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Putting Small College Admissions in a Marketing Mode

JACK L. ENGLEDOW and RONALD D. ANDERSON

ABSTRACT

Marketing has recently been prescribed as an aid in the problems of higher education, but small schools often see marketing as both inimical to their missions and traditions and too expensive to implement. In actuality, small schools may have more to gain by using contemporary marketing procedures than large ones, and they may be better situated strategically because of the flexibility offered by their size and self-determination. An annual marketing planning model is proposed to integrate marketing thinking into admissions procedures, and examples are given of how one small school has begun to generate and use market research procedures as a routine and relatively inexpensive adjunct to its normal admissions activities.

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEMS of the small, private college are well-known. They share with larger public institutions the Scylla and Charybdis of dwindling student pools and creeping inflation [4,10]. They
bear the additional burdens of tuition rates that must cover a much larger proportion of their costs; the inability to achieve economies of scale on resources because of commitment to small classes and small enrollments; fluctuating values of endowments, gifts, and foundation support as a result of unsettled financial conditions [3,5]; and continuing attacks on liberal arts—traditionally their curricular backbone [13,14]. A straightforward projection of these realities suggests a dreary future of increasing costs, heightened competition, more difficult financing, and steady loss of students to the larger public schools. That may be too simplistic and pessimistic an interpretation.

The small, private colleges themselves possess some significant differential advantages in a seemingly hostile environment. From a philosophical standpoint, the intensive, small scale, highly personal style of education which they offer may be more consistent with the values of the decade to come than with one just past. Society's increasing disenchantment with bigness, depersonalization, bureaucracy and canned solutions suggests this. Because of their smaller size and the absence of publicly-dictated missions, they also may be more flexible in their policies and strategies, and more able both to react rapidly to changes in the educational environment and to communicate a clear cut picture of their programs and purpose.

It is clear that survival for small colleges depends upon taking full advantage of these and other strengths and avoiding head-on competition with state-financed schools for all students. Financial, physical, and philosophical considerations make it impossible for them to be all things to all people. A successful future depends heavily upon their ability to identify viable educational missions within their "core of strength," to perform those missions effectively and efficiently, and to communicate effectively and efficiently with their many publics about the nature and worth of these alternative educational experiences.

One key bundle of skills required in this process is marketing—a term which provokes a decidedly edgy reaction in academic circles. It will be the purpose of this article to argue for introduction of a marketing thrust into the small college admissions program, to present an annual planning model for admissions based upon marketing principles, and to show an example of how one small college has begun to build a fairly sophisticated market research base with modest expenditures.
WHY MARKETING

In the past several years, a substantive literature has been building suggesting the application of marketing principles to higher education [1,6,8,9,12]. This message has probably been less heeded in the small colleges than the larger ones, both because the perceived hucksterism of marketing is inimical to the proud tradition and high academic standards of many small schools, and because its perceived cost and complexity suggest that it better serves the large state universities — the academic equivalent of major corporations. Neither of these perceptions is necessarily true. Though marketing is often equated with the raucous-voiced peddling of soap, its basic principles are more general, more useful, and even more dignified than that. Neither is implementation of marketing per se expensive. It requires a commitment, a changed point of view and an intensification of effort more than massive expenditures, and it should, in fact, cause more efficient use of scarce resources when properly implemented.

Put in the simplest terms possible, marketing is a matching process. It involves identifying societal wants or needs and matching them to organizational capabilities and objectives — What the organization wants to be, and what it can be. If the identification and matching process are true, then an exchange takes place — normally dollars for services or products. The core of real marketing is that it must begin with the consumer and the identification of his wants and/or needs, or the whole house of cards eventually collapses.

The application to the small, private college is obvious. It was argued above that such colleges have perhaps a greater ability than larger institutions to decide autonomously what they can be and what they wish to be. Though most schools have over time developed physical plants, faculty, staff, traditions, and reputations which delineate the general nature of their capabilities, they are still left with a broad range of possible policies and strategies in the medium and long run, and considerable tactical leeway even in any given short-run operating period. The harsh realities of the current environment suggest that the day is long past when just being a nice, picturesque little school was enough. The small college which intends to survive the eighties must choose very precisely what it intends to do and be; it must be very certain that those things need
doing; it must do them well; and it must learn to communicate those intentions and accomplishments to its many publics with skill and imagination.

The adoption of a marketing mode for a small college, then, involves the following planning sequence:

1. Realistic evaluation of the school's resources, expertise and general capabilities.
2. Specification or review of the school's objectives.
3. Identification of different types of current and future educational needs broadly within the scope of 1 and 2.
4. Careful matching of the school to educational needs based upon 1, 2, and 3 above — particularly those where the goals and capabilities give a "competitive advantage" over larger state institutions.

This procedure is clearly consistent with increasing pressure for better academic planning in all of higher education [7].

Such planning by the institution itself is a necessary prerequisite to a marketing approach to the admissions process. Unless the college administration has clearly identified its educational mission and established the school's willingness and ability to carry out that mission over time, by definition, marketing cannot take place in admissions activities. It should be the purpose of admissions to finetune the process of identifying and communicating with prospective students within the general dictates of the institutional plan. If no such plan exists, admissions either is left to flounder with no clear target and objectives, or must take upon itself policy formation which is beyond its prerogatives. The framework presented in the next section presupposes that an institutional plan has specified long and short-range objectives and broadly established the nature of the "target market."

A MARKETING PLANNING MODEL FOR ADMISSIONS

A marketing mode for the admissions department of a college involves a complete understanding of the missions and objectives (long and short term) of the institution, and an effort to identify, understand, and communicate with the target group of prospective students suggested by those missions and objectives. This process is complex and cumulative, and it requires careful planning. Figure 1 presents an Annual Planning Model for admissions. It is basically
Figure 1
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a flow chart, suggesting the steps in formulating a detailed annual marketing plan. The steps will be discussed briefly, in order:

**Environment Review**

A systematic scanning to identify both “threats” and “opportunities” which may be present in trends or particular events. This is an ongoing, continuous screening which needs to be focused and summarized at the outset of the planning process in a concise written statement. The statement should answer the question “What are the external forces which may have significant impact on admissions outcomes during this planning period?” A critical issue here is the proper identification of the school’s relevant environment. The following categories furnish general guidelines:

- **The Socio-Economic Climate** — provides the basic behavior, motivation, and feasibility framework to individuals in a society at a given time — the “working edge” of culture.
- **Demographic Trends** — the raw material for student pools plus employment and other economic opportunities.
- **Educational Climate** — overall attitudes toward education, resources available, trends in institutional development and management. Highly correlated with the Socio-Economic Climate and Demographic Trends above.
- **Public Policy** — new laws, agency enforcement trends and policies, significant court decisions, programs or resources offered.
- **Competition** — changes in policy, curriculum, and charges by rival institutions. Changes in the definition of what are rival institutions.

The whole process of environmental scanning is so complex and highly qualitative that it probably is best accomplished if the full admissions staff is actively seeking information, and is regularly scheduled to exchange views and seek consensus on this core of critical planning assumptions.

**Information Sources:** Popular press; academic and trade journals; census data; college pool data; peers at other institutions; staff observations and interpretations; administrator’s views; internal planning documents of the college or other departments of the college; etc.

**College Goals Review**

The long-range goals of the college and the period objectives which result from them determine the period objectives of admissions. Though it is unlikely that the overall goals of the college
will change substantively in the short run, it is almost inevitable that the specific policies and objectives required to attain those basic goals will change — probably annually. It is imperative that the college goals and objectives be precisely stated at the beginning of the planning period; admissions planning cannot proceed without this. There is no other way to assess the nature of the admissions task and constraints within which it must be accomplished.

**Market Analysis**

This step seeks to characterize as precisely as possible — quantitatively and qualitatively — the nature of the market and the nature of the marketing task for the planned period. The process is sequential — beginning with the size and nature of the overall pool, proceeding to the size and specialized characteristics of the pool in the primary marketing area, and concentrating upon the specifics which have relevance to the college's high probability pool. Increasingly detailed and sophisticated materials from the College Entrance Examination Board and similar organizations have made this chore more efficient [2].

The task of market analysis is again an ongoing one which must be focused and summarized at the beginning of the annual planning process. One of the most critical long-term objectives of the admissions department is a continuously improving understanding of the needs, attitudes, interests and motivations of the target market. This implies well-designed, regular, and cumulative market research, and systematic feedback from the staff.

The output of this analysis should be a portrait of the size and nature of the college's market for the planning year, with emphasis on discernible changes from previous periods in numbers, needs, attitudes, information needs, motivations, etc.

*Information Sources:* Routine or special purpose market research; college pools data; secondary sources (research by others, or for related purposes); staff feedback; trade journals; census data, admissions records, other.

The model as diagramed shows that the college goals review and market analysis are interactive, become linked together in a single “unit,” and precede and lead into the balance of the planning process. These important steps place boundaries around what the Admissions Department wishes to accomplish during a planning period, and what the environment and market make it possible
to accomplish. The steps which follow are an attempt to operationalize the admissions efforts based upon these analyses.

Admissions Objectives

This step consists of a precise statement of overall admissions objectives in terms which are concrete and measurable. These objectives should serve as both a framework of purpose for forming strategy and program, and a means of evaluation in the feedback phase. A necessary prerequisite for this stage is determination of the proper dimensions to be included in the objectives (e.g., class standing percentages, SAT Score means, numbers of matriculants, geographical dispersion, financial aid given).

Basic Marketing Strategy

It has been said that objectives are the desired destination, strategy is the route selected to take you there, and program (tactics) is the vehicle used to travel that route. The basic marketing strategy should do a clear-cut job of describing the route, so that it gives direction and purpose to all program efforts which follow — staff, publications, alumni, and others.

The basic strategy should contain three main elements:

1. A strategy statement which is brief enough to serve as a handy guide to action and lengthy enough to separate it from other routes to the same goal.

2. A positioning statement which sets the structure and tone of the communications process. What is the institution? What are the key messages which are to be consistently transmitted to prospective students by all communications efforts?

3. A target market specification which delineates as precisely as possible the particular group of prospective students who will be the focus of admissions activities.

These three are in a sense inseparable, and certainly must be consistent with one another and complementary. It may be more convenient to merge them into a single presentation than to separate them artificially. The point is that all three parts must be included in order to describe the strategy for use as an action guide.

Marketing Program

This step is the real action phase, where the plan finally meets with reality. This is an attempt to translate the strategy into explicit
actions of the tools which the department has at its disposal — staff publications, alumni, special events, and all other. The important point to note here is that this step also begins with a specific set of sub-objectives for each program area — subobjectives which should flow logically from department objectives and strategies already determined. Again, the objectives must be concrete and measurable if they are to be effective. Each admissions counsellor should have specific objectives for numbers and quality applicants and matriculants; the alumni relations staff should have objectives on the number of applicant recommendations from alumni during a recruiting year, etc. The overall program is not likely to be successful unless each unit in the program is assigned specific chores and is accountable for accomplishing them.

Annual Marketing Plan

This is the final stage in the planning process, prior to implementation. It should be a well organized summary of the conclusions of the planning exercise which presents the objectives, program basics, budget, schedule and feedback mechanisms. Formulation of the final plan is an interactive process involving all admissions personnel, so that feasibility checks and basic staff support are built into the finished document. A key consideration is whether the individual program elements (which have probably been built up separately) link together into a consistent cohesive total program which travels the prescribed strategy “route” and presents a means of reaching the departmental objectives. The goal at this stage is not to produce a monumental formal document, but rather to present a crisp and well organized action guide for the year’s activities. The precise nature of that presentation should evolve over time, based both upon the style of the Director who finally prepares it and the needs of the staff which must put it to use.

Feedback and Control

Feedback is regular and pre-specified information flow designed to check progress toward attainment of objectives. Control is the adjustment of programs, based upon feedback, to bring actual performance closer to desired performance. This step is obviously an outgrowth of the objectives phase. The trick here is to have feedback frequent and detailed enough to assess goal attainment
without overwhelming staff with preparing and reading endless reports. This balance, too, in part, evolves with experience.

In all, this planning model is designed to bring the admission department's full talents to bear on an annual, systematic, analysis of its mission, and to generate an effective and efficient plan for achieving that mission.

