not receive an admission to Michigan State immediately upon their first application.

As a final question regarding this aspect of the admissions operation, students were asked whether or not, in their judgment, the MSU admissions counselors adequately described admissions requirements to Michigan State. Most students replied favorably to this, with some 74.60 percent of the respondents indicating that the requirements had been adequately described by Michigan State admissions counselors. It was interesting to note here that several students who indicated that they had not met with a counselor in all six of the questions preceding this, marked this particular question in a negative fashion. Since it is impossible to judge whether or not the

counselor had adequately described admissions requirements when the student had never met with such a counselor, these responses were not included in the survey. In all probability, such a response indicates a remaining hostility on the part of some of the students towards the Office of Admissions at Michigan State University. The small number of students who avail themselves of admissions counseling either on this campus or in the community college setting is very disturbing. No appointment is required for an interview here on campus, and the office is open six days a week for this purpose. In addition, the transfer admission counselors set up regular appointments in the community colleges and announcements are made to the students well in advance when they will be available for interviews. In spite of this, only about one fourth of the students in this survey indicated that they had availed themselves of one or the other of these forms of admissions counseling.

D. Effects

The most important reason for making this study was an effort to determine the effect of the not admit decision from Michigan State University on these students. Several questions were asked in an effort to determine whether students continued their education at another college or university, whether our decision altered their educational plans as far as career objective or major was concerned, and finally whether this decision has put an end, at least temporarily, to their educational aspirations.

Students were asked if they planned to complete their bachelor's degree in another college as a result of our decision and 70.86 percent of the group responded positively to this question. In addition, another 2.65 percent indicated that they were uncertain at this time as to whether or not they would seek admission to another college.

Our negative decision did not unduly influence the students' choice of major. Most students, 67.12 percent, responding to this question indicated that they did not plan to change their major as a result of our decision.

Related to the question of choice of college was a question inserted to determine how realistic students were when they sought admission to Michigan State and how many of these students applied to other universities at the same time they applied to Michigan State. The response to this particular question, "Did you apply to more than one four year college or university when you applied to Michigan State?" indicated that 49.35 percent of the students had applied to another college or university. Due to the fact that many of the students in this survey had inferior academic records, it would appear that too many were overly optimistic at the time of their application to Michigan State.

The last and by far the most important question to be analyzed was really a five part question. Students were asked, "Are you presently enrolled in or admitted to college?" If they responded yes, they were asked the question as to whether or not it was the community college from which they had applied to Michigan State. They were then asked if they were currently enrolled in a community college had they been admitted to another four year college for future enrollment and, if so, they were asked to name that institution. Lastly, they were asked if they were currently enrolled in a four year college to name that institution.

Of the students responding to the questionnaire, 80.77 percent responded positively to the fact that they are presently enrolled in or admitted to college. This single figure alone would indicate quite positively that our decision is not ending the educational opportunity for a vast majority of these students. Of this group, only 28.12 percent of the students indicated

that they were still attending the community college from which they had applied to Michigan State. In addition, 16 students or 44.44 percent of the latter group indicated that they had been admitted to another four year college for future enrollment.

As indicated earlier, in an effort to get more complete information on the entire group, the community colleges were asked to follow up on the students for whom no response had been received. The additional information gained from the 14 out of 18 community colleges responding altered the picture very little. With the addition of the students for whom they had information, the writer found that 80.33 percent of the students were currently enrolled in or admitted to a college. This is compared to the respondent's figure of 80.77 percent.

Of those not currently in college, 14 of the students in the survey were found to be at the present time in the military service. Several of these who completed questionnaires indicated that they intended to either reapply to Michigan State upon the completion of their military duty or to continue in some other college. Between the questionnaires sent to students and the responses received from the community colleges, there were only 12 students in the entire group for whom absolutely no information was available on this crucial question. This means that 87.82 percent of the entire group are positively identified as either in college or in service. This figure in itself may be somewhat low due to incomplete responses from the community college representatives. That is, some students may actually be in college but since no information was available, they were not included as presently attending or admitted to a college.

Of interest to the theory that a state system of education does exist and that these students are able to continue their education in one

of the institutions of higher learning in the state of Michigan, the questionnaires disclosed the following: of the students who are not currently in a four year institution but had been admitted to a four year college for next fall, 17 indicated that they would be attending one of the state supported colleges or universities. Two other students indicated that they had been admitted to out-of-state colleges. Of those currently attending a four year college or university, 91 of the group are in attendance in one of the state supported colleges or universities. Five other students are currently enrolled in Michigan private four year schools and four students are currently attending an out-of-state four year college or university. Of the 159 students for whom there is definite proof of their attendance in a four year college, 70.81 percent of these students are attending a Michigan publicly supported four year college. When the five students attending Michigan private colleges are added to this list, the figure rises to 73.21 percent in attendance in Michigan four year colleges or universities. If the students who responded negatively to attendance to any four year college or university were to be contacted sometime in the future, the actual percentage of students going on to a four year college would undoubtedly be even higher. Many students, for varying reasons, withdraw from college only to return or continue at a different school at a later date. Such action is not unique for this group of students but is common to all students in this age group. This is particularly true of those with military service experience. There seems little doubt that the results of this questionnaire give adequate support to the writer's belief that a system of higher education does exist in the state of Michigan and that students are able to achieve the proper academic "fit" which may in turn suggest that they should be able to complete their educational career goals.

