



Date: October 5, 2007

To: G. Thomas Sav, Chair, University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee  
(UCAPC)

From: Anita Curry-Jackson, Dean, University College *AC-J*

Re: Response to the 2005 Charge to UCAPC  
Report: **University College – *Enhancing Student Success***

As the newly appointed, full-time Dean of University College, it appears most appropriate to prepare a formal response to the June 2005 Faculty President/Faculty Senate Charge to UCAPC. As stated by you, many impending activities between June 2005 and the present took precedence over the 2005 request/charge. With those important projects completed and with the initiation of my tenure, this is an opportune time to “Re-Start” on the UCAPC charge.

In preparation for the response, I was provided three historical documents:

1. The 1999 University College Transformation Report
2. The Feedback from the 1998-1999 Senate
3. The 2005-06 Faculty President/Faculty Senate Charge to the University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee (UCAPC)

An abridged version of the 2005 Charge follows: **To address the large number of students that continue to remain in University College since its transformation from University Division as officially approved by the Board of Trustees at the February 1999 meeting.**

The Report: **University College – *Enhancing Student Success*** addresses three questions:

1. What evidence is there that the [University] College, as conceived and organized, can successfully achieve its stated goal of reducing the size the University College population?
2. Exactly how will the College be organized in order to administer the programs alluded to in question 1?
3. What is the realistic estimate of the resources needed in the short and long run to succeed in the goals of the University College?

I look forward to meeting with you and members of the University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee to share information about University College and its service to the University. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

## University College – *Enhancing Student Success*

Response to the  
University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee (UCAPC)

### **1. What evidence is there that the College, as conceived and organized, can successfully achieve its stated goal of reducing the size of the University College population?**

In 2000, the University College (UC) began several initiatives to facilitate student movement out of the University College with the long term goal of reducing the number of students in the college. Although movement of students out of the University College is determined mostly by each degree granting college's admission requirements, the UC initiatives have helped to increase the number of students who are better prepared to meet the admission requirements into designated colleges; thus, accelerating student movement out of the University College. Evidence of the effectiveness of these initiatives is documented by the annual report/review of the number of students moving out of the University College. Prior to 2000, with 4500 - 5000 students in the University College (Attachment A1), advisor caseloads averaged approximately 400 – 500 students. The percentage of students moving out the UC into a degree-granting college at the end of each year was 35-42%. Beginning with the Fall 2001/2000 cohort, several new initiatives (identified below, 1a) helped reduce advisor caseloads to 350 - 450 students. The overall percentage of students moving out of the University College has continued to increase, thus helping to reduce the number of students in the University College. Below is a summary of the annual report of student movement.

- ? Fall 2001 to Fall 2002 cohort: 43.0% of UC students moved out of the UC
- ? Fall 2002 to Fall 2003 cohort: 45.3% of UC students moved out of the UC
- ? Fall 2003 to Fall 2004 cohort: 44.7% of UC students moved out of the UC
- ? Fall 2004 to Fall 2005 cohort: 48.9% of UC students moved out of the UC
- ? Fall 2005 to Fall 2006 cohort: 48.0% of UC students moved out of the UC
- ? Fall 2006 to Fall 2007 cohort: 46.5% of UC students moved out of the UC

#### **a. Precisely what programs will be available to students in University College that are not now [1999] in place?**

Understanding the need to make changes in the standard operations of the college, the University College began development of several programs to assist in helping students move in a more timely manner out of the University College. Some of those initiatives/programs include:

- ? Annual meetings with deans and advisors from the degree-granting colleges – these meetings are designed to continue to monitor the barriers impacting timely movement of students into the degree-granting colleges. As a result of these meetings several colleges/departments made significant changes to

