DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 967

HE 017 080

AUTHOR

Hand, Carol A.; Prather, James E.

TITLE

A Review of Transfer Student Activity among Georgia State University and Selected Institutions of the University System of Georgia. Instituti nal Research

Report No. 84-8.

INSTITUTION

Georgia State Univ., Atlanta. Office of Institutional

Planning.

PUB DATE

Feb 84 31p.

NOTE PUB TYPE

Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE

MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS

*Academic Achievement; *College Transfer Students; Comparative Analysis; *Grade Point Average; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Performance;

*State Universities

IDENTIFIERS

*Georgia State University; *Georgia University

System

ABSTRACT

Patterns of student transfers and performance indicators among selected institutions of the University System of Georgia were studied. Attention was focused on differences in performance as measured by grade point average (GPA) between students leaving one institution for another system institution, and correspondingly of students transferring into a given institution from an institution within the system. Findings include the following: Georgia State University was the strongest magnet for attracting transfer students from most institutions in the Georgia University System, and the University of Georgia served a less strong role as a magnet institution; students who transferred from Georgia State, Georgia Institute of Technology, Kennesaw College, and West Georgia College tended to have higher GPAs after transferring to another system institution; students across system institutions generally lowered their GPA at Georgia Institute of Technology; students who transferred to Georgia State and the University of Georgia often tended to receive lower grades; and students transferring to Kennesaw College and West Georgia College frequently received higher grades after the transfer. A brief review of the literature is appended. (SW)

^{*} Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made * from the original document.

A Review of Transfer Student Activity Among Georgia State University and Selected Institutions of the University System of Georgia

Institutional Research Report No. 84-8

bу

Carol A. Hand

James E. Prather

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESDURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating ir.

 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

 Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position of Policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Office of Institutional Planning Georgia State University February, 1984

ERIC

<u>Abstract</u>

The purpose of this report was to determine what patterns of student transfers and performance indicators exist among selected institutions of the University System of Georgia. The data for the report were taken from the <u>University System of Georgia Transfer Report Summary</u> for 1980-81. The focus was upon the differences in performance as measured by GPA between students leaving one institution for another System institution and correpondingly of student transfers into a given institution from some other System college or university. The key findings are:

- * Georgia State University is the strongest magnet for attracting transfer students from most colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. University of Georgia served a less strong role as a magnet institution while this effect was not found for Georgia Tech, Kennesaw, and West Georgia.
- * Students who transfer from Georgia State University, Georgia Tech, Kennesaw, and West Georgia tend to have higher GPA's after transferring to another System institution.
- * Students across System institutions generally lower their GPA's at Georgia Tech.
- * Students who transfer to Georgia State University and the University of Georgia often tend to receive lower grades.
- * Those students transferring to Kennesaw and West Georgia frequently receive higher grades after transfer.
- * The performance of students who transferred out of Georgia State University, University of Georgia, or West Georgia College was compared with the performance of students transferring into these same institutions. Students transferring into these institutions tend to do better than did the outgoing transfers.

A number of implications based upon these findings were tentatively posited.



Table of Contents

		Page
Introduction		1
Method		1
Results		2
Implications		7
Appendix A	Review of the Literature	
Appendix B	University System of Georgia Transfer Report Summary	
Appendix C	Transfer and Original GPA's Among Selected University System of Georgia Institutions 1980-81	
Appendix D	Number of Students Sent or Received Among Selected Institutions of University Systems of Georgia 1980-81	
	List of Tables	
<u>Table</u>		
1	Net Gain or Loss in Numbers of Transfer Students Among Selected University Systems of Georgia Institutions 1980-81	
2	Differences Between Transfer GPA and GPA a Receiving Institution 1980-81	t
3	Differences Between GPA at Receiving Insti and Transfer GPA 1980-81	tution
4	Differences Between GPA of Outgoing Studen GPA of Incoming Students 1980-81	ts and



A Review of Transfer Student Activity Among Georgia State University and Selected Institutions of the University System of Georgia

Transferring from one college to another is now widely practiced and accepted behavior. Indeed, many colleges and universities actively recruit students to transfer to their institutions. The University System of Georgia has gone a long way to remove the barriers to transferring with such practices as System-wide core curriculum requirements, and uniform grading and academic calendar formats.

Transfer students and their impact on institutions of higher education have been widely studied (see Appendix A). While there has always been concern about the academic preparedness of transfer students, it is now generally acknowledged that academic performance is but one motivation to transferring along with economic needs, changing field of study, and maturity.

The purpose of this report is to provide information on both the volume and performance of students who transfer to or from Georgia State University (GSU) and selected other institutions within the University System of Georgia. These data are intended as input into planning and reviews of academic and admission issues.

METHOD

Data

The data for this report were taken from the <u>University System of Georgia Transfer Report Summary</u> (see Appendix B). This report contains raw data on all University System of Georgia students who transferred among System institutions during the period Summer Quarter 1980 to Spring Quarter 1981. The number of transfer students and their grade point averages (GPA's) at both sending and receiving institutions are given.



Procedure

This report takes and reformats selected institutional data to focus upon the questions of the direction of transfers and the performance of these students.

Several measures of the differences in average GPA's between sending and receiving institutions were developed to measure the degree of improvement or decline of performance as measured by average GPA's. The average GPA's of original and transfer institutions for selected System institutions (see Appendix C) were used to calculate difference measures.

RESULTS

The group measures focus upon these institutions, listed horizonally in the tables:

Georgia State University (GSU)
University of Georgia (UGA)
Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT)
Kennesaw College (KC)
West Georgia College (WGC).
Southern Technical Institute (STI)

Net Gain or Losses of Transfer Students

Table 1 shows the net gain or loss of transfer students among institutions. It is based upon the number of students transferring out of and into all System institutions as provided in Appendix B. For instance, UGA received 75 students from GSU, while GSU received 228 students from UGA. Thus GSU netted 153 students in the exchange, and UGA lost 153 net. Highlights of this table are:

* GSU experienced net gains from all institutions except STI and the Medical College of Georgia. The institutions from which GSU experienced the most gains were Clayton Junior, Atlanta Junior, WGC, Georgia Southern, KC, and Valdosta.



- * For UGA net gains were from ABAC, Gainesville Junior, Georgia Southern, Middle Georgia, Macon Junior, North Georgia, Gordon Junior, Albany Junior, Columbus College and South Georgia. Net losses were experienced to GSU, Medical College of Georgia, and STI.
- * The only big net gain for GIT was from Middle Georgia; the one big net loss was to STI.
- * KC experienced its largest net gain from Floyd Junior and its largest net losses to GSU and STI.
- * STI received net gains from GIT, KC, and GSU.
- * A net gain was experienced by WGC from Floyd Junior, and net losses to GSU and UGA.
- * GSG is the magnet institution for transfers within the System, followed by UGA.