MARKET RESEARCH IN SMALL COLLEGE ADMISSIONS
— A CASE HISTORY

The most basic tenet of a marketing mode for admissions is that it must be based upon an understanding of the needs of prospective students. The commentary above has consistently suggested that this means continuing market research into the perceptions, attitudes, interests, and motivations of the selected target group of prospects and those who influence their decisions. Much secondary research is available on young people in general [11, 17, 18], but primary research is the only direct source for valuable information about particular students' reactions to particular schools. Most small college admissions staffs have limited financial resources, limited time, and little experience with market research and statistical analysis, so an extensive market research program seems a difficult objective. It is possible, however, to build a valuable and fairly extensive data base — amenable to sophisticated statistical analysis — with only modest marginal additives to the cost and effort involved in routine admissions activities. The following section describes how one small college has begun to assemble such a data pool and to use it effectively.

The School

Able College (name disguised) is a private college of just under 1,000 students with a liberal arts curriculum, a reputation for high academic standards, and a relatively high tuition rate. The admissions staff consists of a director, five counsellors, and an office staff of four, plus some part-time help. They have carried on an aggressive and effective admissions program over time, but like all similar schools have been fighting an uphill battle against the hostile environment sketched at the beginning of this paper. Aided by an alumnus-consultant, they have undertaken an extensive audit of their entire admissions program, and have instituted an annual planning procedure similar to the one proposed above — including
three separate regular market research inputs. The three vehicles are described in Table I and the sections following:

**Student Focus Groups**

As part of the audit process, groups of 8 to 10 students from each of the four classes took part in directed group interviews of two hours' length covering perceptions of various facets of campus life, the academic program, and the admissions process. Although open discussion was encouraged, care was taken to cover common ground to get a large number of free-form opinions on areas of specific interest. (Did admissions paint a true picture of the college for you? What three words best describe the ideal student of Able College?, etc.)

The output of such discussions cannot be analyzed statistically, but the directed discussion can produce valuable insights into areas such as trends in student thought, problem areas in admissions processes, strengths and weaknesses in publications, and others. One of the most important uses is to identify problem areas for more detailed research by other methods.

Able College has used the information from focus groups in a number of ways, including the revision and strengthening of its admissions publications and design of the questionnaires discussed below. They plan to repeat the process regularly. Interestingly, by interviewing one group of 8 - 10 students for each of the four classes, Able can tap the opinions of over 5 per cent of its total student body; one of their big-school state rivals would require 150 focus groups of ten students each to duplicate that feat. There are some advantages to being small.

**Matriculant — Non-Matriculant Questionnaires**

Each year, after the class has been filled, nearly identical questionnaires are administered to all matriculants and to selected non-matriculants. All students who have been accepted, but have chosen not to matriculate are mailed a questionnaire quizzing them extensively on important influences on their decision and their perceptions of Able College and its admissions personnel and procedures. Specifically, the respondents are asked to compare on a number of dimensions the strength of Able College to the College they actually selected, “based upon your own particular needs.” Response is on a five-point scale ranging from “Able much stronger” to “Your college much stronger.” Included are over 30 separate
### TABLE I
**ROUTINE MARKET DATA SOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Nature of Respondents</th>
<th>Nature of Information</th>
<th>Statistical Analyses Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Focus Groups</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>Random samples of Able students — by class.</td>
<td>Directed, open-end discussion of campus attitudes, admissions activities, other issues of interest; content may vary considerably from year to year.</td>
<td>None. Qualitative evaluation only — for general conclusions and further research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculant — Non-Matriculant Questionnaires</td>
<td>≈ 300</td>
<td>Census of 200+ entering Freshmen Respondents to mailing to 400 students accepted not matriculating ≈ 100.</td>
<td>Detailed questions on nature of college decision process and comparison of Able to rival colleges on school characteristics and admissions procedures. Consistent from year to year for maximum comparisons.</td>
<td>% Tables and cross-tabulations. Means with t tests, other univariate statistics. Factor and Multiple Discriminant Analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Applicant Questionnaires</td>
<td>3,000+</td>
<td>All prospective students submitting preliminary applications</td>
<td>Demographic and basic factual information</td>
<td>% Tables and means Multiple Discriminant Analysis. Logit Model Analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABLE COLLEGE**
dimensions covering college characteristics (Academic Reputation, Living Facilities, Prestige of Degree, etc.) and admissions contracts (e.g., Campus Visit, Ease of Paperwork Procedures, Informational Value of Publications).

Matriculating freshmen are administered the same basic questionnaire as part of freshman orientation. The matriculant questionnaire differs only in that respondents are asked to rate Able against the school "they would have attended had they not chosen Able."

The result each year is a data pool from approximately 200 matriculants and 100 non-matriculants (response rates to this mail questionnaire average about 25 per cent) and the pool obviously is cumulative and useful in future years. Since questionnaires are nearly identical and each respondent compares Able directly to some other school, a variety of useful comparisons are available: matriculants vs. non-matriculants; Able vs. other private colleges; Able vs. public schools; year X matriculants vs. year X + 1 matriculants, and others. The form of response yields conventional per cent tables and crosstabulations, but is also compatible with more sophisticated univariate and multivariate statistical analysis.

As an example, last year's data were subjected to factor analysis (to determine which variable seemed to cluster together to form more basic general dimensions). These dimensions (factors) were then input into multiple discriminant analysis to determine which of the basic dimensions were the most important in distinguishing between matriculants and non-matriculants. Analyses were performed using the SPSS statistical package [15], which are widely available in college and university computer libraries.

Able came to several separate conclusions of operational importance based upon these analyses, including:

1. Prestige and Academic reputation formed a separate perceptual dimension from the other basic characteristics of the college. Able rated very high on this dimension versus most rivals and it was one of the most important in separating matriculants from non-matriculants.

2. On-campus and off-campus admissions activities were perceived by respondents as separate dimensions, and the Able staff was much weaker on off-campus contacts. The good news from the discriminant analysis was that off-campus
activities seemed not to be an important determinant of matriculation.

3. Able's overall admissions efforts were perceived as quite strong relative to all rival institutions, but publications were seen as about "average" with visual impact weak. The importance of this finding was accentuated by the fact that factor analysis indicated that effectiveness of publications was strongly linked to academic reputation-prestige which was identified above as a critical dimension to Able.

These and other conclusions became important inputs in the admission staff's planning procedures in the following year. Though some findings simply confirmed conventional wisdom at Able, others were thought-provoking enough to stimulate changes in basic procedures and/or further research.

The basic point to be made is that the matriculant—non-matriculant questionnaires generate a cumulative, versatile data pool amenable to simple or sophisticated statistical manipulation, capable of generating concrete operational results, and a fairly modest expenditure of time and money.

**Preliminary Application Data Pool**

One of the most critical problems facing a small college admissions staff is how to efficiently utilize limited staff and budget in serving extensive geographic territories and large student pools. Able College has adopted a strategy of focusing its activities by means of a continuing effort to identify high probability prospects early in the admissions process. One potential tool in their evaluation is the data pool from preliminary applications.

Able College receives upwards of 3,000 preliminary applications annually. A variety of information is either contained in, or may be derived from, these applications, including high school, class rank, distance from Able, SAT scores, career preference, and more. Information from the preliminary forms is continually computerized as part of the applicant's permanent record. Since actual matriculants may be identified at the end of the admissions year, this data pool contains a great deal of potentially useful information.

One possibility is to subject the data to multiple discriminant analysis, as used in the Matriculant—Non-matriculant Pool above. This analysis results in a discriminant function which gauges the importance of each variable in separating matriculants and non-matriculants in the present year, and should provide guidelines for
separating high probability from low-probability prospects in subsequent years.

A second possibility is to input the basic demographic data into a stochastic utility model, of which the logit model is one example [16]. Such a model has the capacity for not only estimating the importance of individual variables in predicting matriculation, but also for generating an actual probability that any given individual prospect may matriculate at Able or at some rival institution.

These techniques have the potential to strengthen Able's existing efforts at early identification of high-probability prospects—now based largely on intuition and much simpler percentage analyses of individual demographic variables.

**Weaknesses**

Sophisticated market researchers and statisticians can quickly identify flaws in the data bases described here (ignoring prospects not accepted or not submitting preliminary applications; no inputs from important influencers, such as parents and high school counselors; low and perhaps biased responses from non-matriculants; small cell size in some parts of matriculant—non-matriculant analyses). These flaws and others are acknowledged, and can certainly be reduced over time as skills increase, and if budgets grow. Other schools may have different needs and/or other information sources readily available. The purpose here was to point out that fairly powerful market research data are available to the small college as a minimal extension of routine activities, and to give an example from one school which is taking advantage of that fact. The types of data collection and analysis suggested here can be implemented as normal staff functions with some minimal help from outside consultants in designing questionnaires, recording data, and analyzing and interpreting results.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

This article has sought to establish marketing not just as a respectable, but rather a critical activity of small colleges in the next decade. It has presented a practical planning framework for organizing admissions functions into a marketing mode, and given an actual example of the collection and use of market research style data to support that effort.

It should be reiterated that what is proposed here is not just selling or advertising, though these may be important facets of market-
ing. Marketing is a process that seeks to match a school’s selected mission to that group of students which is best suited to benefit from that particular mission. If the mission itself is irrelevant or out of step with the tenor of the times, then the process must ultimately fail, no matter how large the admissions staff or how slick the publications. There are many missions for small colleges which are both relevant and attuned to the times. To be successful, small colleges must take advantage of their strengths by identifying these missions with precision, dedicating themselves to serving them effectively and, just as importantly, by communicating with their publics in far more aggressive and imaginative ways than in days past. The approach suggested here is meant to aid in that effort.
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and exemption between 1975 and 1976. Implications of the study and recommendations for further research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, educational researchers, administrators, and faculty have recognized the need to investigate new ways of facilitating the movement of students from secondary to post-secondary school education (Carnegie Commission, 1973; Honey, 1973; Rainsford, 1973; Menacker, 1975). At a time when nearly everyone has access to higher education, many students urgently need programs and opportunities that will better equip them to make the transition from school to college successfully and to do well once they are in college.

Magill (1973) noted that, on the whole, many students are much more advanced physiologically, intellectually, and academically than were their counterparts a generation ago, and many entering freshmen are particularly well advanced in the field of general education. Blanchard (1971), Casserly (1965), and Snyder (1975) found that there is extensive curriculum duplication between high school and the first two years of college, much of it unnecessary. Many teachers and students, at both the high school and college levels (Blanchard, 1971; Carnegie Commission, 1973), feel that the instructional-social settings of the secondary schools may be more conducive to the teaching-learning process in general education areas than those presently offered by the colleges. The senior year in high school, moreover, is often an unchallenging year for many students who have completed all or most of the requirements for high school graduation by the end of their junior year (Carnegie Commission, 1973).

In response to these and other needs and problems, cooperative practices between schools and colleges have begun to spring up across the country. Advocates claim that, properly designed and supervised, cooperative programs can reduce senior-year boredom and students' sense of marking time (senioritis) by rekindling their enthusiasm for learning and instructor enthusiasm for teaching; eliminate much unnecessary course duplication and course remediation; give students a foretaste of college before they have made a large financial or other commitment to it; enable high schools and colleges to adjust their curricula to ensure a smooth student transi-
tion between the two educational systems; and afford seniors an opportunity to earn college credit while still in high school.

As cooperative programs have spread, there has been increasing concern about the willingness of colleges to accept credit earned in them. Nearly all of the existing research related to credit transfer is based on studies of students moving from 2-year colleges to the upper divisions of colleges and universities or upon students who participated in credit-by-examination programs. Kintzer (1970), for example, examines articulation plans, policies, and practices across all 50 states; Ruyle and Geiselman (1974), in a survey of 1,185 colleges and universities, describe methods (e.g., CLEP, AP, local examinations) that institutions use to credit off-campus learning; and Creager (1973) considers the range of extra-college experiences that are being given academic credit or that are earning the student advanced placement in college degree programs. Other studies have documented the large number of variables and practices involved in credit transfer: for example, Willingham, 1972; Gleazer, 1973; Thomas, 1971; and Snyder, 1975. Furniss and Martin (1974), in a paper presented at the Arlie House Conference on College Transfer, mentioned several barriers to transfer which may directly affect the recognition of college credit, including credit earned in various school-college articulation programs: lack of standardized grading systems, lack of agreement on core curricula, lack of coordination between admissions office and departmental requirements, and lack of agreement on credits from credited and non-accredited institutions. Some of the factors that can affect transfer are a student's choice of major, his persistence in finding ways through and around the institutional system, and the college's recruitment needs. What may be accepted at one institution for course exemption and credit toward graduation may be flatly rejected for consideration at another institution.

