

**Annual Report: Academic Year 2014-2015
Davis Division: Academic Senate**

Committee on Admissions and Enrollment

Total Meetings: 11	Meeting frequency: 2-3 meetings per quarter	Average hours of committee work each week: Variable
---------------------------	---	--

Total of items reviewed: 3 Request for Consultations	Total of reviewed items deferred from the previous year: None	Total items deferred to the coming academic year: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Athletics Report• Faculty Involvement in Enrollment
--	---	---

Bylaw changes proposed: None

New committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee:

- Student Performance Data
- Holistic Review scoring adjustment
- First Year Implementation Plan
- Expected and Minimum Progress
- Report on the UCD undergrad STEM underrepresented students
- Calculation of Priority Registration
- Enrollment Management Process
- Faculty Involvement in Enrollment
- Tiebreak scoring adjustment
- Enrollment, policy, and planning

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None

Committee's Charge:

The Academic Senate Committee on Admissions and Enrollment (CAE) considers matters involving admission and enrollment at Davis.

Committee's narrative:

The Committee on Admissions and Enrollment met 11 times in 2014-2015 and conducted other business via email and the whiteboard in ASIS.

Below represents a summation of the major items the committee addressed during the 2014-2015 academic year.

Holistic Review Scoring Adjustment:

In fall 2014, the committee was briefed that all undergraduate applications to UC Davis undergo holistic review. A human reader trained by Undergraduate Admissions reads the entire application and assigns a score from 1 to 7. A computer Predictive Value (PV) score is also computed from the quantitative information. In cases where the human reader and PV scores differ by two or more, a senior reader evaluates the application independently and assigns the final holistic review (HR) score. For the remainder of the applications, in 2014, the human reader score was used as the HR score, with the PV score serving only as a consistency check.

In winter 2015, committee members read previous applications to determine whether the committee agreed with how the HR process is assessing the applications. The purpose was to check that the HR training leads to results the committee agrees with, particularly for disadvantaged students. The committee considered 12 applications that had been rated 3 or 4, near the most common admissions cutoffs. Members generally agreed that the applications merited similar HR scores. The committee requested explanation of the relative ranking for one pair of files, and Undergraduate Admissions suggested that one of those files should have been scored higher.

In spring 2015, after reviewing the sample applications, examining data on human and PV scores, and consulting with Undergraduate Admissions, the committee voted to make the following adjustments to holistic review scoring:

- Add new score level 1+, intended as the top 5% of the applicant pool. The goal is to eliminate any need for tiebreaks within the highest HR score level. Certain majors have become so selective that not all students within the current top level of 15% can be admitted.
- Allow human readers to give half scores (1.5 through 6.5) when they feel an applicant falls between the normal score levels.
- PV will be rounded to half integers.
- If rounded PV and human scores differ by at most 1, then the human score will be used as the final HR score.
- If rounded PV and human scores differ by more than 1 then file will go to a senior reader, who will assign the final score (integer or half-integer).
- Augmented review is possible for scores from 1 through 6.5, but not for 1+ or 7.

Faculty Involvement in Enrollment Management:

In March 2015, the committee met with Provost Ralph Hexter at his request to discuss enrollment management. The committee and Provost Hexter agreed that with the increase

in UC Davis applicants and enrollment it is necessary to consider how Admissions is shaping our incoming classes and the balance between California and international students. The distribution of freshman and transfer students across the campus also needs more thought. Overall, the state-mandated goal is a 2:1 ratio for entering students. However, discussion needs to begin as to how the targets are set by the college. This involves questions both of teaching capacity and of the academic quality of freshman and transfer admits.

In April 2015, CAE met with Assistant Vice Provost Matt Traxler to discuss the time to graduation and the number of students waitlisted for courses. Assistant Vice Provost Traxler mentioned that one way to address these issues would be to consider capacity in enrollment decisions. Many committee members agreed that there is not a unified faculty voice on how various factors, such as capacity, should be considered in the enrollment process.

Faculty who teach undergraduates can provide the most immediate input on restrictions due to capacity and on the academic level of admitted students, and their voices should be heard in the enrollment planning process. By comparison, as CAE noted to Provost Hexter, relevant campuswide data on our undergraduates appear only after significant delay. For example, graduation data for freshman admits cannot be obtained until more than four years after admissions. Since the Holistic Review Process only began in 2012, the first students admitted under that process are in just their third year at the university. Four-year graduation rates will not be available until CAE and Undergraduate Admissions are planning the *seventh* year of holistic review. More timely feedback on the success of our admissions procedures will require improved communication with the faculty.

In conjunction with this discussion, CAE reviewed a spreadsheet on the enrollment management annual work flow and agrees that with this understanding of how the process works there can be further discussions on how to improve the process, particularly by incorporating more faculty input. Currently faculty input occurs only through the Deans. Hence a first step is to learn what information and guidelines for feedback the Deans receive, and to improve that communication. The committee will continue work on this issue in the following academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Rena Zieve, *Chair and BOARS Representative*

Carlos Jackson

Alissa Kendall

Jon Rossini

Mikal Saltveit

Catherine Puckering, *Academic Federation Representative*

Julia Reifkind, *ASUCD Representative*

Zhengyao Xue, *GSA Representative*

Walter Robinson, *Ex-Officio*

Darlene Hunter, *Consultant*

Erika Jackson, *Consultant*

Sierra Feldmann, *Academic Senate Analyst*