TABLE 1

Net Gain or Loss in Numbers of Transfer Students

Among Selected University Systems of Georgia Institutions
1980-81

	Georgia State University	University of Georgia	Georgia Institute of Technology	Kennesæw Co]l∶ge	Southern Technical Institute	West Georgia College	Atlanta Junior College	Clayton Juntor College
Georgia Institute of Technology	10	-8		6	114	10	-3	9
Georgia State University		-153	-10	-35	23	-51	-96	- 135
Medical College of Georgia	-8	-65	*	-5	-1	-1	-3	-4
University of Georgia	153		8	-14	14	-21	2	-19
Albany State College	6	-4	•	1	1	2	-2	1
Armstrong State College	7	7	14	4	Ž	-1	1	-2
Augusta College	5	-2	O	1	2	0	•	0
Columbus Collège	16	22	5	1	1	2	-2	0
Fort valley State College	8	O	1	-1	•	3	1	1
Georgia College	8	19	2	3	6	2	2	-5
Georgia Southern College	38	46	6	5	15	8	-3	1
Georgia Southwestern College	7	14	-1	3	1	0	-1	3
Kennesaw College	35	14	-6		32	-5	-2	-8
North Georgia College	13	35	4	6	•	1	•	-2
Savannah State rollege	7	-5	-1	•	2	-1	-6	1
Southern Technical Institute	-23	-14	-114	- 32		-2	-14	-11
Valdosta State College	21	17	-4	7	1	ı	0	-4
West Georgia College	51	21	-10	5	2		9	-13
Abraham Baldwir Agricultural College	12	95	11	0	8	4	*	4
Albany Junior College	3	25	6	2	3	3	1	1
Atlanta Junior College	96	-2	3	2	24	-9		3
Bainbridge Junior College	1	-3	•	•	1	1	*	-1
Brunswick Junior College	16	3	3	1	4		ļ	8
Clayton Juntor Collage	1 35	19	-9	8	11	13	-3	
Dalton Junior College	2	17	3	6	5	6	*	1
Emanuel County Junior College	3	•	•	*	*	•	*	•
Floyd Junior College	11	-2	2	11	16	26	•	*
Gainesville Junior College	17	59	5	2	10	10		Ō
Gordon Junior College	13	34	8	2	4	9	Ţ	1
Macon Junior College	9	44	6	3	2	2	1	1
Middle Georgia College	15	46	28	4	13	9	•	1
South Georgia College	2	21	4	-1	6	1	j	0
waycross Junior College	•	-7	1	•	2	2	*	•

^{*}No students either way.

Transfers to Selected Institutions

The differences in average GPA's among those individuals who transferred from other System colleges to the selected institutions are provided in Table 2. For instance, students who transferred to GSU from GIT achieved on average .56 of a letter grade higher GPA's. Moreover, GSU students who transferred to UGA on average have higher GPA's by a factor of .10 of a letter grade. Highlights from Table 2 follow.

- * Students transferring to GSU from the following institutions had higher average GPA's than at their originating institutions: GIT, August College, Macon Junior, Clayton Junior, and North Georgia. Students on average had lower GPA's after transferring to GSU from Atlanta Junior, Middle Georgia, Brunswick, Gainsville, STI, ABAC, and Columbus College.
- * Transferring to UGA resulted in higher GPA's on average for students from GIT, Clayton Junior, and Augusta College. The reverse was found on average for transfers from South Georgia College and Columbus College.
- Those students who transferred into GIT from all System institutions usually lowered their GPA's.
- * Students transferring to KC and WGC generally : aised their GPA's.

Table 2
Differences Between Transfer GPA and GPA at Receiving Institution 1980-1981

Receiving Institutions Georgia Georgia University State Institute of Kennesaw University of Georgia Technology College College Sending Institutions Georgia Institute of Technology .56 .45 .9: Georgia State University --+ - .44 .10 .44 .55 Medical College of Georgia University of Georgi .22 -,39 .46 .50 Armstrong State College .21 .18 -.41 Augusta Čollege .40 .27 Columbus College Georgia College Georgia Southern College Georgia Southwestern College +.25 -.32 -.10 . 04 .02 .15 -,45 .27 .14 .09 Kennesaw College .05 . 16 -.65 .26 North Georgia College ,04 .25 -.14 Southern Technical Institute -.26 .14 Vaidosta State College -.19 .07 . 04 West Georgia College +,07 -.11 .09 Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College Albany Junior College Atlanta Junior College - .26 .03 -.04 -.94 -.30 Brunswick Junior College Clayton Junior College -.17 .31 .35 .10 .46 Dalton Junior College .16 .13 Floyd Junior College .00 -.05 . 11 Gainesville Junior College .01 -.06 Gordon Junior College - . 23 -.11 -.10 Macon Juntor College .37 • 07 Middle Georgia College South Georgia College -,37 -.79 -.48 -.42

Transfers from Selected Institutions

The group of average differences in GPA's in Table 3 shows how students from the selected institutions differentially perform at other System institutions. For instance, students who transferred from UGA to GSU had average GPA's .22 higher at GSU. Those students who transferred from GSU to Atlanta Junior College had on average GPA's higher by a factor of 1.33.

Highlights of this table are:

- * Students who transferred from UGA had increases in their average GPA's at all institutions except GIT. The median increase was .42.
- The median increase in average GPA's of students leaving GIT was .90.
- * Leaving GSU, UGA, GIT, or WGC to attend Atlanta Junior resulted in a letter increase of at least 1.0.

Table 3

Differences Between GPA at Receiving Institution and Transfer GPA 1980-1981

Sending Institutions Georgia Georgia Nest State University Institute of Kennesaw Seorgia Receiving Institutions University of Georgia Technology College College Georgia Institute of Technology -.44 -.65 Georgia State University Medical College of Georgia .56 -.07 .15 .22 .17 University of Georgia Armstrong State College Augusta College Columbus College .10 .27 .45 .16 -.11 .47 Georgia College .75 Georgia Southern College .38 . 42 -.06 Georgia Southwestern College Kennesaw College North Georgia College .44 . 46 .93 .09 Southern Technical Institute Valdosta State College .27 .05 .42 .90 .15 West Georgia College Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College Albany Junior College .55 .50 . 91 .26 Atlanta Junior College 1.33 1.40 1.90 1.02 Brunswick Junior College C.ayton Junior College .41 .51 .73 .19 Dalton Junior College Floyd Junior College Gainesville Junior College .45 .66 Gordon Junior College .77 Macon Junior College Middle Georgia College South Georgia College

THE PERSON NAMED AND ADDRESS OF



Net Gain or Loss in GPA's

Table 4 reflects the net gain or loss in GPA's for a given institution. For instance, students who transferred from GIT to GSU had an average GPA of 3.09 at GSU, while GSU students who transferred to GIT had average GPA's of 2.92 at GSU. The .17 difference in GSU average GPA is indicative of a .17 gain in GSU's favor from transfer activity.