In an attempt to determine whether or not the students who failed to respond to the questionnaire were atypical from the rest of the group, the nonrespondents were checked for grade point average, the type of NA they received and the number who had completed a full two year program. The results fail to show any great variations with the total group. A slightly higher percentage of this group had completed two full years, 26 percent of the nonrespondents as compared to 21 percent for the total group, while the grade point average for the nonrespondents was slightly lower--1.92 as compared to 1.97 for the total group. A higher percentage of the nonrespondents received a regular NA, 54 percent as compared to 46.88 percent of the total group, whereas fewer of the nonrespondents were further encouraged by the "NA 26" letter--44 percent as compared to 48.32 percent of the regular group. These differences are so small that no accurate conclusions can be drawn regarding any great variation of the nonrespondents to the total group in the study.

CHAPTER V

RECORDED COMMENTS

At the end of the questionnaire the students were invited to make any additional comments they cared to. Slightly over half, 50.3 percent, did make some kind of written comment. These varied from one of two words, "Go Blue," from a young man admitted to the University of Michigan, obviously, to a full three-page letter attached to the questionnaire. As might be anticipated, some comments were quite negative and resentful in nature while others were constructive, demonstrated a good knowledge of and acceptance of the transfer admissions policy, and provided additional evidence that these students had managed to achieve the proper "fit" in the system of higher education in the state of Michigan.

Rather than use all of these comments in their entirety, I have grouped them into the areas where they appeared most frequently, with direct quotations used in some, but not all, cases.

The comments centered around these subjects:

A. Effect of Commuting, Work and Home Environment.

In spite of a rather even division of sentiment in the questionnaire on the effect of commuting on their success in community college, several students felt that working and family relations (smaller brothers and sisters, generally) had a negative effect on their academic performance.

Examples:

1. I felt that the atmosphere in the school and the fact that I live at home with five brothers, two sisters and parents didn't help matters very much either.

2. Living at home seemed detrimental to my studies, although beneficial financially. College is not the same maturing influence when one must go home every night.
3. If school was affected by my commuting, I would be in the same boat over again. I would have liked to take the giant step of moving into a four year college away from home. I believe it would have helped my mental state to think more clearly--however I do feel settled, now at _____, and would not wish to transfer again.
4. Dear Mr. Carey: I am regretfully sorry that your office had to go to the trouble of sending me a second copy of your questionnaire, but the first one I received had been misplaced by a younger member of the family. For this trouble I am greatly appreciative.

In regards to my college education I must say that my rejection from MSU was a grave letdown in my college career, but I guess this was through no fault but my own. My grade point average was 2.0 which is below the requirement for a transfer student, but I felt that due to work and family relations at home I was unable to perform to my best ability. I would greatly appreciate some information with regards to enrollment at your college if at all possible. Thank you.

5. Unless one is a genius it is very difficult to work and support yourself, commute to school, and get good grades. After two full years of doing this sort of thing I can say it has harmed my grades very much.

B. Reactions to Community College.

Early in the chapter the writer made mention of the fact that most community college students were very well satisfied with their community college experience and responded favorably to questions in this vein. Many of the general comments were again satisfactory in most respects, but there were some extreme responses in the reactions of students to the community college.

Examples:

1. I would like to say that I feel that _____ community college was a great experience, but I failed to take advantage of everything available and thus suffered a very poor record for myself. But again, there is not another college to compare to MSU.

I'm in the Army now and when I get out after a little growing up I will be going back to college, and if I prove myself, I plan on applying once again to Michigan State. Thank you very much for the time you have spent with me.

2. The atmosphere; and perhaps the attitude of the students; was that of a carnival. --A high school with most of the rules gone. --was the feeling that surrounded me when I attended _____, and the seriousness of my purpose gradually left me. Thus I started to contend that I could easily work, which at the time I had to do, to be able to study -- and manage to earn decent grades. Then as my grades started to slump, I could not leave the college to work only and return as a full-time non-working student because of the pressure of the draft. Eventually my grades fell to the point where I was expelled. Then I also found that I was not subject to the draft. Since then I have been working at Buick Motor hoping to save enough money to eventually return to a college and complete my education. My apologies for this badly written note, but it was written on my break from the assembly line.

C. Reactions to MSU's Methods of Rejection.

Several students felt that our method of rejection left a great deal to be desired. There was also some evidence of a concern about numbers and impersonal treatment that might be encountered at Michigan State University.

