DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 563

HE 006 970

AUTHOR

McDermott, Marie

TITLE

Profiles of Hofstra Prospective Applicants at Various Points in the Admissions Process. Report No. 112.

INSTITUTION

Hofstra Univ., Hempstead, N.Y. Center for the Study

of Higher Education.

REPORT NO PUB DATE NOTE

R-112 Oct 75

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 Plus Postage

*Admission (School); *Enrollment Influences; *Higher

Education; Recruitment; Statistics; *Student Application; *Student Characteristics; Student

Placement

IDENTIFIERS

*Hofstra University; Student Descriptive

Questionnaire

ABSTRACT

For the past two years Hofstra has participated in the College Entrance Examination Board's (CEEB) Admissions Testing Programs (ATP). Through this program, Hofstra has received summary statistics on the students who have requested that their SAT scores be sent to Hofstra, those who apply, and enrolled students. Normative data are also included for prospective applicants to all colleges and to other four-year private colleges to provide a perspective for determining unique characteristics of Hofstra prospective applicants. The profiles are based on responses to the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ), which provides information concerning student interests, backgrounds, activities, and educational plans. The main questions asked in this document have to do with the characteristics of: prospective applicants as compared to those of other four-year colleges and to other colleges in general; the accepted applications as compared to the enrolled; the enrolled as compared to the no-shows; and Hofstra applicants who 'requested financial aid as compared to the total group. In addition, each subgroup's profile can be compared with each other and all groups can be compared over time. These data provide much information that can be used for admissions criteria, financial aid policies, plans for academic programs, and particularly for recruitment purposes. (Author/KE)

* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available

* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not

* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

College Board Admissions Testing Program

Summary Reports

Profiles of Hofstra Prospective Applicants at Various Points in the Admissions Process U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO, NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Marie McDermott

For the past two years Hofstra has participated in the College Entrance Examination Board's (CEEB) Admissions Testing Program (ATP). The College Board has geared the ATP toward providing information to colleges and scholarship sponsors in a set of statistical profiles of high school seniors at various points in the admissions process. Through this program, Hofstra has received summary statistics on the students who have requested that their SAT scores be sent to Hofstra (prospective applicants), those who actually apply (applicants) and finally, enrolled students. Normative data are also included for prospective applicants to all colleges and to other four year private colleges to provide a perspective for determining unique characteristics of Hofstra prospective applicants. The profiles are based on the students' responses to the Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ), which they filled out at the time that they took their SAT's. This questionnaire provides information concerning the students' interests, backgrounds, activities and educational plans.

In addition to the overall profiles mentioned above, we have received from the College Board summary statistics on our applicants within six selected categories: applicants who ranked in the top twenty percent of their high school class, applicants who requested financial aid, applicants who indicated that they wanted to live in dormitories, Nassau County applicants, Queens County applicants and applicants from the entire Metropolitan area and Long Island. These categories were selected by CSHE in cooperation with the Admissions Office. The information required to provide the groupings was taken from Hofstra's application file and submitted to CEEB. For example, by identifying all those Fall 1973 and Fall 1974 freshman applicants whose home address was in Nassau County and their subsequent admissions status (applied, accepted, enrolled, no-show), we have been able to get profiles of these Nassau County applicants at each admissions stage.

The main questions we are attempting to answer with this report are: what are the characteristics of our prospective applicants as compared to prospective applicants to other four year private colleges and to other colleges in general?... the accepted applicants as compared to the enrolled?...the enrolled as compared to the no-shows? Secondly, questions can be asked about each of the six selected groups. For example, what are the characteristics of the Hofstra applicants who requested financial aid as compared to that of the total group. In addition, each sub-group's profile can be compared with each other and all groups can be compared over time (1973-1974).

These data can be particularly useful for recruitment purposes. In addition, they can be used to generate ideas for edmissions and financial aid policies,



need for academic programs and student services. Although the data were not available to planning for the 1975 freshman class, the profiles of the 1973 and 1974 freshmen provide insights into possible trends and changes which can be useful for planning for the 1976 class. The report based on data for the 1975 freshmen should be available by about March 1976.

The Samples

Data on two main samples of Hofstra applicants are included in this report: the fall, 1973 freshman applicants and the fall, 1974 freshman applicants. In addition, comparative data are shown on the 1973, 1974 and 1975 prospective applicants. These students were college-bound seniors who participated in the College Board testing program and indicated that they would like to have had their descriptive information sent to Hofstra but who may or may not have applied for admission to Hofstra. Normative data are also shown in Table 1 in order to show comparisions of Hofstra prospective applicants with all college-bound seniors who participated in the program and with prospective applicants to other four year private colleges.

Representativeness: In the College Guide: The ATP Summary Reports, 1974
Freshman Class published by the College Board, it is noted that the overall normative data presented in the report are based on some one million college-bound seniors. This, however, represents about two-thirds of all college-bound seniors since the data are based on only those students who participated in the testing program. Thus, the information reported in the guide cannot be assumed to be necessarily true of those seniors who did not participate in the program.

In addition to the limitations of the overall data, there are specific cautions to be noted in the Hofstra data:

- 1. Only data on high school seniors are included in the report. About 10% of Hofstra freshmen were not high school seniors the year before entering Hofstra.
- 2. Only those applicants who submitted their SAT information through the College Board rather than directly through their high school are included in the report. About 20-25% of our freshmen had not indicated that they wished their scores sent to Hofstra at the testing time. They subsequently applied and requested that the high school send Hofstra their scores.
- 3. An additional 15-20% of our enrolled freshmen are missing from the samples. Most of these students are probably missing from the samples due to not having participated in the SDQ portion of the College Boards' Admissions Testing Program.

The final samples consisted of approximately 50% of the applied and 45% of the enrolled classes. In order to determine whether the ATP sample was useable, i.e., comparable to the total freshman Hofstra applicant group, statistical comparisons were made. It was found that the SAT's and high school deciles for the samples were comparable to those of the total group. In addition, the self-reported high school deciles of the samples as shown in the summary reports (Table 1, High School Background and Test Scores) were examined for verification of these results. The distribution of the self-reported high-school deciles was somewhat different from the distribution shown in our official records at Hofstra. This could be due



to a number of artifacts including self-report versus the record received from the high school and/or the difference between the point in time that the deciles were sent from the high schools to Hofstra and the time the students took the SDQ. These factors should be taken into account when inspecting the tables which contain the SDQ results of self-reported high school rank and grades, but they don't affect the fact that we found the samples to be reasonably representative of the total groups in terms of high school deciles (according to Hofstra records) and SAT scores.

Examination of the Tables

The summary statistics shown in this report are numerous and provide many fruitful comparisons and observations. In order to simplify and expedite this report only the highlights will be pointed out. The reader is invited to make further comparisons from the data and contact the Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) for further information if needed. The data are available in detail at the Center with some additional tables conself-reported skills and abilities, interest in extra-curricular activities and breakdowns by sex. In addition, the College Guide: The ATP Summary Reports, 1974 Freshman Class, published by the College Board, is available at CSHE. This book contains a copy of each question on the SDQ and specific suggestions for using the data in admissions, recruitment, financial aid, academic programs, and student services. Some of these suggestions will be touched on later in the report.

Table 1 through 7 presented in this report show the highlights of the results of the cross-tabulation tables sent to us by the College Board. All the tables are presented in the same format and each is divided into three sections: High School Background and Test Scores, Degree Goals and Fields of Study and finally, College Plans, Activities and Finances.

