Chapter 5
Summary of Findings, Discussion, Implications,
and Recommendations for Further Research

This study was conducted to determine how the 15 four-year public institutions of higher education in Virginia implement current admission policies and procedures when evaluating applications from students who have received their secondary education within the home. The following sub-questions were constructed to assist in this determination:

1. Are the policies and procedures written?
2. Have the policies been approved through the institution’s governance system?
3. Are there any admission policy changes anticipated related specifically to the evaluation of home school applicants? If so, what are the changes?
4. Have admission officials considered the potential impact of the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment program on admission decisions?
5. How are applications reviewed?
   a. Who reviews the applications?
   b. How many times is each application reviewed?
   c. Who makes the final admission decision?
6. What factors are considered when making admission decisions for home school applicants, e.g., are there different criteria or standards for home school applicants?
7. How many applications from home school students have the institutions received during each of the past three years, 1997 – 1999?

An interview protocol for this study was developed. During the months of July and August 1999, the chief admission officer, or designee, was interviewed at his or her respective campus. Relevant documentation, e.g., catalogs, view books, applications, policy statements, and other promotional materials were collected. Interview tapes were transcribed, and with other documentation, coded and analyzed. Individual case studies were written for each institution and can be found in Chapter 4. These studies describe admission policies and guidelines, enrollment trends, application review and admission decision process, the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) assessment program and the potential impact on admission decisions, and evaluative criteria identified as being more relevant or very important to the evaluation of home school applications.
Summary of Findings

Policy Issues

1. Two institutions had a written policy or statement regarding home school applications. Admission officials at Virginia Tech had recently developed and secured approval of a policy that became effective with the 1999 fall class. Admission officials at Christopher Newport University reported a policy statement for home school applicants had been approved in 1997, but tracking of the development and approval of the policy was not possible.

2. Three institutions reported recent policy discussions regarding applicants from non-accredited programs to include home school applicants.

3. Four institutions reported policy changes that might be considered if the number of home school applicants increased.

Application Review and Admission Decisions

1. The procedure used for reviewing applications, both regular and home school, was reported to be the same or very similar at each institution.

2. Applications are reviewed from one to three times.

3. Individual admission counselors, chief admission officers, and/or admission committees make admission decisions. All admission decisions are made within the admission office.

4. One institution utilized outside readers to assist in the evaluation of the applications.

Home School Enrollment Trends

1. Official tracking of home school applications and enrollment has not occurred at the institutions, although admission officials at a few institutions were able to provide some data.

2. Fourteen institutions reported the number of home school applications and inquiries regarding home school admission guidelines were increasing each year.

3. Approximately 80 home school applications were received between 14 of the 15 institutions for the 1999 fall class. One institution reported receiving the first home school application for the 1999 fall class and one institution had never received an identified home school application.
Virginia Standards of Learning Program and Admission Decisions

1. Admission officials at 14 of the institutions indicated that, in all probability, the SOL assessment program would have no impact on admission decisions at their institution.

2. One institution cited a potential impact of the SOL program as prompting university officials to initiate policy discussions regarding applicants from non-accredited schools.

Evaluative Criteria for Home School Applicants

1. Admission officials at three institutions did not consider any criteria more relevant for home school applicants than other applicants.

2. Standardized test scores, e.g., SAT I or ACT, were selected by officials at 13 of the institutions as being the most important evaluative criteria for home school applicants.

3. Additional important evaluative criteria include community college coursework, high school course selection, SAT II subject area tests, and recommendations.

4. One institution required interviews of all applicants. Five institutions stated interviews were a relevant evaluative criterion.

5. GPA, class rank, and portfolios were not considered relevant criteria for evaluating home school applicants.

Discussion and Comparison of Findings with Other Relevant Research

Higher Education

Prue (1997) concluded from a nation-wide survey of college admission personnel that most college admission counselors agreed the home schooling movement would significantly impact higher education. A total of 87 percent of the respondents to the survey reported having contact with home school applicants in the past 12 months. Fourteen of the 15 chief admission officers interviewed for this study reported that the number of home school applications were increasing and if the increase continued, this population might affect admission policy and procedures. During the interviews, 93 percent of the participants of this study reported having contact with home school applicants during the past 12 months.

