











Texas Tech: 2011
Prospects: 140,000

PROSPECTS

- Individuals identified by the University based on a set criteria for desirability

- Considerations
 - What are the 'desirability' criteria? When were they last reviewed?
 - Where is the University 'targeting'? Are those still applicable?
 - Are the purchased names being utilized? Are they being purchased timely?

Texas Tech: 2011
Prospects: 140,000
Inquires: 70,000

INQUIRIES

- A prospect who has 'reacted' in some form.
- Self-initiated contacts

- Considerations
 - 'Road Show' costs vs. inquiries
 - Oversight of distant recruiters
 - Prioritization of efforts

Texas Tech: 2011
Prospects: 140,000
Inquires: 70,000
Applicants: 11,500

APPLICANTS

- Inquiries who have started or completed an application.

- Considerations
 - Technical ability to see 'partial' applications
 - Review of metrics to see if 'high-value' targets are completing applications
 - Timely hand off for decision making purposes
 - Admitted
 - Pending
 - Denied

Texas Tech: 2011
Prospects: 140,000
Inquires: 70,000
Applicants: 11,500
Admitted: ~5,000

ADMITTED

- Applicants who have met institutional criteria and have been accepted by a college or department.

- Interaction with other University departments begins in earnest.

- Considerations
 - Applicants meet criteria
 - Timely decision on 'pending' applicants

Texas Tech: 2011
Prospects: 140,000
Inquires: 70,000
Applicants: 11,500
Admitted: 5,000
Enrolled: 4,400

ENROLLED

- Admitted individuals who are still around on census day.
- Considerations
 - Are any metrics tracked to show Prospect to Enrolled?
 - Are any metrics tracked to show Admitted to Enrolled?
 - These are individuals who made a decision to attend your university but changed their mind. Administration should focus on why 'high-value' individuals had a change of heart.

OTHER FUNNEL CONSIDERATIONS

- Is there a comprehensive recruiting strategy and/or strategic plan?
- Are there clear performance metrics established?
- Are there appropriate cash controls over application fees?
- Are there appropriate reviews of travel and entertainment expenditures?



BANNER DECISION RULES

DECISION RULES: THINGS YOU NEED TO KNOW

- Banner Table Admit Codes
 - Automatic Admit: FA or FR
 - Automatic Deny: RV or RJ
 - Route for Manual Review: RF
 - Special Review: PN
- Rules are set on: SAADCSN
- Applications can be seen in: PUBLIC.SARADAP
- Decision are written to table: PUBLIC.SARAPPD

DECISION RULES: SAADCSN SECURITY

Security of the decision rules form is critical to ensure an individual is not making unauthorized changes. To review this risk we completed a quick review of individuals who have modify access to the decision rules form (SAADCSN).

- Procedures:
 - SAADCSN Access Review
 - Pull a list of all users who have **modify** access to SAADCSN.
 - Review for appropriateness.

DECISION RULES: RULE SETUP

Are the rules established in line with the current admissions index?

- Procedures:
 - Review SAADCSN to ensure alignment with Index.

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

The purpose of this testing was to determine if errors exist in the processing of automatic admission decisions for the Top 10%, Next 15% and 2nd Quarter Bands.

1. Identify all new first time freshman applications
 - PUBLIC.SARADAP
 - Limit to:
 - SARADAP_TERM_CODE_ENTRY = 2013027
 - SARADAP_STYP_CODE = N

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

2. Obtain all 2013 admission decisions by automatic rules processes
 - PUBLIC.SARAPPD
 - Limit to:
 - SARAPPD_TERM_CODE_ENTRY = 2013027
 - SARAPPD_USER = TT_ST_APPWORX (the generic userid for the automatic decision rules)
3. Attach the admission decision to each applicant
 - Join
 - Primary: PUBLIC.SARAPPD
 - Secondary: PUBLIC.SARADAP
 - Keys: SARADAP_PIDM = SARAPPD_PIDM and SARADAP_APPL_NO = SARAPPD_APPL_NO

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

4. Obtain class rank, join to previous
 - PUBLIC.SORHSCH
 - Key: SORHSCH_PIDM = SARAPPD_PIDM
5. Obtain ACT scores, join to previous
 - PUBLIC.SORTEST
 - All records with SORTEST_TESC_CODE = 'A05'
 - Join
 - Key: SORTEST_PIDM = SARADAP_PIDM