Table 1 presents a comparison of the characteristics of the 1973, 1974 and 1975 prospective applicants to Hofstra and the normative data on the characteristics of 1973 and 1974 prospective applicants to four year private colleges and to colleges in general. Data on the 1973 and 1974 actual applicants to Hofstra are also shown. Table 2 includes a repeat of the data on the 1973 and 1974 applicants in order to provide easier inspection of these data as compared to the data shown on the accepted applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows. Tables 3 through 7 present the same data for applied, enrolled and no-show students for the six selected subgroups mentioned earlier.

Prospective Applicants, Applicants, Enrolling Freshmen and No-Shows

Inspection of Part 1 (High School Backgrounds and Test Scores) of Table 1 and 2 across the early admission stages reveals an increase in SAT Verbal and Math scores as we go from prospective applicants (normative data) to prospective applicants to Hofstra to accepted applicants. This upward trend is not only indicative of a self-selection process among Hofstra applicants in that those with higher than average SAT scores apply here, but also reflects a further screening by the school as shown by the higher scores of the accepted applicants.

The data on the accepted applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows show no differences in their SAT scores. That the no-shows' scores were no higher than those of the enrolling freshmen is further evidence that Hofstra is drawing students with as high SAT's as expected by the setting of high quality admissions standards. The data on self-reported high school grades and rank in class, however, is not



as clearly positive in terms of recruitment of high quality students as the data on the SAT scores. The grades of the Hofstra's applicants were slightly higher than those of the average prospective applicant (normative data) and of the prospective applicants to Hofstra. dowever, the grades of those who don't show at the final admission stage were slightly higher than those of the enrolling freshmen. Since the disparity between the average grades of the samples of shows and no-shows is not great, these data suggest further monitoring over time rather than changes in admissions policy.

The data over time on Hofstra's (1973-1975) prospective applicants' SAT scores show a decrease in SAT scores. This decrease, however, does not appear to be happening in the later admissions stages at Hofstra as shown by the data on the 1973 and 1974 applicants, accepted applicants, enrolling freshmen and noshows. In fact, there is some indication of a slight increase in the scores from 1973 to 1974. In order to further investigate this trend among Hofstra's enrolled students, the Admissions Office's Quality Reports for 1973, 1974 and 1975 incoming freshmen (including SSP and NOAH) were examined. These data verified the reversal from the prospective applicant trend in that there was a slight increase in the Mean Scores from 1973 (SAT-V=499, SAT-M=536) to 1974 (SAT-V=506, SAT-M=549) and in 1975 the score stayed approximately the same (SAT-V=507, SAT-M=550).

The data on self-reported grades also show evidence of a leveling off or possibly a slight increase in quality in the last two years. The average grade point average of the enrolling freshmen was 3.19 in 1973 and 3.24 in 1974 and the percentage ranking in the first fifth of their high school class was 53% in 1973 and 58% in 1974. Although these percentages are slightly inflated due to the problems discussed earlier in the report and the differences from 1973 to 1974 are minimal, the recent trend upwards in class rank for enrolled freshmen has been verified by Hofstra internal reports (1973 Rank Mean = 3.3; 1974 Rank Mean = 2.9, 1975 Rank Mean = 2.5).

The second area of concern to Hofstra is the educational goals of their prospective applicants through the various admission stages. The results shown in Table 1 and 2 (Part 2) indicate that a larger percentage of Hofstra prospective applicants and applicants throughout all the admissions states plan to do at least some graduate study than the percentage of prospective applicants generally (as shown by the norms on other four year private colleges and other colleges in general).

Secondly, we seem to be attracting a slightly higher percentage of prospective students to our Biology and Business program than colleges in general. In general, Biology and Business appear to be the most popular fields of interest. The only major field that appeared to draw slightly more enrolling freshmen than accepted students who didn't show (no-shows) was Music but the number of students involved was small.

Part 3 of the two tables is concerned with the students' college plans, activities and finances. The most noticeable finding in this section of the tables (and consistently replicated in the tables on the sub-groups) is shown in section C on housing preference. The percentage of 1973 and 1974 Hofstra prospective applicants who indicated that they wished to reside in dorms (41%) was less than the percentage shown in the national norms (54%) and in the four year private college norms (60%). In addition, the percentage of no-shows who wanted dorms was larger (52%) than the percentage who actually enrolled (35%) and wanted dorms. This finding is not unexpected since Hofstra is primarily a commuter school. The data on the coed versus single sex dorm preferences appear to be more important for potential



plans for recruitment of dorm students. From these data it was found that more than twice as many (34% vs. 14%) 1974 applicants to Hofstra preferred to live in coed dorms rather than single sex dorms. Prospective applicants to Hofstra also preferred to live in coed rather than single sex dorms in contrast to the results shown by the national norms and four year private college norms. These norms indicated that generally students want single sex dorms as often as coed dorms. Only 9% of the sample of enrolling freshmen at Hofstra wanted to go into single sex dorms as opposed to 26% who wanted coed dorms. Only one tower of the six available to our dorm residents is coed-and this by floor, not by room.

Finally, the section on finances on each of the tables is worth examining as one tool in assessing the financial ability to attend college of Hofstra's prospective applicants compared to prospective applicants in general and our applicants at each successive admissions stage.

This section includes data on parental income and an estimate of the annual parental contribution toward the education of the students. The estimate of the annual parental contribution is based on the student's response to the SDQ questions concerning his parents' number of dependents, number of dependents in college and approximate family income before taxes.

Hofstra's prospective applicants appear to come from families with somewhat higher incomes than prospective applicants in general and slightly higher incomes than prospective applicants to other four year private colleges. As we proceed along the admission stages from prospective applicants in general, to Hofstra prospective applicants, the parental income and contribution towards education of Hofstra applicants again show a slight increase over that of the Hofstra prospective applicants. At this point it would be helpful to have data on these variables for applicants to other local four year colleges for comparative purposes but this information was unavailable.

Beyond the applicant admission stage, however, the relationship between the data for the shows and no-shows is inconsistent over the two years yet seem to suggest the need for change in 1974 in our financial aid policy that resulted in the 1975 Middle Income Plan.

The Subgroups

Tables 3 through 6 present profiles of the 1973 and 1974 applicants, enrolling freshmen, and no-shows in each of four sub-groups (students ranking in the top twenty percent of their high school class, applicants who requested financial aid, dorm applicants and Nassau County applicants). Table 7 presents only the 1974 data on the last two applicant sub-groups, since the 1973 data were not available for these two groups; applicants from Queens County and applicants from New York City and Long Island combined.

For the purpose of this report, the profiles presented in these five tables were only compared to the data on the total groups as presented in the first two tables and the major differences are discussed. A few smaller differences are discussed concerning the major fields of interests of the students within the sub-groups as compared to the total group. These should be viewed as suggestive rather than conclusive. They are included in the highlights because of their importance in recruitment rather than due to the decisive nature of the results. In addition, the reader might want to note specific comparisons within each table



and across the various sub-groups. A few significant highlights from these types of comparisons which appeared to be particularly relevant to recruitment have been singled out and added to the list below.