Examples:

1. It is true that I ended my junior college education with a grade point average of 2.25, however, the last three semesters in college I averaged 2.50 and above. There is no way that MSU could have known that and it was unfortunate that I did not discuss my future plans with an MSU counselor. The size of the enrolling student body has to be taken into consideration and obviously every student cannot be given enough attention.
2. I am currently enrolled at _____ and maintaining a 2.9 overall average. I am very glad that I chose _____ because you are treated as a person and not a number. Talking with some of my friends attending MSU they told me that they are thinking of transferring to other colleges because MSU pushes you from one number to another and from office to office getting nowhere.

I am probably doing better than some of the students that you accepted from a junior college or even high

school. It is not always the straight A student or the honors students who do well in college. It's the average hard-working student who tries and learns from his mistakes.

Some of the most negative comments seemed to come from students who were doing very well at other four year institutions.

3. I am currently president of the student body at _____ progressing well both academically and socially. I needed a chance to realize my potential--MSU did not even offer the chance to meet with an admissions counselor. The end result of my experience; one stereotyped "form" post-card impersonally advising me that I was not MSU material.

It might be noted here that Michigan State University does not use a post card for such decisions.

4. I feel that Michigan State's approach to rejection of a student is all wrong. Your attitude is that you only accept the best and your cold, form letter does not really explain, other than no! I was accepted at _____ and able to transfer all credits plus two credit points -- my grades are very good -- I am active in sports and college activities and happy. I hope I will be an asset to _____. --If only you could be a little more personal in your rejections--explain why! Don't be so quick to tell a student they can't make it. You can be wrong.

D. Wrong Decision, Feeling That the Student Could have Made the Grade at MSU.

Many students felt we made the wrong decision in denying them admission to Michigan State University and indicated they felt that they could have made it had they been allowed to enroll here. At the same time many of these same students indicated that they were doing well in their present college which only further emphasizes that these students do actually find a place to continue their higher education.

Examples:

1. I feel that MSU made a wrong decision in not admitting me in the Veterinary College. I know that had I been admitted I would have succeeded in the program. I am presently attending _____, majoring in biology and have an overall average of 2.96. I hope that after receiving my degree I may be accepted in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

2. I feel you underevaluated my application. The proof is I am at _____ and doing well and I do not regret your refusal. I just changed my major while at _____.
P.S. Do not underestimate a community college student.

Some students replying in this vein indicated that the chance to pursue a major in a given field might have played a very important role in their academic success.

3. When I applied to MSU, it was because you offered the type of program I wanted to enter. Since I was not admitted, I was forced to enter another college.

At the moment I am unhappy with the college I'm at simply because they do not offer the type of program I was interested in. Now, in order to get any type of degree I must take courses that I have no interest in.

I feel that if I had been admitted to MSU I would have done well because I would have been studying something I was interested in and I would have been at the school of my choice.

However, I respect your decision, you must know what you are doing.

4. I still feel that I could have applied my interests and could have gotten into the swing of things at MSU. I am just sorry I couldn't have given it a try.
5. After completing a year at _____ I am happy with myself and _____. I have an overall 2.65 grade average. However I feel I could have successfully completed my bachelor's degree at your university.
6. At the time I applied for admission to MSU I felt that I could attend classes and finish my studies without having to worry. Before I was married I found it was difficult to be serious about school and studying. However, once I was married I feel I became more responsible and at least my intentions and attitudes about higher education changed as reflected perhaps in the grades I received. I felt that although my grades overall weren't the best that I could do college work at MSU if given a chance.

I doubt that I will ever reapply to MSU for the simple reason that I don't have extra \$10 bills to throw away with every application.

Lest the reader feel that applications are encouraged unduly and the application processing fee is only a scheme for raising additional funds,

it should be noted here that all applications are retained in an inactive file for a period of at least one year after the student would normally have enrolled. For most transfer students this means that no additional \$10 application processing fee would be necessary providing that they inform the University of their intention of reapplying for an ensuing quarter anytime during that year.

E. Campus Unrest.

Some of the students commented on campus unrest. There was a feeling of resentment on the part of these students due to the fact that they were denied admission while others who were admitted did not seem to appreciate their opportunities.

Examples:

1. I feel that if I had been admitted to Michigan State I could have continued my education and would now be an instructor in a vocational institution.

At the same time, I feel that the "revolutions" on the college campus are a disgrace to education. It is also a disgrace if they are allowed to continue. As a former taxpayer in the state of Michigan, I feel that a state supported school should be for the majority of the students--not run or torn down by a minority of students. When an everyday citizen commits a crime, he is punished. But it seems that a student can destroy property that is state owned and get away with it. If the wrongdoers would be punished, perhaps others would find that one cannot do just anything and call it freedom of expression or revolt against the unjust establishment. There are ways of changing things--unjust or not--but violence is not one of them.

2. I am presently in the Army (drafted last Nov. 15) being stationed in Fort Bliss, Texas. I am going to apply for an early out for next September -- 1970 -- and return to school for my degree -- either in business administration or architectural engineering. Being in the service has made me more determined to complete my college education. I am also married now.

I do believe that if universities such as Michigan State paid more attention to the average student who is at

college to learn they would have less student strife, etc. It seems a shame that good American citizens should be deprived of their right for education just because they are B and C students, no long hair, and no cause for wanting to destroy University property.