- their admission requirements. Some examples of the effectiveness of these meetings include:
- ✍ In 2000, the College of Education & Human Services added a new degree program (Organizational Leadership) with minimal admission requirements (90 hours, 2 courses as pre-requisites), providing another option for students with more than 90 hours and who are unable to meet the requirements for many of the university's majors. Also in 2001, CEHS changed the admission requirements for the Middle Child Ed major, increasing the number of students eligible for more timely movement into the MCE degree program.
  - ✍ In 2002, the College of Liberal Arts added a new major (Liberal Studies) for students who meet CoLA admission requirements, but do not meet the more specific requirements for many of the majors within CoLA. Additionally, in spring 2007, the Social Work dept. agreed to admit students as pre-social work majors, allowing those students to move out of UC before meeting all of the specific admission requirements for the social work major.
  - ✍ Beginning fall 2007, the College of Engineering and Computer Science increased the number of students admitted as "direct admits" to the college and added a "pre-major" category, enabling more students to move more quickly into CECS and reducing the overall number of University College students.
- ? Developed "Benchmarks" for Students' Timely Movement into Majors. In 2003, the Academic Advising & Transfer Services unit of the University College identified "benchmarks" to help all UC students (not starting in developmental education mathematics or writing courses) identify the appropriate number of quarters needed to transfer into a degree-granting college (Attachment B). The "benchmarks" were incorporated into all first year curriculum guides and are used to advise students during SOAR and subsequent appointments with UC advisors. Students are able to see at a glance the admission requirements for their intended major and identify remaining requirements for movement out of the UC. Used in conjunction with a DARS report, students are more informed regarding requirements for timely movement out of the University.
- ? Full utilization of the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). In 2001, University College advisors began using DARS as an ongoing component of student advising sessions. Advisors review DARS reports with each student, make changes to the report when necessary (to reflect substitutions for transfer credit, exceptions to GE and course requirements, etc.) and insure students understand how to interpret their individual DARS report. Using DARS provides better advising for students, helps students take ownership of their own matriculation, and helps students make a more timely transition into a major/degree-granting college.

? Developed more specialized learning communities. Beginning in fall 2000, the University College made a strong commitment to expand and enhance learning communities (LCs) by increasing the number of LC cohorts. Each year since 2000, the number and types of learning communities have continued to increase. Some examples of new/expanded LCs include:

- ✍ LCs designed to address the diverse interests and needs of WSU students (i.e., LCs focused on issues related to sports, world affairs, service learning, gender issues, etc.).
- ✍ LCs designed to help students focus on the admission requirements for their intended major (i.e., LCs for students intending nursing, engineering, education, science, etc.). Students are provided the necessary information about courses needed for admission to a major, hear from guest speakers, assigned tasks focused on intended majors, and/or provided opportunities to meet the dean or advisors from the college of their intended major.

As a result of this expansion, students have more opportunities to learn about majors, campus involvement, university services, and a variety of other campus initiatives to help students move more quickly out of the University College.

? Initiated Advisor-on-Call (AOC) and Virtual Advisor. In 2005, the University College implemented an “Advisor on Call” (AOC) and virtual advisor system to help reduce the number of students waiting for appointments with an advisor. Students who are unable to schedule an immediate appointment with their designated advisor, have general questions/concerns about registration, scheduling classes, admission requirements to colleges/majors, etc. may utilize the University College Advisor-on-Call by meeting with the designated AOC as a walk-in same-day appointment. The AOC is only available for students in good standing. Similarly, students may use the “virtual advisor”, an on-line advisor-on-call, via the UC website. Both initiatives are used regularly and help the University College meet with more students in a timelier manner and expedite their movement out of UC.

? Developed “Phoenix” initiative. In fall 2004, the University College implemented the Phoenix initiative to address retention of first year students. Students who were eligible for dismissal at the end of their first year were provided an opportunity to continue one additional quarter at WSU if they agreed to enroll in a specially designed UVC 100 course, Phoenix. This course focused on reinforcing college success strategies with required study groups, tutoring and time management sessions, goal setting, weekly meetings with advisors, etc. Interventions included candid one-on-one discussions between student and instructor to collectively find ways to assist

students return to good academic standing and successfully transition into a degree-granting college.

