# SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

## *OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC*

## MEMORANDUM

**To:**      Senate

**From:**    D. Gagan, Chair
Senate Committee on Academic Planning

**Subject:**  Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy
(SCAP Reference: SCAP 98 – 60)

**Date:**    November 5, 1998

---

Action undertaken by the Senate Committee on Academic Planning gives rise to the following motion:

**Motion:**

"that Senate approve as set forth in S.98 -95 , that the Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy be extended by five years to Fall semester 2004, with a review to occur in 2003."

**Memo**
**Simon Fraser University**

To:     **SCAP**
From:   **J. Osborne, Chair DQAC**
Date:   1998 10 27

| Subject: Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy |
| --- |

In April 1996, Senate passed the following motion, approving this policy for a three year trial period.

*Moved that Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors as set forth in S.96-28, the proposed policy on undergraduate admissions, for a trial period from Spring Semester 1997 until Fall Semester 1999, with review by SCAP with report to Senate to occur in Summer Semester 1998 before the policy, as described in the attached paper 'Diverse Qualifications Undergraduate Admission Policy' continues, and that an appropriate committee be established for the adjudication of this policy.*

The Senate established the Diverse Qualification Adjudication Committee (DQAC) to implement the policy.

On 30 September 1998, DQAC reviewed the academic performance of all 165 students who had been admitted under this policy in the previous five semesters, 97-1 to 98-2. An analysis prepared by J Heslop, Analytical Studies, was the basis of this review. DQAC compared these DQ admits with a control group, which consisted of an equal number of students admitted at the margin on their academic records alone. DQAC concluded that the results were encouraging. For the policy to be clearly successful, the academic performances of DQ admits should be no worse than those of the students whom they displaced, assuming that the other attributes of the DQ group were superior to those of the displaced group. The control group in this review closely approximated the displaced group.

DQAC noted that the policy had been implemented conservatively and at very low effort and cost. The policy allowed for the selection of up to 10% of new students, but the actual proportion was under 3%. Overall, there were insufficient data to draw firm conclusions about the success of the policy.

DQAC passed the following motion:

**"DQAC recommends to SCAP that the Diverse Qualifications Admission Policy be extended by five years to Fall semester 2004, with a review to occur in 2003."**

DQAC made no recommendation on the decision of the Faculty of Science to opt out of the DQ process. Members noted that several DQ admits entered Science before that decision became effective. In addition, students may select a Primary and an Alternate faculty, allowing an applicant whose primary interest is natural science to be admitted under DQAP, if s/he enters via another faculty and subsequently transfers to Science.

DQAC regrets that this material was not submitted for SCAP's review in Summer 1998, as directed, but felt that the additional data collected in 98-2 were valuable. A decision on continuing this policy is needed before the 1999/2000 Calendar is published.

## Summary of analysis

This summarizes J. Heslop's analysis. The full version is available on request from N. Heath, Admissions.

## Characteristics of DQ admits {from Tables 1-6}

The control group was selected from all students admitted to SFU under normal academic qualifications in the same semesters as the DQ cohort category by counting upwards from the admission gpa cutoff until the same number of admits was reached in each basis of admission (BOA). The control group is just above and the DQ group is just below the cutoff.

Distribution by Basis of Admission

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| BC12 | 20% | 20% |
| BC College | 33% | 35% |
| Other | 47% | 45% |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

Mean admission averages

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| BC12 | 75% | 76% |
| BC College | 2.65 | 2.83 |
| Other | n/a | n/a |

Distribution by admission average (% scale)
(Used for sec school admits)

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| < 70% | 4% | 0% |
| 70% - 74% | 56% | 0% |
| 75% - 79% | 33% | 91% |
| 80% - 84% | 7% | 9% |
| ≥85% | 0% | 0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

Mean age at time of entry

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| Age in years | 24.8 | 25.0 |

Distribution by admission gpa (4 point scale)
(Used for transfer and degree holder admits)

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| None | 13% | 12% |
| <2.0 | 1% | 1% |
| 2.00 – 2.49 | 15% | 4% |
| 2.50 – 2.99 | 65% | 44% |
| 3.00 – 3.49 | 4% | 33% |
| 3.50 – 3.99 | 2% | 6% |
| ≥4.00 | 0% | 1% |
| Total approx. | 100% | 100% |

Distribution by intended faculty

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| APSC | 16% | 15% |
| ARTS | 56% | 51% |
| BUS | 14% | 19% |
| EDUC | 10% | 6% |
| SCI | 4% | 7% |
| Unknown | 1% | 2% |
| Total approx. | 100% | 100% |

Distribution by gender

|  | DQ | Control |
|---|---|---|
| female | 56% | 53% |
| male | 44% | 47% |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

## Performance comparisons

• Persistence by semester:{from Table 8}
This gives the number registered and the proportion of all students from that cohort who could have registered in that semester.

|  | DQ | | Control | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Semester 1 | 165/165 | (100%) | 165/165 | (100%) |
| Semester 2 | 109/155 | (70%) | 121/155 | (78%) |
| Semester 3 | 70/123 | (57%) | 69/123 | (56%) |
| Semester 4 | 32/64 | (50%) | 35/64 | (55%) |
| Semester 5 | 8/23 | (35%) | 14/23 | (61%) |

The control group shows a slightly higher persistence rate.

