

**Annual Report: Academic Year 2013-2014
Davis Division: Academic Senate**

Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Total Meetings: 7	Meeting frequency: 2-3 meetings per quarter or as needed	Average hours of committee work each week: Variable

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Issues considered by the committee:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holistic review scoring adjustment • Athletics admissions • Admission by High School Review • Transfer admissions policies, practices, and targets

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future SARI reports should include information on <u>all</u> athletes who would not have been admitted without athletic sponsorship. The current report includes only the much smaller group of athletes in the Admission by Exception category.

Committee's Charge

The Admissions & Enrollment Committee (CAE) considers matters involving undergraduate admissions and enrollment at UC Davis.

Committee Narrative (2013-14)

CAE met seven times in academic year 2013-14 and considered a range of issues, some of which are briefly described below:

2013-2014 Admissions Summary:

Undergraduate Admissions (UA) presented numbers on the previous admissions cycle. The number of freshman applicants increased to 55,850 for fall 2013, with a corresponding drop in admit rate to 41.4% from 45.4% the previous year. 5,113 new freshmen enrolled in fall 2013, of whom 85% are residents, 11% international, and 4% national. There were 14,780 transfer applicants for fall 2013. The transfer admit rate was 60.4% (8330 admits), and 3090 students enrolled.

Holistic review scoring adjustment:

All 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, based on fits to the human readers' scores from previous years. The quantitative information includes grades and test scores but also data on family income, high school quality, number of academic classes taken, etc. For about 5% of the applications, the human reader and PV scores differ by two or more; in this case a senior reader evaluates the application independently and assigns the final holistic review (HR) score. For the remainder of the applications, in 2013 the final HR score was taken as average of the human reader and PV score. In 2014 the human reader score was used as the HR score, with the PV score serving only as a consistency check.

CAE leans towards the 2013 method of averaging the scores as a better approach than the 2014 method and will probably request that it be restored for 2015 admissions. The change was based on the idea that error in the human reader scores can be controlled through improved training, while PV scores will always have some error because of their inability to capture the qualitative portions of the application. However, data for the 5% of

files read by a senior reader show that the senior reader's score is slightly more likely to agree with the PV score than with the initial human reader. This convinced most CAE members that using the average of the PV and human scores is the better option. However, since the files that go to senior readers tend to be the most unusual cases, UA will compile additional data on how well human readers agree on more typical applications before CAE makes a final decision.

Athletics admissions:

In April 2012 the Representative Assembly endorsed all the recommendations in the report of the Special Committee on Athletics. As requested in one of the recommendations, CAE considered the most recent SARI report on athletics. On average sponsored athletes have lower high school grades and lower SAT scores than other UC Davis students. The gaps have been widening for several years, primarily because of improved test scores and grades among the non-athlete population. Another worrisome aspect is the increasing use of Admission by Exception (ABE) for athletes. From 2002 through 2007 the fraction of athletes admitted through ABE was comparable to that of the general student population, around 2%. Since then the athletic ABE cases have become more common; from 2009 to 2011 the ABE rate was five times higher for athletes than for other students. The increase stems from a period when the Faculty Athletic Representative's input on ABE cases was bypassed, but more recent data will be needed to determine whether athletic ABE remains an issue.

Further discussion of athletics admissions raised additional concerns. Recommendation 4 from the Special Committee on Athletics states that "*[athletic] applicants should be held to the standards for admission, as assessed through holistic review, that are used for the general applicant pool.*" This is not currently the case. Instead, the HR score is effectively irrelevant to athletic admissions. Every sponsored athlete who is expected to be "entitled to review" (ETR) is admitted. ETR requires completing a certain set of high school classes with at least a 3.0 GPA, and taking the SAT (regardless of score). The athletes who do not meet these criteria are the ABE cases. These minimal and unchanging requirements for athletic admissions explain the widening academic gap between athletes and other students.