- ? Developed “Preparing for Academic Success Seminar” (PASS) Course. In winter 2007, the PASS-UVC 100 course was developed to intervene immediately with students whose GPA drops below 2.0 anytime during their first year at WSU. The PASS-UVC 100 course integrates multiple college success strategies including study skills, time management, and the “*StrengthsQuest*” program (by Gallup) to focus on student talents and achievement. This program is designed to help students “get back on track” as quickly as possible to meet the goals for timely movement out of the University College.
- ? Developed “Wright-On-Track” (WOT) program. In 2006, The Wright-On-Track program was developed to provide support and priority registration to successful first year students to help them graduate in four years. The WOT program was implemented through collaborations with the degree-granting colleges and supported by a Teaching Enhancement Grant initiative.
- ? Student Academic Success Center (SASC). In 2006, as a result of the Foundations of Excellence study, the University College made several organizational changes, including development of the Student Academic Success Center (SASC) which combined student academic support services into a single unit/center. The units of SASC include, Tutoring Services, Math Learning Center, Writing Center, and Developmental Education. With the exception of the developmental math program, DEV 095/formerly MTH 102, these units are all located together in the basement of the library. Providing academic support services in one central location, has provided quality services to enable students to meet their academic needs and thus increase their timely movement out of the University College.
- ? BANNER Training for Advisors. Prior to the full implementation of BANNER, the UC advisors scheduled several training sessions to help UC advisors become familiar with BANNER applications. These sessions allowed advisors to learn the BANNER system and how the utilization of BANNER could help advisors provide optimum advising. Additionally, advisors were able to provide input on how the system could be adjusted/modified to meet the needs of students as well as advisors. Although the training proved invaluable, BANNER training and implementation has become an ongoing initiative and challenge for advisors. However, despite the challenges of BANNER, advisors successfully utilize BANNER to provide quality advising with minimal impact on student movement into degree-granting colleges.
- ? Staff changes and re-instituting 90+hour rule. In 2000, a staff position (Assistant to the Dean, later promoted to the Assistant Dean for Administrative Services) was added to specifically advise students with 90+ hours to work directly with addressing the needs of those students. Since the

University College (aka University Division) was designed for first year and second year students, students were required to move into a degree-granting college by the time they earn 90 hours (junior standing). Transfer students were excluded from this requirement. In the past, no real effort was made to address the issue of students with more than 90 hours in the University College. If they did not meet the admission requirement for their intended major, they were allowed to stay in the University College until they were eligible to transfer to the degree-granting college. In some cases, students remained in the University College until they were within 1-2 quarters of completing a degree. Another responsibility of the Assistant Dean, was to re-visit the 90 hour rule and help students identify alternate majors and/or career options. As a result of those initiatives, the number of junior and senior students (targeted group) remaining in the University College decreased by more than 3%. (Attachment A1).

**b. What literature supports the likelihood of success of these programs? (i.e., What leads us to expect success now where we have failed in the past?)**

- ? Many of the new programs have been developed as a result of the university's participation in the Foundations of Excellence national study conducted by the Policy Center on the First Year Experience. Wright on Track (WOT) and PASS initiatives were developed as a direct result of WSU participation in the FoE experience and the documented success of those programs at other FoE institutions. In addition to literature provided by the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, the University College utilizes resources provided by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and the National Association of Deans and Directors (AAD&D). Attachment C provides a list of selected literature focusing on retention programs and initiatives.
- ? Much of the anticipated success is based on the university's plan to increase enrollment in the degree-granting colleges. As the University College enhances programs/efforts designed to retain students and expedite student movement out of the University College, the degree-granting colleges are revising their admission requirements to include "pre-majors", early transfer programs, and more direct admits from high school. Collectively, these actions will successfully reduce the number of students in the University College.

**c. What would be the expected ideal size of University College or the ideal amount of time to be spent in University College? (i.e., How would we define success?)**

- ? To a great extent, the amount of time a student is "housed" in the University College is determined by the admission requirements for the college/intending major (see benchmarks/goals). University College records indicate that since 1989, WSU degree-granting colleges have systematically changed the

admission requirements for selected degree programs (Attachment D) -- raising cumulative gpa, required hours, test scores, adding specific courses and increasing the designated grades for selected courses within a major. Those changes adversely affected the number of students eligible to transfer into majors, thus increasing the number of students remaining in the University College. The University College became a “holding area” for juniors and seniors waiting to meet the admission requirements for their intended major/degree granting college. Additionally, University College was the depository for students seeking second degrees, increasing the number of students with “senior” status, and ultimately increasing the total number of students in the University College.