The tables show few major unexpected differences between each group and the total group. The main differences found were as follows:

- 1. Hofstra applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows who were in the top two deciles were more likely to have high SAT scores, to expect to do some graduate study, and to have received a high school honor or award and have parents whose average income was slightly less than the Hofstra applicants across the three admissions stages in the total group. In addition, the enrolled students in this sub-group and the financial aid sub-group have higher average SAT scores than the no-shows, probably reflecting the selective financial aid awards policy. This policy grants awards to only those applicants in the top two deciles with combined SAT's of 1200 or more.
- 2. Hofstra applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows from Nassau County were less likely to say that they would prefer to reside in dorms than applicants across the three admissions stages in the total group. Students residing in Nassau County were slightly more likely to major in business and less likely to major in English than all enrolling students.
- 3. Hofstra applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows who requested financial aid had somewhat higher grades and higher SAT scores, were more likely to plan to work part-time, expected to get less money towards their education from their parents and had a lower parental income than applicants across the admissions stages in the total group. They were also a bit more likely to major in music. In addition, the inconsistent relationship over time for the Show-No-Show data in the Finances section substantiates our earlier suggestion that there was a need for change in the 1974 financial aid policy which was effected in the 1975 policy.
- 4. Hofstra applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows who indicated that they wished to reside in dormitories were more likely to have a slightly higher percentage of minority students and, to have lower SAT Math and Achievement scores than the applicants across the three admissions stages in the total group. A larger percentage of dorm students indicated an interest in majoring in English than the entire group. The dorm group, especially in 1974, also had a somewhat higher rate of students who indicated more than nominal participation in community and church groups than the total group.
- 5. The profile of Hofstra applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows from New York City and Long Island was not significantly different from that of the total group.



6. The sub-group of Queens applicants, enrolling freshmen and no-shows was particularly small (only 27 enrolling freshmen) thus limiting the possibility of significant differences. Despite this limitation, the percentages of applicants across admissions stages who came from public high schools and resided in Queens was somewhat lower than the percentage in the total group.

Overview

Hofstra's participation in the College Board's 1973 and 1974 Admissions Testing Program has yielded a collection of profiles on a sample of Hofstra prospective applicants as they proceed across the successive admissions stages as prospective applicants, then applicants, accepted students, and finally as enrolled students or no-shows. In addition, normative data were provided on prospective applicants to all colleges and to other four year private colleges. These data provide many fruitful comparisons which can be used for admissions criteria, financial aid policies, plans for academic programs and particularly for recruitment purposes. Although we have been able to include a profile of the 1975 prospective applicants, additional data on these applicants will not be available until about March, 1976.

Since the tables provide numerous comparisons only the highlights are discussed. The reader is invited to make further observations and/or contact CSHE for further information.

Applicants

Prospective Applicants

									. •							
ra	1974 1723	82	6		3.31 3.03	3.01	3. To	3.29		53	78	3.19		482 523		531
Hofstra University	1973 N=2273	81	_ ∞		3.27	2.98	3.12	3.31	4	24	6/	3.15		479 521		524
አ	1975 4265	77	10		3.25 2.93	2.95	3.02	3.25		21 48	8/	3.12		454 493		535
Hofstra University	1974 4503	78	10		3.21	2.94	3.04	3.20		20 47	1.1	3.09		462 502		531
Ho Uni	1973 N=4955	79	6		3.21 2.90	2.90	3.05	3.22		21	75	3.08		467		523
Priv. Norms	1974 N=N/A	80	∞ ′		3.26	3.00	3.07	3.28		. 23 49	28	3.12	,	454		516
4 Yr. Coll.	$\frac{1973}{N=N/A}$	80	∞		3.22	2.98	3.05	3.25		23 48	75	3.06		451		512
rall Norms	1974 N=N/A	83	· ∞		3.19	2.91	3.01	2.91 3.23		19 45	92 -	3.06		438		508
Overall Coll. Nor	1973 N=N/A	84	œ	:	3.15	2.91	3.00	3.20		19 43	11	2.99		434 467		504
	Part 1: High School Background and Test Scores	I HIGH SCHOOL TYPE % from Public Schools	<pre>II ETHNIC BACKGROUND</pre>	<pre>III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Average</pre>	English Average	Foreign Language Average	Biological Science Average	Physical Science Average Social Studies Average	(B) Self-Reported Class Rank	% in First Tenth % in First Fifth	in First	(C) Overall Grade Point Average	<pre>IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Aptitude Test</pre>	Verbal Mathematics	(B) Achievement Tests	Avg. in All Achievement Test Scores

																										,			_	
Applicants	Hofstra University	1974		1	22	59 19		1	0	7	17	13	-	∞ (က်	9	0	7	-	0	'n	ľΩ	m	က	0	7	9	14	o ·	٥
App1i	Hofstra Universi	1973 N=2273		0	22	59 17		1	0	ო	16	12	N/A	10	က	7	0	က	N/A	0	7	4	က	2	0	4	N/A	N/A	д ,	٥
	ťy	1975	}	4	22	54 19		Н	1	2	6	16	7	10	Ω.	ന	0	7	H	0	N/A	m	2	œ	0	2	Ŋ	12	-	٥
	Hofstra University	1974 [.] 4503		ന	24	52 21		\vdash	٦	7	14	14	1	6.	4	9	0	ന	1	1	4	4	2	4	0	ന	2	13	- 1	_
icants	Ho	1973 N=4955		ന	24	20 A		1	1	ო	14	12	N/A	11	m	7	0	'n,	N/A	~	ო	7	က	4	0	4	N/A	N/A	7 '	٥
re App1	Priv. Norms	1974 N=N/A	1	က	31	40 23			_	2	11	∞	0	'	2	ო	0	7	5	_	7	: ញ	7	9	1	m	4	10	- 1	_
Prospective Applicants	4 Yr. Coll.	1973 N=N/A	1	ന	က္က	38 24		-	1	2	10	7	N/A	6 6	2	7	0	7	N/A	-	2	ന	2	9	1	ന	N/A	N/A	,	٥
P ₁	Overall 11. Norms	1974 N=N/A	1	7	31	25		1	1	7	10	10	1	∞ (m	ന	0	, ⊣	7	_	7	ന	2	œ	0	7	ന	6	7	o
	Over Coll.	1973 N=N/A	 	Ŋ	31	32 27	r	П	-1	ന	6	10	N/A	. 01	m	ო	0	⊣ .	N/A	,	7	ന	2	∞	-	ന	N/A	N/A	1 5	_
																						•								
	ć	Fields of Study	V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals	% Two-year Program or Less	% BA or BS	% Graduate Study % Undecided	(B) Intended Field of Study	% Agriculture	% Architecture		% Biological Sciences			% Education	% Engineering	% English		Foreign Lang			· % Journalism	% Mathematics	% Music	% Nursing and Other Health			Psycho]		% Vocational	% undecided