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

- 6. Obtain SAT scores, join to previous
 - PUBLIC.SORTEST
 - All records with SORTEST_TESC_CODE = 'S13'
 - Join
 - Key: SORTEST_PIDM
- 7. Attach a name and 'R#'
 - SATURN.SPRIDEN
 - Join
 - Key: SPRIDEN_PIDM = SARADAP_PIDM

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

- 8. Eliminate updated records
 - See detailed procedures
- 9. Eliminate 'pending' decisions
 - See detailed procedures

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

- 10. Slice database into review sections
 - Top 10% (Class Rank: 100% - 90%)
 - Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 90
 - Next 15% (Class Rank: 89.99% - 75%)
 - Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 75 AND SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 89.99
 - 2nd Quarter (Class Rank: 74.99% - 50%)
 - Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 50 .AND. SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 74.99
 - 3rd Quarter (Class Rank: 49.99% - 25%)
 - Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 25 .AND. SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 49.99

DECISION RULES: IDEA TESTING

- 11. Sort and review admit code breaks for congruence with index
- 12. RESULTS

ASU AUTO ADMISSION PROCESS

- Stand alone computer code (KAD)
- Pulled and queried Banner data
- Updates enrollment status in SAAADMS
- Creates Student record in SGASTDN

BANNER DATA

- KAD decisions on available information
- Transcript information
- Test scores
- Benchmarks
- Unranked students

KAD MATRIX

- Pre-check
- Reviews based on criteria set in rules for admittance to assign student admit code of AT
- Reviews based on criteria set in rules for rejection to assign code of RJ
- Any others are then marked for a manual file review



MANUAL DECISION PROCESS

MANUAL DECISIONS

Manual entry of decisions occur at Texas Tech for the following reasons:

- Decision from the 'deferred applicant pool'
- Appeals of rejected applications
- All transfer student applications

MANUAL DECISIONS

Decisions from the 'deferred applicant pool'

- Documented decisions
- Authority to authorize admissions from the deferred pool is defined

MANUAL DECISIONS

Appeals of rejected applications

- Policy and procedure
 - Defined criteria
- Communication of process with applicants
- Appeals Committee
 - Quorum
 - Justification for selection

MANUAL DECISIONS

All transfer student applications

- Defined transfer student criteria, consider differences for dual credit applicants
- Segregation of evaluation and approval of transfer applicants
- Evaluation of transferable courses
- Review of:
 - transcript entry
 - admission decision entry

MANUAL DECISIONS

Hanging reviews

- Reports identifying applicants yet to be reviewed

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS

CONNECT

Jessica Pickens & Matt Walsh
Office of Audit Services
Texas Tech University System
806.742.3220

Jessica.Pickens@ttu.edu
Matt.Walsh@angelo.edu

Project #2012044
Additional Procedures - Automatic Decisions Testing

Purpose: The purpose of this workpaper is to document testing conducted to determine whether errors exist in the processing of automatic admission decisions for the Top 10%, Next 15% and 2nd Quarter Bands.

Procedure:

1. To identify all new first time freshmen applications for the Fall 2013 term, Ms. Pickens pulled **PUBLIC.SARADAP** on May 23, 2012 and limited it using the following criteria:

SARADAP_TERM_CODE_ENTRY	201327	Fall 2013 Applications
SARADAP_STYP_CODE	N	New First Time Freshmen

2. To obtain all Fall 2013 admission decisions determined by automatic decision rules, Ms. Pickens pulled **PUBLIC.SARAPPD** on May 22, 2012 and limited it using the following criteria:

SARAPPD_TERM_CODE_ENTRY	201327	Fall 2013 Applications
SARAPPD_USER	TT_ST_APPWORX	Automatic Decisions

3. To attach automatic admission decisions to each application, Ms. Pickens joined the limited **PUBLIC.SARADAP** (secondary) and the limited **PUBLIC.SARAPPD** (primary) using the following parameters:

Type of join: all records in primary file

Keys: SARADAP_PIDM = SARAPPD_PIDM

SARADAP_APPL_NO = SARAPPD_APPL_NO

The following fields from each database were brought forward with the join:

SARAPPD_PIDM
SARAPPD_APPL_NO
SARAPPD_APDC_DATE_DATE
SARAPPD_APDC_CODE
SARAPPD_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE
SARAPPD_USER
SARADAP_PIDM
SARADAP_TERM_CODE_ENTRY
SARADAP_APPL_NO
SARADAP_LEVEL_CODE
SARADAP_APPL_DATE_DATE
SARADAP_STYP_CODE

This database was called **Applications & Automatic Decisions**.