3. I am acquainted with a good many students from MSU and they are in attendance at this time at the college. All of them feel that it is rather difficult to gain entrance at the college but not too hard at all to stay in. These particular persons, about 50 to 60 in number, the majority of them from East and West Fee halls, have voiced this opinion time and again. And I, myself, have attended a number of lectures at the college and have found that I could have, indeed, "held my head much further above water" than many of those now in attendance. I do not feel that I am exaggerating.

From student polls and discussions, etc., it appears to me that the student body is generally getting pretty fed up with the SDS, those particular students of the Black student body who cause trouble, dorm studying and -----dorm food! We are aware that MSU is indeed a city in itself but somehow there must be a cure. Thank you for listening.

F. Dissatisfaction with Counseling.

A large number of students expressed unhappiness with the counseling situation, both in the community college and with admissions counseling at Michigan State University. Several indicated they wished that they had had opportunities to discuss their situation with a counselor prior to having the decision made. As was pointed out earlier in this chapter, this opportunity is available to all students both here at Michigan State and in the community college setting. Other students complained that they were ill-advised on the courses required for admission to Michigan State. This again is probably more the fault of the student than counseling from either institution. The MSU information brochure for transfer students and the general catalog clearly indicate which courses are required, not for admission but for waiving of University College course requirements. A list of courses is also presented that will satisfy these waiver requirements. Some students went to fairly great length to elaborate on this.

Examples:

1. Before being enrolled at _____ I was not assigned to a counselor and I took subjects that I didn't really have enough background knowledge in to successfully compete with other students. That first semester I did extremely poor. Partly due to the above and to the fact that I was working full time while attending classes. If I had previously met with a counselor I am sure he would have discouraged my attempt to take these classes. As a result I still haven't enough credits to transfer because of changing majors several times. It will take another year for me to make up what I lost to obtain my bachelor's degree. The prospects of completing my studies in the future are very dim because of my draft classification. My grades are much better now, but I still can't transfer. Because of the lack of money and credits. I'm still working full time and I'm taking summer courses to try to catch up on credits.

If I was properly advised, when I applied to _____ on which courses to take, I would have had my bachelor's degree and I would already be in MSU, but this was not the case and on my own I made many mistakes which I am still paying for.

I thank you very much for sending this second questionnaire--the first one caught me during exams so I really didn't have the time to reply,--and for being concerned with me. If I have to go in the Army I will try all the harder to get into MSU when I get out--but only after I attain my bachelor's degree.

This student is obviously confusing the bachelor's degree with the associate degree granted by the community college.

2. _____ community college is not well equipped to handle commuter students--the only kind due to lack of dormitories and housing. Counselors at the community college are ill advised as to definite requirements for State--said I would be accepted easily. Changed my major partly as a result of your decision which made me assess my position.

Now that I am in a four year college, I realize what I missed academically and particularly so by jumping into a commuter community college. I am thinking of possibly reapplying for graduate study, depending upon finances and other matters.

Admission to Nursing programs for transfer students is on a limited basis and this, too, causes ill feeling as indicated by the following comment:

3. Unfortunately, I do not feel that Michigan State University provides adequate opportunity for transfer students who desire to obtain admission into the College of Nursing, and since have applied to another university for admission. This is upsetting to me for I have always admired the Nursing program at State.

In addition, I do not feel that the advice given to me by admissions was wise or in my best interest, even though it was the only advice that could be offered.

This again refers to the lack of spaces for transfer students in the Nursing program.

4. The demands for a B.S. are not realistic or in focus with the jet and space age they are obsolete. The whole program needs to be updated. As an R.N. working toward a B.S. in nursing I feel very strongly that the guidance I received was excellent on the community college level. However, at the university level, help was minimal. It was most discouraging to me. It will be some years before I will continue my work towards my B.S. Also others of my profession have been discouraged and will not continue the efforts in progress toward their B.S. in nursing.

Students seem to feel that entrance requirements were not spelled out as exactly as possible. Michigan State University has avoided establishing specific academic grade point averages for admission of transfer students to be used in an arbitrary manner so that the admissions decision could be a personal matter related to the student involved. The only requirements are normally two years of transfer work and an attempt to have transfer students complete the University College requirements prior to their admission to Michigan State. Students continually want an established grade point average for admission and have sometimes set one in their own thinking that is non-existent as in the following case:

5. You should be more explicit on entrance requirements. For instance: In your catalog you state a 2.0 average is needed. [No such statement is made in the catalog.] But in reality one needs at least a 2.3 and preferably a 2.5. [Again, no such specific GPA is established, this has been purposely avoided.] You should give _____ community college more information on admissions requirements: namely grade point.

Through my experience, I have discovered that community college counselors do not really know much about the universities and their requirements. Most of the time I knew more than they did.

6. ...I feel that the counselors that you sent to my community college were grossly unprepared and out of touch with the students on the undergraduate level. I almost did not apply to MSU because of the impression I received from them.

It is interesting to note that this student was applying for a program in Chemical Engineering and that the "counselor" who visited with the student was one of the assistant deans from the College of Engineering.