	Table 1 (co	(cont'd)							•	
Part 3. College Plans, Activities		ΔÌ	Prospective Applicants	ve Appl	icants			Applicants	ants	
and Finances	000	н	4 Yr.	Priv.	H	Hofstra	j	Hofs	Hofstra	
VI COLLEGE PLANS (A) Special Assistance	N=N/A 1973	. Norms N=N/A 1974	N=N/A 1973	N=N/A 1974	N=4955 1973	University 55 4503 4 3 1974 1	Ly 4265 1975	N=2273 N=1973	University 2273 1723 1973 1974	
% Education/Vocational Counseling	N/A	9 7	N/A	47	N/A N/A	51	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	49	•
	N/A		N/A	20	N/A	50	N/A	N/A	20	_
	N/A N/A	20 27	N/A N/A	21 27	N/A N/A	24 28	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	24 25	
	N/A N/A		N/A N/A	47 9	N/A N/A	74 6	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	94	3
(B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit			٠							
% Planning to Apply	54	55	54	56	54	55	28	50	51	
(C) Housing Preference										,
% Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm % Dorm (Total) VII ACTIVITIES	N/A N/A N/A	29 25 54	N/A N/A N/A	33 27 60	N/A N/A N/A	13 28 41	13 28 41	N/A N/A N/A	14 34 48	- 10 -
% More than Nominal Participation in Community and Church Groups % Participating in H.S. Varsity Athletics	96	99 37	i. 72 35	71 36	61 32	62 34	61	64 33	66 32.	
% Holding Major Office in H.S. Club or Organization % Receiving a H.S. Honor or Award	39	37 52	41 53	40 56	31	29	27 53	35	32 58	
VIII FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution Toward Education										
Mean Contribution (in thous.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$1.76	\$2.32	\$2.44	\$2.00	\$2.60	*.
(B) Parental Income			•	-						,
Average Income (in thous.) % Below \$12,000 % \$18,000 and above	\$15.1 N/A 23	\$16.8 38 31	\$16.2 N/A 27	\$17.6 36 34	\$17.3 \$ 37 32	\$18.7 33 37	\$19.1 28 N/A	\$19.1 30 41	\$20.2 28 41	

Table 2: Profile of Hofstra Applicants, Accepted Applicants, Enrolling Freshmen and No-Shows

No-Shows	Hofstra y University	4 1973 1974 5 N≈1556 999	87 82 83	8 8 7		3.34 3.	3.07 3.18	3.08 3.	3.39 3.		31 28 30 58 57 63	9	24 3.24 3.32		499 495 498 545 538 543		550 532 541
Enrolling Freshman	Hofstra University	1973 1974 N=436 415	82 8	4			3.03 3.04				53 5		3.19 3.24		492 49 537 54		532 55
pted	Hofstra University	1974	84	7	-	3.41	3.14	3.29	3.40	٠	30	<u>6</u>	3.30		499 544		543
Accepted Applicants	Hofstra Universi	1973 N=1992	82		·.	3.33	3.06	3.21 3.07	3.38		27 56	84	3.23		495 538	٠.	532
cants	tra rsity	$\frac{1974}{1723}$	82	6		3.31	3.01	$\frac{3.16}{3.09}$	3.29	/	25	82	3.19		482 523		531
Applicants	Hofstra University	$\frac{1973}{N=2273}$	81	- ∞		3.27	2.98	3.12	3.31		24.	79	3.15		479 521		524
		Part 1: High School Background and Test Scores	I HIGH SCHOOL TYPE % from Public Schools	II ETHNIC BACKGROUND % Minority Students	<pre>III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Average</pre>	English Average	Mathematics Average Foreign Language Average	Biological Science Average	Social Studies Average	(B) Self-Reported Class Rank	% in First Tenth % in First Fifth	% in First or Second Fifth	(C) Overall Grade Point Average	<pre>IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Aptitude Test</pre>	Verbal Mathematics	(B) Achievement Tests	Avg. in All Achievement Test Scores

_
•
ש
_
-
ų.
con
_
_
u
J
7
le
۵
ંત
H
•

IOWS	ra	<u>1974</u> 999	0 19 62 18		1	O (19	13	0	∞ m		9	0	ന	⊣ ,	0 <	4 ν	ı	2	2	0	ന	· 9	13	0	9
No-Shows	Hofstra University	<u>1973</u> N=1556	0 21 62 17		,	0 6	3 16	10	N/A	m ה	•	7	0	က	N/A	> <	t	•	7	7	0	?	N/A	N/A	 -1	9
nrolling Freshman	tra rŝity	1974 415	0 23 55 21		₽.)	20	14	7 7	- ო	t	Λ (o (· (v	⊣ ⟨	o 4	t v		יט נ	7	,	ന	5	. 12	0	9
Enrolling Freshman	Hofstra Univeršity	1973 N=436	0 22 60 18			٦ ,	15	13	A/A	4	r	~) (າ :	4 c	> ~	4			⊣ (0	ຕຸ	N/A	N/A	-	ιn.
Accepted Applicarts	Hofstra University	1974 1414	0 20 60 19		н с	۰ د	19	I3	→ ∞) M	ų	0 0	o ه) -	ے ہ	4	. 7.	ć	nς	۷ ()	י ניי	و م	<u>က</u> ဇ	> (9
Acce App11	Hofstra Universi	1973 N=1992	0 21 62 17		н с) m	16	11 × 11	4: /N	m	7	~ C	יי כ) /N	4 C		4	c		1 (> <	4 ;	N/A	N/ A 1	٦ ٦	9
Applicants	Hofstra University	1974 1723	1 22 59 19	,	, H C	2	17	J (- &	ო	v	· c	۰ د	ı	1 0	. 2	2	c	າ . ຕ) C	، د	1 4	0 1	1 , C		>
Appli	Hofstra Universi	1973 N≈2273	0 22 59 17		10	m	16	N/A	10	m ,	7	. 0	· m	N/A	0	4	7			ı c	> <	t / 2	4 / N	1/1 1	٠	>
	. Part 2: Degree Goals and	Fields of Study V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals	% Two-year Program or Less % BA or BS % Graduate Study % Undecided (B) Intended Field of Study	יייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייייי	, % Agriculture % Architecture	Art	% Biological Sciences % Business	% Computer Science	% Education	% bugineering			Foreign Lang			% Journalism	» ita tilema ti cs		% Nursing and Other Health		% Physical Science				% Undecided	