Highlights of this table are:

- * Students who transferred from GSU to UGA had a pretransfer GPA of 2.67, while students who transferred from UGA to GSU had an average GPA of 2.87 at GSU. The net gain for GSU was .20. Other net gains for GSU from these institutions are: Clayton .81, WGC .55, and KC .45.
- * For the UGA the median net gain was .52.
- * At GIT and KC there was not evidence of the net gain that GSU and UGA experienced. West Georgia did not experience a net gain with GSU and UGA. Kennesaw College experienced a very small net gain for both GSU and UGA.

Table 4
Differences Between GPA of Outgoing Students and
GPA of Incoming Students
1980-1981

Gain or Loss Between Incoming and Outgoing Transfers (Incoming Minus Outgoing GPA's)

	Georgia State <u>University</u>	University of Georgia	Georgia Institute of Technology	Kennesaw College	West Seorgia <u>College</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	.17	.16		39	
Georgia State University		.12	05	.04	07
Medical College of Georgia					•••
University of Georgia	.20		10	02	13
Armstrong State College		.25			
Augusta College		.78			
Columbus College					
Georgia College		.50			
Georgia Southern College	.23			59	
Georgia Southwestern College				•-•	
Kennesaw College	.45	.64	.67		.60
Morth Georgia College					
Southern Technical Institute	.25			33	
Valdosta State College		, 16			
West Georgia College	.55	.52		25	
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College					
Albany Junior College		,			
Atlanta Junior College	.14				
Brunswick Junior College					
Clayton Junior College	.81	.93			.66
Dalton Junior College					
Floyd Juntor College					
Gainesville Junior College					.43
Gordon Junior College		.76			
Macon Juntor College					
Middle Georgia College		.6 5			
South Georgia College					

6

ERIC POULTERS DOVERING

And the second of the second

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report was to determine what patterns of student transfers and performance indicators exist among selected institutions of the University System of Georgia. The data for the report were taken from the <u>University System of Georgia Transfer Report Summary</u> for 1980-81. The focus was upon the differences in performance as measured by GPA between students leaving one institution for another System institution and correspondingly of student transfers into a given institution from some other System college or university. The key findings are:

- * GSU is the strongest magnet for attracting transfer students from most colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. UGA served a less strong role as a magnet institution, while this magnet effect was not found for GIT, KC, and WGC.
- * Students who transfer from GSU, GIT, KC, and WGC tend to have higher GPA's after transferring to another System institution.
- * Students across System institutions generally lower their GPA's at GIT.
- * Students who transfer to GSU and UGA often tend to receive lower grades.
- * Those students transferring to KC and WGC frequently receive higher grades after transfer.
- * The performance of students who transferred out of GSU, UGA or WGC was compared with the performance of students transferring into these same institutions. Students transferring into these institutions tend to do better than did the outgoing transfers.

IMPLICATIONS

This unique data set that allows comparison of student flow among
University System institutions was found to be very rich and varied. After



analyzing these data, it is possible to tentatively suggest the following implications:

- * Many students who transferred from System institutions to GSU are likely to find GSU to be tougher than their originating college. This is true in spite of the fact that many of them have already taken what are often the more rigorous core courses in composition, mathematics, history, and the natural sciences. A similar statement can be made about UGA, while GIT is unique in its high level of difficulty for transfer students. Students who transferred to KC or WGC typically did not experience the kind of difficulty that they might at GSU, UGA, or GIT.
- * It is quite clear that when a student leaves GSU, UGA, KC, or WGC, for any institution other than GIT, he will almost invariably experience an increase in GPA's at the new institution. Thus it appears that transferring from one of the universities or Atlanta area junior colleges is to a certain degree motivated by the promise of better grades. The most dramatic increases in GPA's may be found for students who transfer to Atlanta Junior, Clayton Junior, KC, or WGC. So it appears clear that while GSU and UGA are magnets to other System Institutions, they also serve a feeder role in allowing students to increase their GPA by transferring to another System institution.
- * Both GSU and UGA appear to be sending out their poorer students and pulling in most other institutions' better students. This sorting out process appears to work very efficiently and favors GSU and GA.
- * GSU attracts many more students than it feeds out to other University System institutions, and GSU's attraction is System wide. While UGA attracts System wide also, its net gain of students is generally smaller than GSU's. GiT does not appear to be a very strong magnet nor does KC, or WGC. GSU is particularly strong in getting students from UGA, Atlanta Junior, and Clayton Junior.

Students appear to be in an efficient market with concern to GSU. GSU gains mainly good students and loses those who often can perform better at other System institutions. It can be speculated that non-System institutions such as DeKalb, Morehouse, Spelman and the like have similar patterns with GSU. Also, it may often be the case that students regularly seek out area institutions to enroll in courses that are found to be difficult at GSU.



It is interesting to note that Clayton Junior students tend to do better at GSU and UGA. Clayton Junior College appears to be doing a good job of preparing its students for transfer. It is unclear from this analysis as to whether or not the drawing power of STI is an artifact of foreign students transferring there after receiving English language training or whether the attraction is its applied technical programs.



Appendix A

Review of the Literature

Transfer Students

Several studies have focused on various aspects of the transfer student phenomenon. State University of New York (1981) found that transfer students represented 8.5 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment for the Fall 1979 term. Furthermore, the majority of transfer students continued to come from other institutions that were part of the State University System.

In a study of student transfers within the University System of Georgia, Bryson (1981) reported that 1137 students transferred to GSU from other System institutions in fiscal year 1979, with 1022 such transfers in 1980. The majority of these students transferred from the University of Georgia, Clayton Junior College, Kennesaw College, and Atlanta Junior College (all University System of Georgia institutions). The largest numbers of students leaving Georgia State University transferred to the University of Georgia, Kennesaw College, Clayton Junior College, Southern Technical Institute, and Georgia Institute of Technology.

Bragg (1982b) looked at the number and mobility patterns of Illinois 2-year college students who transferred to 4-year institutions. She found a small decline in the number of such transfers between Fall 1973 and Fall 1979. Two-thirds of the transfer students were between the ages of 21 and 24 while 17% were between 25 and 30. As might be expected, half the transfers were female. Forty-one percent enrolled in a liberal arts program, with 10% entering business programs and 19% "undeclared". The average pretransfer GPA was found to be 2.93. Bragg (1982a) analyzed the rates of persistence and achievement of over 10,000 Illinois transfer students. The



(. Î

overall attrition rate for the students after one year was 21%, with a higher proportion of students with low grades appearing to discontinue enrollment. The GPA's declined in the first term after transfer and rose in the second term, but not to the pre-transfer levels. Stark and Bateman (1982) surveyed community college students who had transferred to 4-year colleges. They found that 62% of the respondents were between the ages of 20 and 29, and 17% were over thirty. Thirty-one percent of the students had a GPA between 2.6 and 3.0, while 32% had a GPA over 3.0. The reasons given most often for first attending a community college were that it was close to home and inexpensive.

