Conclusion: We could not find (within the accessible UHM Faculty Senate record) any record of the Faculty Senate contemplating standardizing the GPA admissions requirements for all UHM Community College transfer students (i.e. GPA requirements have always been defined in terms of resident / non-resident, rather than community college transfer v. non-community college transfer).

1. Resolution from the Subcommittee on Admissions of the Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (1998) [The Transfer Applicants section provides some context]

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MANOA

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS

ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Transfer Applicants

Transfer applicants are defined as those who enrolled in any postsecondary educational activity subsequent to the completion of high school. Transfer admissions requirements are dependent on the number of prior college credits earned by an applicant. Acceptable prior college credits must be earned in courses that are equivalent to Manoa courses in content and level.

0-23 earned credits College GPA: Resident 2.0; nonresident 2.5 Applicants must also meet freshman admission requirements

24 or more earned credits College GPA: Resident 2.0; nonresident 2.5

Nonresidents whose GPA fall between 2.0 and 2.5 may be admitted by A&R on an exceptional basis. However, no applicant whose GPA falls below 2.0 can be admitted without mutual agreement between A&R and the college/school into which the student seeks admission.

Some programs are more selective, requiring a higher GPA and/or the completion of specific pre-requisite courses. For example, applicants wishing to enter CBA must complete Acct 201-202, Econ 130-131, etc., have junior standing and a minimum 2.7 GPA. Other selective programs include, Architecture, Dental Hygiene, Education, Engineering, Medical Technology, Nursing, SHAPS, SOEST, Social Work, Speech Pathology and Audiology, TIM.

General: The following general guidelines are used by A&R to compute a transfer applicant's cumulative collegiate GPA for admission. These guidelines cannot address all the different grading practices that the admissions staff encounter when reviewing transcripts. In addition, these policies pertain only to the transfer GPA that is calculated for purposes of determining general admission to UH-Manoa.

In calculating the transfer admission GPA A&R uses:
All transferable academic courses deemed substantially equivalent to UHM courses, from all regionally accredited colleges and universities the applicant has attended, in which the student received a grade.

All repeated courses (grades for the first and all subsequent attempts are computed [averaged] into the transfer GPA).

The following grade points:

A=4; B=3; C=2; D=1; F=0; UW (unofficial withdrawal)=0; WF (withdrew failing)=0; ABS (excessive absences/absent for final exam)=0.

Grades of CR (credit), NC (no credit), P (pass), S (satisfactory), W (withdrew) do not affect the GPA calculation. However, selective programs may view these grades differently in their admission process.

The Admissions and Records Office does not include in the transfer admission GPA:

- Courses taken at an institution that is not fully accredited by the appropriate U.S. regional accrediting association.
- Courses considered below college level.
- Vocational and technical courses.
- Remedial and developmental courses.
- Religion courses which show a confessional bias.
- Courses taken out of sequence (backtracked). A lower level course taken concurrently with or subsequent to a higher level course, for which it is an explicit or implicit prerequisite, is not counted.

2. **CAPP Minutes of 10/102012** [Brief section about Transfer GPAs]

**Issue #12.13: Admissions Policy:** Thao Le and Stacey Roberts are members of the subcommittee. Le reported on it. The main question is if we are accepting “weak” students to UH or not? The current data shows that a minimum required GPA for high school graduates to enter UH is 2.8, reflecting the top 40% of their class. Students who transfer from the Community Colleges are required to have a minimum GPA of 2.0 for residents and 2.5 for non-residents. There is a suggestion to require at least 4 math classes for both high school graduates and transfer students before coming to UHM and a minimum GPA of 2.5 for resident transfer students. It is noted that a significant number of UHM undergrads transfer from Community Colleges (about 40%). Therefore, it seems clear that good students who transfer from the CCs will increase the quality of undergraduate student population at UHM.
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ADMISSION STANDARDS
Draft Report of the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Planning

Background

Introduction

The issue of a possible increase in the stringency of standards for admission to the University of Hawaii at Manoa was brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in a memorandum by Marvin Anderson, UH-M Chancellor, addressed to E. Alison Kay, then Chairman of the Committee, dated 10 February 1984. The matter was referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Policy and Planning in March 1984.