	_		
,	_	7	
	ζ	•	
	-	•	
	-	د	
	-	י	

Table 2 (count d) Accepted Ereshman No-Shores and Finances Ereshman No-Shores	•		3	,	•	•								- 13 -			/			and the second	/	
Table 2 (cont'd) Accepted Enrolling Pert 3: College Plans, Activities Applicants App		hows	tra rsitv	999	1	51	0 0	10 24	22	10		51		16 36 42	67	34		ı.	,	\$19.4 27	39	÷
Table 2 (cont'd) Accepted Applicants and Finances	:	No-S	Hofs Hnive	N=1556		γ/N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A		51		N/A N/A N/A	99	9 66 9 67				.4 28	43	
Table 2 (cont'd) Accepted Applicants and Finances	ling	hman	tra: raitus	415	1	50	/T	18 24	. 52	48 9	1	20		9 26 35	67	31	8	\$2.46	·	\$19.3 30_	39	
Table 2 (cont'd) Accepted Applicants A	Enrol	Fres	Hofs	N=436		N/A	A/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A		51		N/A N/A N/A	62	31	<u> </u>	. 94		33	35	
Table 2 (cont'd)	oted	cants	tra	1414 107/	1777	51	10 10	18 24	23	48 10		51		•	79	1 E 4	n	\$2.51	/	\$19.4 28	39	
Part 3: "College Plans, Activities and Finances (A) Special Assistance \tilde{\below{\text{T}}} \text{ Fulances} \text{ Fading English} \text{ Mathematical Skills} \text{ Mathematical Scale} \text{ More of Dormal More Apply} \text{ Cond Dorm} \text{ Move Office In H.S. Varsity Athletics} \text{ More than Nominal Participation} \text{ More than Community and Church Organization} \text{ Mecciving a H.S. Honor or Award} \text{ Mean Contribution (in thous.)} \text{ Mean Contribution (in thous.)} \text{ Meance Income (in thous.)} \text{ Meance Materage Income (in thous.)} Meance	Accel	Appli	Hofs	N=1992	12/2	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	ı	51		N/A N/A N/A	65	37	o n	66.		.1	41	
Part 3: "College Plans, Activities and Finances (A) Special Assistance \tilde{\below{\text{T}}} \text{ Fulances} \text{ Fading English} \text{ Mathematical Skills} \text{ Mathematical Scale} \text{ More of Dormal More Apply} \text{ Cond Dorm} \text{ Move Office In H.S. Varsity Athletics} \text{ More than Nominal Participation} \text{ More than Community and Church Organization} \text{ Mecciving a H.S. Honor or Award} \text{ Mean Contribution (in thous.)} \text{ Mean Contribution (in thous.)} \text{ Meance Income (in thous.)} \text{ Meance Materage Income (in thous.)} Meance		cants	tra	1723	17/4	65	18	20 24	25	9 7		51	1	14 34 48	99	32 5	o n	\$2.60		\$20.2 28	41	
Part 3: "College Plans, Activities and Finances and Finances (A) Special Assistance % Education/Vocational Counseling % Mathematical Skills % Writing Skills % Part-time Work % Part-time Work % Planning Lounseling (B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit % Planning Preference % Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm % Coed Dorm % Coed Dorm % Housing Preference % Single-Sex Dorm % Housing Preference % Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm % Receiving Participation in Community and Church Groups % Holding Major Office in H.S. Club or Organization % Receiving a H.S. Honor or Award II FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution (in thous.) % Below \$12,000 % \$8610w \$12,000 % \$18,000 and above	7	Appli	Hofs	N=2273	13/3	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A		50		N/A N/A	64	. SE 1	r C	\$2.00		.T. &	41	
Part 3: Colle Part 3: Colle (A) Special Assist % Beding Skil % Writing Skil % Writing Skill % Writing Skill % Writing Skill % Writing Skill % Personal Cou % Part-time Wo % Part-time Wo % Part-time Wo % Part-time Wo % Participating % Coed Dorm % Coed Dorm % Porm (Total) II ACTIVITIES % Participating % Parental Contribut Mean Contribut Mean Contribut % Below \$12,00 % \$18,000 and	Table							t	1									. •				
14		3Olloge Plane	and Finances	VI COLLEGE PLANS	. **	Education/Vocational			Study Sh	Part-time Personal	Advanced Placement or Course	% Planning to Apply	(C) Housing Preference	% % % ACTI	% More than Nomi in Community a	Holding Major Organization	% Necelving a n.s. monor of award VIII FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution Toward Education	Mean Contribution (in thous.)		rerage Income Below \$12,000		

Table 3

Profile of Hofstra 1973 and 1974 Applicants Enrolled Students and No Shows Who Ranked in the Top Twenty Percent of Their High School Class

High School Decile 1 and 2

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	App1	ied	Enro	11ed	No-S	hows
Part 1: High School and Test		N=926 1973	N=755 1974	N=195 1973	N=225 1974	N≃729 1973	N≕521 1974
I HIGH SCHOO % irom Pu	L TYPE blic Schools	84	87	83	89	85	85
II ETHNIC BAC % Minorit	KGROUND y Students	8	6	3	3 •	. 9	7
III HIGH SCHOO (A) Subject Average	Grade Point		· .				
Foreign Biologic Physical	Average ics average Lang. Avg. al Science Avg. Science Avg. tudies Avg.	3.59 3.43 3.40 3.49 3.36 3.62	3.60 3.47 3.43 3.57 3.47 3.61	3.59 3.48 3.38 3.50 3.34 3.60	3.57 3.46 3.36 3.53 3.47 3.65	3.59 3.42 3.42 3.50 3.37 3.63	3.61 3.46 3.46 3.59 3.47 3.61
(B) Self-Rep Rank	orted Class			e e			
		54 91	51 88	51 87	53 87	55 92	50 88
Fifth		99	, 97	97	97	99	97
(C) Overall	Grade Point Avg.	3.52	3.55	3.52	3.54	3 .52	3.55
IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholast		,					
Verbal Mathemat	ics	526 56 7	522 573	530 5 73	536 590	526 567	517 567
(B) Achieveme	ent Tests				,		
	All Achieve- st Scores	567	569	569	587	568	564



- 15 -Table 3 (cont'd)

High School Decile 1 and 2

		App1	i.ed	Enro	lled	No-S	hows
Part 2:	Degree Goals and Fields of Study	N=926 1973	N=755 1974	N=195 19 73	N=225 1974	N=729 1973	N=521 1974
	V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals						
·	<pre>% Two-year Program or Less % BA or BS % Graduate Study % Undecided</pre>	0 18 67 14	0 18 64 18	1 20 67 13	0 21 60 . 18	0 17 67 14	0 17 66 18
	(B) Intended Field of Study		•				
	% Agriculture % Architecture % Art % Biological Sciences % Business % Computer Science % Education % Engineering % English % Ethnic Studies % Foreign Language	1 0 2 18 8 N/A 9 3	0 0 2 21 11 1 9 3	1 1 2 16 8 N/A 12 4	0 0 2 22 13 2 7 1 4 0	1 0 2 20 8 N/A 8 2	0 0 2 21 10 1 10 4
•	% History and Cultures% Home Economics% Journalism% Mathematics	N/A 0 3 6	2 0 4 6	N/A 0 2 7	2 0 5 6	N/A 0 3 6	2 0 4 6
	% Music % Nursing and Other Heal % Philosophy % Physical Science % Psychology % Social Science % Vocational % Undecided	3 th 2 1 5 N/A N/A 1 5	3 0 3 5 11 0 6	6 1 1 4 N/A N/A 1 3	5 2 0 3 5 11 0 6	2 2 1 5 N/A N/A 1 5	2 3 0 3 5 11 0 7

Table 3 (cont'd)

