

#171

GRADUATE POLICY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 7, 1988

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jayne Standley, Chair  
Steve Celec  
Russell H. Johnsen  
Robert Zmud  
Delos DeTar  
Patricia Rose  
Elaine McManus  
John Miller  
Eugene Czajkoski  
Steve Edwards  
Al Imershein  
Natholyn Harris  
Richard Chapple  
Jaakko Hintikka  
David Rasmussen

ALSO PRESENT:

Fred Kreimer  
Donna Wieckowicz  
Joyce Howard

The meeting was called to order at 3:40 P.M. Dr. Johnsen briefly explained to the committee a problem the graduate studies office has encountered regarding signatures on thesis/dissertation title pages. Dr. Johnsen pointed out that on occasion after a student acquires the necessary signatures, a change must be made to the title page, e.g., title change, semester of graduation change, etc., and the supervisory committee may be unavailable to sign a new title page. Dr. Johnsen recommended that the signatures be removed from the title page and be placed on a special signature page to follow the title page. He further recommended that the new procedure be implemented beginning with the Fall 1989 semester (see attached examples). Dr. DeTar moved that this recommendation be approved. Motion was seconded by Dr. Harris and passed.

Dr. Standley then presented to the GPC for discussion the GRE subcommittee report on the FSU mean GRE score - BOR comparison, which had been distributed to the committee in advance. She briefly outlined to the GPC the reasons that led to the appointment of the subcommittee. Dr. Standley stated that after reviewing the statistical data provided in Betty Tilton's report on GRE scores, the subcommittee sought ways to define the extent of the problem and consider how accurate are FSU's GRE data; who computes the data for the BOR report; do GRE data reflect FSU's admission practices and catalog requirements; is the GRE score alone representative of the "quality" of our graduate students; how should FSU try to influence the BOR in presentation of GRE data; and is FSU in compliance with the Board rules by not requiring a GRE score be submitted by all graduate applicants?

After a lengthy discussion ranging from committee concerns on the accuracy of the reporting structure; no one person having line authority for the preparation and accuracy of the report; how

The motion as passed now reads:

6. All departments should be apprised that if a student satisfies minimum admission requirements, it does not mean that the student must be admitted. All departments are encouraged to raise their admission standards in keeping with their identified mission.

Dr. Standley called for approval from the committee to combine recommendation 1 and 6 as amended. Passed

GPC considered recommendation 3 which reads:

3. The data going to the BOR is crucial to our state image and subsequent funding. One individual with line authority over support staff should be identified to prepare, interpret, and be accountable for its accuracy from the beginning of the process to the actual submission to the Board and to act as FSU liaison with BOR.

The committee discussed the question of line authority and felt that this function was handled by Mr. Grady Rea and was not needed in the recommendation. It was moved by Dr. DeTar to delete the words with line authority over support staff from the second sentence. Motion was seconded by Dr. Celec and passed.

The motion as passed now reads:

3. The data going to the BOR is crucial to our state image and subsequent funding. One individual should be identified to prepare, interpret, and be accountable for its accuracy from the beginning of the process to the actual submission to the Board and to act as FSU liaison with BOR.

GPC considered recommendation 4 which reads:

FSU should be aggressive in requesting that any GRE data published by BOR include notation of standard errors of measurement. We should also push for the BOR never combining such data into one mean but keeping it separate by age, race, U.S. citizen vs. foreign, degree sought, and academic program. We should cite ETS's own guidelines about this.

The committee felt that the first sentence of the recommendation complicated the accuracy of the report, and that the words U.S. citizen vs. foreign in the second sentence is a sensitive subject and should be deleted. It was moved by Dr. DeTar that the first sentence and the words U.S. citizen vs. foreign in the second sentence be deleted from the recommendation. Motion was seconded by Dr. Celec and passed.

The motion as passed now reads:

We should also push for the BOR never combining such data into one mean but keeping it separate by age, race, degree sought, and academic program. We should cite ETS's own guidelines about this.

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

## GPC SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

## FSU MEAN GRE SCORE: BOR COMPARISONS

Presenting Problem: FSU's mean GRE score was reported in comparison with others in the SUS in a BOR report in Spring, 1988. it ranked 6th in the SUS and below the SUS mean. (See Attachment 1). This report was cited by the 1988 legislature in discussing quality of SUS graduate programs for differential funding, mission, etc.

Response: 1. Jim Pitts, Faculty Senate President, was present in legislative meeting and reported the situation to the University.