Students often encounter resistance to their transfer credit simply because it is credit earned outside the institution to which they are applying. Faculty and administrators at some institutions believe that the socialization process at their colleges would be altered in undesirable ways if normal curriculum patterns were disturbed, a change they believe could occur if outside credit were to be recognized. Dearing (1974) tries to illustrate this point by imagining an instructor or advisor talking to a student with transfer credit:
I am not denying the quality or the validity of the previous work that you have accomplished in your educational program. However, if you are aiming for a degree at this institution, or indeed for admission to this course or this program at the level which seems to you just, there is a requisite body of knowledge and a set of skills whose mastery you must demonstrate. For students who enter this institution as freshmen and are continuing, this mastery is demonstrated by successful completion of specific courses. Unless your previous learning experiences are very nearly identical to those of continuing students, you must be considered to have deficiencies which can best be removed by replicating their experience. Practically, this means completing the prescribed courses even though some of the material may be repetitive. (pp. 51-52)

In theory and in practice, then, it is easy to see how confusion, disagreement, and injustice could occur with regard to transfer credit.

Very little research, moreover, has been done on the transferability of college credit earned by high school students in school-college cooperative programs, an area of increasing concern to, among others, administrators of high schools and colleges sponsoring these programs, participating students and their parents, as well as institutions contemplating establishing cooperative practices and students considering college credit opportunities. The relevant studies which do exist are often extremely difficult to interpret. Creager (1973), for instance, asked colleges if they wanted credit for “college level work completed in high school.” This is not the same as asking if they granted credit for “college courses completed while enrolled in high school.” “Grant credit” is itself ambiguous, for it may include a range of institutional action, e.g., course exemption, advanced standing, and credit toward elective area. There are, moreover, numerous variables that can affect transfer credit decisions, even within an institution — a student’s choice of major, the financial status of an institution, how course titles are worded, grading systems, and the reputation of the sending institution — to name a few. Most surveys ask institutional representatives who may or may not be involved in such decisions what would happen at their institution if an entering student tried to transfer a certain type of credit. Asking hypothetical questions of people who may not actually be involved in the decision may not be a very effective way to gather reliable data, especially since these kinds of decisions are never made in a vacuum.
In a previous study (Wilbur & Chapman, 1977), the policies and procedures of colleges asked to accept college credit earned in one such high school-college cooperative program — Syracuse University Project Advance (SUPA) — were investigated. The present study is an update of that report. The investigation involved a follow-up study of more than 2700 Syracuse University Project Advance students during a 3-year period from 110 high schools in New York and New Jersey who subsequently attended over 300 post-secondary institutions across the country. SUPA was developed by Syracuse University and six public high school districts to allow high school juniors and seniors an opportunity to enroll in college courses and experience college standards as a part of their regular high school program. University courses which have undergone systematic instructional development and which have been piloted on campus by the Center for Instructional Development and the cooperating academic departments are offered in the high schools for both high school and college credit. The courses are taught by highly qualified and specially trained high school teachers under the supervision of University faculty. SUPA was particularly suited for a case study because courses were regular University courses, and considerable evidence was available that college standards were indeed maintained (Chapman & Wilbur, 1976).

The present study investigated how college credit earned through SUPA was received by colleges and universities throughout the United States in 1974, 1975, and 1976. Specifically, four questions were addressed:

1. How did post-secondary institutions recognize credit earned in SUPA?
2. Do colleges have written policy for evaluating college transfer credit earned by their entering freshmen while enrolled in high school?
3. Does a student’s choice of major or area of concentration affect transfer credit recognition?
4. Is there a pattern among post-secondary institutions of similar type, kind, and size in the way they evaluate and reward SUPA credit?

METHODOLOGY

During the fall of 1974, 1975, and 1976, samples of former SUPA participants who were currently college freshmen were con-
tacted by mail and asked to complete a questionnaire assessing the
credit transfer procedures of their college. Although other courses
were offered, only credits earned in the Freshman English and
Introductory Psychology courses were considered in this study for
the following reasons: Both English and Psychology had sizable
enrollments during each of the 3 years; the English course is typi-
cally a required freshman course; the psychology, typically an
elective; and, finally, the six-credit-hour English course is a non-
traditional, variable-credit course in which both Pass-Fail and
letter grades were used. The psychology course, on the other hand,
is a traditional three-credit-hour, single-letter-grade offering. Stu-
dents were asked to indicate what action their college had taken
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regarding their SUPA transfer credit, i.e., whether they had been given credit toward their degree and exemption from certain course requirements, credit only, exemption without academic credit, neither credit nor exemption, or some other action.

In addition, they were asked if, to the best of their knowledge, appropriate written policy existed at their college relevant to their SUPA credit and whether their choice of major affected credit transfer decisions. In using mailed questionnaires, standard procedures for helping to ensure a good rate of return were followed.

Table I shows the population surveyed and rates of return for each of the three groups. Over a 3-year period, students went to 326 different post-secondary institutions scattered throughout the country but concentrated in the eastern third.

**Table I**

Description of Samples and Returns for 1974, 1975, and 1976 Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Survey</th>
<th>Number of Students Surveyed</th>
<th>Number and Per Cent of Sample Returning Questionnaires</th>
<th>Number and Per Cent Who Transferred Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100% of participants from 9 high schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(64% random sample from 40 high schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45% random sample from 61 high schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDINGS**

*Recognition by institutions.* Over the 3-year period from 1974-76, colleges and universities recognized SUPA course work for credit and exemption in approximately 76 per cent of all cases
# Table II

Institutional Action Related to the Academic Credit Earned by Students in Two S.U.P.A. Courses  
(Based Upon Student Responses Over Three Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Count</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
<th>Credit &amp; Exemption</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73-74)</td>
<td>(74-75)</td>
<td>(75-76)</td>
<td>(73-74)</td>
<td>(74-75)</td>
<td>(75-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Essay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fiction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Poetry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Mini 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Mini 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Ind. St.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and for credit only for approximately 15 per cent of the students. Credit was treated similarly for students within institutions (i.e., generally there was internal consistency by institutional officials), and credits earned in the non-traditional, variable-credit course were recognized in approximately the same manner as the traditional three-credit-hour, single-grade course observed in the study (see Table II).

Written policy. For the first group of students surveyed (1974), approximately 56 per cent reported that, to the best of their knowledge, no written policy existed at their college or university which related to the evaluation of college credit earned by students while they were still enrolled in high school. This paralleled the findings of a separate survey of officials at these same institutions that year (Wilbur & Chapman, 1977). Table III compares these responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Presence of Written Institutional Policy Regarding the Recognition of College Credit Earned by Students While Still Enrolled in High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1974 Survey</th>
<th>Written Policy Exists</th>
<th>No Written Policy Exists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Report</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Report</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the large number of marginal comments by students indicating uncertainty about the existence of appropriate written policy, for the second year of the study, students were given three choices on this question: "yes," "no," and "don't know." The percent of students answering "yes" dropped to 22.8; those answering "no," to 3.5 while those answering "don't know" comprised 73.7 per cent of the 605 respondents. Subsequent informal interviews with students confirmed the finding that written policy statements in college bulletins and catalogues leave students unsure of what, if any, special considerations apply to transfer credit of this kind. No important differences were found when data from both years were sorted by type, kind, and size of institution. Because of the
lack of clarity of this issue, the question was not continued in the third year.

Choice of Major. Over the 3-year period of the study, respondents overwhelmingly indicated \( x = 96.3 \) per cent that their choice of academic major was not a factor in the way their SUPA credit was evaluated. Table IV shows the breakdown of these responses for each of the three groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Row %</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (1974)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (1975)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (1976)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognition and Institutional Characteristics. Few differences were observed regarding the handling of SUPA credits when the data were sorted by type (2-year, 4-year, university), kind (public, private), and size of institution. In only one category — private universities — was there a slight decrease in the number of students receiving credit between 1975 and 1976 (see Table V). The English essay unit is used in the table as typical of the treatment of all credits in the study.

**Discussion**

The principal finding of the present study is that SUPA credit has been widely recognized by post-secondary institutions in the United States and that recognition has increased in the number of institutions accepting the credit and in the number of students successfully transferring it. If this trend continues, high school students can enroll in the program with reasonable assurance of the wide transferability of SUPA credit.
Institutional Action Related to the Academic Credit Earned by SUPA Students in the Freshman English Essay Unit for 1975 and 1976*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count Row %</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Exemption</th>
<th>Credit &amp; Exemption</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because of the relatively small number of cases, data from 1974 have not been cross-tabulated.
There is insufficient evidence at present, however, to explain with certainty why SUPA credit has been so well received. Some possible reasons are as follows: 1) Colleges have recognized the merits of SUPA itself, 2) Syracuse University's reputation is some assurance of the quality of the program it sponsors, 3) SUPA credit is reported on a regular university transcript, and 4) colleges may simply not be concerned with where the credit was earned. If the last three reasons are part of the explanation for SUPA credit's wide acceptance, then it would be premature to conclude that cooperative programs like SUPA have been fully accepted. Such programs are still highly innovative; and, when post-secondary institutions become more aware of them, these programs will undoubtedly face more rigorous scrutiny. In other words, it is possible that, to date, the credit has been accepted largely on the basis of its sponsor's reputation and on its being reported in a familiar format — an official university transcript. Comparatively few colleges that have accepted the credit have bothered to request information from SU beyond the transcript, although they may, of course, question the SUPA student carefully. This situation will no doubt change as articulation programs become better known. When that happens, cooperative programs will have to be able to prove their claim that their credit represents genuine college-level achievement. It is with this prospective challenge in mind that SUPA has devoted so much attention to the design, supervision, and continuous evaluation of its program.

There are two main implications from the findings relating to written policy. First, institutions may wish to clarify their transfer credit evaluation procedures for the benefit of prospective students and for their staff who must interpret these policies to the public. Similar reviews of policy were necessary when the College Entrance Examination Board introduced the Advanced Placement program in the mid-1950's. Project Advance and other articulation programs are also rapidly expanding their course offerings and the number of their participants, which makes the need for policy clarification all the more urgent. Second, students enrolled in SUPA courses should, at least for the next few years, anticipate a lack of written policies and should be prepared to cope with the confusion and uncertainty of college officials.

This study represents only a preliminary step in the research required to answer many remaining questions. Certain variables
that may become more important have yet to be fully explored. For example, as the number of students, the amount of credit, and the variety of courses being transferred increase, some institutions may be compelled to reconsider their transfer credit policies. Articulation programs could conceivably have a noticeable effect on enrollments in a particular academic area within an institution, particularly an institution that draws heavily from high schools involved in articulation programs. Also, colleges that were initially hesitant to accept the credit may alter their views as they see other colleges they respect giving recognition, especially if they are in direct competition for students. It will, therefore, be necessary to continue to conduct longitudinal studies to see if patterns of recognition change over time. It is highly recommended that other institutions or agencies sponsoring or facilitating various articulation programs initiate or continue to do research in this area. Such research could accumulate data cutting across various contexts and variables, e.g., different types, kinds, and sizes of sponsoring institutions, supervisory systems, course designs, location of instruction. It would also be highly desirable for two or more researchers to coordinate their investigations using many parallel design features. In this way the resulting findings could be more easily compared or contrasted, and the important variables could be more easily identified. Such research could probably best be facilitated by state education departments and by national educational foundations.
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Providing Meaningful Feedback on Transfers

Gerald S. Leischuck

Annually thousands of persons transfer from junior and community colleges to senior colleges and universities. Primary among concerns, not only of those transferring but also of the two institutions involved, is the matter of post-transfer academic performance. This paper describes a feedback system which yields meaningful information for both the feeder junior college and the university.

In Alabama there are twenty publicly supported junior colleges enrolling annually nearly forty thousand students. Each year junior colleges send approximately four thousand transfers to thirteen state supported senior colleges and universities. Recognizing the impact the two-year colleges are having on senior colleges and the importance of sound articulation among programs, Auburn University has developed a system of regular, continual study of the several factors relating to the questions: how many are transferring? what are they studying? how are they doing? how long does it take for them to graduate?

