Introduction
The charge of the Admissions Policy Action Team is to examine school-based admissions policies and suggest policy changes that have the potential to optimize transfer student admission and transition processes. Through examination of these policies, this team will also determine which students are best served by University College.

To meet this charge, the Admissions Policy Action Team set the following goals for Year 1:

- Collect and evaluate school-based policies for direct admission and/or admission to UCOL for transfer students
- Collect data on the processes by which these policies are enforced, with particular attention to bottlenecks that could be streamlined
- Examine school-based policies for moving UCOL students into majors/schools of interest
- Suggest improvements to policy and/or procedures in order to move qualified transfer students more quickly into their schools/majors of interest

Members of the Admissions Policy Action Team for 2015-16 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gina Gibau (co-chair)</td>
<td>School of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Alfrey (co-chair)</td>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Mzumara</td>
<td>Testing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Scully</td>
<td>School of Health and Rehab Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Amonette</td>
<td>SPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Masterson</td>
<td>PETM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Nemeth</td>
<td>Kelley School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra Dyson</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise O’Grady</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Graunke</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Decision Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon McCullough</td>
<td>Herron School of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Brown</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Marshall</td>
<td>University College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team includes representation from units that attract large numbers of transfer students as well as from units/offices that advise transfer students or oversee aspects of the transfer process. During the Fall of 2015, the campus welcomed 1509 new external transfer students. These students differ from their freshmen counterparts in that they are generally older, work more hours off campus and attend part time in larger numbers. In addition, most transfer students at IUPUI can
be characterized as “non-traditional,” since this student population tends to be married and have child dependents.

**Progress**

Thus far, the Action Team has accomplished the first three goals listed above and has made preliminary suggestions for improvement.

**Review of School-Based Admissions Policies - COMPLETED**

With the help of Pamela Brown in Admissions and Kayla Polk and Rebecca Wald Stoker in University College, the committee collected and reviewed the current school-based policies for direct admission of transfer students as well as for admission of students from UCOL. The committee concluded that the existing school-based admissions policies are appropriate and do not need to be changed. In all cases, the requirements for admission to schools were clearly appropriate to the requirements of the discipline and/or were based on evidence that students who lacked those qualifications were not successfully retained in the major. Furthermore, requirements for direct admission of transfer students into each school were consistent with school requirements for admitting students coming from UCOL. Thus, the team does not recommend any changes to school-based admissions policies.

**Review of Transfer Admission Procedures - ONGOING**

Discussing the current procedures for admitting transfer students revealed several key challenges:

- If a new transfer student goes through admission review and is found to be non-admissible to the school of interest, but then a new transcript arrives demonstrating that they are admissible, Admissions will not re-evaluate their admissibility – they only process the new transfer credit. These cases are often discovered at Orientation or after the start of the semester.
  - E.g., PETM and SPEA do Orientation prep for PETM/SPEA-interested students admitted to UCOL, so they catch direct admit-eligible transfer students very early in the process

- Many school websites do not provide an easily-accessible list of requirements for direct-admission to the school for prospective transfer students. Students who know these requirements are empowered to be more proactive in demonstrating they have met them (for example by discussing the relevant prior credit in their initial advising meeting at Orientation).

- The admissions process is not automated – it is all done by humans. While the process for freshmen admits is relatively straightforward, the task for transfer admits is decidedly more arduous, particularly if they have attended multiple universities previously, thus making it more challenging to determine an overall transfer GPA or whether a total of at least 26 applicable credit hours has been previously completed (as required for direct admission by some schools).
• IUPUI transfer application deadlines are MUCH later – by months – than peer institutions. This greatly limits the amount of time available to process transfer credit, particularly for unarticulated courses that must be individually reviewed. A delay in this process provides an opportunity for the prospective transfer to seek admission elsewhere.

• For students admitted to UCOL (either as transfers or beginning students), the biggest slow-downs for moving from UCOL into programs of interest are GPA disputes/grade replacements and majors incorrectly listed in the system. Each semester, UCOL sends to each school a list of current UCOL students interested in majors in that school to review for possible admission; but students whose major is listed incorrectly will not be caught by that process. It is also unclear as to the timing of the review process among schools, which may impede the school admission process.

• For transfer students, slow articulation of transfer credit – as well as uncertainty over whether undistributed credit might be applicable to degree requirements – also contributes to the delay in moving out of UCOL. An added complication to the transfer credit articulation process occurs for intercampus transfer students whose credit is not reviewed by Admissions but rather determined in the schools.
  o E.g., Schools must determine how to incorporate general education core courses from other IU campuses into the IUPUI general education core if no equivalencies exist; currently, there is no campus-wide policy or procedure that standardizes this process.