2. Sliger assigned Betty Tilton to review the BOR report process with GRE scores being one element of that review. She prepared a report with extensive data on GRE scores.

3. Turnbull received the Tilton Report and sent a memo to the Graduate Dean requesting input.

4. Johnsen asked that GPC discuss the problem.

5. GPC sub-committee was named to prepare issue for the agenda and included: J. Standley, GPC; S. Klees, GPC; D. Montgomery, GPC; B. Tilton, ass't to President; F. Kreimer, Senate Steering Committee; R. Johnsen, Dean. Additional data were provided by J. Howard.

The above Sub-Committee sought to define the extent of the problem and considered the following possibilities:

1) Are the data accurate? Who compiles it and assures its accuracy?

2) If data are accurate, are they actually reflecting our admissions practices?

3) Are admission practices in line with catalog requirements?

4) Is the GRE score alone representative of the "quality" of our graduate students and graduate programs?

5) If the GRE score is not representative of our graduate programs, how could FSU influence the BOR's presentation of data?

6) Are we out of compliance with the Board rules by not requiring a GRE score be submitted by all graduate applicants? (see Attachment 2)

In exploring the above questions, the sub-committee reviewed the following data and found the attached results.

Q1 WHO COMPILES DATA?

a) ETS sends GRE data tape to Jessie Aloï with scores for all students who requested that a score be sent to FSU

b) Jessie sends data tape to Systems (D. Hawkins)

c) Systems sends data tape to N.W. Regional Data Center where it becomes the PREAPPLICATION FILE

d) If any of these students applies to FSU, Jessie gives them an application # and their preapplication file becomes an APPLICATION FILE

e) If student is admitted, this then becomes the ADMISSION FILE. If a score comes in after this point, Jessie's office may add it to the admission file.

f) The admission file goes to Pete Metarko's office who makes the STUDENT DATA BASE FILE (SDB) which allows an admitted student to enroll.

g) If the student enrolls, the SDB file becomes an ENROLLMENT FILE. No scores are added after enrollment.

Grady Rea (under Sliger) has the responsibility of Institutional Data Admin., i.e., sending data to BOR which for the Fall semester this year was due Oct. 17. His staff person for this function is Liz Laurienzo. The SDB (software developed by Metarko's office) is edited to BOR specifications by the Systems Office (D. Hawkins under Tom James under Gene Sherron under Gus Turnbull). Graduate admissions (Jessie Aloï) is under Pete Metarko (under Betsy Muhlenfield under Steve Edwards).

CONCLUSION: NO ONE PERSON HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE PREPARATION, INTERPRETATION, OR ACCURACY OF DATA USED BY THE BOR TO REPRESENT FSU'S PROGRAMS OR FUNDING NEEDS.

Q2 HOW ACCURATE ARE FSU'S GRE DATA?

The majority of individual scores are probably accurate since they are not key punched but automatically transferred from the ETS tape; however, there may be inaccuracies in the

software transitions as BOR specs change and THESE TRANSITIONS NEED TO BE CLOSELY AND REGULARLY MONITORED.

Q3 DO GRE DATA REFLECT OUR ADMISSION PRACTICES AND CATALOG REQUIREMENTS?

Attachment 3: Table 1 from Tilton Report showing average GRE scores by academic areas. The College of Business (GMAT) and Law School (LSAT) are not included since they use alternative tests.

Attachment 4: Table showing GRE scores by GPA reported for admission 87-88

Attachment 5: Table showing GRE scores and GPA by age for 87-88

Attachment 6: Table showing GRE scores for beginning vs. advanced students 87-88

Attachment 7: Table showing GRE scores by race for 85, 86, & 87

Attachment 8: Table showing admitted applicants meeting catalog requirements 86-87.

CONCLUSION: GRE DATA SEEM TO ACCURATELY REFLECT CURRENT ADMISSION STANDARDS AND EMPHASIS ON PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITY AND MATURE/RETURNING GRADUATE STUDENTS, ESPECIALLY IN PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS OR SERVICE DEGREES TO STATE OF FLA.

Q4 IS THE GRE SCORE ALONE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE "QUALITY" OF FSU GRADUATE PROGRAMS? IS GRADUATE QUALITY AT FSU DECREASING?