More precisely, the issue relates to a possible increase in stringency in the standards for admission to freshman standing at UH-M. Consideration of documents bearing on the issue, and discussion with administrators and others at the six subsequent meetings of the Committee in Spring of 1984, led to the recognition that answers were not available to some of the key questions that should be settled before a recommendation could be made regarding the change. The questions were formulated and brought to the attention of Albert Simone, then Acting President, UH who had earlier, as Vice President, offered to assist in getting needed research done, with the request that the research be done during the summer. The results of the research, becoming available to the Committee in October 1984, have been considered in preparing this report.

Pertinent power and responsibility of the Senate

A change in admission standards would represent a very important change in academic policy. The power to change academic policy is one appropriately shared by the governing board of a university with its faculty. The Charter of the Faculty Congress and Senate of the University of Hawaii at Manoa states that the Congress and the Senate "represent the faculty with respect to academic decision-making and policy development at the University of Hawaii at Manoa;" and, further, that the "Manoa Faculty Senate is the policy-recommending agent of the Congress with respect to the academic goals, policies, and programs of Manoa..., including the establishment and maintenance of standards for scholarship, instruction, research, and public service."

Hence, in its consideration of the issue of a possible change in UH-M freshman admission standards, the Committee has regarded the power and responsibility of the Senate as not restricted to assistance with "gathering the information necessary in formulating recommendations in this important area," but includes the actual provision of recommendations reflecting faculty opinion.

Acknowledgement and sources of information

The Committee acknowledges with gratitude the opportunities it had to discuss the UH-M admissions standards, proposed revisions, and consequences of the revisions, with the following UH-M administrators on the dates indicated.

Donald Fukuda, Director, Office of Admissions & Records, UH-M, 10 April 1984
Richard Kosaki, Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs, UH-M 24 April 1984
Committee assumes that the primary intention may be expressed more precisely as derived from the following presumption: an increase in what is learned by UH-M students would result directly from decreasing the number of entering students who have low demonstrated learning capabilities and/or achievements.

It may also be intended that the academic prestige of UH-M be increased. Although increased prestige might result in attraction to UH-M, more students with high capability, a consequence of more stringent entrance requirements, will certainly be an overall decrease in undergraduate enrollment. However, a decrease in enrollment might be achieved by other means than a change in admission standards. Hence, decrease in enrollment cannot rationally be considered an aim in changing standards unless it is coupled with the aim of increasing what is learned by UH-M students.

SCOPE AND NATURE OF REPORT

In this report we will examine the premise that an increase in what is learned by UH-M students would be achieved by a decrease in the number of students entering with low learning capabilities as indicated by the measures to which admission standards are applied. We will also identify other effects that may be expected to result from the adoption of more stringent standards for admission to UH-M. We will quantify the effects insofar as data available to us permit quantification; and we will discuss them in terms of interests of three kinds:

1) interests implied by policies stated for the UH and UH-M;
2) faculty interests, as we perceive them; and
3) interests of the other communities served by and supporting the UH and UH-M. As we will show:

a) There is evidence that the effect that we assume was intended in the proposal of more stringent standards will actually be rather slight—slighter, we believe, than may be anticipated by those proposing the change; and

b) There are substantial reasons for believing that the proposed change will have other effects that are counter to stated policies for the UH and UH-M, or to what we perceive to be the interests of the UH-M faculty and of the other communities served by and supporting the UH and UH-M.

In addition, we will make certain recommendations concerning changes in the UH-M freshman admission standards and in other policies affecting the "quality" of UH-M. We propose that the Senate adopt these recommendations, in the light of its power and responsibility as discussed earlier, to the extent that the recommendations reflect faculty opinion generally. We consider that the Senate should at least recommend against a change in UHM freshman admission standards until our recommendations as to other possible changes are thoroughly considered.

PRESENT ADMISSION STANDARDS

Stated UH-M freshman admission standards

According to the UH-M General Information Bulletin for 1983-85, applicants for admission as a freshman must submit scholastic aptitude test (SAT) or
It seems clear that there should be consideration of two steps less extreme than increasing the stringency of the stated entrance standards stated in terms of SAT scores and applying these standards rigorously:

1) rigorous application of the stated "minimum" standards; or

2) rigorous application of the "minimum" standards less one-standard-deviation allowance in the case of applicants with high GPA's etc.