In a study of transfer and nontransfer students, Peng (1978) found that one-fourth of the 2-year college students transferred to a 4-year institution. Sixteen percent of 4-year college students transferred to another 4-year institution; when compared with persisters, these students had higher college grades and socioeconomic status, but lower ability test scores.

Slark (1982) also looked at reverse transfer students (Community college students who had previously attended a 4-year institution). She found that 21% of all credit students at Santa Ana College had previously attended a 4-year institution, and that 38% of these had attended a college out of the state or country. Seven percent were simultaneously enrolled at a 4-year institution. Almost half (41%) of the students had left the 4-year college because they had obtained the degree they sought, while only 4% left because of academic difficulties.

A survey conducted in the Los Rios Community College District
(Renkiewicz, Hirsch, Drummond, and Mitchell, 1982) showed that almost one-

fifth (19.6%) of the respondents were reverse transfer students. One-fourth (25.7%) had previously attended a community college, and over half (54.7%) had no prior college experience. Of the graduates from a 4-year institution, 82% were employed, while almost 70% of the first time students were employed. Financial reasons or uncertainty about their major were reasons given most often for transferring by students who had left a 4-year institution without a degree.

Brimm and Achilles (1976) examined the performance of reverse transfer students who later returned to a 4-year institution. These were students who originally left the 4-year institution due to poor academic performance. After their return to a 4-year institution, their grades improved with each quarter's course work.

References

- Bragg, A. K. Fall 1979 Transfer Study. Report 2: First year persistence and achievement. Springfield: 11: inois Community College Board, 1982. (ERIC Occument Reproduction Service No. ED 220 165) (a)
- Bragg, A. K. Follow-up study of students transferring from Illinois two-year colleges to Illinois senior institutions in fall 1979.

 Report 1: Mobility patterns and pre-transfer characteristics.

 Springfield: Illinois Community College Board, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 220 164) (b)
- Brimm, J. & Achilles, C. M. The reverse transfer student: A growing factor in higher education. Research in Higher Education, 1976, 4, 355-360.
- Bryson, C. H. <u>Student transfers fiscal years 1979 and 1980</u> (Institutional Research Report No. 82-1). Atlanta: Georgia State University, Office of Institutional Planning, 1981.
- Peng, S. S. Transfer student in instituions of higher education. Research in Higher Education, 1978, 8, 319-342.
- Renkiewicz, N. K., Hirsch, P. M., Orummond, M. E., & Mitchel, G. N. The reverse transfer student: An emerging population. Sacramento, CA:
 Northern California Community Colleges Research Group, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 308)
- Slark, J. <u>Reverse transfer student study</u>. Santa Ana, CA: Santa Ana College, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 248)
- Slark, J., & Bateman, H. <u>Follow-up survey of former SAC students who</u>
 <u>transferred to a four year college</u>. Santa Ana, CA: Santa Anna
 College, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 293)
- State University of New York, Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies. Application and enrollment patterns of transfer students, Fall 1979. Albany: State University of New York, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 030)



Appendix B

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA TRANSFER REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide summary statistics about students transferring to and from institutions in the University System of Georgia during the Summer and Fall quarters of 1980 and the Winter and Spring quarters of 1981.

The basic data provided include transfer students for which both sending and receiving grade point averages were reported. The data are submitted in four tables to indicate: 1) junior college to senior college, 2) junior college to junior college, 3) senior college to junior college, and 4) senior college to senior college.

To utilize the report it is necessary to select the appropriate table, locate the column of the sending institution at the top of the page, and the row of the receiving institution on the left side of the page; the data are then presented where the row and column intersect. For example, Table 1 presents data for junior college students transferring to senior colleges. Clayton Junior College is the sixth sending institution listed in the column at the top, and Georgia State University is the second receiving institution listed in the left margin. Thus the second group of data below Clayton indicates that Clayton sent 170 students to Georgia State University and that those students had a 2.67 GPA at Clayton and a 2.98 at Georgia State University. Where data are missing, no students were reported as transferring from that institution to the receiving institution.

This report has been developed from information provided by representatives of the thirty-three institutions in the System. Any questions or suggestions to improve the report are welcomed.

Haskin R. Pounds Vice Chancellor for Research and Planning

Gayle E. Suchke Director of Data Services



Table J

MUSTRULEY SYSTEM OF CLORGIA JUNIOR COLLICA TO SICHOR COLUITA DERIVATE DATA NORDLE DE SEUDING SAD GRADE POINT AVERGE 1980-1981