Attachment 9: Guidelines for use and interpretation of GRE scores

Attachment 10: FSU/UF comparisons on non-Fla. students

Attachment 11: GRE comparisons - FSU, UF, USF (from Tilton report)

a) FSU has more non-Fla. and international students than UF. Are we more national in scope than they? We use almost all of our exceptions (10% of enrollment) while UF reports that they use exceptions for only 4% of their enrollment.

b) A quick overview of GPC reviews since 1980 yielded some data of GRE score comparisons by departments across the last 10 years. (See Attachment 12 as an example). From this quick and albeit cursory review there was no

evidence that GRE scores have deviated substantially in this period of time. This data would be valuable and should be made a part of all future GPC reviews.

CONCLUSION: ACCORDING TO ETS'S PUBLISHED GUIDELINES AND NATIONAL NORMS, FSU IS USING THE GRE CORRECTLY IN ITS ADMISSIONS PROCEDURES. THE GRE IS ~ AT BEST A GROSS PREDICTOR OF SUCCESS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH SHOWS THAT IT HAS A LOWER CORRELATION WITH FIRST YEAR GPA THAN DOES THE GPA FROM THE LAST 2 YRS. OF UNDER GRAD OR GRAD STUDY. ( A COMPARISON BETWEEN GRE AND FIRST YEAR GPA IN FSU MATH DEPT REVEALED A NEGATIVE CORRELATION.) IF FSU INTENDS TO MAINTAIN NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN RECRUITING AND RETAINING MINORITY GRADUATE STUDENTS, THEN IT SHOULD BE AGGRESSIVE IN ASSURING THAT ITS QUALITY IS JUDGED INSTATE IN THE SAME MANNER THAT IT IS JUDGED NATIONALLY - BY ITS GRADUATES, NOT ITS ENTRANTS.

Q5 HOW SHOULD FSU TRY TO INFLUENCE THE BOR IN PRESENTATION OF GRE DATA?

- a) Request that any GRE data be published with standard error of measurement.
- b) Request that Gre data not be combined into one mean, but published by age, race, and academic program.

Q6 Should FSU require a GRE score for everyone in order to comply with BOR rules even if we do not use it for admission?

FSU reported scores on 64% of applicants in 86-87 and on 61% of applicants in 87-88 while UF and USF report scores on about 90% of their applicants. In 86-87, only three SUS institutions (FAMU, UWF, and UCF) reported GRE scores on a smaller proportion of registered graduate students than did FSU

CONCLUSION: WE SHOULD REQUIRE SCORES OF EVERYONE EVEN IF WE DO NOT USE THEM FOR ADMISSION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) Everyone at FSU should be apprised of the image problem with regard to GRE scores and we should insure that every department is using admissions practices which meet our minimum criteria as stated in the catalog. Betty Tilton's reports are thorough and provide excellent information about our admissions practices. A copy of the 1987-88 report



should be sent to every department by Dean Johnsen. Each program area should also be requested to review their admissions practices and report back in writing to the GPC to ensure that any inadequacies are immediately corrected. All departments should be requested to maintain accurate admissions records for each academic year and submit it on an annual basis to the Graduate Office.

2) We should quit speaking of low "quality" in our graduate students or in our admissions standards since there is no evidence to suggest that higher GRE scores would result in greater quality in most of our graduate programs. We should, however, be aggressive in speaking to FSU's unique role in the SUS with emphasis on multiple admissions standards and national scope, commitment to graduate education of minority and mature students, and to appropriate statewide use of standardized test scores.

3) <sup>Dep. in</sup> The data going to the BOR is crucial to our state image and subsequent funding. One individual with ~~line~~ authority over ~~support staff~~ should be identified to prepare, interpret, and be accountable for its accuracy from the beginning of the process to the actual submission to the Board and to act as FSU liaison with BOR. (If that has already been done, it is not evident from the tracking of the task by this subcommittee or from the way the system is functioning to represent FSU.)

4) FSU should be aggressive in requesting that any GRE data published by BOR include notation of standard errors of measurement. We should also push for the BOR never combining such data into one mean but keeping it separate by age, race, U.S. citizen vs. foreign, degree sought, and academic program. We should cite ETS's own guidelines about this.

5) FSU should require GRE scores of everyone even if we do not use them for admission purposes. This would make us less suspect in negotiation with BOR over use of the scores. (Note: Some committee members felt that requiring GRE scores of foreign students was inappropriate.)

6) All departments should be apprised that if a student satisfies minimum admission requirements, it does not mean that the student must be admitted. All departments are encouraged to maintain high admission standards in keeping with their identified mission.