4. To obtain each applicant's class rank, Ms. Pickens pulled PUBLIC.SORHSCH (secondary) on July 12, 2012 and joined it with the Applications & Automatic Decisions database (primary) using the following parameters:

Type of join: all records in primary file
Key: SORHSCH_PIDM = SARAPPD_PIDM

The following fields were brought forward with the join:

SORHSCH_PIDM
SORHSCH_PERCENTILE
SORHSCH_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE

The database is now called Decisions & Rank.

5. To obtain each applicant's ACT and SAT scores, Ms. Pickens pulled PUBLIC.SORTEST on July 12, 2012.

To obtain each applicant's highest ACT score, Ms. Pickens extracted all records with 'A05' in the SORTEST_TESC_CODE field. This database was called A05. Ms. Pickens sorted the database first by PIDM (ascending) and then by test score (decending). To attach each applicant's highest ACT score to the Decisions & Rank table, Ms. Pickens joined the sorted A05 database (secondary) with the Decisions & Rank (primary) table using the following parameters:

Type of join: all records in primary file
Key: SORTEST_PIDM = SARADAP_PIDM

The database is now called Decisions, Rank & ACT.

To obtain each applicant's highest SAT score, Ms. Pickens extracted all records with 'S13' in the SORTEST_TESC_CODE field. This database was called S13. Ms. Pickens sorted the database first by PIDM (ascending) and then by test score (decending). To attach each applicant's highest SAT score to the Decisions, Rank & ACT table, Ms. Pickens joined the sorted S13 (secondary) database with the Decisions, Rank & ACT table (primary) using the following parameters:

Type of join: All records in primary file
Key: SORTEST_PIDM = SARADAP_PIDM

The following fields were brought forward with each join described in step 5:

SORTEST_PIDM
SORTEST_TEST_DATE
SORTEST_TEST_SCORE
SORTEST_TESC_CODE
SORTEST_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE

The database is now called Decisions, Rank, and Scores.

6. To attach applicant names and R#s, Ms. Pickens pulled and joined

6. To attach applicant names and R#s, Ms. Pickens pulled and joined SATURN.SPRIDEN (secondary) with the Decisions, Rank, and Scores (primary) table using the following parameters:

Type of join: All records in primary file
Key: SPRIDEN_PIDM = SARADAP_PIDM

The following fields were brought forward with the join:

SPRIDEN_PIDM
SPRIDEN_FIRST_NAME
SPRIDEN_LAST_NAME
SPRIDEN_ID

7. To eliminate those records whose class rank, ACT score, or SAT score has been updated since the automatic decision was initially made, Ms. Pickens ran the following criteria:

(SARAPPD_APDC_DATE_DATE >= SORHSCH_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE) .AND.
(SARAPPD_APDC_DATE_DATE >= SORTEST_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE) .AND.
(SARAPPD_APDC_DATE_DATE >= SORTEST_ACTIVITY_DATE_DATE1)

8. To select only those applications that resulted in a true admission decision, (eliminate decisions that resulted in PN (pending) or PE (pending engineering)), Ms. Pickens ran the following criteria:

SARAPPD_APDC_CODE = "FA" (Assured Admit) .OR. SARAPPD_APDC_CODE = "FR" (Unpublished Automatic Admission) .OR. SARAPPD_APDC_CODE = "RF" (Review) .OR. SARAPPD_APDC_CODE = "RV" (Deny)

9. Ms. Pickens extracted applicant records to three different databases using the following criteria:

Top 10% (Class Rank: 100% - 90%)
Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 90
This database is called Top 10%.

Next 15% (Class Rank: 89.99% - 75%)
Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 75 AND SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 89.99
This database is called Next 15%.

2nd Quarter (Class Rank: 74.99% - 50%)
Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 50 .AND. SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 74.99
This database is called 2nd Quarter.

3rd Quarter (Class Rank: 49.99% - 25%)
Criteria: SORHSCH_PERCENTILE >= 25 .AND. SORHSCH_PERCENTILE <= 49.99
This database is called 3rd Quarter.