Admission of transfer students

The current policy on admission of transfer students is that a transfer student must have earned at least 24 semester hours "in courses comparable to UH-M offerings at a regionally accredited US college or university." A grade of "C" or better must have been earned in all coursework to be transferred. Because this policy is relatively liberal, serious concern should be given to a thorough evaluation and possible revision of it. In addition, the nature of the transfer policy significantly affects articulation between UH-M and other academic units in the University System. Articulation has been a long-standing and serious concern within the University System, and serious consideration should be given to a thorough evaluation of it.

Relation to Strategic Plan

With respect to UH-M admission standards, the Strategic Plan for the University (July 1984, p. 11) stated merely that: "To enhance the opportunity for UH Manoa to become a world-class University, the highest standards of admission to the University of Hawaii will be instituted for that campus." Even the present de facto standards for admission to UH-M are more stringent than those for admission to the community colleges. We believe that these are as stringent or more stringent than those for admission to the other four-year colleges of the UH, UH-Hilo and West Oahu College. As pointed out elsewhere, the stated standards would be still more stringent. Hence the Strategic Plan does not specifically call for increased stringency in UH-M admission standards generally.

However, the "Plan" calls (p. 21) for a requirement that entrants to any of the UH 4-year colleges have at least two years of high-school level foreign language, whereas in the present standards foreign languages are merely among subjects in which, in total, an entrant must have 6 units and can count toward the requirements no more than two units.

IMPACTS OF RAISING ADMISSION STANDARDS

The Committee has prepared a table (Table 1) that outlines some possible effects of the application of more stringent admission requirements for the UH-M campus. At this point, it is difficult at best to assess what the effects would actually be. Some effects are obvious (e.g., a large percentage—over 35%—of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian students would be denied admission by an increase in their SAT scores.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 30-40 points on the combined SAT score). It would also affect the number of students admitted from the neighbor islands. Others are not so obvious, for example, the nature and extent of the impact on the community colleges and the other four-year campuses.

The Report on Admissions Standards prepared by the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs concluded that it was not possible to assess possible effects on the rest of the University System. At the October 30 meeting of the Committee, Dennis Kaibara, the President of the Faculty Senate of Leeward Community College, and liaison to this Committee, expressed great concern over the potential affect of increased admission standards on community colleges. He pointed out that teaching loads are already extremely heavy, especially in remedial areas, and that physical plant facilities are simply inadequate to handle the potential increase in student body that may result from higher admission standards applied for the Manoa campus. There is no doubt that further consultation with community college faculty is essential before any conclusions can be drawn regarding the issue of impact.

A similar situation exists with regard to the State Department of Education. So far as the Committee is aware, formal consultation with the DOE on the matter of admission standards is not complete, and is clearly necessary to achieve the Department's cooperation and to fully assess the potential impact of a change on the DOE's own requirements for high school graduation as well as the counseling and guidance it provides for its college-prep students.

Admissions standards study results

The October 1984 Report on University of Hawaii Admissions Standards was reviewed carefully by the Committee. The major findings are summarized in this section.

The report focused on the relationship between Manoa campus admission standards and the college GPR as a measure of success. Although the Committee recognizes that GPR is not the only measure of success, it is one of the few that lends itself to statistical analysis. The study examined the records of UH-M graduates from the last seven years as well as the fall 1983 UH-M undergraduate population. The study applied two sets of more stringent admission standards to these populations to examine what the impact of the more stringent standards would have been on those two groups of students.

One of the major findings of the report was, "a 40-point increase in the combined SAT requirements, combined with an explicit eligibility index, would probably result in a smaller but not appreciably better undergraduate student population." The Committee also noted that, according to the study, fully 34% of the UH-M graduates from spring 1977 through spring 1984 would not even have been admitted to the campus if the more stringent admission requirements examined in the report had been imposed.

The study found that SAT scores were generally poor predictors of success in college. In fact, combined SAT scores had only a 10 percent predictive value for college GPR. A recent (5 November 1984) article in Newsweek pointed out that some colleges (e.g., Bowdoin College, Sarah Lawrence College) no longer require SAT scores to be used as criteria for admission because of their dubious ability to predict success in college.
by adjusting the standards for continued enrollment and (quality) graduation rather than merely restricting the entrance of students. (p. 12) As the primary, public, land-grand institution charged to meet both the standard of university-level excellence and to maintain open and equitable access for children from Hawaii's heterogeneous and diverse population, Manoa must have an admissions program with supportive academic policies designed to attract, retain, upgrade, and uplift those admitted. The basis of this approach to improving student academic quality and performance is in the following findings:

1. There is a very large "error" in increasing either the SAT and/or High School GPR cutoffs in predicting initial and continuing academic success (using standard Educational Testing Services measures).