Sending Inst.	ABAC CITA N Send Recy	Albany D. CPA r B Send Rete	Atlanta GrA B Sond Recy	Balmirli to GPA N Send Recv.	Branswick CPA _H Sept Hees	Chayten CIPA M Sacol Nasy	Hallon LPA N Sejot Price	Emilion1 CCA Novemb Recy	E167d CPA N Send Beck	Gathereville sura Note not Regue	Cordon 6.8'A H Soul Resy	Histon GPA II Send Recy	Hiddle Ga. CFA H Selet Bere	South Ca. Cra B Soud Recy N	Mascrona CFA Send Recy	Hn.
Ga. Tạth	11 3, 25 2,29	10 3.21 2.26	5 3.40 2.52		5 1.04 2.18	8 2.97 2.36	V 1.085 2.40		3 1.17 2.21	6 3.75 2.45	8 3.36 2.77	9 3.12 2.84	32 3.03 2.24	* 3.12 1.82 (2.90 2.30	105
ila. Stace	12 2.22 2.46	5 7.36 2.56	103 2.91 1.97	1 3.10 2.40	17 2.58 2.28	120 2.6/ 2.2H	4 1.10 1.46	3 2.90 3.10	0 <i>1.11 1.11</i>	19 2.89 2.62	34 5.07 2.84	12 2.74 3.11	35 2.68 2.31) 2.32 2.62		389
ticdical College	4 1.30 3.32	2 3.13 3.37	3 2.20 2.35		1 4.00 1.90	5-2,80-1,38	4 1. 17 1. 12	3 2.91 3.11	0 3, 27 3, 40	6 2.88 1.15	1 4.00 3.20	5 1.26 1.50	9 3.06 3.09	3 3.40 3.42		50
thive of Georgia	300 2.67 2.70	34 2.64 2.60			12 2.86 2.69	43 2.62 2.97	25 4.77 2.93			91 2.73 2.74	37 2.76 2.65	59 2.64 2.73	11 2.76 2.22	24 2.91 2.51		438
Albany State	3 2.53 2.17	36 2.64 3.10	2 2.55 1.25	1 1.50 J.in										2 2.35 3.15 1	2.10 3.20	45
Asservong State	2 2.50 2.X	1 3.40 1.60			7 2.49 2.13	3 9.90 2.11		1 2.50 1.40				4 2.72 2.90	7 2.04 2.60	6 2.37 2.52		31
notusca Collate	9 2.63 1.96	3 2.22 1.53				1 2.60 2.60		6 1.22 2.63		1 2.60 1.90		3 2.30 2.63	6 2.22 2.12	6 1.92 2.42		35
Columbus' Col le 6a	5 1.22 2.20	3 2.33 2.63	2 2.50 3.05	1 3.70 3.00	1 2.80 3.60	1 2.00 2.00					8 2.82 2.62	1 4.00 3.50	2 2.50 3.50	2 1.70 2.10		24
Fore Valley	5 2.10 2.50	3 1.90 2.50						1 (1,50), 20			2 2.55 2.65	2 2.13 3.14	3 2.23 1.63	2 2.30 2.55		21
Car College	15 2.38 2.33	2 2.26 2.53		1 2.30 2.60	2 2.40 2.45	5 2.30 3.18	1 7.5n 2.70	7 2.57 2.3n	2 2.15 2.45		20 2.57 2.59	69 2.40 2.62	59 2.42 2.48	5 2.32 2.10	1.20 2.30	196
Ga. Southern	26 2.62 2.3	50 2.59 2.61	3 2.97 2.50	2 2.35 2.65	27 2.60 2.60	8 2.22 2.25	5 2.64 2.60	14 2.84 2.45	3 2.29 2.30	8 2.54 2.11	34 2.66 2.43	19 2.36 2.52	20 2.53 2.35	33 2.43 2.34 3	2.31 2.51	342
Ga. Squttmeetern	28 2.32 2.30	0	1 t.An 1.50	1 1.33 3.33)		1 2.00 1.20	1 2.20 2.)n		5 2010 2020	6 2.82 2.26	12 7.40 2.32	18 2.56 2.50	9 2.01 2.23	<i>*</i>	84
KenPcasu Collage	2 2,25 1.10	0 21.85 3.50	4 2.70 1.77		J. 1.40 J.nu	10 2.02 2.12	6 2.42 1.92		12 2.62 2.57	3 2.53 2.17	2 2.50 3.54	3 2.12 2.50	4 2.52 1.97		-1 ~~	49
North Geothia	1 2.30 3.20	0			1 2.90 3.20	4 2.00 2.72	3 3.01 2.92		2 3, 30 1, 75	55 1.00 2.84		2 2.75 2.50	1 1.20 1.30	1 3.00 7.10		20
Savatnah Sratm	3 2.80 2.2	0	6 2.52 2.62		7 7.05 2.30						1 2 10 2.50		1 2.0n 1.50	8,2,42,2,54		21
Southern Tech	8 2.59 2.5	2 6 1.82 3.72	14 2.58 1.91	1 4.00 2.30	4 2.85 3.00	t7 2.00 2.62	2 2.10 2.73		16 2.42 2.50	И 2.69 2.29	4 2.12 2.92	2 2.75 3.00	14 2.4" 2.25	6 2.27 2.73	2.65 2.90	108
Taldoeta State	81 2.58 2.60	9 48 2.59 2.55	1 2,70 3.10	12 2.72 2.57	15 2.56 2.53	6 2.42 2.18	1 2.70 7.40			9 7.62 2.33	11 2.71 2.33	26 2 37 2.58	21 2.68 2.46	79 2.44 2.49 3	7 2.42 2.3*	30,5
West Georgia	4 2,35 2.4) 4 2.32 2.2 <u>1</u>	3 2.70 1.97	1 2.20 0.50	4 2.10 2.22	1/ 2.12 2.59	14 7.12 7.52		17.2.20.2.61	13/2/11/20	,5 2.43 2.33	1.11.2.63	10 2.34 3.66	3 2.45 2.32 2	3.00 2.80	_ 150
Total Humber Sens		261	143	23	79	<u> 11:</u>	<u> </u>	56	61	<u> 731</u>	143	236	325	156 5	·——	2.592

9/22/62

19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



UNIVERSITE SYSTEM OF GENERAL SENIOR COLLIGE DO ROCIPE COLLIGE DESCRIPE DATA BUTTALL DE STULLING AND CHAIL POLICE AVELAGO (MILER)