High School Decile 1 and 2

/		App1:	ie d	Enrol1	.ed	No-Sh	ows
Part 3:	College Plans, Activities and Finances	N= 926 1973	N = 7 55 19 7 4	N= 195 19 73	N= 225 1974	N= 729 1973	N= 521 19 7 4
	VI COLLEGE PLANS (A) Special Assistance						
	•						
	% Education/Vocational	Ņ/A	55	N/A	56	N/A	54
	Counseling	n/A N/A	14	N/A	12	N/A	14
	% Mathematical Skills	N/A N/A	17	N/A	18	N/A	16
	% Reading Skills	N/A N/A	22	N/A	24	N/A	20
	% Writing Skills	N/A N/A	19	N/A	20	N/A	17
•	% Study Skills % Part-time Work	N/A N/A	51	n/A	51	N/A	52
	% Personal Counseling	N/A	10	N/A	11	N/A	9
	% reisonal dodnisering	14/ 21	20				
	(B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit						
	% Planning to Apply	56	53	5 7	52	56	54
	(C) Housing Preference	* •	e.				
•	% Single-Sex Dorm	N/A	16	N/A	10	N/A	18
	% Coed Dorm	N/A	3 0	N/A	24	N/A	32
	% Dorm (Total)	. 55	46	41	34	58	52
	VII ACTIVITIES		.*				•
	% More than Nominal						
	Participation in						•
	Community and Church .					•	•
	Groups	63	66	62	66	63	66
	% Participating in H.S.						
	Varsity Athletics	29	29	28	35	29	26
	% Holding Major Office in	/ 0	20	34	34	43	41
	H.S. Club or Organization	42	39	24	24	73	7.
	% Receiving a H.S. Honor or	7 4	7 9	72	77	7 5	80
	Award	74	13	12	,,	,,	
	VIII FINANCES		*	,			1
•	(A) Parental Contribution Towa Education	rd					
	Mean Contribution (in thou	s) 1.83	2.29	1.79	2.20	1.84	2.34
	(B) Parental Income		,	•			
	Average Income (in thous) % Below \$12,000 % \$18,000 or above	17. 35 32	.4 18.3 30 36	40	1 18.0 31 34	17. 34 34	7 18.4 30 37
		32		26	34	34	

- 17 Table 4

Profile of Hofstra 1973 and 1974 Applicants, Enrolled Students and No-Shows Whose Home Address was in Nassau County

Nassau County

	•						•
		App1	ied	Enro	lled	No-S	hows
Part	1: High School Background and Test Scores	N=960 1973	η≕787 19 7 4	N=256 1973	N=237 1974	n=590 1973	N=419 1974
	I HIGH SCHOOL TYPE % from Public Schools	87	86	82	87	88	87
	II ETHNIC BACKGROUND % Minority Students	4	4	0	4	4	2
	III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Avérage			1	٧.		
	English Average Mathematics Average Foreign Lang. Avg. Biological Science Avg. Physical Science Avg. Social Studies Avg.	3.26 3.02 2.99 3.13 3.05 3.23	3.29 3.12 3.03 3.19 3.14 3.27	3.31 3.10 3.04 3.18 3.11 3.29	3.33 3.18 3.05 3.25 3.18 3.34	3.34 3.13 3.07 3.22 3.12 3.30	3.41 3.27 3.19 3.34 3.24 3.39
	(B) Self-Reported Class Rank			•		<u>.</u>	
•	% in First Tenth% in First Fifth% in First or Second	24 49 78	26 53 82	24 . 53 . 83	32 58 83	28 54 83	29 61 , 89
	Fifth (C) Overall Grade Point Avg.	3.15	3.20	3.21	3.25	3.22	3.33
	IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Apt. Test						
	Verbal Mathematics	482 532	485 5 33	495 54 3	502 550	499 552	504 558
	(B) Achievement Tests		М		:	£*	
	· Avg. in All Achieve- ment Test Scores	5 3 5	547	5 3 5	564	548	556

- 18 -Table 4 (cont'd)

Nassau County

	App1	i ed	Enrolled			No-Shows	
Part 2: Degree Goals and Fields of Study	1 - 960 1973	N=787 19 7 4	N= 256 19 73	N= 237 1974	N= 590 1973	N=419 1974	
▼ COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals							
% Two-year Program or Less % BA or BS % Graduate Study % Undecided	1 22 60 18	0 23 57 19	0 20 62 17	0 25 55 19	1 21 62 17	0 20 60 20	
(B) Intended Field of Study			,	,		14	
% Agriculture % Architecture % Art % Biological Sciences % Business % Computer Science % Education % Engineering % English % Ethnic Studies % Foreign Language % History and Cultures % Home Economics % Journalism	1 0 3 17 13 N/A 11 4 6 0 3 N/A 1 3 4	0 0 2 18 15 1 9 2 5 0 2 2 0 4 5	2 0 3 16 15 N/A 10 5 4 0 4 N/A 0 3 4	1 0 2 18 17 2 9 2 0 2 1 0 3 4	1 0 3 19 12 N/A 10 2 N/A 1 3 4	0 0 2 20 12 1 9 2 5 0 2 2 0 4 6	
% Mathematics	· 4	4	5	7	4		
% Music % Nursing and Other Health % Philosophy % Physical Science % Psychology % Social Science % Vocational % Undecided	2 0 4 N/A N/A 1 7	3 0 3 6 13 1	1 0 3 N/A N/A 1 8	3 1 3 5 13 0 6	2 0 4 N/A N/A 1 7	3 0 3 6 13 0 8	

- 19 -Table 4 (cont'd)

Nassau County

		•						
		App1	ie d	Enrolled		No-Shows		
Part 3:	College Plans, Activities and Finances	N=960 1973	N= 787 1974	N ≖2 56 19 7 3	N= 237 19 7 4	N≖ 590 19 7 3	N= 419 19 74	
	VI COLLEGE PLANS (A) Special Assistance		· ·					
	<pre>% Education/Vocational Counseling % Mathematical Skills % Reading Skills % Writing Skills % Study Skills % Part-time Work % Personal Counseling</pre>	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	48 14 18 22 23 44 9	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	49 11 18 24 23 47	'N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	51 12 17 22 21 47	
	(B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit		• .					
	% Planning to Apply	49	46	52	46	49	48	
	(C) Housing Preference							
	% Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm % Dorm (Total)	N/A N/A 41	9 20 29	N/A N/A 28	4 15 19	N/A N/A 46	12 35 37	
	VII ACTIVITIES						¢	
	<pre>% More than Nominal Participation in Community and Church Groups % Participating in H.S. Varsity Athletics</pre>	61 3 3	65 28	57 34	62 30	66 30	65 2 8	
•	% Holding Major Office in H.S. Club or Organization	31	30	28	28	35	34	
•	% Receiving a H.S. Honor or Award	51	58	· 5 7	61	53	63	
\	VIII FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution Towar Education	d		· .				
1	Mean Contribution (in thous	3) 2.0	9 2.66	5 1.90	6 2.5 3	2.1	3 2.56	
	(B) Parental Income	19.	6 20.8	3 18.	2 20.2	20.		
	Average Income (in thous) % Below \$12,000 % \$18,000 or above	26 42	26 44	32 3 6	31 41	2 5 44	24 41	





Table' 5

Profile of Hofstra 1973 and 1974 Applicants Enrolled Students and No-Shows Who Requested Financial Aid

Financial Aid Requested

		Appli	.ed	Enro	iled	No-Sl	nows	
Part	1: High School Background and Test Scores	N= 1123 1 973	N≕ 920 1974	N= 228 1973	N= 270 1 974	N= 800 1973	N= 551 1 97 4	
	I HIGH SCHOOL TYPE % from Public Schools	82	81	83	88	82	79	
	II ETHNIC BACKGROUND 7 Minority Students	13	12	6	10	12	10	
	III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Average							
•	English Average Mathematics Average Foreign Lang. Avg. Biological Science Avg. Physical Science Avg. Social Studies Avg.	3.37 3.10 3.11 3.25 3.11 3.41	3.42 3.17 3.15 3.30 3.22 3.39	3.41 3.17 3.16 3.36 3.15 3.42	3.44 3.30 3.17 3.34 3.29 3.45	3.44 3.16 3.17 3.30 3.18 3.48	3.50 3.24 3.27 3.40 3.29 3.46	
	(B) Self-Reported Class Rank			. •			2	
	% in First Tenth % in First Fifth % in First or Second Fifth	36 63 86	35 64 88	38 66 88	41 70 89	39 67 89		
	(C) Overall Grade Point Avg.	3.26	3.30	3.30	3.36	3.32	3.39	
	IV 'TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Apt. Test		17	i	·			
	Verbal Mathematics	498 537	502 54 6	512 553	522 575	512 549		
	(B) Achievement Tests			•	4	•		
	Avg. in All Achieve- ment Test Scores	54 6	553	5 5 5	569	550	554	