To develop data focusing on these and related questions a computer based junior college transfer student information file (JCTSIF) was developed which is fully compatible with an existing student information file (SIF). At the time of entry student identification numbers of transfers are placed into JCTSIF together with information regarding pre-transfer performance and duration of study at the junior college. The SIF contains data relating to all aspects of post-transfer academic performance.

The Data Yielded

Substantial amounts of information are available about transfers from each of the several junior colleges; however, only those data which have general interest at the institutions involved are produced. Too, in producing and disseminating data there are two guiding caveats. First, no data are developed which would identify individual students. Second, in no instance are data released which identify the various institutions, thus eliminating any inclination for interinstitutional comparisons. Within the university, of course, data are
available for each of the junior colleges, but the two-year institutions are identified by code only. Reports to the junior colleges convey data only for that institution and a summary for all two-year institutions in the state system.

Information which is developed on an annual basis relates to the following: rate of transfer, academic program entered, current enrollment status (graduated, dropped out, currently enrolled), pre- and post-transfer academic performance (overall and for each of the three enrollment status subgroups), performance trends, and individual course/discipline performance.

1. Rate of transfer. Transfers from the state system first entered the university in 1966. Since then, over six thousand transfers have matriculated here. Annualized rates of transfer are produced for each of the junior colleges.

**TABLE I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>6198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals are not additive since only select years are shown.

2. Academic program selection. For each feeder institution it is possible to report program selection and, if desired, emergent trends in program selection. Not shown in Table II are data which depict program selection patterns on an annualized basis.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.’s</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>6198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals are not additive since only select years are shown.

3. Current Enrollment Status. For each of the junior colleges an analysis is produced which exhibits enrollment status at the time of the report. Data are developed on an annual basis relating to when the transfers entered.
TABLE III
CURRENT ENROLLMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Entered</th>
<th>Per Cent Graduated</th>
<th>Per Cent Dropped Out</th>
<th>Per Cent Currently Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; All</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; All</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>0 8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>12 425</td>
<td>67 76</td>
<td>33 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>32 589</td>
<td>78 76</td>
<td>22 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>17 633</td>
<td>53 67</td>
<td>47 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>13 712</td>
<td>38 53</td>
<td>38 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>31 831</td>
<td>23 22</td>
<td>77 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals*</td>
<td>208 6198</td>
<td>47 46</td>
<td>25 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals are not additive since only select years are shown.

4. Academic performance. Student performance levels are indicated by academic achievement and length of stay at the junior college along with first quarter and overall post-transfer performance and duration of study after transferring. Similar data are generated for each of the subgroups and for the overall group of transfers.

TABLE IV
PRE- AND POST-TRANSFER ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Transfers</th>
<th>J.C. Performance</th>
<th>A.U. Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Qtrs.</td>
<td>Mean Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All Transfers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.'s</td>
<td>6198</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Graduates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.'s</td>
<td>2846</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dropouts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.'s</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Currently Enrolled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.'s</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Performance trends. One summary analysis seeks to assess trends in student achievement. To do this transfers are subgrouped on the basis of the date of transfer. In this particular analysis the following time periods were utilized as a basis for subgrouping: 1966-1970, 1970-1974, 1974-1976.
TABLE V
PERFORMANCE BY SUCCESSIVE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>J.C. GPA</th>
<th>1st Otr. A.U. GPA</th>
<th>Overall A.U. GPA</th>
<th>Percent Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.C. A</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All J.C.'s</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Intermediate Group)

| J.C. A  | 1.99     | 1.16             | 1.54            | 55.3             |
| All J.C.'s | 1.81     | 1.27             | 1.56            | 61.8             |

(Latest Group)

| J.C. A  | 2.04     | 1.32             | 1.65            | 7.2              |
| All J.C.'s | 1.91     | 1.27             | 1.51            | 7.2              |

While generalized group data in summary form are useful as descriptive indices of overall pre- and post-transfer performance, such analyses often fail to convey information at the level of specificity most beneficial in the planning and articulation process. Therefore, two additional computer programs were developed which produce data indicating level of success in courses and/or academic programs.

6. Discipline/course performance. Upon request any college may obtain information on actual courses being selected and grades earned by transfers from that institution in any course or group of courses for whatever period of time. Since the JCTSIF interfaces with the master SIF, the process is an exceedingly simple and routine one.

TABLE VI
GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH 101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 207</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Program completers. Finally, the two institutions involved may wish to know how students who have entered particular programs are doing. This example exhibits information on transfers from one junior college who entered programs in engineering.

**TABLE VII**

**TRANSFERS FROM J.C. A TO PROGRAMS IN ENGINEERING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entered Engineering and:</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Av. No. of Hours</th>
<th>G.P.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated in Engineering</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>144.29</td>
<td>1.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped out (Engineering)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Enrolled (Engineering)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.27</td>
<td>1.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Pgm. &amp; Graduated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>166.14</td>
<td>1.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Pgm. &amp; Dropped Out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Pgm. &amp; Currently Enrolled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81.33</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>106.38</td>
<td>1.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entered Another Program and:</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Av. No. of Hours</th>
<th>G.P.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed to Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>2.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

As increasing numbers of college students share their formal educational experiences between junior and senior colleges, every effort must be made to remove any barriers which might inhibit their success. This is a report of the types of data which one university makes available on a regular basis to those who teach and administer at the university and at the feeder colleges. Not only are generalized descriptive summaries provided, but also there are reports which convey student achievement in individual courses. Increased meaning is added when comparisons are made of transfer student performance to performance levels of native students. Data such as these are being used to the end that programming is improved at both ends of the transfer process.
Residency for Tuition Purposes in Wisconsin

PHILLIP J. HELLMUTH, THOMAS H. HOOVER AND DOROTHY IGL STEPIEN

ABSTRACT

Residency for tuition purposes at public colleges and universities has been a matter of concern for many years. In the last five years there have been significant rulings at various levels from the U.S. Supreme Court (Vlandis vs. Kline and Elkins vs. Moreno) to local courts.

The effect of these court rulings has been to clarify the law concerning residence for tuition purposes. This paper reviews the subject from the local perspective of the Wisconsin jurisdiction and the University of Wisconsin - Madison. Acceptable and required processes are discussed and illustrated by appropriate court cases. The paper will prove valuable to anyone charged with determining residency for tuition purposes or in revising statutes and procedures involved in this matter.

I.

Residency for tuition purposes is a problem of national scope. As opposed to other kinds of residence, this special status is governed in every state in the United States by separate laws or administrative rules. It has been the subject of local and national court cases from which have emerged certain facts which are instructive both to those who are affected by the laws or rules and to those who must administer these laws and rules fairly in the interest of all concerned. In general, the interested parties include students, whose fees are assessed on the basis of residency tests; institutions, which must implement, publicize, explain, and defend the application of existing rules and laws; the state, whose responsibility it is to provide higher education for its citizens at reasonable costs, while protecting its taxpayers from subsidizing students from other states who seek to attend its institu-
tions and; finally, the taxpayers themselves who ultimately must fund the state’s portion of educational costs in public higher educational institutions.

Considerations of facts regarding residence for tuition purposes often cause complications, but the parameters emerging from the court cases are rather simple and coherent:

Higher education has not been found to be a fundamental right; in fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has declared that education is not a fundamental right. Had the court held otherwise, the ability of states to regulate student admissions and student fees would have been severely limited.

States have the right to apply different rates of tuition to students, depending on whether they are or are not residents of the state.

In pursuance of this right, states may establish tests to determine whether a given person is a resident of the state for tuition purposes.

These tests must be reasonable, generally applicable, and may not establish an irrefutable presumption of non-residency. However, a durational period of up to one year during which a new state resident may be charged the nonresident tuition is appropriate.

This article discusses the Wisconsin Statute governing residency for tuition purposes (36.27 Wisconsin Statutes) and its application. Wisconsin has established a solid basis for residency determinations resting on legal precedents from the landmark United States Supreme Court decisions through Wisconsin State Supreme Court and local Circuit Court cases.

At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the issue of residence for tuition purposes is very important due to the large


4Vlandis, 37 L. Ed. 2d 67, 72.

population of nonresident students. The differential in fees for each full-time student amounts to approximately $1,500 per year. Figures for First Semester 1977-78 reflect more than 10,000 nonresident students at University of Wisconsin-Madison. With so large a nonresident population and such a great fee differential, it is inevitable that many problems regarding residency arise.

The Wisconsin experience with determination of residency for tuition purposes can be instructive to persons in any state with campuses having large numbers of persons from other states in their student populations. Research shows that the general type of residency determination criteria and legal impact are similar in all jurisdictions in the United States.\(^6\) Understanding the development of laws and procedures determining residency for the State of Wisconsin over the past years will provide a good basis for dealing with the laws or rules within other jurisdictions.

The present law governing residency for tuition purposes in Wisconsin is Section 36.27 of the Wisconsin Statutes. This statute has evolved over the years as a result of judicial decisions and pressures from students and their parents, state officials and legislators, and university faculty members. It is also a result of efforts by administrators at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to deal fairly with problems of residency determination for tuition purposes. In the process, constitutional issues have been carefully considered and specific language has been adopted to avoid excessive rigidity in statutory application.

In Wisconsin the first statutory directive for free tuition for state resident students was enacted in 1866,\(^7\) and legislative authorization for the Regents to prescribe tuition for nonresident students was well established by 1878.\(^8\) Originally these laws were designed as an aid to the University Registrar in the assessment of nonresident tuition charges. Nonresident tuition has been assessed since at least 1900.\(^9\) The requirement for such fees is stated in the University catalogue of 1907-08:


\(^{7}\) Sec. 8, Chapt. 114, *Laws of Wisconsin* (1866).

\(^{8}\) Sec. 388, Chapt. 25, *Revised Statutes of Wisconsin* (1878).

\(^{9}\) *Catalogue of the University of Wisconsin for 1902-03*; Press of Evening Wisconsin Co. (Milwaukee). Published by the University 1903. p. 47.
Tuition is free for all students from the State of Wisconsin. The liability of students to pay tuition charges, as distinguished from incidental fees, shall be determined by the Registrar.

Fees for that period for nonresident tuition were $20.00 per semester. This was in addition to an incidental fee for all students of $15.00 per semester. The requirement was not based on a separate statutory provision but was at that time a University regulation adopted by the Board of Regents.

The 1915 and 1917 Wisconsin legislative sessions enacted the first definitive statute on residency for tuition purposes. This became Section 36.16 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The intent of this legislation was to assist in residency determination problems arising from the inability of students to obtain reclassification once admitted as nonresidents. The statute remained in effect until 1964 without substantive changes. The principal points covered by the statute were:

A residence requirement of one year of continuous, bona fide, Wisconsin residency preceding admission to the University, either of the student or the student's parents.

A provision that admission as a nonresident student set up an irrebuttable presumption that the student was a nonresident for the next four academic years even if the student dropped out of the University and continued living in Wisconsin.

A provision to remit nonresident fees for a "number of needy and worthy nonresident students," not exceeding 8 per cent of the number of nonresident students registered for the preceding year.

The original statute was modified in 1957 to provide for fee remissions for an additional 2 per cent of the nonresident student population of the previous year. As distinguished from the 8 per cent remission these remissions were for "equitable relief from..."
the assessment of nonresident tuition.”

The “2 per cent remission” as it is now called, gave urgently needed flexibility for equity considerations.

In 1964 the statutory provisions which erected an irrebuttable presumption of nonresident status for tuition purposes for students from outside Wisconsin was modified to become a rebuttable presumption. This was before such irrebuttable presumptions were held to be unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court in Vlandis vs. Kline.

From 1964 until July 1, 1975, the Wisconsin Statute made residency for tuition purposes a matter of “bona fide residence.” The statute created a presumption of nonresidency for tuition purposes for students who came to Wisconsin from other states to enroll in educational institutions. The presumption could, however, be rebutted by showing bona fide residency over the entire preceding year. For adults, bona fide residency provided the basis for “residency for tuition purposes,” but for minors, bona fide residency of the parents was determinative. In evaluating bona fide residency the statute required that four specific items be given consideration: work within the state, filing of state income tax returns, voter eligibility, and motor vehicle registration. These items were considered indicators, and not the sole determinants of residence.