Table 9

	Die leib Ca, State Pro-Colf.	GIA LES	GLA 4.1A	4JA CPA	Co. C. Close Co. Sonchers Co. SiMestors & SPA SPA SPA	CPA CPA CPA CTO	Voldesto West Co. Cho (PA	Tatal No.
	The Secret of the Conf. of the Second	=	=	•		and toly . If Soul Bory H. S. d. Reev It Sent Reco		
美華法 章		5 7.50 7.41	1 2.70 2.79	1 7, 10 2, 20	3 1.47 2.21 2 5.20 1.05 2 1.75 2.60 2 1	7-0G 3.0N	¢ 2.36 1.+1	24
Alcony Ir.	6 8 6, 2 92 2 3,05 5,15	9 1.96 2,68 5 1.77 1.9	<u>l</u>	4 2.47 EDO 1 2.10 2.60	15 7.77 3.35	3 1.47 1, 17	10 2.09 2.61 1 2.49 3.00	1 60
et I :At e	2-1,40-5,30-7-1,81-6,16	2 1,95 3. 15	1 1,40 2,90	t 1,80 % P	2.3,59.2.90 2.1	.en 2.1n	1 1.10 2.00 12 1.25 2.72	42 1
Bring Light		3 5.15 7.77 1 1.70 •.0)	1 1.50 1.70	1 2:20 1:00 1 7:50 4:00 1 1:30 4:00		2 2.00 2.05	10
Promoutch	2 1/3 2/35 1 3/30 G/2 2 3/35 a	.00 9 2 31 3.32	5 2.44 2.20	1 3 m 1,000	\$4.00 (0.00 \$1.00 \$1.00	L 1.80 3-00	9 2173 2.06	•5
Alleton	37 (1.65 d) 10 35 2.17 7.58 \$ 1.40 £	.00 20 2.00 2.55 1 3.90 1.0	2 1 2,30 2,50 1 0,90 2,20	£ 1.90 \$.86 £ 1.78 1.60	# 1.67 2.37 3 3.70 1.90 2 3	1-75 2.50 2 1-60 2.75 1 1.70 1.00 2 0 80 2.00	2 8.40 2.10 (* 1.42 2.1)	18
Palson	2 2.60 3.7u	C 2.10 2.76				2 2.20 2.95 2 1.05 2.95	1 5-00 2:20 6 1,86 1:81	25
treest			1 1.80 m.00		4 t 27 1.90 1 2.00 +.00		t 0.60 9.00	7
Find	1 3.50 6.60	9 2.50 9.25			L 2.30 3.80 2 L05 1.65 1	. 20 2,50	1 9-30 9.40 11 2.16 2.65	5 19
(#	3 L.50 2.00 2 2.70 2.55	32 1.98 2.44 1 2.60 5.3	1 2.10 1.10 1 1.60 1.00	1 2.00 1.40	I 0.60 p.50 3 2	1.50 1.00 10 1.67 2.01 1 1.30 2.00	2 1.50 2.05 1 1.27 1.59) •L
Gottina	1 2.40 3.30	5 2,59 2,23 2 2,00 2,4	0		5 2.07 2.41 1 2.20 1.40 2 3.10 2.05		€ 1.58 2.25) 16
Nacon	3 1.17 2.10 9 1.70 3.30 1 2.40 2	.80 15 2.96 2.63 1 3.00 1.5	0	1 1.10 4.00 2 2.10 2.65	12 1.52 2.27 15 2.17 2.57 2 1.55 7.35	1 0.50 0.50	7 2.00 9.54 1 2.10 0.00	, 44
PIJ610 60.	4 1.12 3.02 1 1.70 2	.70 7 1.95 9.59 1 1.70 2.5	D 1 2.76 +.00	5 2,36 2,70 1 1,50 4,00	9 2.36 2.69 6 2.22 2.55 5 2 76 2.80	1 0,20 2,20 t 9.20 9.00	9 1-08 9,10 1 1,30 1,50	3 44
Scroth Ca.	1 1.00 2.00	9 1.93 2.97	5 2.05 1.47 1 2.00 1.00	1 1.70 1.60	1 1,30 1,40 8 2,15 7,47 1 3,80 4,40 1	2.30 3.00	5 1.21 9:97 2 2,20 2.55	3 25
Majrense.		7 2,34 3,11 1 1.00 2,1	1 2.60 4.00		7 3:04 3:10.	_	61.05 1.92	24
1eral Pube r ben	31 40 5		12	r,,,,,,,	32 68 11 9		64	529

3-13-83

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GFORGIA JUNIOR COLLECT TO RUNIOR COLLECT TRANSFIR DATA NITHER OF STOLLDIS AND CRADE POLIT AVERAGE 1980-1981

Sendint Inst.	ABAC Alt	bony Je	Atlanta CPA	0-15-brld&e Gra	Beunswick GrA	GLay Lon GPA	Nalton GFA	Emanue t Cha	Flord GPA	Cathevell1c	Cordon 674	Macon GPA	Middle Co.	South Ga. GPA	Vaye tose GPA	Tota No.
Fecv. Inst.	N Send Recy N															
ABAC	4	2.37 2.97		1 1.40 2.60		1 1.20 1.60	1 1.00 2.10	3 2.97 2.73	2 2.60 2.40		1 2.10 1.61	1 3.20 2.80	1 2.90 3.00	3 1.31 1.51		20
Albany Je.	10 2.38 2.79			5 2.62 2.36	2 3.5n 2.15		1 3.00 3.30	1 1.20 2.00			1 4.00 4.00		2 2.40 2,25	2 1.60 2.10	2 1.15 2.05	5 24
Atlenta	t	1.00 1.50			1 2.10 3.00	1 1.20 1.50					1 3.30 4.00	2 2,30 3,59		1 2.70 2.70		1
Bainbela##	4 2.10 2.00 3	2.50 3.47				1 1.20 2.00								1 3.60 1.10		•
Brunowtck	1 2.60 2.51								1 1.40 4.00				4 2.40 3.01	4 1.11 3.10	8 L.88 2.92	2 10
Cl •Pton	5 2.22 2.60 1	2.70 3.00 4	2.87 1.85	•			1 2.00 2.80			2 2.45 1.69	6 2.63 2.03	2 2.15 1.75	1 1.30 1.00	1 1.50 1.50		23
Dal con	2 2.15 2.90								3 2.00 2.17			1 1.00 3.00	1 2.50 2.00			1
Enemuel	2 1.80 1.70										1 1.80 2.00		l 1.60 1.40	1 1.50 1.50		5
Ployd	2 1.05 1.60				1 3.60 3.00		4 2.11 3.42						1 1.40 2.30			
Ga(netville	2 1.15 1.75					2 1.65 2.60	1 1.60 1.20	1 2.50 2.20			1 2.00 0.50	1 1.60 2.50	4 2.02 2.70	2 2.00 1.45		14
Çotdon	5 2.28 2.58					5 1.74 2.12						1 1.80 3.00	2 2.60 1.65			13
Racon	5 2.26 1.82 L	2.00 1.40 1	1.30 2.50		1 4.00 4.00	1 0.80 2.00		1 2.70 1.00	1 1.20 3.00		1 3.03 2.44		12 2.07 2.41	1 2.90 3.00		31
Middle Co.	5 2.50 2.88 1	2.00 2.20						2 2.60 3.25	1 2.50 3.60		2 2.90 2.45	25 2.43 2.96		5 2.52 1.90	1 3.30 3.46	4.2
South Ga.	\$ 1.75 1.60 I	1.10 1.50			6 1.88 2.10	1 2.40 2.80		1 2.20 1.00				1 2.50 0.70	1 1.30 1.80		3 2.01 2.1	1 70
Uaye ross	3 2.53 1,91				1 2.23 2.81								2 2.00 2.10	9 1.91 1.79		_11
Tot s) Wunber Sent	5412	<u> </u>		6	14	12	8	9	8	.2	22	34	32	30	.12	260