Table 5 (cont'd) Financial Aid Requested

			, I			
	Appl	ied *	Enro	lled	No-S	hows
Part 2: Degree Goals and Fields of Study	N=1123 1973	N= 920 1974	N= 228 19 73	N= 270 19 74	N=800 1973	N=551 19 7 4
V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals	•		•		•	
% Two-year Program or Less	0	1	0	0	,0	1
	21	20	23	21	19	18
% BA or BS	63	61·	63	59	66	62
% Graduate Study	16	19	14	19	15	21
% Undecided	10	13	7.4	17		
(B) Intended Field of Study		•				ī
e/ 1 1 1 + 0	1	1	. 1	0	1	1
% Agriculture	. 0	0	. 0	0	0	1
% Architecture	1	2	2	2	1	2
% Art	15	18	15	21	16	20
% Biological Sciences	10	12	12	13	8	11
% Business					N/A	2
% Computer Science	N/A		N/A		N/A 9	8
% Education	9	7	10	5	3	3
% Engineering	3	3.	. 3	3	.	3
% English	8	. 6	8	5	8	5
% Ethnic Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Foreign Language	3	2	4	2	3	2
% History and Cultures	N/A	2	N/A		N/A	
% Home Economics	0	0	. 0	0	0	0
% Journalism	. 4	4	3	4	4	4
% Mathematics	4	5	4	5	5	5
, /o Hathematic	\mathcal{Q}					
% Music	5	4	. 8	7	• 4	1
% Nursing and Other Hea		3	· 1	2	2	4
	0	0	0	٠ 0	. 0	0
% Philosophy	4	2	4	3	4	. 3
% Physical Science	N/A		N/A		N/A	
% Psychology		-	N/A		N/A	,
% Social Science	и/и	•	1	0	. 1	1
% Vocational	2	1.	. 3	7	6	6
% Undecided	5	. 7	٠)		J	٠.

Table 5 (cont'd)

Financial Aid Requested

		Appli.	ed	Enrolled		No-Shows	
Part 3:	College Plans, Activities and Finances	N= 1123 : 1973	N=920 1974	N=228 1973	N= 270 19 7 4	N= 800 19 73	N= 551 1974
	VI COLLEGE PLANS (A) Special Assistance				·		
	% Education/Vocational Counsel: ng % Mathematical Skills % Reading Skills % Writing Skills % Study Skills % Part-time Work % Personal Counseling	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	55 18 20 24 24 57 11	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	56 16 19 2 5 2 5 5 5 11	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	55 16 19 2 3 21 59 11
	(B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit						
	% Planning to Apply	55	55	- 56	5 3	55	56
	(C) Housing Preference			• ,		4 4	16
	% Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm % Dorm (Total)	N/A N/A 53	13 31 44	N/A N/A 39	9 30 3 9	N/A N/A 57	16 31 48
	VII ACTIVITIES						
	% More than Nominal Participation in Community and Church	65	68	65	70	65	68
	Groups % Participating in H.S. Varsity Athletics	33	34	30	3 6	31	30
	% Holding Major Office in H.S. Club or Organization	38	36	38	3 5	. 3 9	. 38
	% Receiving a H.S. Honor or Award	61	66	66	69	62	69
	VIII FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution Towa Education	rd	,	•			
	Mean Contribution (in thou	ıs) 1.46	1.84	1.41	2.02	1.5	1.84
	(B) Parental Income Average Income (in thous) % Below \$12,000	14.6 46	37	48	35	46	.9 15.4 38 26
-	% \$18,000 or above	19	27	. 15	31	20	20



Table 6

Profile of Hofstra 1973 and 1974 Applicants, Enrolled Students and No-Shows Who Indicated That They Wished to Reside in Dormitories

		•		Dorm Rec	uested		
		App1	ied	Enro	11ed	No-S	hows
Part	1: High School Background and Test Scores	N=942 19 73	N=607 1974	N=127 1.973	N=128 1974	N=701 1973	N= 352 1974
	<pre>1 HIGH SCHOOL TYPE % from Public Schools</pre>	81	85	. 81	90	81	86
!	<pre>Il ETHNIC BACKGROUND</pre>	12	15	10	20	11	12
,e~	III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Average						
	English Average Mathematics Average Foreign Lang. Avg. Biological Science Avg. Physical Science Avg. Social Studies Avg.	3.26 2.89 2.96 3.05 2.92 3.35	3.30 ·2.89 2.96 3.09 3.04 3.29	3.26 2.96 3.02 3.11 2.84 3.38	3.36 2.98 2.93 3.20 2.95 3.32	3.33 3.02 3.02 3.15 2.99 3.43	3.41 3.06 3.14 3.25 3.20 3.42
	(B) Self-Reported Class Rank		-				
•	% in First Tenth % in First Fifth % in First or Second	24 51	24 54	· 22 49	28 58	28 57	29 65 92
	Fifth (C) Overall Grade Point Avg.	79 3.13	81 3.14	7 9 3. 15	81 3.18	3.20	3.28
	IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Apt. Test						٠
	Verbal Mathematics	, 478 508	4 78 / 505	4 85 5 22	49 6 5 2 4	· 49 3 52 3	496 5 27
	(B) Achievement Tests	,			•		:
•	Avg. in All Achieve- ment Test Scores	510	51 3	522	5 3 4	517	5 23



- 24 Table 6 (cont'd)

			Dorm Requ	<u>iested</u>		
	App1:	Led	No-Sl	ows		
Part 2: Degree Goals and Fields of Study	N=942 1973	N=607 1974	N=127 19 7 3	N= 128 1974	N=701 1973	N=352 1974
V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals			. •			
% Two-year Program or Less% BA or BS% Graduate Study% Undecided	0 23 60 16	0 20 62 17	0 25 59 16	0 18 58 24	0 20 62 16	0 19 66 16
(B) Intended Field of Stu	ıdy		•			
% Agriculture % Architecture % Art % Biological Science % Business % Computer Science % Education	1 0 3 14 11 N/A 9	1 2 15 10 2 7	1 3 11 16 N/A 10		1 0 3 14 10 N/A 8	1 0 3 16 10 2 8
% Engineering	2	3	2	4	2	4
% English % Ethnic Studies % Foreign Language % History and Cultur % Home Economics % Journalism % Mathematics	10 0 2 res N/A 0 5	0 3 1 1 7	14 0 2 N/A 0 3 2	12 0 5 1 0 8 3	9 0 2 N/A 0 5 3	8 0 2 1 1 5 4
% Music % Nursing and Other % Philosophy % Physical Science % Psychology % Social Science	Health 2 Health 1 3 N/A N/A	2 0 2 6	5 3 2 1 N/A N/A	2 2 0 2 4 16	2 2 1 5 N/A N/A	17

% Vocational % Undecided

Table 6 (cont'd)