In July of 1975 the statute underwent revisions finally emerging as the present 36.27(2). The resultant statute was carefully developed and clearly phrased in terms of a rebuttable presumption. It states:

A student who enters and remains in this state principally to obtain an education is presumed to continue to reside outside this state and such presumption continues in effect until rebutted by clear and convincing evidence of bona fide residence.

In addition to retaining the four above mentioned items from 36.16 in the consideration of bona fide residence it added the possession of a driver’s license and self support and made clear

---

that the test of bona fide residency for tuition purposes is basically a question of domicile. The heart of the statute now reads:

In determining bona fide residence . . . the intent of the person to establish and maintain a permanent home in Wisconsin is determinative. In addition to representations by the student, intent may be demonstrated or disproved by factors including, but not limited to, filing of Wisconsin income tax returns, eligibility to vote in Wisconsin, motor vehicle registration in Wisconsin, possession of a Wisconsin operator's license, place of employment and self support.15

The recreated statute retained both the 8 per cent and 2 per cent remissions. Equitable relief in the 2 per cent remission has become "relief . . . because of extraordinary circumstances." The new statute is the result of a careful legislative deliberation based upon recent judicial thinking, and it is reasonable to assume that fair and equitable University administration of the statute will bring judicial support.

The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System has the first obligation to apply Wisconsin Statute 36.27 to all requests for exemption from nonresident tuition. With the legislative mandate to merge all State public institutions of higher education into a single system in 1971, the Board delegated the authority to decide the nonresident tuition appeals cases to the various institutions of the System. At the University of Wisconsin - Madison the Chancellor formulated a Non-resident Tuition Appeals Committee to apply the statute and appointed the Registrar to chair the Committee. The Committee serves three necessary functions. First, it hears the appeals of students who have been classified as nonresident by the Residence Counselor. Second, the Committee advises the Residence Counselors in interpreting policy in administration of law. Finally, the Committee recommends changes in policy or administration of the Wisconsin Statute to the Chancellor.

II.

The State of Wisconsin pays the portion of the educational costs for its resident students which are charged as tuition to

15Ibid.
nonresident students. It is the Wisconsin taxpayers who are served by the residency determinations process and the University, though charged with assessing fees and determining residency for tuition purposes, does not become the adversary of its students in residency determinations. The University has the responsibility to carry out the statute in a fair and equitable manner giving students the opportunity to present their cases for residency and insuring that determinations are based on all pertinent facts and circumstances. The “firing line” administration of the Wisconsin law is conducted by the Residence Counselors who are employees of the Registrar’s Office at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. A discussion of some of the interpretations of the “residence for tuition purposes” status under the Wisconsin law will be helpful.

Residence under the new Wisconsin Statute 36.27(2) is similar to the understood definition of domicile; that is, the permanent place where a student lives, from which he/she only temporarily departs and from which he/she derives status as a citizen. Because it is defined by the Wisconsin Statute as being based on the establishment of a permanent home in Wisconsin, this type of residence is distinguished from residency for other purposes such as voting, welfare, hunting license or marriage. This difference is often a source of confusion to students who consider themselves residents of the State of Wisconsin, but who may not be residents for tuition purposes.

The Wisconsin law requires a twelve month waiting period before bona fide residence for tuition purposes is established. A durational period of residency prior to qualifying for tuition payment at resident rates is common to all state universities and has been specifically approved by the U.S. Supreme Court. Families moving into the state frequently fail to understand the concept of a durational period, especially since they must immediately pay Wisconsin income tax on state derived earnings and may be residents of the state in every other way.

Residency for tuition purposes has a particular construction under the Wisconsin Statute for minors. Legally, a minor’s residence follows that of the parents. Therefore, any minor student whose parents have been bona fide residents for the twelve

---

16Robert F. Carbone, Resident or Nonresident: Tuition Classification in Higher Education (Education Commission of the States, 1970).
RESIDENCY FOR TUITION PURPOSES

months next preceding the beginning of any semester or session for which that student registers at the University will be residents for tuition purposes. There are similar provisions for minor children whose natural parents are divorced or separated and for orphans of Wisconsin residents.

Legal guardianship of a minor student is important in determining residence. A court appointed guardianship of a minor is treated under the law the same as a parental relationship; however, de facto guardianships are not recognized under the Wisconsin Statute.

This becomes a complicating factor for students whose parents are divorced when legal custody of the minor child is awarded to a parent who lives outside the State. Under the law, such a student cannot be considered a resident because the legal guardian is not a Wisconsin resident. Frequently, the facts and circumstances of such cases result in a remission of nonresident tuition.

In 1972 the age of majority in the State of Wisconsin was changed from 21 to 18. As a result, most students who attend the University are legal adults. Adult students who are residing outside of the State of Wisconsin, but whose parents have moved to this state and have become residents, may often be found nonresidents for tuition purposes since they must establish residence in their own right. However, in particular cases, a student's own facts and circumstances surrounding the move may lead to the conclusion that a constructive move to Wisconsin was made with the parents, hence the student may also be a resident of the State.

There is a statutory exemption which provides that any student who is a graduate of a Wisconsin high school and whose parents are bona fide residents of the state for twelve months next preceding the semester or session for which the student registers at a state supported university is entitled to be classified as a Wisconsin resident for tuition purposes. Many students fit under this section even though they may have been living and working in other states for many years.

Students frequently assume that marriage to a Wisconsin resident automatically establishes Wisconsin residence. The current legal trend, however, is to consider individuals in their own right.\(^{18}\)

\(^{18}\)A provision which mandated automatic residence for females who married Wisconsin residents was deleted in the 1975 revision of the Wisconsin Statutes.
Therefore, married students must establish Wisconsin residence independently of the residence of the spouse.

Under the Statute a problem arises when the family of a minor student moves out of the state. The student, having lost residence in Wisconsin but not having had time to establish residence for tuition purposes in a new state, is in an inequitable situation. At the University of Wisconsin - Madison, a remission of out-of-state fees is routinely awarded for one year from the date the parents of a minor moved out of the state. This frequently allows the student to attain majority and establish legal Wisconsin residence.

In determining residency of a foreign student, the visa status becomes critical. Students with permanent immigrant status or refugee status can establish residence in the state by meeting the provisions of the Wisconsin Statute.

In determining residence for tuition purposes for persons who return to Wisconsin after temporary departures such as school attendance, work elsewhere or military service, cognizance is taken of evidence showing continuity of state residence and demonstrated intent to return to the state. Persons who leave the state for temporary periods of time should avoid the establishment of ties with other states and take steps to retain Wisconsin residence. For instance they should vote by absentee ballot in Wisconsin, retain their Wisconsin drivers license and motor vehicle registration, report all of their income to the State of Wisconsin and satisfy any tax obligations that might be incurred as state residents. Having satisfied the foregoing obligations these people continue to be residents for tuition purposes.

Involuntary detention in the State of Wisconsin does not constitute residence. The Wisconsin Statute does provide for exemption from out-of-state fees for persons in armed forces or engaged in alternative service and their dependents. These people are not classified as residents for tuition purposes. Persons incarcerated or involuntarily detained or committed in hospitals do not establish residence by the mere fact of being in the state under these conditions.\footnote{The Wisconsin Board of Regents Fee Notes provide that a person involuntarily detained by the courts from leaving Wisconsin will pay only resident instructional and appropriate segregated fees.}

The most difficult concept of the Statute to administer and for
students to understand is the clause which states, “A student who enters and remains in this state principally to obtain an education is presumed to continue to reside outside this state, and such presumption continues in effect until rebutted by clear and convincing evidence of bona fide residence.” 20 (Emphasis added.) When a student has been enrolled full-time in an educational institution in Wisconsin during the year he/she claims Wisconsin residence, the burden of proof to establish bona fide residence for the entire year is placed on the student. In establishing bona fide residence the Statute provides guidance in evaluating intent. “Intent may be demonstrated or disproved by factors including, but not limited to, filing of Wisconsin income tax returns, eligibility to vote in Wisconsin, motor vehicle registration in Wisconsin, possession of a Wisconsin operator’s license, place of employment, and self support.” 21 (Emphasis added.) While the Statute suggests several enumerated criteria, it is important to note that these criteria are not conclusive in making residency decisions. The student has wide latitude in presenting factors and circumstances germane to the case and all relevant evidence is considered. Cases involving the presumption make up the majority of the cases that eventually end up in Appeals hearings.

The Nonresident Tuition Appeals Committee generally hears appeals for the approaching semester in the month preceding registration and at any time throughout the particular semester or summer session. It is only under very unusual circumstances that the Committee will hear a residence appeal retroactively to a previous semester, and there is a standing rule that residence status will not be awarded retroactively beyond the current fiscal year.

Students who wish to appeal their residence classification first discuss their case with a Residence Counselor. The counselor is empowered to determine residency questions and, after the discussion, may find it appropriate to award residence for tuition purposes. If the Residence Counselor feels that either there is insufficient information to award residence for tuition purposes or if in the counselor’s judgment the information presented is insufficient on its merits to award residence for tuition purposes, the student will be advised of the decision and that a formal appeal

may be filed with the Committee. The student may either appear in person or waive the right to a personal appearance for that semester. All nonpersonal appearances are considered in closed session and decided on the basis of relevant documentary information.

If the student chooses to appear in person the appeal is decided on all available evidence, including written documents, the personal testimony of the student, statements by the legal counsel (if the student is represented), and the testimony of other witnesses if any. Personal appearances are made before the Committee in an open session which is followed by a closed session in which the case is evaluated and a decision is reached.

When a student is granted a hearing for a particular semester either in person or on the record, it is incumbent on the student to present all pertinent facts and circumstances related to the case. A rehearing is not permitted for that semester unless there is significant new evidence which was not available to the student at the time of the first hearing.

The Nonresident Tuition Appeals Committee is the final appeal body for a nonresident tuition appeal within the University of Wisconsin System. Any further appeal of the Committee’s decision must be made to an appropriate legal body outside the University of Wisconsin System.

III.

It is important for state universities to operate their systems of residency determination consistent with current judicial thinking. Under current legal theory it would appear that the concept of preferential tuition at public universities based upon residence classification is viable but that a student classified as a nonresident for tuition purposes must be given an opportunity to show that in fact he/she is (or has become) a state resident for tuition purposes. As previously noted the Wisconsin legislature has been sensitive to judicial treatment of its statutes on residency for

---

22For brevity and to avoid unnecessary replication the reader is directed to Carbone, Robert F., *Alternative Tuition Systems*, Iowa City, Iowa: ACT Publications, 1974, Appendix 2, where a full discussion and legal analysis of relevant U.S. Supreme Court cases appear.

tuition purposes. At the University of Wisconsin - Madison three cases involving the construction and applicability of these statutes have been decided by the judiciary; two were decided in the Supreme Court of Wisconsin and one in the Circuit Court without appeal. These decisions form the basis for the administrative processes of residence classification at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The first case involved an appeal to Circuit Court that a law student, Jerry L. Hancock, was a nonresident for tuition purposes for a particular semester. Hancock alleged that he was a resident for tuition purposes for the semester in question as well as for succeeding semesters. In the succeeding semesters he did not appeal his nonresident status through established University procedures but simply made these allegations part of his appeal to the Circuit Court. That court upheld the University’s determination that Hancock was not a resident for tuition purposes for the semester in which he had appealed his case through University processes; but it also held that he was a resident for tuition purposes for succeeding semesters.

On appeal to the Supreme Court, the Circuit Court holding in regard to the nonresidency finding for the semester in which Hancock appealed his case through University processes was upheld; but the Circuit Court finding of residency for tuition purposes for succeeding semesters was reversed. The Supreme Court decision contained a lengthy discussion of the case describing the administrative mechanism by which the University determined residency for tuition purposes in individual cases and held this to be an integral part of the adjudication. Lacking the necessary review of residency for tuition purposes within the University for semesters after the first, the Supreme Court found it inappropriate for the Circuit Court to have made substantive residency determinations for those semesters.

This important decision firmly established the legality of the University approach to the statute on residency for tuition purposes and gives specific approval to its internal delegations of authority and the administrative procedures for handling cases which arise under the statute.