Thirty-two percent of the institutions participating in the 1997 nation-wide survey reported having a written policy for the evaluation of home school applicants. Of the 15 public
four-year institutions in Virginia, two institutions (13 percent) had a written policy for this population, and three institutions (20 percent) were discussing policy revisions or development for non-accredited applicants, which would include home school applicants. Prue (1997) reported that the majority of the respondents to the nation-wide survey indicated that the contact with home school applicants was positive. The majority of the chief admission officers in Virginia also reported positive interaction with home school applicants.

**Home School Enrollment Trend in Virginia**

Annual home school enrollment increases at the elementary and secondary level in Virginia are comparable to reported increases across the nation (Lines, 1998). Data provided by the Virginia Department of Education indicate that total enrollment in home school education increased by 11 percent from the 1998-1999 school year to the 1999-2000 year. Enrollment at the secondary level, grades 9-12, increased by five percent. The Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) reported that 67 percent of its membership’s children attend college (Prue, 1997). An informal survey conducted in June 1999 by this researcher with home school graduates attending the annual Home Educators Association of Virginia conference, revealed that 52 percent planned to attend college in the fall of 1999 (see Appendix J). There were 88 home school graduates attending this conference. The annual secondary enrollment report from the Virginia Department of Education is constructed in such a manner that the number of home school graduates for 1998-99 could not be determined. Thus, the total percentage of all home school graduates planning to enroll in college for the 1999 fall class could not be determined. Admission officials at 14 of the four-year public institutions reported receiving a combined total of approximately 80 applications from home school students for the 1999 fall class.

**Academic Achievement**

Several studies have been conducted on the academic achievement of home school students at the elementary and secondary level, although only a small number of them have investigated the academic success of home school students at the post secondary level (De Oliveria, et al., 1994; Galloway & Sutton, 1995; Marlow, 1994; Ray, 1990, 1997; Rudner, 1999). Participants in the nation-wide survey who reported informal follow-up of home school applicants enrolled at their institution indicated that the applicants were successful (Prue, 1997). The majority of chief admission officers at the public institutions in Virginia reported receiving
positive informal feedback regarding the success of home school applicants admitted to their institutions.

Conclusion

This study extends the knowledge base regarding admission policy, guidelines, and practices for the evaluation of home school applicants at four-year public institutions. Although the study was confined to the institutions in Virginia, the size, location, mission, classification and diversity of these institutions is representative of other four-year institutions in the nation. This study supports previous conclusions that institutions do not have written policies for the evaluation of home school applications (Callaway, 1997; Harris, 2000; Klicka, 1997; “National Center,” 1996; Prue, 1997). An increase in the number of home school applications received and inquiries regarding home school admission guidelines were reported at 93 percent of the institutions participating in this study. These increases support observations and assertions of other researchers that the home school population is growing and will affect higher education (Callaway, 1997; Harris, 2000; Lines, 1996, 1998; “National Association,” 1998; Prue, 1997).

Implications

The results of this study imply that the majority of admission officials at the four-year public institutions in Virginia recognize recent and continuing increases in the home school population. Most institutions reported increases in both total numbers of home school applications received and inquiries regarding admission requirements and guidelines. As admission officials gain experience with this population, admission policies and practices may need to be revised to ensure the fair and equitable evaluation of all applicants. Admission officials should begin tracking home school applicants after enrollment to evaluate admission decisions, gather data regarding the academic success of these applicants at the post secondary level, and help in the development of future policies or procedures for other special population groups.

With 93 percent of the institutions reporting an increase in home school applications and inquiries, admission officials might benefit from networking activities with peers at other institutions. Although each institution has its own unique mission, the ultimate goal of most admission offices is to enroll potential graduates of the institution. Sharing of previous experiences and knowledge gained through interaction with this population would assist other admission professionals. Institutions considering policy development regarding this population
should consult recently developed policies and official statements at other institutions. The sharing of this information would encourage the consistency of policies and admission guidelines at the state-supported institutions.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Although 93 percent of the institutions reported an increase in the number of home school applications being received each year, none of the institutions reported officially monitoring application trends or tracking actual enrollment of this population at the four-year public institutions. Further research to develop monitoring techniques of applications received and tracking mechanisms for enrollment trends this population is needed. Additional research should be conducted to determine the success of the home school applicant after enrollment. A study of this nature could provide important information for admission officers regarding previous admission decisions.

Additional research should be conducted regarding appropriate evaluative criteria not only for home school applicants, but other applicants from non-accredited environments. Standardized test scores, community college coursework, and recommendations were identified as relevant criteria for home school applicants in this study. Further research may determine different or additional evaluative criteria that might be more appropriate for all applicants. Field research with the participants at the annual Home Educators Association of Virginia Conference could be conducted to determine how home school students make college choices and their experience with college admission officials. Enrollment trends of home school applicants at private institutions could be compared to enrollment trends at the public institutions.