7. My high school counselor led me to believe that I would have no trouble getting into Michigan State after one year at community college. I did not find out about the difficulties in transferring from a community college to a four year or similar school until after I began at _____. I'm not the only person I know who has gone through this and particularly with MSU. Please try and make it clear in your catalog which your representatives leave in high schools that it is very hard, with your program, to admit students after only one year at the community college. (My own plans would have been quite a bit different if I had had some correct information.)

G. Appreciation of Our Interest, Planning to Reapply in the Future.

Proof that our negative decision did not radically alter the educational objectives of these students was offered by the number of students who indicated that they still plan to apply to Michigan State sometime in the future. Some simply commented, "I will apply in the fall of 1969," another, "I am willing to give up credits towards admission to Michigan State University," and others indicated that they still wish to pursue one of our professional programs upon the completion of a bachelor's degree. Many of these students also indicated that they appreciated our interest in them such as the following:

Examples:

1. I would like to thank you for taking interest in me as a former applicant. I hope to attend MSU in the near future.

Several of the students who indicated that they plan to reapply were currently in the Armed Forces.

2. I apologise for not being able to return this earlier but I just got a release from the Armed Services. If there is any additional information you would like I would be happy to assist you.

Rather lengthy letters were not uncommon in the response of these students.

3. This letter is in reply to your student questionnaire and in appreciation of your interest in my application to Michigan State University.

As you know I was not accepted to MSU. I believe the reason was my grade point average which was a little below MSU standards. I realize MSU has many students applying at MSU with a grade point average much higher than mine and you don't have to take a chance on a poor student. My major was police administration in junior college. In this area of education I received very good grades. I feel if I would have had the opportunity to enter MSU I could have handled the work. My low grade point average was not due to poor study habits but difficulties at home which have now been corrected.

Since my application to MSU I have entered the U.S. Army. I joined the Army after I completed two years at community college. I have just recently graduated from 15 weeks of intensive training and schooling in Military Intelligence. The schooling and training I have received due to its nature cannot be discussed but many aspects pertain to Industrial Security. I received a special assignment to Japan for the next two and one half years. Near the end of my enlistment I plan on taking an industrial security course offered at Fort Holabird, Baltimore, Maryland. With my schooling in military intelligence and industrial security, my experience in these areas and my wife, I plan to finish my education. I would like to enter MSU and get my degree in industrial security or police administration. Near the end of my assignment MSU can expect another application from me for admission and I'll hope for better results.

Thank you for your time and I really appreciate your interest in me.

4. I feel that though the academic preparation was good, the community college could not offer the many "pluses" of a four year school. This is one of the reasons I chose MSU. I have been thinking of it ever since my

junior high school days. Though my studies have recently been interrupted by my entering the Army, I do hope to complete a degree at MSU when I am discharged. P.S. Thank you for your interest; that is one of the reasons for having chosen MSU.

H. Correct Decisions.

Several students indicated in their comments that they felt our decision was correct and had been in their best interest. One indicated that he felt that he could have done well if he had been admitted to State because he would have been studying in his area of interest, but he went on to state, "However, I respect your decision, you must know what you are doing." Other students were a little more positive in this respect:

Examples:

1. When I was turned down because of inability to be able to compete at MSU's high standards, I was told by many faculty members that this was probably a good thing. It might be noted that I obtained a 3.53 GPA my first semester at _____. All I can say is "thank you."
2. Being as I have become definite in my decision to go into chemical engineering, I will be attending _____ for a year and transfer to Michigan Tech.

I feel that you were, in every respect, just in your refusal of my admittance at the time of my application.

Please excuse my delinquency with regard to my failure to mail this report earlier.

I. Stimulus for Future Success.

One last comment that needs relating here because it probably is typical of the attitude of many students who received a negative response to their application to Michigan State:

Example:

1. It certainly was a let down when I was not accepted at State. But perhaps it was a major turning point in my life. I was determined not to quit; but to go on and get the job done.

Statements such as this indicate that our decision did not deter these students from achieving their educational objectives, but, in fact, may have been a positive influence providing them the stimulus to go on for their bachelor's degree in some other institution.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The rapid growth of the community college in recent years (approximately one new community college each week) has opened the doors to education beyond high school for millions of students throughout the United States. The state of Michigan has been one of the states most deeply involved in this rapid growth, particularly during the last decade. In 1960 there were 16 community colleges in Michigan with a total enrollment of 27,229 students. Today there are 29 colleges with an estimated enrollment in the fall of 1969 of 109,220 students. Coupled with the increases in this segment of the college-going population is the problem of providing for the continuing education of these community college students following the completion of their two year programs at the community college.

A matter of grave concern for all of those involved in the admissions process is the need for improved articulation between community colleges and four year institutions so that students are able to achieve the best "fit" possible as they make the transition between what were formerly called "junior colleges" and the four year colleges and universities. A better understanding of the requirements of the four year institutions by community college counselors and students, a better knowledge by all concerned of the types of higher education available (the system of higher education in Michigan), and the proper placement of all students within that system are necessary if Michigan is to realize its educational objectives.