- Cumulative Performance: (mean cgpa & mean total credits completed) {from Table 8}

|  | DQ | | Control | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Semester 1 | 2.31 | (8) | 2.37 | (7) |
| Semester 2 | 2.27 | (17) | 2.52 | (16) |
| Semester 3 | 2.60 | (24) | 2.68 | (25) |
| Semester 4 | 2.72 | (32) | 2.69 | (31) |
| Semester 5 | 2.96 | (38) | 2.87 | (36) |

Very few students have 5 semesters of data (see table above). By the fourth semester at SFU, the DQ group appears to be performing slightly better than the control group. By the fifth semester (1998-2 for 1997-1 admits) the number of students still registered is too small (8 DQ's and 14 control group) to draw conclusions.

- Academic standing summary {from TABLE 9}

|  | DQ | | | | | Control | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entry sem | Good | Bad | Total | %Good | %Bad | Good | Bad | Total | %Good | %Bad |
| 1997-1 | 67 | 8 | 75 | 89% | 11% | 92 | 1 | 93 | 99% | 1% |
| 1997-2 | 109 | 15 | 124 | 88% | 12% | 102 | 11 | 113 | 90% | 10% |
| 1997-3 | 83 | 54 | 137 | 61% | 39% | 93 | 44 | 137 | 68% | 32% |
| 1998-1 | 42 | 3 | 45 | 93% | 7% | 46 | 8 | 54 | 85% | 15% |
| 1998-2 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 100% | 0% | 9 | 1 | 10 | 90% | 10% |
| Total* | 311 | 80 | 391 | 80% | 20% | 342 | 65 | 407 | 84% | 16% |

*Definitions:*   Good - In Good Academic Standing
Bad - On Academic Probation, Continued on Probation, Ineligible to Register or Required to Withdraw
*Total number of semesters of registration for which information is available.*

For all 5 admission semesters and registration semesters combined, 20% of the DQ cohort had a "bad" academic standing vs. 16% for the control group. However, the DQAC felt that their scoring criteria had improved over time and felt that the later data reflected this.

- Performance achieved in first 15/29/30+ sem hrs {from Table 11}

|  | DQ - All Faculties | | | | Control - All Faculties | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| cgpa range | | ≤1.99 | 2-2.99 | ≥3.00 | | ≤1.99 | 2-2.99 | ≥3.00 |
|  | mean | | | | mean | | | |
| Hours Completed | | | | | | | | |
| <15 sem hrs | 2.44 | 22% | 45% | 34% | 2.41 | 39% | 28% | 33% |
| 15-29 sem hrs | 2.35 | 34% | 46% | 20% | 2.47 | 25% | 43% | 32% |
| 30+ sem hrs | 2.59 | 7% | 67% | 27% | 2.23 | 6% | 72% | 22% |

Due to the entry shock, we expect the cgpas to be lower in the first 15 hours at SFU, but they should slowly recover over time.

- Performance achieved in first 29 sem hrs by basis of admission {from Table 11}

|  | DQ - All Faculties | | | | Control - All Faculties | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| cgpa | n | ≤1.99 | 2-2.99 | ≥3.00 | n | ≤1.99 | 2-2.99 | ≥3.00 |
| Basis of Admission | | | | | | | | |
| BC and other Canadian 12 | 37 | 51% | 46% | 3% | 33 | 55% | 30% | 15% |
| BC College Transfer | 42 | 21% | 64% | 14% | 42 | 26% | 48% | 26% |
| Matures | 27 | 15% | 22% | 63% | 26 | 35% | 12% | 54% |
| Others (excl. matures) | 29 | 17% | 38% | 45% | 28 | 14% | 43% | 43% |

Students with a basis of admission of BC12 or Canadian Gr. 12 in both the control group and the DQ group alike performed very poorly. BC College transfers did much better, with DQs slightly ahead of the control group. Matures and Others did better yet. DQ Matures performed better than the Matures in the control group.

NH Oct. 98