One additional area of research that would extend the knowledge regarding home school students and their college selection practices would be with the Virginia Community College System. Enrollment trends at the community college level could be compared to enrollment at the four-year public and private institutions. Transfer of home school students from community college programs to four-year institutions offers another research area.

The tracking of admission and enrollment of students at four-year public institutions from public schools in Virginia that lose accreditation after 2004 might be another area of future research. Admission officials at fourteen of the institutions indicated that the SOL assessment program would not impact admission decisions at their institution. A follow-up study of
admission practices related to this potential group of applicants from non-accredited schools should be conducted.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Introduction Letter to Chief Admission Officers

Director of Admission
Institution
Mailing Address
City, State Zip Code

Dear

I am requesting your participation in an important research study involving an area where little research has been generated to date. I am studying how current admission policies at four-year public institutions in Virginia are implemented in regard to the evaluation of non-public, non-traditional applicants, particularly home school applicants. Home schooling in Virginia has been steadily increasing over the past several years. As these students complete their home education they will be seeking admissions to state-supported institutions. Information gained from this study can be utilized by institutions to address admission concerns related to non-traditional applicants and for policy development or revisions.

To accurately describe how current admission policies are implemented, I would like to conduct interviews with the directors of admissions, or their designee, at all 15 senior public institutions in Virginia and review relevant documents. The final report will be written as a multiple case study and will include a thorough description of admission practices at each institution. You will have the opportunity to review the report for your institution. My committee consist of the following individuals: Dr. Don Creamer, Chairperson, and Dr. Steve Janosik, Higher Education and Student Services; Dr. John Muffo, Academic Assessment Program, Dr. Shelley Blumenthal, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admission, and Dr. Cora Salzberg, Director of the Better Information Project, SCHEV. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have about the research. I can be reached by e-mail at redavis2@vt.edu or by phone at 540-375-7658, or at 203 Chestnut Street, Salem, Virginia, 24153.

I will be contacting you in the near future to establish an interview date. In anticipation of your interest and support, I thank you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca J. Davis
Ph. D. Candidate
Virginia Tech
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Appendix B
Summary of Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Interviewee and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td>July 15, 1999</td>
<td>Patricia P. Cavender, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>July 14, 1999</td>
<td>Eddie K. Tallent, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>July 29, 1999</td>
<td>Laika K. Tamny, Associate Director of Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwood College</td>
<td>July 16, 1999</td>
<td>Robert J. Chonko, Director of Admissions &amp; Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College</td>
<td>July 21, 1999</td>
<td>Martin A. Wilder, Jr., Vice President for Enrollment Management &amp; Dean of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>August 6, 1999</td>
<td>Michelle Marable, Acting Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>July 15, 1999</td>
<td>Michael O’Connor, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>August 3, 1999</td>
<td>David W. Kraus, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>July 21, 1999</td>
<td>John Blackburn, Dean of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia’s College at</td>
<td>August 11, 1999</td>
<td>Russell Necessary, Interim Director Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>July 23, 1999</td>
<td>Delores T. Taylor, Director of Admissions, Office of Undergraduate Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Military Institute</td>
<td>July 28, 1999</td>
<td>Vernon L. Beitzel, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>August 3, 1999</td>
<td>Karen E. Torgersen, Director Undergraduate Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State University</td>
<td>July 29, 1999</td>
<td>Lisa Winn, Director of Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of William and Mary</td>
<td>July 13, 1999</td>
<td>Tim Wolfe, Assistant to the Dean of Admissions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

On-Site Interview Protocol

I. Introductions
II. Overview of the Research
III. Demographics Form
IV. Interview Session
V. Collection of Relevant Documents
VI. Exit
Appendix D

Introduction for Interview Session

I want to thank you for allowing me to visit with you today. I am interested in discussing how you and your staff utilize current admission policy and practices to evaluate applications from home school students. I would like to audio tape the interview if you do not have any objections. The tape will be transcribed and used during data analysis. The institution will be identified in the final report. The interview will take approximately one hour.