- ? Typically, students who are more focused and better prepared for college, move into the degree-granting colleges sooner than less prepared students. Based on existing literature and research focused on student academic success and retention, the University College identified student academic benchmarks for each degree-granting college/major and timelines for movement out of the University College. In 2005, when colleges were asked to identify their projected growth over the next 7 years, the University College projected a decrease in growth (as degree-granting colleges increase in size, the University College should naturally decrease in size). The University College identified 3900 students as the projected/ideal size for the college. Since the university admits approximately 2100-2300 new students each year, at least half of those students should move out of the University College at the end of the first year. As more transfer and second degree students are admitted directly into a degree-granting college, the size of the University College would be determined mostly by the number of new first year/direct-from-high-school students and the number of remaining/continuing students from the previous year. Success would be determined by percent of students meeting benchmarks and moving out of UC. Generally, most students should move out of UC by end of the sophomore year.

## **2. Exactly how will the College be organized in order to administer the programs alluded to in question 1?**

- ? UC organizational structure and staff duties redefined. In order to implement the programs and initiatives identified as necessary to decrease the size of the University College, several changes were made to the organizational structure of the University College. As mentioned above in response 1a, departments were combined and restructured (support services and offices were combined to create SASC and the academic advising center was combined with adult and transfer services to create Academic Advising and Transfer Services/AATS). The number of advisors increased from 11.5 FTE to 12.5 FTE. Advisors who serve as college liaisons were asked to increase contacts and collaborations with college counterparts to keep abreast of new initiatives impacting student transfers and movement of students into the

degree-granting colleges. Several advisors are part time while other advisors have additional coordinator responsibilities (placement testing, scholarship programs). A staff position was added (Assistant to the Dean, now Assistant Dean for Administrative Services) to work primarily with students with 90+ hours earned. Collectively, all the UC administrative positions are responsible for monitoring, assessing and tracking the movement of students out of the University College with a focus on improving our service to students and finding ways to increase the number of students meeting college admission requirements to move out of the University College. Thus, while staff responsibilities have increased, the overall increase in staff has been minimal.

**a. Aside from the creation of the new Deanship, the personnel and organizational chart of the college remains the same. What personnel additions and changes are contemplated? Will faculty be appointed to this college?**

- ? Since the transition from University Division to University College, the structure of the college has changed significantly (Attachment E). In addition to the changes identified above, the University College has added 2 Advising Assistant positions (funded by Teaching Enhancement Grant for PASS UVC 101 courses) and redefined several advisor positions to include more responsibilities (including advisors who travel to off-site locations to advise students).
- ? In 2005, Articulation and Transfer responsibility (previously assigned to Jeanne Fraker, Associate Dean, University College), was reassigned to Joe Law, Assistant Vice President for Articulation and Transfer.
- ? The creation of the Student Academic Success Center (SASC) in 2005 did not require any staff additions.
- ? The Developmental Education program hires adjunct instructors and UC academic advisors will continue to teach the UVC 101 class. There is no expectation that any faculty will be appointed to the University College.
- ? Currently the learning community courses (UVC 101, LA 101, SM 198) have faculty teaching the linked courses (mostly GE courses: HST, SOC, PSY, MUS, ENG, PLS, etc.). More than 24 faculty, from all different disciplines/colleges are involved in teaching the LC linked classes.

**b. What, exactly, will the relationship of the new college to the College of Education and its efforts to form “bridges” to secondary schools?**

- ? The Assistant Dean for Academic Support Services will continue to collaborate with the College of Education to insure the successful implementation of any program initiatives identified to help connect to secondary schools.

- ? The Academic Advising and Transfer Services unit of UC has an advisor who serves as the primary coordinator for post secondary education students (PSEO) and programs. The advisor also serves as the UC liaison to the College of Education. In this capacity, the advisor maintains an updated listing of all CEHS new initiatives, changes, etc. impacting the advising or dissemination of information related to secondary students. These efforts help accelerate the degree completion for PSEO students.

**c. What are expectations of the participation of faculty from the other colleges in the programs for UC students?**

- ? Faculty involvement is expected to remain at the same level of involvement. Many faculty (generally instructors/faculty of GE courses) choose to actively participate in the University College learning communities. Additionally, faculty are invited to serve on the first year Common Text reading committee, and faculty are invited to serve on the UC Advisory Board and other University College committees.

**3. What is a realistic estimate of the resources needed in the short and long run to succeed in the goals of the University College?**

In the short run, the current available resources allow the University College to maintain existing programs to meet the goals of the college. However, many of our initiatives are funded through grants, fundraising, SOAR fees, and a portion of the new student program fee. Without those resources, several activities/initiatives would be severely impacted. In the long run, the college will need to maintain at least the same level of resources and possibly reorganize/redirect staff and/or resources to better accommodate the needs of our changing population and goals of the university.