This paper was written in an effort to promote that understanding and knowledge.

To accomplish this objective, a study was made of all Michigan residents who sought admission as transfer students from the public community colleges to Michigan State University in the fall of 1968, and were denied admission.

Admissions folders for the students in the study were analyzed for grade point average, the number of hours completed, type of recommendation, test results where available, high school rank when available, and the type of decision rendered the student. The information thus gained from the folders helped provide the information needed regarding the aptitude and preparation of these students.

While very little has been written on the subject of what happens to students who are denied admission, many studies have been made on the success of transfer students in four year institutions. These studies have served to reinforce the advisability of the completion of two full years in community college prior to transfer as a vital factor in the student's future academic success.

Questionnaires were sent to the students involved in the study in an effort to determine the students attitudes relative to community college and to four year institutions involved, and particularly, to point out weaknesses in the existing partnership between community colleges and the four year institutions. Students were sent questionnaires a second time if they had failed to respond after an adequate passage of time, and students still failing to respond were called by phone and asked to complete the questionnaire. A smaller group, those who indicated by phone they planned to send the questionnaire, were written to yet a third time.

The response was quite heartening: 100 percent of the information from the folders was available, of course, but 159 students out of a total of 209 in the study did send in questionnaires. This amounted to slightly over 76 percent. In addition, the community colleges were sent a questionnaire seeking additional information on the whereabouts of students from whom we had not had a response. Through this additional effort, something was learned as to the educational status of all but six percent of the students in the study.

An analysis of the data indicated there was much need for improved articulation between the community colleges and the four year institutions and that much needed to be done in an effort to better inform prospective transfer students about the entire higher educational structure in Michigan. The data showed that very few of the applicants had completed two full years of community college and made a grade point average of better than 2.0, were recommended and had still received a regular not admit letter from Michigan State. It became clearly evident that many who applied were not properly prepared academically, had failed to apprise themselves of requirements for the various receiving institutions and had rather vague ideas of the differences of competition existing within the higher educational structure in Michigan.

In spite of this, the study gave ample proof of the writer's theory that many are able to continue their education at other institutions after receiving a denial from one of the four year colleges and that most students do manage to find a "fit" in the system of higher education in Michigan. The vast majority of these students, over 80 percent, were currently enrolled in college and positive proof was furnished that 88 percent of the students were either in college or in the Armed Forces, most of the latter planning to return to college upon the fulfillment of their military

obligation. As further proof of the existence of a system of higher education in Michigan the data showed that over 71 percent of the students in the study were currently enrolled in a Michigan public four year college.

Many students took advantage of an invitation to make written comments on their questionnaire, over 50 percent of the students doing so. The comments proved very valuable and pointed out some shortcomings on the part of both the community colleges and Michigan State University. In fact, comments made by these students will perhaps play the most important part as far as any changes to be made by the Office of Admissions at Michigan State this year and in the years to come.

Recommendations:

It has been estimated that over half of the freshmen beginning college in Michigan this fall will start their program in one of the Michigan publicly supported community colleges. The implications of this estimate make it crystal clear that there is greater need for better articulation between the community colleges and the four year institutions. It is recommended that more complete usage be made of studies such as this and the follow-up studies conducted by most four year institutions concerning their transfer students. It is altogether too evident that there is need for much better understanding of the transfer process in Michigan higher education by all concerned.

Many more students should be counseled to seek admission to one of the regional universities, or one of the new four year state colleges. The existing major universities simply cannot, particularly in light of recent legislative budgetary restrictions, continue to take an ever increasing number of transfer students.

Students should be advised while still in high school and certainly while in community college that most four year institutions desire the completion of two full years of college before accepting transfers.

Without becoming arbitrary, it is most desirable that the community colleges and their students be accurately informed of the levels of competition existing within the four year institution so that students will be able to more readily fit into one of these institutions, thus foregoing the heartache and frustration that might possibly result from a denial of admission.

It is recommended that much better use of the present provisions for accomplishing this task be made. Four year institutions have admissions counselors who are well versed in the transfer process. Most four year institutions welcome the opportunity to visit with transfer students both in the community college setting and on the four year campus. Altogether too few prospective transfer students are availing themselves of this direct form of counseling and every effort should be made to increase this audience. It is equally evident that the prospective transfer student is not utilizing the counseling services available to him in his community college. No matter how good the articulation between community colleges and the four year institution might be, unless the students themselves take advantage of the knowledge gained through such articulation, the efforts of many concerned individuals will go for nought.

It is quite evident from the responses gained from the study that there is a very definite need for a more cordial, more complete letter of denial. Many students seemed to misunderstand the intention of the letter and took as a final rejection of their application what was meant to be only a rejection for that time, under a given set of circumstances. An example of the type of change that has already come about as a result of this study is shown by the two letters at the end of this chapter. The

first is a copy of the "NA 26" used for the fall of 1968. The second letter is the new "NA 26" recently put into effect.