Dorm Requested

			Appl:	ied	Enrol1	Led	No-SI	no ws
Part 3:	_	Plans, Activities and Finances	N≕942 1973	N=607 19 7 4	N=127 1973	N=128 1974	N=701 1973	N=352 19 7 4
		GE PLANS						
	(A) Spe	cial Assistance						
•	% E	ducation/Vocational						
	C	ounseling	N/A	4 7	N/A	50	N/A	50
		lathematical Skills	N/A	22	N/A	23	N/A	19
		Reading Skills	N/A	22	N/A	20	N/A.	22
		riting Skills	N/A	27	N/A	26	N/A	28 2 3
		Study Skills	N/A	26 47	N/A N/A	27 47	n/A n/A	49
		Part-time Work Personal Counseling	N/A N/A	4 7 11	N/A N/A	11	N/A	12
	- /6 - 1	rersonal Counseling	N/A	11	IV D		11/ 44	
	• •	vanced Placement or ourse Credit						
	% I	Planning to Apply	49	53	46	54	49	5 2
	(C) Hot	using Preference						,
	. % \$	Single-Sex Dorm	N/A	25	N/A	22	N/A	26
		Coed Dorm	N/A	56	N/A	49	N/A	60
,	%]	Dorm (Total)	81	81	79	· 71	81	86
	VII ACTI	VITIES						
	9 Mar	re then Nominal						
		rticipation in						•
		mmunity and Church						
		oups	66	7 3	65	. 80	69	7 3
		rticipating in H.S.		•				÷
	Va	rsity Athletics	36	34	37	36	36	33
	6/ Uo	lding Major Office in						
K. S.		S. Club or Organization	40	3 5	35	33	4 2	40
		ceiving a H.S. Honor or						
		ard	54	56	58	59	5 7	64
	TITT DINA	Nores					`	
	VIII FINA	NCES rental Contribution Towar	·4					
		ducation	·	•	-			
	Me	an Contribution (in thous	1.99	2.68	1.95	2.38	2.00	2.67
•	(B) Pa	rental Income		7				
	Av	erage Income (in thous)	19.8	2 1.4	18.5	19.2	20.	0 21.1
		Below \$12,000	28	29 .	. 31	31	29	27
	%	\$18,000 or above	45	44	38	40	46	43



Table 7

Profile of Hofstra 1974 Applicants, Enrolled Students and No-Shows by Selected Categories

	٠,	New York	City and	Long Island		Oneens		
Part 1: High School Background and Test Scores	pu	Applied N=1282	Enrolled N=348	No-Shows N=728	Applied N=164	Enrolled N=27 .	No-Shows N=104	
I HIGH SCHOOL TYPE %, from Public Schools	ools	. 82	87		. 65	69	09	
II ETHNIC BACKGROUND % Minority Students	ts	6	6	∞	. 11	16	. •	
III HIGH SCHOOL RECORD (A) Subject Grade Point Average	int							•
English Average		3.34	3.36	3.45,	3.39	3.38	3.57	
		3.05	3.05	3.23	3.12	3.08	3.35	
A Biological Science Avg. Physical Science Avg. Social Studies Avg.	ce Avg. Avg. vg.	3.20 3.11 3.30	3.15 3.33	3.24 3.43	3.12 2.97 3.26	3.24 3.24	3.15	
(B) Self-Reported Class Rank	ននេ	. •						
in First in First	•	27 54	30 57	32 63	56 46	36 50	, 31 56	
% in First or Second Fifth	cond	82	85	91	. 80	98	92	
(C) Overall Grade Point Avg	int Avg	3.21	3.25	3.35	3.19	3.22	3.41	
IV TEST SCORES (A) Scholastic Apt.	Test							
Verbal Mathematics	·	480 526	494 542	. 499	483	, 490 522	504 524	
(B) Achievement Tests	χ							
Avg. in All Achieve- ment Test Scores	eve-	545	554	551	545	556	260	
والمقاوم والمواور والمواورة والمواور	en de la companya de	the state of the s	and the first of the second se		and the second second second second second	المعساسية والمستحسية لاشافه متاه مناهمين المقدومة فالتكاف المقدد		,

Ŧ
L.
gon
ت
e 7
ab16
H

	No-Shows N=104		0 21 60 16		3 1 17 17 3 4	10 0 1 0 0 5	0 0 0 10 0 7
Oneens	Enrolled N=27		0 13 58 29		0 0 0 28 16 0 0	800044	0 0 4 8 8 0 16
	Applied N=164		0 22 59 20		, 1 1 17 17 17 17 3	10 0 0 0 0 3	1 4 0 7 13 0
Long Island	No-Shows N=728		0 18 63 19		1 0 2 18 13 0 8	N 0 0 0 0 4 N	2 3 1 6 0 5
City and	Enrolled N=348	•	0 24 55 20		1 0 20 15 15 3	4022044	6 1 1 2 5 12 0 6
New York	Applied N=1282	્ દ	521 19 19		1 0 18 15 1 8	, 6044044	33 3 1 6 1
	2: Degree Goals and Fields of Study	V COLLEGE OVERVIEW (A) Degree Level Goals	% Two-year Program or Less % BA or BS % Graduate Study % Undecided	(B) Intended Field of Study	% Agriculture % Architecture % Art % Biological Sciences % Business % Computer Science % Education % Fraction		



Part 2:

d)
cont
\sim
7
1e
Tab

O .		New Yo	New York City and L	Long Island	-	Queens	
Part 3:	College Plans, Activities and Finances	Applied N=1282	Enrolled N≈348	No-Shows N=728	Applied N=164	Enrolled N=27	No-Shows N=104
	VI COLLEGE PLANS (A) Special Assistance			:		ı	
		50	51	52	67	777	55
	% Mathematical Skills % Reading Skills	1/ 18	16 19	15 17	16	25 22	13
		22	23	£2.	19	22	19
	% Study Skills % Part-time Work	25 46	24 49	21 49	73 73	2 5 5 5	15 45
	% Personal Counseling	,	, o	6	6	7	10
·	(B) Advanced Placement or Course Credit						,
<i>ب</i>	% Planning to Apply	51	67	52	52	41	55
	(C) Housing Preference		•				•
	% Single-Sex Dorm % Coed Dorm	10 26	21	12 27	6 26	6.	5 26
	% Dorm (Total)	36	27	36	32	18	. 67
	VII ACTIVITIES	. *		٠.			
* # 	% More than Nominal Participation in						•
	Church Groups	64	99	799	7 99	59	6 5
·	varsity Athletics	31	32	. 53	30	28	28
	Holding Ma H.S. Club	31	29	32	30	30	31
	% Receiving a H.S. Honor or Award	29	62	65	62	62:	89
		•					



	New Yo	New York City and Long Island	ong Island		Queens	
College Plans, Activities and Finances (Cont'd)	Applied N=1282	Enrolled N=348	No-Shows N=728	Applied N=164	Enrolled N=27	No-Shows N=104
VIII FINANCES (A) Parental Contribution Toward Education						
Mean Contribution (in thous)) 2.46	2.46	2.37	2.48	2.78	2.41
(B) Parental Income Average Income (in thous.) % Below \$12,000 % \$18,000 or above	19.1 31 39	19.1 32 39	18.2 30 36	19.0 28 36	18.7 25 50	18.2 27 30