3-19-82

24

Sending Inor. Recy. Inst.	Ga. Southern Ga. S'Western GPA GPA N Soud Royv N Good Rocv N	Gl' A	rth Georgia Savannah GPA GPA Send Roev N Send Poes	So. Tech GPA N Send Rery	Valdosta GPA N Se <u>nd Recv</u>	GPA	otal No. lecv
Ga. Tech	10 2.78 2.33	11 3.13 2.48 5	5 2.84 2.54	8 7.90 2.71	2 3.15 2.50	F 3.40 2.90	149
Ca. State	49 2.56 2.58 9 2.38 2.73 9	06 2.79 2.94 16	6 2.67 2.92 7 2.40 2.03	13 2.48 2.22	26 4.80 2.61	6/ 2.74 2.67	6 3 5
Medical tollege	17 3.08 3.29 5 3.24 3.10	5 3.02 3.42	7 2.97 3.07	1 3.10 3.60	3 2.93 3.20	1 3.00 2.90	200
Univ. of Georgia	80 2.55 2.70 18 2.73 2.82 /	/4 2.65 2. 81 41	1 2.73 2.77 1 1.70 4.00	9 2.56 2.53	58 2.70 2.77	43 2.73 2.62	5 76
Albany State	5 2.12 2.26		3 2,23 2.07		7 1.96 2.84		27
Armstrong	35 2.13 2.23 2 1.90 2.70		25 2.24 1.92	1 2.00 0.70	4 1.77 2.00	3 2.03 2.13	117
Augusta	41 1.93 2.02 1 3.00 1.30	2 2.00 3.05 4	4 2.00 2.82 t 2.00 0.70	1 3.40 2.10	1 2.10 3.10	3 1.67 2.50	158
Columbus	3 2.23 2.40 6 2.10 2.22	:	2 1.25 2.30		5 2.02 2.40	4 1.57 2.07	44
Fort Valley	1 1.40 2.40	1 2.50 3.00			1 1.10 1.90		7
Georgia College	18 2.13 2.39 1 2.60 2.90	3 2.37 2.50	2 2.50 2.50 4 2.55 2.45		7 2.36 2.39	3 2.23 2.17	87
Ga. Southern	8 2.47 2.72 1	12 2.44 2.38	B 2.60 2.19 5 2.32 2.52	4 2.22 1.92	15 2.30 2.63	7 2.44 2.40	198
Ga. S'Western	7 2.31 2.71	1 2,70 2.60			7 2.20 2.51	3 2.30 2.13	52
Kennesaw	17 1.58 1.85 4 2.62 3.15	10	10 2.11 1.9/	21 1.88 2.02	12 2.07 2.11	33 2.07 2.16	250
North Georgia	2 2.35 2.70	4 2.82 2.82			1 2.70 3.50	1 2.20 2.60	23
Savannah State	1 2.80 3.60				1 2.10 2.60	3 2.33 2.10	63
Southern Tech	19 2.41 2.64 1 2.30 1.00 S	53 2. 35 2.50	2 2.60 1.95		3 2.20 2.20	8 2.52 2.66	281
Valdosta State	11 2.58 2.98 10 2 57 2.64	5 2.26 2.08	5 1.96 1.72	2 2.05 2.90		3 2.30 2.37	118
West Georgia	15 2 13 2.27 1 2.40 2.67	28 2.41 2.67	2 2.10 2.25 2 2 25 2.10	5 2.12 2.63	4 2.55 3.00		130_
Intal No Sent	325 76 20	9510	50	_66	157	183	<u>3,115</u>

3-25-87

AND WAT HOLDS

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA SENIOR COLLEGE TO SENIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER BATA NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND GRADE POINT AVERAGE 1980-1981

Sending Inst.	Ga. Tech GPA	Ga. State GPA	Med. College GPA	Univ. of Ga.	Albany State GPA	Armst rong GPA	August a GPA	Columbus GPA	Ft. Valley GPA	Ga. College GPA
Recv. Inst.		N Send Recv								
Ga. Tech		37 2.92 2.48		34 3.03 2.64	i.	18 3.16 2.75	9 3.29 2.94	9 3.40 2.61	1 4.00 1.60	4 3.45 2.25
Ga, State	47 2.53 3.09		4 3.22 2.70	228 2.65 2.83	7 7 2.61 2.23	12 2.53 2.74	10 2.61 3.01	20 2.86 2.61	8 2.59 1.81	16 2.59 2.49
Medical College		12 3.10 3.32		67 2.94 3.11	1 4 3.30 2.77	3 2.50 3.40	65 2.91 3.35	4 2.87 3.05		6 3.72 3.52
Univ. of Georgia	26 2.74 3.19	75 2.67 2.77	2 3.35 2.20		1 2.30 2.40	31 2.73 2.91	47 2.59 2.86	31 2.84 2.52	1 2.00 2.70	38 2.60 2.64
Albany State		1 2.60 4.00		5. 2.64 2.6	6		1 2.80 3.60	3 2.00 2.70	2 2.25 1.75	
Armstrong	4 2.25 3.62	5 2.54 2.62	1 3.20 2.50	24 2.66 2.9	3 2 2.00 1.80		4 3.22 2.82	4 2.50 2.27	1 2.40 2.00	2 2.10 2.20
Augusta	9 1.64 2.70	5 1.98 2.70	17 2.98 2.39	49 2.08 2.5	5 3 2.17 1.17	4 2.30 1.95		3 1.77 2.60	1 1.80 1.40	13 2.25 2.55
Columbus	4 1.95 2.75	4 2.22 3.12		9 2.16 2.7	3 2 2.20 1.80	1 1.50 3.10	2 2.10 2.85			
Fort Valley				1 0.80 3.10	2 1.85 1.90			1 1.70 2.30		
Georgia College	2 1.75 2.10	8 2.44 3.16	1 3.30 3.00	19 2.14 2.8	9 1 2.90 2.90	4 2.30 2.47	9 1.77 2.27	2 2.55 2.45	3 2.37 1.77	
Ga. Southern	4 2.35 2.60	11 2.35 2.73	1 3.40 3.70	34 2.40 2.6	2 2 2.45 2.50	56 2.38 2.74	14 2.19 2.65	6 2.42 2.22		11 2.61 2.57
Ga. S'Western	1 1.90 2.60	2 2.75 3.55	1 1.50 4.00	4 2.65 2.6	7 5 2.48 2.74	1 2.40 1.80		15 2.43 2.19	3 2.13 1.50	2 3.15 2.70
Kennesaw	17 1.81 2.74	61 2.39 2.83		60 2.17 2.6	3 1 3.10 3.30	4 2.12 2.77	3 2.83 3.27	1 3,40 4.00		6 2.73 3.30
North Georgia	1 2.30 2.60	3 2.43 1.73		6 2.62 2.1	2	1 3.00 1.90	2 2.35 2.45	1 2.10 1.40		1 3.20 3.80
Savannah State	1 1.60 2.30	-	5 2.00 2.74	6 1.90 1.9	8 41 2.24 2.61		1 2.00 2.00	2 2.65 1.35		2 1.90 2.90
Southern Tech	122 1.90 2.80	36 2.47 2.74		23 2.62 2.6	7 1 1.80 2.90	3 2.50 2.33	3 2.27 2.43	1 3.50 3.70		6 2.02 2.50
Valdosta State	6 2.53 3.17	5 2.86 2.64	1 2.70 2.00	41 2.61 3.0	3 6 2,23 1.83	6 2.95 3.03	5 2.92 3.34	6 2.03 1.95	1 1.90 1.50	5 2.04 2.34
West Georgia	11 1.64 2.55	16 2.12 2.67	_	22 1.10 2.6	0 2 2.40 2.15	2 2.70 2.75	3 2.13 2.67	6 2.53 2.17	3 3.17 2.67	5 2.42 2.34
Total No. Sent	255	281	33	632	80	146	178	115	24	117

3-25-82

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.