2. Given that the resident population is made up in the majority of non-white, non-mainstream populations with less access to "quality" private and public preparatory school programs with "selective" quantitative scores and lower verbal scores, restricting access generates a disproportionate, discriminatory impact. Such an outcome is contrary to both local historical development as a public, land-grant institution and to basic missions of a public university within American values and commitments.

3. These combined "errors" in deselecting out students who are capable of satisfactory performance and progress towards graduation is directly contrary to basic university policies and practices at major public, land-grant universities. Adoption of selective cutoffs in this local instance without adequate empirical grounding contributes directly to institutionalized exclusion and discrimination on arbitrary, non-academic grounds.

The conclusions quoted above directly reflect the conclusions of this Committee regarding the question of raising admission standards at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Clearly, an improvement in the quality of education at Manoa is not likely to be reached by raising the present admissions standards. In fact, the data from several studies indicate that there is no advantage to be gained from so doing. Instead, the Committee concluded that if an increase in the quality of education at Manoa is desired, it must be obtained by implementing higher standards for the quality of student performance after matriculation into Manoa.

A recent article in the October 24, 1984, Chronicle of Higher Education provided a thorough summary of the findings of a new report on excellence in undergraduate education. Although this Committee's report cannot provide a precis of the report, it strongly recommends that the University of Hawaii, including its faculty, students, and administrators, closely examine the conclusions and recommendations of this important document. For purposes of this report, the Committee found several particularly appropriate statements it wishes to point out.
budget allocations or even to indicate quality of the program itself. Removal of this pressure would allow faculty to apply higher standards of grading without having to constantly concern themselves with its impact on their enrollments.

6. Do not over-emphasize student evaluations of faculty, although recognizing their importance as a tool for improving instructional improvement. Too much emphasis on evaluations may pressure faculty to be less than stringent in their grading practices.

7. Encourage departments to develop and apply standards (e.g., GPR, coursework completed, comprehensive examinations, senior theses) for admission to, retention in and graduation from baccalaureate majors and programs.

8. Consolidate part-time teaching positions or assignments into professorial positions. A similar recommendation emerged from the report on excellence in undergraduate education summarized in the Chronicle of Higher Education article. Many courses at UH-M are taught by lecturers and part-time faculty. While these people may, on the whole, be competent, they are not subject to regular and vigorous review of the sort required for tenure and promotion. Improvement in the quality of services could produce a higher quality of education more readily than a marginal "improvement" in the "quality" of the student body as measured by more stringent admission standards. Universities are judged more by the quality of their faculties than the quality of their students. Therefore a better faculty is likely to attract better students.

These alternatives are offered by the Committee to the university community and the broader community as positive steps that have a high likelihood of improving the quality of education at the University of Hawaii at Manoa.
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public, private sector education be included (academic track and program data by individual and school-by-school basis).

2. **Academic Performance Data Base Needs.** In addition to course-by-course logs on academic performance, supplemental data on:

   (1) financial aid and work commitments data.

   (2) academic actions (both positive - honors, etc. and negative - suspensions, probations, withdrawals, etc.).

   (3) semester-by-semester (including continuing education/summer session logs) data be kept, including voluntary or involuntary absences (suspensions, probations, transfers, in relation to quality of academic performance data) (as progress/non-progress status checks).

3. **Post-Attendance/Post-Graduation Flow/Performance Checks.**

   Data be compiled routinely on the following where applicable:

   (1) GRE/Professional School Test Scores.

   (2) Graduate Studies Attainment/Completion Checks.

   (3) Occupational Flow and Placement Checks.

   (4) Self Assessments of Felt Impact of Education at Manoa.

4. **Technical Review Committee on Implementation.** An Ad-Hoc Institutional Committee on Student Development and Performance be formed to review and recommend on the following:

   (1) The needed data series in addition to those presently collected and filed.

   (2) The needed support in terms of costs of adding new data items and the needed infrastructure of technical staff and equipment and software to complete routine, periodic reviews.

   (3) The needed level of technical support and staff to monitor student development and performance adequately to answer concerns about the effectiveness of this University on meeting its missions of access and quality of educational opportunities.