Another issue is Recommendation 5 from the Special Committee on Athletics report, which urges that, "*The admissions files of all prospective student athletes be given the standard holistic review...and that SARI reports show data on the academic performance of those UC-eligible student-athletes whose holistic review scores are below the regular admissions bar.*" CAE found that about 10% of athletes apply late and are not given HR scores. Also, the SARI reports to date do not include information on all athletes who fall below the regular admissions cutoffs, but only on the much smaller group of ABE athletes. CAE instructed UA on additional information to include for next year. (We acknowledge that the next SARI report will be the first to include data from 2012 admissions, which was the first year of holistic review. However, previous SARI reports could have included analogous data based on the existing review criteria.)

CAE reviewed data from 2013 and 2014 admissions. In each year, only 28% of sponsored athletes would have been admitted based on HR scores. As noted above, about 10% had late, unscored applications. The remainder scored below the HR cutoff. The athletes' HR scores peaked at 2 below the admissions cutoff, on a scale of 1 to 7. For fall 2014, 66 admitted athletes had the lowest possible HR scores of 6 or 7. Only 13 non-athletes were admitted with these HR scores.

CAE will follow up on this next year. We will explore ways to bring athletic admissions more in line with the university's increasing academic standards, and we will look at performance data on the students with the lowest HR scores.

Admission by High School Review:

While looking into athletics admissions, CAE learned about another group of students admitted after not qualifying by HR score. These are admitted by High School Review. A student's application is reconsidered if another student from the same high school with a lower GPA was already admitted. If no one from a high school was initially admitted, the top applicants from that school are also reconsidered. For fall 2014, 308 students were admitted by High School Review. They were roughly evenly divided between students exactly at the HR cutoff who originally missed admission through a tiebreak procedure, and students one below the cutoff. Fewer than 10% scored 2 or more below the HR cutoff. Outcome studies will need to be done to evaluate how this group performs at UC Davis.

Transfer admissions policies, practices, and targets:

CAE wanted to know more about the process of setting the target numbers for incoming freshman and transfer students in each college or division. We spoke about the procedures with Vice Provost Carolyn de la Pena, Associate Vice Chancellor Kelly Ratliff, and Director of Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) Robert Loessberg-Zahl. The many factors considered include enrollment limits for lab classes, budgetary considerations for the number of non-resident students, space in dormitories, and movement among divisions and colleges after students arrive on campus. The UC Master Plan also gives a 2:1 target ratio between incoming freshman and transfer students. Davis, along with Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSD, is one of only 4 campuses presently at or below this ratio.

The annual enrollment planning process begins early in the fall term with a preliminary three-year growth trajectory, depending on the outcomes of recent admissions cycles in the different colleges and divisions and with input from Student Affairs on availability of housing, services, and classrooms. Colleges and divisions may be consulted at this stage, and are subsequently asked more formally for their enrollment goals through the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. The Vice Provost and BIA then balance these goals into provisional targets. A strength of pool assessment by UA confirms that the targets are realistic, particularly those for non-resident applicants. If necessary, adjustments are made, although in recent years the provisional targets have been fine. The final targets are ultimately approved by the Provost, typically in December or January.

Last year the ratio of freshmen to transfers ranged from 4:1 in the College of Biological Sciences to 0.8:1 in the Division of Social Sciences. The overall ratio campus-wide was 1.6:1.

Among the many elements that go into the enrollment targets, academic concerns should be a major factor. In particular, attention should be paid to the academic performance of the weakest transfer students and freshmen in each college or division. A significant disparity suggests that the ratio for that unit should be adjusted. At present the faculty's on-the-ground experience with freshmen and transfers is quite different

among units. Such information enters the planning process mainly through the enrollment plans from individual colleges and divisions, which vary widely in their usefulness. From committee members' experience, some deans merely pass on requests for enrollment targets to individual department chairs and then compile the results. With little sense of the annual admissions goals and constraints, the department chairs have difficulty providing sensible answers. CAE will work with Vice Provost Carolyn de la Pena and BIA to make sure that relevant feedback is heard.

Respectfully submitted,

Rena Zieve, Chair

for: Yuk Chai
Patrick Farrell
Carlos Jackson
Martine Quinzii
Catherine Puckering (AF Rep)
Dillan Horton (ASUCD Rep)
Janet Kim (ASUCD Rep)
Lin Zhu (GSA Rep)
Walter Robinson (Ex-Officio)
Erika Jackson (Consultant)
Darlene Hunter (Consultant)
Solomon Bekele (Academic Senate Analyst)