**a. If no resources are anticipated, why can't the current staff and its organization simply change its methods?**

The University College continually evaluates the effectiveness of its programs, initiatives and activities. As needs are identified, changes are made, oftentimes requiring a change in the standard method of operating and staff responsibilities. The University College has been a forerunner in embracing change within the boundaries that are set. As such, the college remains limited in how much the college can change. The University College cannot change the Wright State admission requirements, nor can the University College change admission requirements to the degree-granting colleges. Both factors impact the number of college-ready students enrolled in the University College and thus, ultimately impact the overall movement of students out of the University College.

- b. If new resources are required, are they anticipated to come from current revenues, (i.e. transfers), or are some new sources of revenues, such as large grants, anticipated? What are some realistic estimates as to the amount of any such new money?**

Revenues for University College initiatives (first year programs, service learning, learning communities, peer instructors, peer leaders, etc.) are largely supported through fundraising, grants and first year student fees. The University College is expected to continue to seek and find grants and implement additional fundraising activities to support any new initiatives and/or new resources.

- c. If additional duties are contemplated for existing faculty and staff in other colleges, how will they be compensated? Has this prospect been part of the current negotiations for a labor contract?**

No additional duties are contemplated for any faculty or staff in other colleges, thus the University College has not been involved in any contract negotiations. Faculty and staff who volunteer to serve on UC committees, are involved with UC learning communities, first year programs, or other UC programs, are not compensated by the University College.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

## Attachment A1

### University College

#### UC Main Campus Student Movement Summary

<u>Fall Term</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Returned Following Fall Term</u>	<u># Moved out of UC Following Fall</u>	<u>% Moved out of UC Following Fall</u>	
F01	4,739	3,150	1,353	43.0%	of returning students
F02	4,806	3,194	1,446	45.3%	of returning students
F03	4,848	3,292	1,472	44.7%	of returning students
F04	5,033	3,304	1,617	48.9%	of returning students
F05	4,844	3,113	1,494	48.0%	of returning students
F06	4,683	3,016	1,401	46.5%	of returning students

**Attachment A2**

*Wright State University*  
 Total University  
 Fall 199 – Fall 2006  
 Headcount Enrollment

Fall Quarter	Undergrad Enrollment	* University College		University College Freshmen		University College Sophomores		Univers Ju
		#	% of Undergraduate Enrollment	#	% of University College	#	% of University College	#
1971	9,255	2,230	24%	2,218	99%			
1972	9,046	2,664	29%	2,206	83%			
1973	9,121	2,905	32%	2,297	79%			
1974	9,556	3,005	31%	2,287	76%			
1975	10,464	3,469	33%	2,627	76%			
1976	10,035	3,596	36%	3,032	84%			
1977	10,443	3,680	35%	2,906	79%			
1978	10,208	3,229	32%	2,656	82%			
1979	10,487	2,336	22%	2,238	96%			
1980	10,821	2,314	21%	2,248	97%			
1981	10,810	2,576	24%	2,443	95%			
1982	10,687	2,984	28%	2,577	86%			
1983	11,203	3,278	29%	2,748	84%			
1984	11,410	3,381	30%	2,750	81%			
1985	11,869	3,572	30%	2,888	81%			
1986	12,480	3,826	31%	3,161	83%			
1987	12,512	4,185	33%	3,412	82%			
1988	12,713	4,717	37%	3,706	79%			
1989	13,122	5,295	40%	3,808	72%			
1990	12,933	5,547	43%	3,797	68%			
1991	13,036	5,356	41%	3,618	68%			
1992	12,925	4,818	37%	3,288	68%			
1993	12,727	4,806	38%	3,232	67%			
1994	12,220	4,647	38%	3,049	66%			
1995	11,670	4,555	39%	2,981	65%			
1996	11,262	4,515	40%	2,973	66%			
1997	11,218	4,541	40%	3,012	66%			
1998	11,246	4,615	41%	3,044	66%			
1999	12,116	5,116	42%	3,338	65%	1,150	22%	448
2000	11,896	4,934	41%	3,312	67%	1,091	22%	390
2001	12,220	5,193	42%	3,431	66%	1,117	22%	454
2002	12,531	5,304	42%	3,491	66%	1,207	23%	430
2003	12,708	5,165	41%	3,336	65%	1,199	23%	445
2004	13,001	5,546	43%	3,679	66%	1,223	22%	483
2005	13,058	5,296	41%	3,678	69%	1,030	19%	430
2006	12,934	5,088	39%	3,613	71%	1,048	21%	309