Appendix C

TRANSFER AND ORIGINAL GRA'S AMONG SELECTED UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA INSTITUTIONS 1980.81

	TRANSF	ERED 1	0		RANSFER FROM ÇSI			SPERED UGA	10	_	RANSFER FROM UG		•	FERED N			FEREO F RGIA TE			SFEREÖ Enne sam	_		ENEO FR	ОН		NEO TO EONGIA			SFERED I	
	TRANSFER			(CSI)	WEW		TRANSFE			UGA	WEW		TRANSFI	EN GTT		GIT	NEN		TRANSF	EN NC		*C	HE, U		TRANSFE	1 MGA		MCA	MEM	
	. 674	CPA	H	CPA	CPA	H	GPA	GPA	H	GPA	GPA	H	GPA	GPA	H	GPA	GPA	H	GPA	GPA	H	GPA	CPA	H	GPA	GP4	H	GPA	GP4	H
CA Tech	2.53	3.09	47	2.92	2.48	37	2.74	3.19	26	3.03	2.64	34							1.01	2.74	17	3,13	2.48	11	1.64	2.55	11			1
C2Á							2.67	2.77	75	2.65	2.67	228	2.9?	2.48	37	2.55	3.09	47	2.39	2.83	61				2.12	2.67	16	2.74	2.67	67
HCG				3.10	3. 32	12			2	2.94	3.11	67			0			0			0			5			0			1
UCA	2.65	2.87	298	2.67	2.77	75							3.03	2.64	34	2.74	3.19	26	2.17	2.63	60	2.65	2.01	74	2.10	2.60	22	2.75	2.62	43
Albany			7			1			1			5			0			0			1			0			2			0
Arestrong	2.53	2.74	12			5	2.73	2.91	31	2.66	2.93	24	3.16	2.75	18			4						0			2			3
Augunt 8	2.61	3.01	10			5	2.59	2.86	47	2.08	2.55	49			•			9			3			2			3			3
Calumbus	2.84	2.61	20			4	2.04	2.52	31			9			9			4			1			Ð			6			4
Ft.Vel			•			0			1			1			1			0			0			1			3			0
CA COI	2.59	2.47	16			•	2.6D	2.64	36	2.14	2.89	19			4			2			6			3			5			3
CA South	2.56	2.50	49	2.33	2.73	. u	2.55	2.70	80	2,20	2.62	- 34	2.78	2.33	10				1.50	1.65	17	2.44	2.30	12	2.13	2.27	15			7
CASW		-	•			2	2.73	2.82	10						0			1			4			1			3			3
Kennessu	2.79		74	2.77	2.83	61	2.65	2.81	74	2.17	2.63	60	3.13	2.48	11	1.01	2.74	17			0			0	2.41	2.67	28	2.07	2.16	33
NGA	2.67	2.92	16			3	2.73	2.77				6			5	7		1	2.11	1.97	10			4			2			1
SAV			7			0			1			6			0			1			0			0			2			3
S. Tech	2.48	2.22	13	2.47	2.74	36			•	2.62	2.67	25				1.70	2.00	122	1.66	2.02	21	2.35	2,50	53			6			•
Veldosta	2.80	2.61	26			5	2.70	2.77	Sê	2.61	3.03	41			2			6	2.07	2.11	12			,						3
WGA	2.74	2.67	67	2.12	2.67	16	2.73	2.62	43	2.10	2.60	22			1	1.4	2.55	11	2.07	2.16	33	2.41	2.67	28			0			0
ABAC	2.72	2.46	12			Q	2.67	2.70	100			5	3.25	2.29	11			0			2			2			4			0
Albeny Jr.			5			2	2.64	2.60	34			•	3.21	2.26	10	•		4			2			0			4			1
Atlenta Jr.	7.91	1.97	103	1.03	3.16	7			0	1.95	3.35	2			5	1.40	3.30	2			4			2			3	1.75	2.77	12
Beinbeldos			1			0			Ó			3			0			0			0			0			1			9
Brumwick	2.58	2.28	17			1	2.86	2.69	12			•			5			2			1			0			4			0
Clayton	2.67			2.17	2.50	35	2.62	2.97	43	2.04	2.55	24			ŧ	1.65	2.30	17	2.02	2.12	10			2	2.12	2.50	37	1.92	2.11	24
Selton			4			2	2.77	2.93	25			8			,			0			6			0	2.39	2.52	14			•
Canerue 1			3			0			0			0			O			0			0			0			0			0
Floyd	2.77	2.77	11			a			0			2			3			1	2.62	2.57	12			1	2.50	2.61	37	2.10	2.63	11
Caineavilli						2	2.73	2.74	91	1.90	2.64	32			6			1			3			1	2.31	2.25	13			3
Cordon	3.07					1	2.76	2.65	37			3						0			2			0	2.43	2.33	15			6
Mecon	2.74					3	2.64	2.71	_	2.04	2.63	15			9			3			3			0	•		3			ì
Mid.CA	2.68					Á	2.76	2.72		2.00		_		2.24	32			Á			4			0	2.34	1.84	10			1
S.GA	4.08	4.71	.,			1		2.51				3	2.02		4			Ó			0			1			3			2
			,			'n	•••		0			7			1			0			0			0	I		2			0
Heactone			u						•			•			-															



APPENOIX D

Number of Students Sent or Received Among Selected
Institutions of University Systems of Georgia

1980-B1

CLAYs. ATL. UGA ĸC TECH WGA JR. TON GSU GIT Sent Rec. Sent Rec. Rec 11 Rec. Sent Rec. Rec. Sent Rec. Sent Rec. Sent Sent <u>Sent</u> 75 GIT ž 6SU MCG 22B 22 2 3 0 0 1 1 0 0 UGA 22B ---Albany Arms trong Augusta Columbus В Ft.Val 49 3B GA Col В 1 53 0 3 33 1 3 GA South 60 6 1B 74 41 28 2 2 2 6 GASH 2Î 0 2 1 Kennesaw 7 13 NGA 0 8 2 1 SAV 1 S. Tech 67 12 11 Valdosta 5B 5 В WGA В ABAC 0 Albany Jr. 0 Atlanta Jr. Bainbridge 17 Brunswick 7 В Clayton В ¢ 0 Oalton ŋ Emmanue 1 Ö Floyd 15 6 Gainesville В Gordon 15 Macon Mid.GA i S.GA Ō Wayeross