Please respond to the questions in a manner that clearly describes how applications are received, reviewed, and admission decisions are determined at this institution. Accurately describe the process for reviewing applications and making admission decisions. Feel free to clarify any question and elaborate with specific examples when appropriate.
Appendix E

On- Site Visitation Demographic Information Form

Name of Institution ____________________________________________________
Interviewee __________________________________________________________
Present Title __________________________________________________________
Mailing Address _______________________________________________________
Telephone ___________________________
Email Address ____________________________

I. Type of Institution
   _____A. Comprehensive College/University
   _____B. Liberal Arts College

II. Size of Institution
   __________ Fall 1998 Total enrollment

III. Experience
   ______ Number of years on admissions staff at this institution
IV. Application Data

________ Number of applications received for Fall 1999

________ Of this total, how many were from non-public, non-traditional applicants particularly home school applicants?

_____ Is data available for home school application trends over the past three years? If yes, approximate number applications.

_____ Fall 1999

_____ Fall 1998

_____ Fall 1997

_____ Has the institution tracked the actual enrollment of home school applicants? If yes, approximate number of applicants during:

_____ Fall 1999 (number offered admission)

_____ Fall 1999 (number accepting admission)

_____ Fall 1998

_____ Fall 1997

VI. Policy Information

_____ Has your institution established a written policy for evaluating home school applicants?

_____ Was the policy approved through the institution’s governance structure?

_____ Is there a copy of policy available for review?

_____ If there is not a policy; will one be developed in the future?
Appendix F

Interview Questions

Date __________________________

Institution __________________________

Interviewee __________________________

1. Please explain the process for reviewing applications from home school students.

2. Does this process vary from the one utilized to review other applicants? If so, in what ways? Please give examples.

3. Can you identify any factors that are considered when making policy decisions related to home school applicants?

4. How are admission decisions made?

5. Have you considered the impact the state SOL assessment program will have on your admission policy, if public schools should lose their accreditation?

6. Do you have current practices or policies in place for the evaluation of applicants from non-accredited programs?
7. Do you consider any of the following criteria more relative to the evaluation of home school applicants than other applicants? If so, why?

____ GPA
____ Class Rank
____ High School Course Selection
____ Honors Courses
____ Advanced Placement (AP) Courses
____ Norm-Referenced Test Scores
____ Standardized Tests Scores (SAT I and ACT)
____ SAT II Scores
____ Interviews
____ Recommendations; _____ Required, if so, who is it required from_______
____ Number recommendations allowed
____ Portfolios
____ Personal Statements
____ International Baccalaureate (IB)
____ Community Service Projects
____ Extra-curricular Activities
____ Community Service Organizations
____ Performance or Competency-Based Diploma

Other comments and issues:
## Appendix G

### Checklist On-Site Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Verbal Approval</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Revisions in Progress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA – Wise</td>
<td>Interim Director</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W &amp; M</td>
<td>Designee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H

**Home School Application Trends**

1997 – 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNU</td>
<td>Very Few</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMU</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMU</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Very Few</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWC</td>
<td>NDA 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NDA 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSU</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODU</td>
<td>Estimated 5 in past couple of years</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Data Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU</td>
<td>NDA 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NDA 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA – Wise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCU</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>Estim. 2 - 3</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W &amp; M</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>Est.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix I

Case Study Approval Letter

Rebecca J. Davis
203 Chestnut Street
Salem, VA 24153

March 20, 2000

Director of Admissions
Institution
Mailing Address
City, State, Zip Code

Dear

Please review the enclosed case study that was been developed from our interview and published admissions and promotional materials for the university. If you find the study to be an accurate description of admissions at --------- --------- and the evaluation of home school applicants, please sign in the appropriate place at the bottom of this letter and return in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

If you feel the study is inaccurate or would prefer something be worded in a different manner, please make corrections on one of the enclosed copies and return. I will review your suggestions and return a corrected copy. The second copy of the case study is for your records.

If you have any questions about the case study that can be resolved over the phone or by e-mail, please give me a call, Monday – Wednesday at 540-231-9717 and on Thursdays and Fridays at 540-375-7658 or send comments to redavis2@vt.edu. I would like to thank you again for your willingness to participate in this study and the opportunity to visit with you this past summer. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca J. Davis
Ph.D. Candidate

Enclosures

I have read the case study for ------------------- and agree that it accurately reflects the admission policies and practices in regard to the evaluation of home school applicants. I understand that the case study will be published as a component of a doctoral dissertation in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Virginia Tech.