\* University College enrollment includes Lake campus

## Attachment B

### UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

**AATS Benchmarks for Students' Timely Movement into Majors**  
*(for students not starting in developmental education math or writing)*

#	COLLEGE/MAJOR	<i>Time expected to remain in UC</i>
1	<b>College of Liberal Arts</b> Economics -- 4 quarters Integrated Language Arts -- 6 quarters	3 quarters <i>(except EC &amp; ILA)</i>
2	<b>College of Science/Math</b> Mathematics -- 6 quarters	3 quarters <i>(except Math)</i>
3	<b>Raj Soin College of Business</b>	5 quarters
4	<b>College of Education &amp; Human Services</b> Organizational Leadership – 7 quarters	5 quarters <i>(except OL)</i>
5	<b>College of Nursing and Health</b>	6 quarters
6	<b>College of Engineering/Computer Science</b>	6 quarters

*Reviewed by UCAT on 4/18/05*  
*Adopted by UC/Academic Advising & Transfer Services*  
*04/ 20/ 2005*

## Attachment C

### University College Resources

National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition

National Academic Advising Association (NACADA)

National Association of Deans & Directors of University Colleges & Undergraduate Studies (AD&D)

### Selected Literature

Tinto, Vincent. 1987 and 1993. *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ACT, Inc. (2004). *What Works in Student Retention?* (Research Report). Iowa City, IA: W.R. Habley and R. McClanahan.

ACT, Inc. (2004). *The Role of Academic and Non-Academic Factors in Improving College Retention*. (ACT Policy Report). Iowa City, IA : V. A. Lotkowski, S. B. Robbins, and R. J. Noeth.

Astin, A. W., (1993). *What Matters in College?: Four Critical Years Revisited*. (1 st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, V. N., Habley, W. R. (Eds.). (2000). *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kramer, G. L., et al. (2003). *Student Academic Services: An Integrated Approach*. (1 st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. et al (2005). *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter* (1 st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Roueche, J. (1993). *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The At-Risk Student in the Open-Door College*. (1 st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Seidman, A. (Ed). (2005). *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

**Attachment D**

**SUMMARY OF PROGRAM ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

--

--

College
---------

## College of Education and Human Services

*(Benchmark: Students in the CEHS majors are expected to be in their college by the end of their fifth quarter, except as noted.)*

Early Childhood Education, Health & Physical Education, Integrated Business Education, and Marketing Education

- ✍ 2.5 GPA
- ✍ 45 hours earned
- ✍ Acceptable scores on the Praxis I

Following found at: [www.ed.wright.edu](http://www.ed.wright.edu)

- ✍ Formal Application
- ✍ Writing Sample
- ✍ 2 Recommendations

Middle Childhood Education

- ✍ 2.5 GPA
- ✍ 45 hours earned
- ✍ Statement of Good Moral Character

Rehabilitation Services

- ✍ 2.35 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours earned

Organizational Leadership

- ✍ 2.0 GPA
- ✍ 90 hours earned
- ✍ Completion of any two 100/200 level courses from the following areas:  
ACC, EC, FIN, MKT or STT

*(Benchmark: Students in the OL major are expected to be in their college by the end of their seventh quarter.)*

## Raj Soin College of Business

- ✍ 2.5 cumulative GPA from all schools
- ✍ 45 hours earned
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in ENG 101 and 102
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in MTH 128/129 or in a higher level math

*(Benchmark: Students in the RSCB majors are expected to be in their college by the end of their fifth quarter.)*

## College of Engineering and Computer Science

*(Benchmark: Students in the CECS majors are expected to be in their college by the end of their sixth quarter.)*

- ✍ 2.25 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours earned
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in ENG 101 and 102

Additional requirements:

Biomedical Engineering or Industrial & Systems Engineering

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in EGR 101 (or MTH 229, 230)
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CEG 220
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CHM 121/125 or PHY 240/200

Computer Science

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher MTH 257
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CS 240