Finally, the writer has recommended to all of the men in the Office of Admissions and Scholarships at Michigan State University that the word be given clearly and concisely to prospective students, both at the high school level and at the transfer level, as to the requirements necessary to gain admission to Michigan State. The admissions officers meeting with high school students this fall during their college nights will be much more explicit in indicating to students that with few exceptions, two full years at a community college with a better than average record will be required if the student is to be able to gain admission to Michigan State following attendance at a Michigan community college.

Lastly, certain of the results of this study will be made available to the community college by virtue of newsletters that are sent to the Michigan community colleges on a periodic basis by the Office of Admissions and Scholarships at Michigan State University.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

"NA 26"

Dear _____:

We are very sorry, but a thorough review of your application indicates that your record is not yet sufficient to predict success for you in your studies at Michigan State University, and we therefore are not able to grant you admission at this time.

We urge you to continue carrying a full academic load at _____ (name of school) _____. If at a later date you have significantly improved your record and wish to transfer to Michigan State, we shall be happy to give your application serious consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard E. Hensen
Assistant Director
REH/mh

cc: Community College

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Date

Address

"NA 26"
Revised

Dear _____:

A thorough review of your application indicates that you are not qualified for admission to Michigan State University at this time.

We clearly state in our instructions in the application that you should complete two full years of college prior to admission as a transfer student. We recommend that you continue your studies at your present college. Studies of transfer students here and at other institutions clearly reveal that students who complete two full years of college have a much better chance for future academic success than those who seek transfer earlier in their college careers.

It is also in your best interest to complete all of your University College requirements prior to enrollment at Michigan State. For these requirements and a list of courses we accept in place of them, consult either our general catalog or our brochure, "Information for Transfer Students," or check with your local counselor.

If you will have your record sent to us during your last term or semester or at the end of your two year program, we shall be happy to reconsider your application. You will not need to complete a new application at that time, simply write to us and ask us to reactivate your present application.

Anything you can do in the time remaining to improve your academic record will enhance your chances for admission, of course.

Most sincerely,

Richard E. Hensen
Assistant Director

REH:gak

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Baird, Leonard L., "The Degree Goals of College Applicants," College and University, Spring, 1968.
2. Baird, Leonard L., J. M. Richards, Jr., L. R. Shevel, "A Description of Graduates of Two-Year Colleges," ACT Research Report, January, 1969.
3. Improving Undergraduate Education, A Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967.
4. D'Amico, Louis A. and J. D. Russell, "Junior College Enrollment Characteristics," College and University, Fall, 1968.
5. DeLisle, Frances, "Transfer Patterns From Michigan State University Involving the Undergraduate Degree Program Population of Fall, 1965 and Extending to Fall, 1966," Michigan State University Office of Institutional Research Report Number 4, 1967.
6. Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., "Recognizing the Expanding Role of the Junior Colleges in Higher Education," College Admissions Policies for the 1970's, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1968.
7. Grover, Arland L., "A Comparative Study of Wyoming Community College Students Who Transfer to the University of Wyoming," College and University, Winter, 1967.
8. Hoyt, Donald P., "Forecasting Success in Specific Colleges," ACT Research Report, August, 1968.
9. Proceedings of the Illinois Statewide Articulation Conference for Two Year and Four Year Colleges, Private Publication, Chicago, Illinois, 1966.
10. Knoell, Dorothy M., and Leland L. Medsker, Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges, Cooperative Research Project No. 2167, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1964.
11. Knoell, Dorothy M., and Leland L. Medsker, From Junior To Senior College, A National Study of the Transfer Student, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, American Council on Education, 1965.
12. Lavin, David E., The Prediction of Academic Performance, Russell Sage Foundation, Connecticut Printers, Inc., Hartford, Conn., 1965.

13. Lynes, Russell, "How Good Are the Junior Colleges," Harpers, November, 1966.
14. Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers Report, Membership Publication, Fall, 1968.
15. Meadows, Mark E., and R. R. Ingle, "Reverse Articulation: A Unique Function of the Junior College," College and University, Fall, 1968.
16. Morrison, Jack R., "Pre-College Counseling: The Time Given," College and University, Spring, 1968.
17. O'Connor, Thomas J., Follow-Up Studies in Junior Colleges: A Tool for Institutional Improvement, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C., 1965.
18. Panos, Robert J., and A. W. Astin, "A Profile of Entering 1965 College Freshmen," College and University, Winter, 1967
19. Registrar's Report, "Students Enrolled from Michigan Community Colleges," Office of Evaluation and Research, MSU, Private Publication, 1961-68.
20. Seashore, Harold, "Academic Abilities of Junior College Students," Junior College Journal, XXIX, 1958, pp.74-80.
21. Smith, Max S., The Community College, Syllabus for Education 822.
22. Spence, James R., "Whither Admissions Research, Not Whether," College and University, Spring, 1968.
23. Thresher, B. Alden, College Admissions and the Public Interest, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1966.
24. Thornton, James W., Jr., The Community-Junior College, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.