---

24Hancock v. Regents of University of Wisconsin, 61 Wis. 2d 484, 213 N.W. 2d 45 (1973).
Subsequent to the *Hancock* decision a case arose in which the University had determined that a student, Greenberg, who had been in the state for more than three years was a nonresident for tuition purposes. The student had fulfilled all the enumerated statutory criteria by working in the state, paying taxes, voting, obtaining a driver license and registering a motor vehicle. The University review of the case revealed little to support a finding of residence for tuition purposes other than the mere fulfillment of the statutory items which must be considered in each case. The finding of nonresidency for tuition purposes was upheld by the Circuit Court, and no appeal was pursued to higher judicial authority. The holding in this case supports the University's interpretation of the statute and the relative weight and latitude it may accord evidence. In a larger sense it implies substantial credence to internal University decision procedures and reflects the important responsibility placed on the University, its residency counselors and internal appeals process.

Finally, the recent decision of *Lister vs. Board of Regents of Wisconsin System and Others* reaffirmed two well established legal principles in an action brought by several law students against the University to recover the difference between nonresident and resident fees. The Supreme Court construed the law students' claim to be an action for damages against the state and dismissed the case upholding the defendant's contention that claims for monetary relief were barred by principles of state sovereign immunity.

The Supreme Court held that the Registrar, a party defendant, was not amenable to suit. His action required the exercise of discretion and judgment in determining who was a bona fide resident of the state and thereby entitled to resident status for tuition purposes. In light of his function as a public officer performing a discretionary act, there was a substantive limitation on his personal liability for damages.

The three cases together with *Vlandis vs. Kline* and the recent

---

25 This case is unreported. It appears as *Greenberg v. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin*, Case #143-150 Circuit Court, Dane Co., decided October 8, 1974.
26 72 Wis. 2d 282, 240 N.W. 2d 610 (1977).
U.S. Supreme Court decision of *Elkins vs. Moreno* provide a solid footing for the University of Wisconsin in the administrative determination of residency for tuition purposes. The validity of the statute has not been found wanting, the University procedures for determining substantive residency issues have been judicially approved, the wide latitude of the University in giving weight to statutory considerations and substantive issues has been established. The remedies available to aggrieved appellants have been litigated twice, and finally, the well settled doctrine of the limited liability of public officials performing discretionary acts has been found specifically applicable to University administrators for their determinations made under the statute.

---

28The *Elkins* case was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court shortly before this article went to press. It is reported at 46 Law Week 4337 (April 19, 1978). In its decision the Court refused the request of the University of Maryland to review and overrule the constitutional principles underlying the *Vlandis* decision since federal statutory law and state common law are potentially dispositive of the *Elkins* case.
Designating Honor Graduates in Upper-Level Institutions: Some Findings and Observations

LOUIS J. RODRIGUEZ
AND
GORDON F. SUTTER

ONE OF THE CHALLENGES facing upper-level institutions is that of developing appropriate procedures to determine honors graduates. Universities as a whole have experienced the well-known grade inflation during the past ten years. This development has made the determination of honors graduates suspect. Some universities, for example, have abandoned the traditional categories of summa cum laude, magna cum laude for that of cum laude only.

Grade inflation is particularly acute in the upper-level institutions. This is because students normally experience their lowest grade point averages during the first two years at an institution of higher learning. This condition leaves upper-level institutions with the last two years in which grade point averages are usually higher. Furthermore, there is the issue of whether honors should be determined on the student's four years of undergraduate study or only for the work done at the particular upper level.

In an effort to ascertain current practices by upper levels, we distributed a questionnaire to twenty-one upper-level universities in the United States and replies were received from all the institutions surveyed.\(^1\) Sixteen of the twenty-one institutions indicated that they recognized students with exceptional academic achieve-

\(^{1}\)Texas Eastern University, East Texas State University Center at Texarkana, Governors State University, Metropolitan State University of St. Paul, Corpus Christi State University, University of Texas at Dallas, University of Texas of the Permian Basin, Richmond College of the City University of New York, University of Houston/Victoria Center, University of Houston at Clear Lake City, University of North Florida, The Capitol Campus/Pennsylvania State University, University of Baltimore, Florida International University, University of West Florida, Laredo State University, State University of New York, College of Utica-Rome, Concordia Senior College of Fort Wayne, Uvalde Study Center of Sul Ross State University (Southwest Texas Junior College campus), Florida Atlantic University and Sangamon State University
ment, and five stated they did not designate honors graduates. Of the five without honors programs, one is competency-based and does not assign grades and has not developed a plan for recognizing exceptional academic achievement. However, at times, one of the four colleges of this particular University has recognized outstanding achievement by one or more of its students based largely on the recommendation of faculty members. Another one of the five indicated they too were competency-based and did not use grades or credits, thus they did not have a method of recognizing exceptional student performance. Still another one of this group stated, "We are presently studying the possibility of initiating an honors program." One institution indicated that they would terminate operating at the end of the 1976-77 academic year. The other university did not indicate why they did not have a program to designate honors graduates.

In universities with honors programs, the percentage of the undergraduate student body receiving some form of honors recognition ranged from 1 to 50 per cent with a mean of 22 per cent. Of these universities, fifteen computed grade point averages and one did not. In the one exception, the honors graduates were chosen by the faculty of each academic program. Additionally, one of the reporting institutions selected its honors graduates by first computing the grade point average and then taking the top 5 per cent as summa cum laude, the next 10 per cent as magna cum laude, and the next 10 per cent as cum laude.

The range of undergraduate grade point averages for these fifteen institutions as a whole was from 2.4 to 3.1 with a median of 2.9 and a mean of 2.8. On a scale of one to seven, with seven being the highest degree of satisfaction, the mean of reporting institutions in terms of how they viewed their experience with the honors selection process was 5.2. This high degree of satisfaction was a somewhat unexpected result in light of the uneasiness revealed in the replies to survey question number seven.

In answer to the question, "Many institutions are reviewing their honors program due to grade inflation. What is the status of this program at your institution?" the following comments were received: "Better grading practices."; "No review of program and none anticipated . . . everyone happy with the program as is."; "A general review of grades and standards in progress."; "A statement of more distinct guidelines for honors eligibility and common
grading severity would improve the recognition system.”; “Returning ‘C’ to an honorable status.”; “We changed in 1975 from pass/fail grades to the traditional A, B, C, D, and F. The number of F’s we give has risen from 1.5 to 2.0 per cent.”; “Our biggest difficulty with honors is a requirement that a minimum of 48 hours must be earned at our institution to qualify for honors designation.”; “The university has decided to raise the overall grade point average to 3.9 where it was 3.8 before and to 3.2 where it was 3.0.”; “No present review.”; “This institution has made no review at this time of its honors program.”; “We have not formally reviewed our graduation with honors policy since we were established in the Fall of 1975.”; “The program has undergone review and, while there is some dissatisfaction with the current system, the college governance bodies have been unable to agree on an acceptable alternative.”

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

An analysis of the responses to the questionnaire result in several findings. Upper-level institutions are concerned with grade inflation as it relates to their designation of honors graduates. Significant difficulty exists with theses programs because of universities having undergraduate students with them for only two years as opposed to the traditional four. Some dissatisfaction appears to exist with the current selection procedures on the part of the majority of the reporting institutions. Indications are that the institutions which are initiating review procedures seem to be seeking ways to “tighten up” on grading practices. There is no evidence that consideration is being given to including work taken at other institutions in an attempt to overcome the high grade point average earned in the junior and senior year of work.

A number of observations evolve from our study. Students should usually be expected to earn a minimum of 40 semester hours or its equivalent in the upper-level institution before being eligible for honors candidacy. This criteria would normally represent approximately 30 per cent of the total undergraduate academic work on a bachelor’s degree. In the face of grade inflation and doubts about academic standards, designation of honors when first computing grades and then using a percentile approach for each honors classification is worthy of consideration. While this approach is not
without flaws because grade point averages within the percentiles are likely to be quite high, the percentile cutoffs can be established on the basis of grade point average experiences in the junior and senior years of four year universities. This procedure has the advantage of permitting flexibility in setting standards in the face of the grade inflation problem which is usually more pronounced relative to the honors process in upper-level institutions compared to the traditional four year schools. It would appear that all upper-level institutions should give serious consideration to developing some process designating honors graduates. Failure to ascertain and recognize outstanding scholarship appears to be paradoxical to the effort to stress academic excellence in upper-level institutions.
Identification of Rural-Background Medical School Applicants by the Talent Identification Program of the Western Missouri Area Health Education Center*

E. VIRGINIA CALKINS, ANN JOHNSON AND KENNETH R. MARES

INTRODUCTION

ONE OF THE MAJOR GOALS of the Western Missouri Area Health Education Center (WMAHEC) is to help increase the supply of trained health science personnel in underserved parts of the 38-county area in which it has functioned since being established in 1972.

To help carry out this goal, WMAHEC has sponsored the Talent Identification Program (TIP) in order to identify, motivate, and assist high school juniors and seniors with disadvantaged backgrounds who have potential for careers in the health sciences. As part of this effort TIP contacts and provides information and assistance to students who may be or may become interested in the health sciences.

In working to improve the supply of physicians in "shortage" areas in western Missouri and other parts of Missouri, WMAHEC and the UMKC School of Medicine place particular emphasis on identifying potential medical students from rural areas and assisting them in applying and preparing for medical school. This policy is in accordance with evidence from Missouri and elsewhere suggesting that rural background students are more likely to practice medicine in rural areas after graduation than are non-

*"This project has been funded at least in part with Federal funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under contract number USPH NO 1 MB 24385. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government."

TIP and other WMAHEC programs are funded in large part by the Public Health Division of HEW. "Disadvantaged background" is defined to include low income or racial-ethnic family background or residence in a rural area.
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rural students.\textsuperscript{2} It also is in accordance with evidence that rural counties in western Missouri have a shortage of physicians in comparison with non-rural counties.\textsuperscript{3} Now at the end of the first five-year funding period, TIP appears to be operating successfully in identifying and assisting potential medical students from rural backgrounds.

**IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS THROUGH TIP**

In order to identify potential health sciences talent, letters and information are sent explaining TIP's function to high school counselors, together with requests for permission to visit their schools. Counselors or principals wishing to have TIP staff visit their schools to further explain the health science training opportunities available in the WMAHEC region or elsewhere in the state of Missouri may then respond via mail or telephone to obtain a mutually convenient date.

If TIP receives no response to its communications, further attempts are made to communicate with that particular school later in the year. If, in the opinion of the high school counselor, there are no students who are interested in pursuing or able to pursue a career in the health sciences, no further attempts are made to visit that school until the following year. Thus TIP efforts in the 38-county area have been concentrated on visiting communities in which local school officials have been responsive to TIP's initial contacts.

To encourage promising young people in rural areas to enter medicine and other health science fields, TIP staff make a special effort to contact counselors and students in high schools in rural counties. For this purpose, rural counties are defined as those in the WMAHEC 38-county region which had 50,000 or fewer people in 1970. All but Buchanan, Clay, Jasper, Jackson, and Greene counties are rural by this definition. TIP staff try to remain in close communication with schools in the 33 rural counties, and travel widely throughout the region to develop and maintain per-


\textsuperscript{3}In 1976, the thirty-three rural counties had an average of 42 physicians per one hundred thousand population (using 1970 population figures) as compared with an average of 138 for the five remaining WMAHEC counties.
sonal relationships with high school staff and potential health science students.

As shown in Figure 1, 1126 contacts were made with high school students in the 33 rural WMAHEC counties between 1972-73 and 1976-77. The number of contacts per year in these counties generally has increased from 1972-73 when TIP was beginning to establish operating procedures and policies, to 1976-77 when staff had developed continuing relationships with high schools throughout the region. There were 50 contacts with rural students in 1972-73, 53 in 1973-74, 246 in 1974-75, 482 in 1975-76, and 286 in 1976-77.

When visiting a high school, TIP staff meet with the counselor(s), science teachers, interested students and their parents. General information concerning health careers is presented and publications which describe the 6-year BA/MD curriculum, admission requirements, and the application process are distributed and discussed.