### Computer Engineering

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher MTH 257
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CS 240

### Electrical Engineering

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in EGR 101 (or MTH 229, 230)
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CEG 220 or CS 240
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CHM 121/125 or PHY 240/200

### Engineering Physics

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in EGR 101 (or MTH 229, 230)
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in one of the following: CEG 220, EGR 153 or CS 240
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CHM 121/125 or PHY 240/200

### Mechanical Engineering or Materials & Science Engineering

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in EGR 101 (or MTH 229, 230)
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in EGR 153 or CEG 220
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in CHM 121/125 or PHY 240/200

## College of Liberal Arts

- ✍ 2.0 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours earned
- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in ENG 101 and ENG 102
- ✍ Three additional General Education courses from Areas 2, 3, or 4.

*(Benchmark: Students in most COLA majors are expected to be in their college by the end of their third quarter. Exceptions are noted.)*

### Additional Requirements:

#### Communication and Social Science Education

- ✍ 2.5 GPA

#### Criminal Justice and Urban Affairs

- ✍ 2.3 GPA

#### Economics

- ✍ Grade of "C" or higher in MTH 128/129 or in a higher-level math course

*(Benchmark: Students in the Economics B.A. major are expected to be in their college by the end of their fourth quarter.)*

#### English Education/Integrated Lang Arts

- ✍ 2.5 GPA
- ✍ 48 hours earned

*(Benchmark: Students in the English Education major are expected to be in their college by the end of their sixth quarter.)*

#### Modern Language

- ✍ 2.5 cumulative GPA (or 3.0 GPA in foreign language courses)

## College of Liberal Arts cont.

#### Motion Picture Production B.A.

✍ 2.25 GPA

Social Work (minimum for consideration)

- ✍ 2.25 GPA\*
- ✍ Grade of “C” or higher in SW 270 and 271
- ✍ Formal application
- ✍ EC 200, PLS 200, SOC 200, PSY 105, 341, BIO 107, SW 272, COM 104

**\*This program is competitive admission!**

*(Benchmark: Students in the Social Work major are expected to be in their college by the end of their sixth quarter.)*

Special Admission Requirements:

B.F.A. in Art or Theatre (except for Motion Picture Production)

- ✍ 2.0 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours
- ✍ Audition required for Acting, Musical Theatre, and Dance

Motion Picture Production B.F.A.

- ✍ 2.25 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours earned
- ✍ Grade of “A” or “B” in MP 131 and 180

Music

- ✍ Audition
- ✍ Three outside recommendations
- ✍ Formal application

**College of Nursing and Health**

- ✍ 2.5 GPA\*
- ✍ 48 hours in prescribed courses
- ✍ 2.5 GPA and grade of “C” or higher in all prerequisite courses – ENG 101 & 102, PSY 105 & 110, CHM 102, HAP I, M&I 220, SOC 200, STT 160
- ✍ Formal application

**\*This program is competitive admission!**

*(Benchmark: Students in the Nursing major are expected to be in their college by the end of their sixth quarter.)*

**College of Science and Mathematics**

- ✍ 2.0 GPA
- ✍ 24 hours earned
- ✍ Grade of “C” or higher in 2 courses in chosen major

*(Benchmark: Students in the COSM majors are expected to be in their college by the end of their third quarter, except Math majors by the end of their sixth quarter.)*

Additional requirements:

Math

- ✍ MTH 229 and 230 with grade of “C” or higher in each
- ✍ 2.5 GPA or higher for the average of MTH 229 and 230

Psychology

- ✍ 2.25 cumulative GPA
- ✍ 2.25 GPA in all Psychology courses (minimum two classes)
- ✍ 30 hours earned

Attachment E

University College  
Organizational Chart  
February 5, 2007

**Dr. David Hopkins**  
President

**Dr. Steven Angle**  
Provost

**Dr. Anita Curry-Jackson**  
Dean

**William Johnson**  
Assistant Dean  
Administrative Services

**Donna Maas**  
Assistant to the Dean

**Juanita Melton**  
Assistant Dean  
Student Academic Success  
Center

Student Assistants

Inter  
Ad

**Student Tutors**

**David Hurwitz**  
Director, Tutoring Center

**Melanie King**  
Office Assistant II

**Kim Robbins**  
Office Assistant II

**Janet Jensen-Brown**