______________________________
Name/Title

__________________________________________
Date
Appendix J

HOME EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA

SUMMARY OF 1999 HOME SCHOOL GRADUATES

June, 99

Total Graduates  -  88
Returned Surveys - 85

1. Have you applied to any colleges?  Yes – 44       No – 37         Blank Forms - 4

2. Please list the colleges to which you applied. (See Attached Handout)

3. Please list the colleges to which you were accepted. (See Attached Handout)

4. Where do you plan to attend this fall? (See Attached Handout)

5. If you encountered any difficulties in the admission process, please describe them. (See Attached Handout)

6. How many of your high school years, grades 9-12, were you home schooled?

   Grades 9 – 12 - 65
   Grades 11 – 12 - 5
   Grades 10 – 12 - 7
   Grade 12 - 2
   Grades 9.5 – 12 - 1
   Blank Forms - 5

General Information about HEAV:

- 1999 Membership – 1,500
- 1999 Conference Attendance – Approximately 4,000
- Graduation Participation at Conferences
  1999 – 88
  1998 – 70 (estimate)
  1997 – 60 (estimate)
  (HEAV officials estimates that many more graduated in their local area and do not report graduating or participate in HEAV graduation activities.)
- HEAV reports providing information and resources to about 85% of the home schooling families in Virginia
1999 HOME SCHOoled GRADUATES ATTENDING THE
HOME EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE
REPORTED APPLYING TO THE FOLLOWING COLLEGES

Appalachian Bible College  University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Brevard College  University of Richmond
Bob Jones University  University of Virginia
Cedarville College  Virginia Commonwealth University - 2
Charleston Southern University  Virginia Tech - 5
Chowan College  Wheaton College
Christendom College  Community College in North Carolina
Cleveland Institute of Music  Air Force Training Program
College of William and Mary
Cornell
Culinary Institute of America
Drexel University
Duke
East Carolina University
Eastern Mennonite University
Emory and Henry College
Evangel University
Gardner-Webb
Germanna Community College - 2
George Mason University – 3
Greensboro College
High Point University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Johnson and Wales
Liberty University – 4
Lynchburg College
Mary Washington College
Montreat College
New Tribes Bible Institute
Northern Virginia Community College – 3
Oberlin
Paul D. Camp Community College
Pensacola Christian College
Piedmont Virginia Community College - 2
Radford University
Richard Bland
South Eastern
Thomas Nelson Community College – 2
Union
University of Maryland
University of Miami
1999 HOME SCHOLED GRADUATES ATTENDING THE HOME EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE REPORTED BEING ACCEPTED TO THE FOLLOWING COLLEGES

Appalachian Bible College        Air Force
Brevard College
Bob Jones University
Cedarville College
Charleston Southern University
Chowan College
Christendom College
College of William and Mary
Cornell
Culinary Institute of America
Drexel University
Duke
East Carolina University
East Carolina University
Emory and Henry College
Gardner-Webb
Germanna Community College - 2
George Mason University – 3
Greensboro College
High Point University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Johnson and Wales
Liberty University – 4
Mary Washington College
New Tribes Bible Institute
Northern Virginia Community College – 3
Oberlin
Paul D. Camp Community College - 3
Pensacola Christian College
Piedmont Virginia Community College - 2
Richard Bland
South Eastern
Thomas Nelson Community College – 2
Union
University of Maryland
University of Miami
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University - 2
Virginia Tech – 5
Wheaton College
1999 HOME SCHOoled GRADuATES ATTENDING THE HOME EDUCATORS ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE REPORTED PLANS TO ATTEND THE FOLLOWING COLLEGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appalachian Bible College</th>
<th>Air Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Jones University</td>
<td>Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ridge Community College</td>
<td>Community College in North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christendom College</td>
<td>Correspondence Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Newport University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of William and Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Institute of America</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Mennonite University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner-Webb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanna Community College - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University – 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Bible College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tyler Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty University – 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Fairfax Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Tribes Bible Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College – 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. Camp Community College - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola Christian College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Virginia Community College - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Nelson Community College – 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech – 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. If you encountered any difficulties in the admission process, please describe them.