APPENDICES

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. When you first enrolled in the community college did you plan to transfer to a four-year college or university? Yes____No____

If your answer is yes, did you plan to transfer:

a) After completing one year? Yes____No____
b) After completing two years or the associate degree? Yes____No____
2. Was the community college your first choice college after finishing high school? Yes____No____

a) If no, did you attend another college prior to community college? Yes____No____

If so, where?_____
3. Was your choice to begin your higher education at community college due to:

Mainly financial considerations? Yes____No____
Poor high school preparation? Yes____No____
Other? Please explain:_____
4. Did you expect to be admitted when you applied to Michigan State as a transfer student? Yes____No____Uncertain____
5. In looking back, do you now feel that our "not admit" decision was in your best interest? Yes____No____
6. Do you plan to reactivate your application or to re-apply to Michigan State in the future? Yes____No____
7. If you had been admitted, would all of your MSU University College ("basics") equivalent courses have been completed prior to enrollment here? Yes____No____
8. As a result of our decision:

Do you plan to complete a bachelor's degree in another college? Yes____No____

Have you changed your major? Yes____No____
9. Did you apply to more than one four-year college or university when you applied to MSU? Yes____No____
10. Did your community college counselor:

Apprise you of admissions requirements to various colleges? Yes____No____
Encourage you to apply to MSU? Yes____No____
Encourage you to complete a full two years at community college prior to transferring? Yes____No____

Encourage your application to less competitive four-year colleges?

Yes____No____

11. Did you have an opportunity to meet with an admissions counselor from MSU:

Individually? Yes____No____; In a group setting? Yes____No____

Prior to your application? Yes____No____; After application? Yes____No____

Prior to receiving our decision? Yes____No____; After our decision? Yes____No____

12. In your judgment did the MSU admissions counselor adequately describe admissions requirements to MSU? Yes____No____

13. Are you presently enrolled in or admitted to college? Yes____No____

a) If the answer is yes, is it the community college from which you applied to MSU? Yes____No____

b) If you are currently enrolled in community college, have you been admitted to another four-year college for future enrollment? Yes____No____

c) If yes, please name:_____

d) If you are currently enrolled in a four-year college, please name:_____

14. Do you feel that your community college provided you with good preparation for MSU? Yes____No____

15. Do you feel that it is easier to earn good grades in your community college than in a major university? Yes____No____

16. Do you feel that your community college experience was:

Similar to a four-year college experience? Yes____No____

Similar to your high school experience? Yes____No____

Other (please explain)_____

17. If you worked to support yourself while in community college do you:

Plan on working while attending a four-year college? Yes____No____

Feel that working adversely affected your grades? Yes____No____

18. Do you feel that the fact that you were a commuter student:

Had a negative effect on your community college grades? Yes____No____

Made community college a less meaningful experience? Yes____No____

Not applicable because I was not a commuter student_____

Any additional comments you wish to make will be greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX B: Exhibit of First and Second Letter to Not Admit Transfer
Students From Michigan Community Colleges.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Dear Student:

We need your help, and perhaps we may be of help to you and other students from your community college who seek to transfer to four year institutions.

Last year, when you applied for admission to Michigan State, we wrote to you indicating that we could not admit you at that time. We sincerely believe that our response was the most honest decision we could render based on the overall record you had written. We are very concerned that our decisions are in the best interests of students. We are further concerned with the effect this decision has on students and for this reason we are asking for your assistance.

Will you please give us a few minutes of your time and complete the enclosed questionnaire? Your response will be very helpful to your community college, to MSU and certainly to those students who apply to State in the future. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Most sincerely,

Terrence J. Carey
Director
jw

Enclosure

APPENDIX C: Exhibit of Third Letter to Not Admit Transfer
Students From Michigan Community Colleges

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Dear _____:

As a result of our phone conversation the other evening, we are sending you another copy of the questionnaire as you requested.

We certainly appreciate your help with this study. It surely will be helpful to our future relations with prospective transfer students from Michigan's community colleges.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Most sincerely,

Terrence J. Carey
Director
sh

Enclosure

APPENDIX D: Exhibit of Letter Sent to Community Colleges Requesting Information About Students.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN 48823

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS

The Office of Admissions and Scholarships at Michigan State University is making a study of prospective transfer students from Michigan's public community colleges who were denied admission to MSU. The information gained from this study will hopefully aid both the community colleges and MSU in the counseling of students and serve to improve articulation between the two-year and four-year institutions of the State.

We have written to all students from your college who were denied admission for the fall term, 1968. Unfortunately, we have not had a response from your students listed below.

We would be most appreciative if you could take a few minutes and provide us with the information needed to make our study complete. Where more than one answer applies, such as a student who is currently enrolled in your college but has been admitted to another four-year college, please include both answers. Where no information is available, please so indicate after student's name. Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated. There is a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Most sincerely,

Terrence J. Carey
Director

<u>Student's Name</u>	<u>Currently enrolled</u> <u>in your college</u> (Please indicate yes or no)	<u>College currently</u> <u>attending</u>	<u>College admitted</u> <u>to</u>
-----------------------	---	--	--------------------------------------