Ms. Pickens separated each class rank group by admit code (see criteria used

in each tab below) according to the 2012 Admissions Index (Provided by Jaime Hansard, Managing Director - Undergraduate Admissions. See '[Admissions Index](#)' tab). Because applicants can meet the criteria for other admit codes based on the higher of the applicant's SAT or ACT scores, Ms. Pickens manually excluded applicants meeting criteria for admission under a higher admit code by sorting the database in excel by SAT and ACT scores and using criteria documented in the 2012 Admissions Index. See 'Admissions Index' tab.

For the records remaining, (not meeting the criteria for other admissions codes) Ms. Pickens randomly selected applicants for manual review and tested each applicant against the following attributes:

A: Class rank entered into Banner and used to determine admission decisions agrees with source documents in Xtender

B: Applicant granted the correct admission decision based on class rank and test scores

C: Only Appworx determined an admission decision

D: No duplicate PIDM issues reported for applicant

Attribute **A** was tested by reviewing/calculating the class rank from high school transcripts included in the Banner Student Xtender folder and comparing it to the class rank entered into Banner form SOAHSCH. For applicants whose high schools do not rank students, Ms. Pickens used criteria established by Undergraduate Admissions (and provided by Mackenzie Broughton, Unit Supervisor - Undergraduate Admissions) to determine class rank. See '[Class Rank Based on GPA](#)' tab.

Attribute **B** was tested by reviewing the applicant's class rank and test scores and comparing it to the criteria for each admission code on the 2012 Admissions Index and/or the Class Rank by GPA and comparing it with the decision determined by Appworx and recorded in Banner Form SAADCRV.

Attribute **C** was tested by reviewing Banner Form SAADCRV to determine if a user (other than Appworx) had made changes to the admission decision.

Attribute **D** was tested by searching the General Person Account Consolidation website by each applicant's R#.

See tabs below for testing.

Results:

Top 10%

No exceptions noted.

Next 15% FA

No exceptions noted.

Next 15% FR

Based on class rank and entrance exam scores, 76 applicants were identified as potentially being granted the wrong admit code. Ms. Pickens tested 5 of the 76 applicants and determined that all five were granted the wrong admit code based on their class rank and college entrance exam scores. 4 of 5 applicants tested were granted the wrong admit code by Appworx. All 4 errors noted during testing involved applicants who were granted the 'FA' admit code through automatic Appworx processes, but should have been granted the 'FR' admit code. OAS was unable to determine if 1 applicant tested was granted the correct admit code because of a duplicate PIDM issue reported for the applicant. Additionally, OAS noted that one class rank was entered into Banner incorrectly.

Next 15% RF

Based on class rank and entrance exam scores, 1 applicant was identified as potentially being granted the wrong admit code. Ms. Pickens tested the applicant and determined that the applicant was granted the wrong admit code based on class rank and college entrance exam scores. The applicant was granted the 'FA' admit code through automatic Appworx processes, but should have been granted the 'FR' admit code.

Next 15% RV

No exceptions noted.

2nd Quarter FA

No exceptions noted.

2nd Quarter FR

No exceptions noted.

2nd Quarter RF

No exceptions noted.

2nd Quarter RV

No exceptions noted.

3rd Quarter FA

No exceptions noted.

3rd Quarter FR

Based on class rank and entrance exam scores, 1 applicant was identified as potentially being granted the wrong admit code. OAS is unable to determine if Appworx granted the correct admission decision because a duplicate PIDM issue has been reported for the applicant. Appworx could have calculated an admission decision based on test scores and class rank from either student assigned to the duplicate PIDM, or a combination of test scores/class rank from both students.

3rd Quarter RF

Based on class rank and entrance exam scores, 1 applicant was identified as potentially being granted the wrong admit code. The applicant was the same applicant tested as part of the '3rd Quarter FR' group.

3rd Quarter RV

Conclusion:

Appworx incorrectly processes some applications in the Next 15% class rank group. All errors noted involved students who were granted the 'FA' admit code through automatic Appworx processes that should have been granted the 'FR' admit code. A potential error exists in the 3rd Quarter class group; however, OAS was unable to determine if errors occurred because duplicate PIDM issues have been reported for the applicant. Additionally, OAS noted that one class rank was entered into Banner incorrectly.