College of William and Mary – Nothing in particular.
Culinary Institute of America – A letter from the Hampton City School Board Director.
East Carolina & Chowan College – Wanted much higher than average SAT scores – more
than the requirement for public schools.
George Mason University & Virginia Commonwealth University – Misplaced transcripts,
delayed applications by the college.
GMU – Nope! They “love” me!
Johnson & Wales – I had to take the GED.
Liberty University – I was told that I didn’t need both SAT and ACT, so I only took SAT.
Then I wouldn’t get accepted to Liberty without ACT scores.
Just getting my schedule done the right way! I have a lot of classes that I don’t need!
In applying to Liberty I found that the requirements for home school graduates included the
administration of the SAT-II: Writing in addition to the routine requirements.
Thomas Nelson Community College – When I was accepted I had not graduated high school
yet.
No difficulties, I did not have a SAT I score when I applied, so the college gave me a
placement test.
University of Maryland & Cleveland Institute of Music – GED Requirement – they act as if
we don’t have a real education. Just a theory, but I know a public-schooled guy who got a
large academic scholarship to UM but had a lower GPA & SAT than me. I didn’t get any
academic money. Do they not consider a home school education as valuable?
Virginia Tech – “Regular” students have to take the SAT I & SAT II: Writing tests to attend
VA Tech. As a home schooler, VA Tech told me that I would not be admitted without taking
the SAT I, SAT II: Writing; SAT II: Math; SAT II: Biology, and sending in my standardized
test scores for 3 of my 4 high school years. That was not fair.
Had to take extra SAT II tests!
Nope, accepted 12 days after I applied!
Air Force Training – Some difficulty in receiving diploma.
Christendom College – No
Drexel University – None
Eastern Mennonite University – None
Germanna – No Problems; No
Illinois Institute of Technology – None
Liberty University – None
Northern Virginia Community College – No
University of Virginia – None
Virginia Tech – None; None
Wheaton College – None
Pensacola Christian College – No
Rebecca J. Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Assistant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete duties as assigned in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend monthly meetings and prepare minutes for posting on the Internet of the Virginia Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>1997 – 1998</th>
<th>Bath County Public Schools</th>
<th>Warm Springs, VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil Personnel Services Specialist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advised students in grades 8, 11, 12, in regard to scheduling of classes, development of five-year plans, college and career planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated counseling activities with students, parents, faculty and administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Director of High Schools That Work (HSTW) grant and Middle School Grant funded by State Council of Higher Education for Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared and monitored Guidance Department annual budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>1991 – 1997</th>
<th>Dabney S. Lancaster Community College</th>
<th>Clifton Forge, VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Personnel Specialist – Talent Search Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided services to students in Bath County and Alleghany-Highlands Schools, including development and supervision of a tutoring program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted workshops on career exploration, study skills, college selection, college applications, financial aid forms, SAT Prep and registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kentucky Tech Regional Educational Consultant I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated the development, implementation, and monitored and evaluated vocational/technical and continuing education in a ten county area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of region-wide marketing program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed and monitored all sex-equity and single-teen parent proposals for the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured $300,000 during the initial funding cycle for the development and implementation of on-site child care facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>1988 - 1991</th>
<th>Somerset Community College</th>
<th>Somerset, KY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinator, Destination Graduation Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment, implemented and monitored USDE funded proposal dealing with drop-out prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised employees and prepared annual reports and budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>1984 - 1988</th>
<th>New Mexico Department of Education</th>
<th>Santa Fe, NM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
State Supervisor Vocational Home Economics Education
- Monitored compliance of secondary and post-secondary schools utilizing State Educational Standards, State Board of Education regulations, and federal laws
- Reviewed and selected for funding and monitored grant federal projects across the state, totaling approximately $500,000
- Provided technical assistance to school systems on curriculum design and development, needs assessment, program development, and vocational youth organizations
- Established and maintained relationships with business and industries related to vocational education
- State representative to the Mid-West Vocational Curriculum Consortium
- Developed and monitored the Vocational Program Unit’s annual budget

Food Service Director/Instructor
- Managed food service operation at private boarding school, including building maintenance and up-keep, supervision of staff, completion of state and federal reports, and prepared and monitored annual budget
- Developed and implemented occupational food service training program

1977 - 1981 Morehead State University Morehead, KY
Instructor
- Taught vocational home economics education, grades 7-12 at University’s Laboratory Training School
- Supervised college students enrolled in the teacher preparation program
- Participated on various university committees

Education
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

1986 - 1987 University of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM
Educational Administration
- Completed classes in Educational Administration Program

1976 - 1981 Morehead State University Morehead, KY
Bachelor & Master Degrees
- 1981 – Master of Arts – Secondary Education Supervision
- 1977 – Master of Adult and Continuing Education
- 1976 – Bachelor of Science Degree - Vocational Home Economics Education