• Currently it is not always obvious whether transcript review is in-process or not.
  o E.g., if individual courses show up on the IUPUI transcript as UN-100, it is not clear whether the course has not yet been sent for review, or whether it has already been sent but is still mid-review. (If the course has completed the review process there should be a note in TES.)

• Furthermore, after the initial review of transfer credit by Admissions, it is not always obvious to advisors whether a course has been listed as undistributed because it clearly is not significantly similar to any IUPUI course, or because Admissions did not have enough information to make the judgment call and the course should be sent to the relevant department for further review.

Review of Transfer Student Success - ONGOING
In addition to policies and procedures, the team discussed factors that predict transfer student success.

• Per Steve Graunke, prior GPA and number of credit hours are the best predictors of success for transfer students at IUPUI. In general, if two students with identical GPAs and number of credit hours enter IUPUI and one of them is from a 2-year college and the other from a 4-year institution, we would predict that the 4-year college student would perform better academically; however, students coming from Ivy Tech tend to come in with
more credit hours and higher GPAs, which makes up for not coming from a 4-year university in terms of predicting their success.

• The biggest stumbling block to moving students out of UCOL and into their majors of interest is GPA. If students are admitted to UCOL with a 2.0, are they doomed never to have a high enough GPA to move into their units of interest? If a student can’t get to a 2.5 GPA, there are comparatively few opportunities on the campus to move into a school/major. Most of the top 10 majors that attract the largest number of transfer students – including Nursing, Fine Arts, Elementary Education, Social Work, Business, and Management – require a GPA of at least 2.5 to enter from UCOL.

Recommendations
The following list of recommendations stem from discussions among Action Team members. Actions contingent upon the work of other action teams, other plans in-process and/or additional resources are clearly indicated.

Recommendations to be completed soon
  • Schools should have transfer student requirements and other relevant information prominently displayed on their website (e.g., some transfer students don’t know who is their advisor). [this recommendation will be accomplished through the work of the Communications Action Team]
  • Schools need to delineate their transfer population for their faculty and staff (“how do we know who they are?”) [this recommendation will be accomplished through the work of the Data Action Team]
  • Advisors across campus should be using AdRx copiously to document prior discussions/decisions related to review of courses, how they are likely to apply to the degree, etc. [this recommendation will require a campus mandate from the Director of Career and Academic Advising and/or above] (High priority)
  • Develop a new undistributed course number, UN-150, for courses that have been reviewed by admissions and do not have IUPUI course equivalency (thus saving advisors from trying to figure out whether or not it needs to be sent for further review). (Highest priority)

Recommendations needing more time
  • For clearer communication between Admissions and academic advisors about transfer credit review, Admissions can use OnBase to communicate course review information.
  • Add a hold each semester (similar to the meningitis hold) that requires students to answer the following questions prior to registering for classes:
    o Are you still pursuing XXX major? If not, students select their new major of interest – which automatically notifies the program of interest and prompts an advising meeting, perhaps by implementing an advising hold until students meet with an advisor about the new
major. [this recommendation would require additional resources]
(Questions of implementation will be reviewed in Year 2)
- Earlier deadlines for transfer student applications and transcript submission [this will require a policy change]
- Cumulative transfer GPA requirements defined for each school (to make automation easier) [this recommendation will require a policy change]
- Admissions should provide UIUE data lists to schools on their transfer students (e.g., Steve Graunke suggested how we may move to automate this process) [this recommendation would require additional resources]
- Schools should attempt to construct 2+2 degree maps that specifically consider Ivy Tech transfers (e.g. SPEA)
- More proactive review of transfer students entering UCOL as they approach orientation to see if they are eligible for direct admission [this recommendation will require additional resources]
- Recommend that Campus Admissions committee look at success of transfer students who come in with GPA < 2.5; APPC is already considering some related policies; reach out to IRDS for data? Matt Rust and Kim Lewis are analyzing divergent policies
- Schools proactively reach out to pre-major (UCOL) students who are potentially qualified (or may soon be qualified) for their majors – for example, have completed certain prerequisite courses, etc.; UCOL prefers their students to have too much rather than not enough information about their options

Next Steps
This action team will continue to meet to discuss ideas about how to assess any changes made in the interim and to plan for the implementation of suggested recommendations in Year 2. The latter will include the development of clear and realistic budget projections to be submitted for the 2017-18 fiscal year.
- Determine necessary website content on transfer policies/processes to be included in school webpages (e.g. 2+2 with Ivy Tech, TSAP outlines, other degree maps; look at pages for other universities with good transfer student resources: Arizona State, Virginia Commonwealth – Denise will see what schools were examined during last year’s FoE process; determine WHERE the information is linked – top-level vs many clicks down)
- Consider how to implement the hold to verify major (or major change) given the requirement of a system modification; an alternative would be to use iGPS to update this information