SELECTION OF RURAL-BACKGROUND STUDENTS
AT THE UMKC SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

One indication that TIP efforts to recruit rural-background students for health science careers have been succeeding can be found in records on application, admittance, and enrollment of students at the UMKC School of Medicine. Because the School of Medicine admits students into its six-year educational program directly from high school, these data make it possible to determine whether there has been a relationship between TIP contacts at rural high schools and entrance of rural-background students into the UMKC medical school. (Many TIP students are guided and assisted to enter other medical schools but students in this category first obtain a regular college degree at institutions where it is difficult to keep track of their career plans.) These data also have obvious implications with respect to assessment of WMAHEC efforts to help prepare more physicians for medically underserved communities.

Table I provides information on UMKC medical school applications, admission, and entrance of students who received TIP

---

4Tabulations for Figure 1 excluded 736 contacts which were made in Gentry County in 1975-76 as part of a large group meeting with potential health science students rather than the usual individual and small-group sessions generally conducted by TIP staff.
assistance between 1973 and 1977. Years shown in the table refer to the entering first-year class. Thus 1977 refers to the entering class for the 1977-1978 academic year. All information in the table was provided by the Office of Admissions of the School of Medicine and by TIP.

As shown in Table I, the number of TIP students applying for entrance, admitted, and entering the UMKC School of Medicine increased substantially between 1973 and 1977. The number of TIP applicants increased from 23 in 1973 to 55 and 51 in 1976 and 1977, respectively. The number of TIP students admitted increased from less than ten in 1973 through 1975 to 18 in 1976 and 19 in 1977. The number of TIP students that actually entered in the first-year class similarly increased to 16 in 1976 and 17 in 1977. TIP students constituted 6 per cent of applicants, 11 per cent of admissions, and 8 per cent of the entering class in 1973; in 1977 TIP students accounted for 13 per cent of the applications, 24 per cent of admissions, and 21 per cent of the students entering the first-year class. TIP’s success in recruiting medical students with disadvantaged backgrounds is shown particularly by the fact that TIP students constituted nearly one-quarter of admission in 1976 and 1977.

Table I also shows that recruitment of rural students accounted for a substantial part of the increase in TIP applicants, admissions, and students entering the UMKC School of Medicine between 1973 and 1977. Only one TIP applicant in 1973 and 1974 was from a rural county but by 1977 there were 18 rural-background TIP applicants who constituted 35 per cent of all TIP applicants. Correspondingly, rural-background TIP students accounted for 9 per cent of students admitted to and entering the School of Medicine in 1976 and 1977 (combined) as compared with none for both categories for 1973 and 1974.

Figure 2 plots the number of TIP contacts with high school students in rural counties from 1972-1973 to 1976-1977 along with the number of students from these counties who received TIP assistance in applying for admission to the corresponding first-year classes at the UMKC School of Medicine. For the 1973 and 1974 classes, after only 50 and 53 contacts respectively were made in rural county high schools, there was only one applicant from a rural county. For 1975, after 246 contacts were made in rural counties, there were 10 applications from rural TIP students; how-
ever, only 2 of these applicants were admitted to and entered the School of Medicine. Applicants identified through TIP receive help in filling out forms and preparing for the admissions process, but in 1975 the success rate of TIP applicants was still low. As mentioned above, only 20 per cent of the rural applicants were accepted, and only 17 per cent of the non-rural applicants were admitted.

At the beginning of the 1975-76 recruitment year, the TIP staff met with the Selection Council of the medical school to discuss the academic and personal qualities sought in an applicant. Greater emphasis was placed thereafter in recruiting students who had a reasonable chance of being admitted. The recruitment staff, by this time, had experience in helping these students prepare for the admissions process. In its orientation for interviewers in 1976 and 1977, the Selection Council included a session dealing with characteristics of rural and minority students. At the same time, UMKC admissions and counseling personnel were extending their efforts to inform high school seniors throughout Missouri of health science education programs at the University.

The result of all these efforts was improvement in the acceptance rate for TIP applicants, in the number of TIP rural students entering the School of Medicine, and in the enrollment of rural-background students in general. As indicated by the data in Table I, in 1976 and 1977 there was an increase in the percentage of TIP applicants admitted to the School: for these two years combined, 44 per cent of TIP rural applicants (14/32) and 31 per cent (23/74) of TIP non-rural applicants were admitted to the entering classes. Thus the relatively high rate of TIP contact in rural counties which was sustained in 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 resulted in the admission of 14 rural-background students in 1976 and 1977.

In addition, the number of rural-background students in general (TIP and non-TIP) in the School of Medicine entering classes also showed a sharp increase in 1975 and remained high for the following two years. As shown in Table II, rural-background students constituted 47 per cent of the entering class in 1975, 38 per cent in 1976, and 29 per cent in 1977, as compared with only 18 per cent and 14 per cent in 1973 and 1974, respectively. A significant part of this increase is attributable to improvement in the number of TIP rural-background students.
entering the School of Medicine. In 1975, for example, TIP rural students accounted for 20 per cent (6/30) of the rural-background students in the first-year class, and for 60 per cent (6/10) of the rural WMAHEC-area students. (Except for incidental assistance, TIP is not allowed to help candidates or students from outside its 38-county service area.) TIP rural students accounted for 35 per cent (7/23) of the rural-background students in 1977, and for 88 per cent (7/8) of the rural-background WMAHEC area students.

Of course it is possible that some or many of the TIP rural-background students who have applied to or entered the School of Medicine beginning in 1975 might have sought to become physicians at UMKC or elsewhere even if the TIP program had never been established. However, the fact that only one student from WMAHEC rural counties applied before 1975 and the rough correspondence shown in Figure 2 between TIP rural contacts and subsequent applications to the School of Medicine indicate that TIP has played an important part in generating candidates from rural counties.

Additional indications supporting the conclusion that TIP has been effective in identifying and assisting students from rural areas were found in comparing data on the counties in which TIP contacts were made with data on the county of origin of the 14 rural WMAHEC-area students admitted to the School of Medicine in 1976 and 1977. These students came from the following counties: Lafayette — 5; Cass — 2; Pettis — 2; and Andrew, McDonald, Newton, Nodaway, and Ray — 1 each. These eight counties accounted for 45 per cent of the 1126 contacts TIP staff made in 33 rural WMAHEC counties between 1972-1973 and 1976-1977. Thus it would appear that the substantial effort apparently made to contact students in these counties resulted in a noticeable impact in terms of TIP rural-background students entering the School of Medicine in 1976 and 1977.

CONCLUSION

Data on contacts made in rural counties in an effort to identify and assist potential medical students as part of the Talent Identification Program at UMKC and on applications, admissions, and entrance of rural-background students at the School of Medicine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>TIP Number and Percent</th>
<th>Rural Background TIP Number and Percent</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>TIP Number and Percent</th>
<th>Rural Background TIP Number and Percent</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>TIP Number and Percent</th>
<th>Rural Background TIP Number and Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>23(06)</td>
<td>1(00)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9(11)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6(08)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>24(06)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4(05)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3(04)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>45(10)</td>
<td>10(02)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8(10)</td>
<td>2(03)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7(10)</td>
<td>2(03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>55(13)</td>
<td>14(03)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18(23)</td>
<td>6(08)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16(20)</td>
<td>6(08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>51(13)</td>
<td>18(05)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19(24)</td>
<td>8(10)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17(21)</td>
<td>7(09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are shown in parentheses.
indicate that the program has been effective in helping to enroll qualified rural students at the school. Increases in TIP contacts in rural counties and efforts to provide more opportunities for rural-background students at the School of Medicine have been paralleled and followed by increases in the number of rural-background students in general and TIP rural students in particular who apply to and enter the School of Medicine.

As a result of these efforts, rural-background students constituted 38 per cent of the entering classes at the School of Medicine between 1975 and 1977, and TIP students accounted for 17 per cent of this group. They also accounted for 52 per cent of the rural WMAHEC students entering the School during this period, and for 72 per cent of the rural WMAHEC students entering in 1976 and 1977. Based on past trends indicating that rural-background Missouri medical graduates are more likely than others to practice in rural areas, one can say that the UMKC School of Medicine and WMAHEC are now in a better position than they were before 1975 to help provide additional physicians for rural Missouri in the future.

### TABLE II

Number and Percent of Rural Background Students Entering the UMKC School of Medicine Between 1973 and 1977, by WMAHEC and TIP Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Rural Students and Percent of Entering Class</th>
<th>Number of Rural WMAHEC Students and Percent They Comprised of All Rural Students</th>
<th>Number of TIP Rural (WMAHEC) Students and Percent They Comprised of Rural WMAHEC Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>13(18)</td>
<td>4(31)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>10(14)</td>
<td>3(30)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>34(47)</td>
<td>11(32)</td>
<td>2(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>30(38)</td>
<td>10(30)</td>
<td>6(60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>23(29)</td>
<td>8(35)</td>
<td>7(88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are shown in parentheses.

5Cullison, Reid, and Colwill, *op. cit.*
Figure 1.
Talent Identification Program
1972-1977

Top No. = Rural County Contacts = 1126
Bottom No. = Rural TIP Applicants to the
UHHC School of Medicine = 38
FIGURE 2

Number of Rural Contacts Compared with Number of Rural Applicants, 1973 to 1977

Contacts shown for 1973 were made during the 1972-1973 academic year. Applicants shown for 1973 were for the first year class entering in the fall of 1973.
JUST AS COLLEGE SENIORS' PERCEPTIONS of careers influence choices of occupations, so their perceptions of graduate and professional school probably influence their choices of postgraduate education. Furthermore, as Pace (1966) and others have suggested, students' expectations about the institutions they enter may affect their subsequent behavior. If their expectations are inaccurate they may be dissatisfied. There are many problems in thoroughly testing out the seemingly simple idea that expectations will influence later behavior; the difficulties in definition, measurement, and analysis are very complex. This report concentrates on graduate and professional school students' perceptions of their schools and their expectations about these schools when they were seniors.

Some evidence suggests that students' views of schools are often vague, unrealistic or stereotypical (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). The problem is that students select themselves; they make themselves available to a school according to their perception of the school's image. If the student and the school do not truly "match," the student may be dissatisfied or perform poorly. Both the field and the student may be shortchanged. Thus, it seems important to know what seniors expect of graduate and professional schools and to contrast these expectations with their perceptions of the reality of their actual experiences.

Methods and Data Sources

A national sample of college seniors replied to a questionnaire, The College Senior Survey, in the spring of 1971 (Baird, Clark, & Hartnett, 1973). The distribution of the sample of 94 colleges met the requirements of a sampling frame quite well, and the characteristics of the colleges were close to the national averages on the environmental scores developed by Astin (1965). Analyses of the sample of students indicated it was a reasonably representative sample of seniors at these institutions.
The Senior Survey covered, along with biographical and academic information about seniors, their perceptions of four types of postgraduate schools: graduate schools of arts and sciences, law schools, medical schools, and graduate schools of education. Seniors responded to 15 items, repeated for each type of school, covering five areas: academic demands, course work, faculty-student relations, facilities and nonacademic demands. Seniors were asked to indicate whether they thought each statement was true or not true of the schools. The items are shown in Table I. Seven thousand seven hundred and thirty-four of the seniors were followed up a year later and, if they were attending graduate or professional school, were asked to respond to items describing their schools, many of which were repeated from the earlier senior survey. Analyses (Baird, 1974) showed that the sample was not biased, except that slightly fewer minority students than expected responded.

Because of the numbers entering each field, and because of the analysis design, only the responses of the 2,777 students who entered graduate schools of arts and sciences, the 679 who entered law schools, the 629 who entered medical schools, and the 442 who entered graduate schools of education were analyzed. The responses of these students as seniors (expectations) were compared with their responses a year later when they were students in the type of school they had described as seniors (current perceptions). Because of the large N's, fairly small differences in proportions would be statistically significant. Therefore, the arbitrary, but larger and more important differences of 15 and 30 percentage points were used as criteria of significance.

RESULTS

As shown in Table I, students in all four types of advanced study found, by margins of at least 15 percentage points, that the teaching was not as good as expected, that a kind of studying much different from undergraduate school was required, that the course work was duller than expected, and that they did not like the course work as much as they had anticipated. The greatest discrepancies between expectations and experience were among law students, only 17 per cent of whom expected the course work to be dull, but 57 per cent of whom found it so, and medical students, 79 per cent of whom expected the teaching to be excellent,
TABLE I

Student Expectations and Perceptions of Four Types of Advanced Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views of Graduate School</th>
<th>Views of Law School</th>
<th>Views of Medical School</th>
<th>Views of Schools of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is intense competition for grades</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73*</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty is friendly and readily accessible to students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teaching is excellent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many opportunities for research and creative work</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires much more studying than undergraduate college</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires a much different kind of studying than college</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77**</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It allows considerable choice in courses students may take</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily teaches skills and practical training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not like the course work, but it is required for the career I have chosen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course work is dull</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course work is very stimulating</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires many long hours of hard work</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84*</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many students have to defer marriage to get through</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are more concerned about money than in helping people</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44*</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The costs are so great that many students go into debt</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All figures are rounded percentages. Only percentages responding "True" are shown. * = Difference of 13 points. ** = Difference of 30 points.
but only 37 per cent of whom found it so. The following paragraphs describe the results for each type of advanced study.

Graduate school. As shown in the table, the graduate students expected graduate schools to have friendly, accessible, and capable professors. They expected a flexible and stimulating curriculum which offered many opportunities for research and creative work, and which would not emphasize the pragmatic. They expected their fellow students to be altruistic, if indebted. They did not expect to find the course work dull, or to dislike it. They did not expect students to defer marriage. The current perception results showed that they found the faculty to be as friendly as they expected, but the teaching not as effective as they had hoped. The curriculum was as flexible and full of opportunities for creativity as they had anticipated, but it involved more competition for grades, harder work, and a different kind of study than they had expected. They found the course work duller and less enjoyable than anticipated. Finally, they felt that their fellow students were more concerned with money than they had expected.

Law school. Law students had expected to find law school to be highly competitive and require a great deal of hard work and studying — studying drawing on skills different from those they used in their undergraduate years. They expected to have few choices in the curriculum, which they saw as quite pragmatic. They expected accessible faculty and good teaching. They anticipated interesting and exciting course work. They thought their fellow students would be concerned with helping people and would be in debt.

A year later the law students reported that the academic pressures were, if anything, more demanding than they had expected. There was more choice in the courses students could take, and the courses were sometimes more stimulating than they had anticipated. However, they found the course work to be dull and uninteresting much more frequently than they had expected, and the teaching may have been a disappointment. Finally, they found that their fellow students were much more interested in money than they had expected. Other aspects of law school were about as they had anticipated.

Medical school. Medical school students had also expected an academically demanding experience — requiring much hard work and studying, but providing stimulating and friendly professors.
They expected the curriculum to be prescribed and practical, but allowing them to pursue their research interests, interesting, and exciting. They expected other medical students to be concerned with people, indebted, and, in many cases, postponing marriage.

A year later, the medical students reported that the program was just as demanding as they had expected; they also found that they had to study in a different way than they had as undergraduates. Although the curriculum was as prescribed as they had anticipated, they found that the curriculum was more devoted to training practical skills than they had expected. Although professors were seen as accessible, they seemed to be considered poor teachers. In general, the program appeared to be much less interesting and appealing than the students had expected.

Graduate schools of education. In contrast to the three other types of schools, graduate education students had expected to find a rather undemanding, low key program, with little stimulation or emphasis on research or creative work. However, they reported that they found much more academic competition, which demanded hard work and new study methods. They said there were more opportunities for research and creative work. They felt much more affect about the program, simultaneously reporting it more stimulating and more of a grind than they had expected. They found their fellow students more interested in money than they expected. The quality of teaching, flexibility and pragmatic emphasis of the program were about as they had expected.

**DISCUSSION**

Clearly, there are some major discrepancies between students' expectations about graduate and professional schools and their reports of what it was like during their first years of study in those schools. Strikingly, the largest differences seem to be in the area of the academic programs. Students in all four disciplines had high hopes for stimulating courses and teaching; all appear to have been disappointed. The discrepancy helps explain the fact that, in response to other questions, over a third of the sample said that their expectations of what graduate or professional school would be like were not fulfilled, and that approximately 40 percent said they would strongly consider changing to another program if they could do so without losing ground. These results,
combined with the fact that the most dissatisfied students had probably already left the programs, and thus did not respond to the sections of the survey referring to the schools, suggest that there may be widespread student disappointment with graduate and professional school study.

The causes of students' inaccurate perceptions may lie in the stereotypes presented in the mass media and the literature produced by graduate and professional schools themselves. In their recruiting information they may unwittingly lead students to have unrealistic hopes for their years of advanced study. In any case, there seems to be a strong need for more accurate information about fields and schools. Professional associations such as the American Psychological Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Association of American Law Schools should provide students with accurate descriptions of the typical experiences of students in their fields, and individual schools or departments should be encouraged to accurately describe their formal and informal environments to prospective students, since departments and schools within fields differ (Baird, 1976). Such information would enable students to make their choices more wisely, and would help to minimize the kind of discrepancy between expectations and reality that were reported in this paper.
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Commentary

Colleges and Consumerism:
False Alarms and Over-Reaction

JOHN R. THELIN

"STUDENT CONSUMERISM" has been hailed for having stimulated innovations and accountability in higher education on two counts: first, colleges and universities have been prompted to revise programs and curricula so as to accommodate changing student demands; second, colleges and universities now must be careful to avoid making false claims in catalogues and brochures for prospective applicants. This is welcomed and healthy to the extent that it has deterred institutional stagnation, complacency, and deception. Often overlooked, however, is a serious and harmful consequence of consumerism in higher education: a tendency to generate anticipatory fears and paralysis within educationally and administratively sound campuses.

In 1977, for example, Presidents and Deans of Admissions at independent colleges in California were alerted to reports that the state legislature was composing a bill which would apply severe standards of "consumer protection" to private higher education. The legislation ostensibly would require college and universities to publish elaborate reports on student retention and attrition, and on the employment, earnings, and job placement of graduates.

What were the problems and fears which California's independent colleges anticipated from the impending legislation? At worst there was an uneasy feeling that the legislature was impatient with higher education programs which failed to demonstrate "pay off" on "educational investments" by preparing students for jobs via marketable skills. This could be interpreted as legislation hostile to the liberal arts colleges, which would not fare well when the earnings and job placement record of their recent

graduates were publicly contrasted to those institutions which offered professional training and vocational curricula.

The burden would be on the liberal arts colleges to compile long-term data which would counter the misleading disparity in earnings of recent graduates; i.e., the economic and vocational “advantages” of a general education would be demonstrable only after alumni had sufficient time to establish themselves in career fields and learned professions.

Even if that strategy of data analysis were plausible, it was odious to the private colleges for two reasons: first, “consumer protection” legislation tended to reduce the “outcomes” of higher education to jobs and earnings; second, preparation and compilation of the data from alumni records and surveys would be an expensive, time-consuming drain, especially for the small administrative staffs at predominantly undergraduate institutions. Little wonder, then, that “consumer legislation” was often associated with tacit endorsement of vocational and professional education.

Was this the case? Were the rumors and fears warranted? The proposed legislation was enacted as California State Assembly Bill 911, the “Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977.” And, as college presidents, deans, and registrars had feared, the 24-page bill contained elaborate regulations. But what was overlooked upon initial reading of the bill at many campuses was an important paragraph at the end of the section on “Requirements and Standards,” which stated:

Accreditation by a national or applicable regional accrediting agency, recognized by the United States Office of Education or accreditation, approval, or licensure by a state board will be accepted by the superintendent as evidence of compliance with the minimum standards established by the accrediting or licensing agency, and therefore as evidence of compliance with the minimum standards specified in the provisions of this chapter.2

Here was a vote of confidence in established private colleges and universities, a good faith acceptance of their self-imposed accreditation policies. And, elsewhere in the bill, it was noted that

it was "the intent of this Legislature to encourage privately supported education and protect the integrity of degrees and diplomas conferred by privately supported as well as publicly support educational institutions." 3

What many college officials had anticipated as state regulation and intrusion which would curb and penalize private colleges was, in fact, the opposite. The primary concern of the legislature was to regulate and monitor proprietary institutions and correspondence schools which promised job placement, entrance into unions, and completion of state certification requirements. We often forget that the rubric of "post-secondary education" now encompasses programs, agencies, and commercial ventures far beyond colleges and universities.

One "lesson" to be gained from this incident is that perhaps private colleges and universities underestimate the esteem in which they are held by the public and the government. Second, anticipating problems and dire consequences of legislation tends to leave colleges and universities susceptible to alleged panaceas, as professional journals and conferences have experienced a proliferation of consulting firms, direct mail services, marketing agencies, and public relations specialists whose advertisements imply that more marketing, better graphics, and other external services are the key to altering institutional reputation and arresting declining enrollments. Over-reliance on these external aids, along with drastic changes in curricula and programs, ought be reviewed with caution, as these cannot guarantee a change in a college's "consumer appeal." 4

The case of consumer legislation in California suggests that colleges have been remarkably sound. Most admissions offices are responsible and efficient in maintaining confidential, thorough record-keeping of materials submitted by applicants. Subscription to data services provided by the ETS and ACT have increased thoroughness and accuracy in admissions and selection planning. There are, of course, incidents of "dirty tricks" and dubious re-

3Ibid., p. 1.
4Note, for example, the closing of Franconia (New Hampshire) College and Lone Mountain College of San Francisco — two private colleges which emphasized innovative, experimental offerings in higher education. The point is that innovation per se is no assurance that demography, location, finances and other factors will not be instrumental in determining institutional survival or mortality.
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6. A recent study by RAND Corporation indicated that the volunteer army spends approximately $1500 per recruit on promotional efforts, advertisements, and enlistment campaigns.
Book Review


Like any general and vague topology, that of Michael Maccoby will eventually be replaced by one that will seem more precise and revealing. But the distinctions that Maccoby finds in contemporary corporate leaders are a major advance over previously popular images of the organization man. Through clinical interviews with top executives, their families and friends, and the traditional tools of the psychologist (dream analysis, Rorschach tests, etc.), Maccoby extends the technique of applying clinical insight towards delineating social types.

Like Harold Lasswell in Psychopathology and Politics, the first such systematic application of psychoanalytic theory and technique, Maccoby reminds us that qualities of leadership within complex organizations are varied and often contradictory. Advanced technology corporations that hope to succeed have had to develop executives willing to take risks and to work cooperatively with others. The modern gamesman replaces (in historical order) the craftsman, the jungle-fighter, and the company man.

Like the craftsman, the gamesman is detached from much of the domination of the company. The task becomes an abstracted contest. With the junglefighter, the gamesman shares ambition and demonstrates the will to confront others in the struggle for success. But the gamesman, like the company man, is also a team player, a loyalist, able to manipulate and stroke coworkers. Successful social analysis of ideal types, as Max Weber demonstrated, often requires that the analysts have ambivalent feelings towards the brave new world they are envisioning. Likewise with Michael Maccoby. The gamesman is our best hope: he is daring, open, creative, and responsible. But careerism, which Maccoby sees as the modern pathology, limits “qualities of the heart” (honesty, compassion, idealism, etc.) in favor of the “qualities of the head.” The games are carefully defined and pursued by what best advances the self-interest of the executive. Maccoby focuses on the inner conflicts and restlessness of the gamesman, the failure of greed and individualism as personally satisfying goals, as the hope for corporate humanism.

Readers hoping for a systematic analysis of research findings, in addition to Maccoby’s creative synthesis, will be frustrated. His fascinating questionnaire for executives yields little data. Polemics, par-
ticularly against the human relations theories of McGregor and Maslow, occupy too much space. Maccoby is too harsh on the archaic, but still persistent corporate types. He focuses on the neurotic and obsessive, but not the entrepreneurial qualities of the junglefighter, and, like William H. Whyte, Jr., tends to overlook the achievements of the company man in coping with the labor intensive organization.

I would also modify the view of Maccoby and David Riesman that personnel in the contemporary university are best characterized by the junglefighter. Retrenchment has exhibited some of the worst features of jungle fighting: an increasingly self-protective and anti-intellectual aristocracy of senior faculty subverting the need for innovation and adaptation. Academic scholars, though perhaps not with the purist dedication that Veblen envisioned, are still predominately craftsmen. Nonfaculty administrators have traditionally been company men (and women). But, with the increased need for efficiency and planning in academic organizations, and the necessity of skills in marketing and public relations, perhaps an academic gamesman will emerge — one who can balance the need for faculty autonomy and intellectual self-pursuit with the harsh realities the contemporary university must face.
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