Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Thursday, May 5, 2016
11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
63 Mrak

Meeting Summary

Present: Rena Zieve (Chair), Alissa Kendall, Nilesh Gaikwad, Darlene Hunter, Ebony Lewis, Jon Rossini, Tayler Ward, Sierra Feldmann (Analyst)

Absent: Carlos Jackson, Megan Guidi, Brendan Livingston, Catherine Puckering, Walter Robinson, and Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 4/14/16 Meeting Summary (Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)

Committee members had no edits to the 4/14/16 meeting summary
Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 4/14/16 meeting summary

2. Information from Undergraduate Admissions:
   a. Further data from departments/colleges that are currently participating in selective review

Discussion postponed until June meeting.

3. Departmental input on transfer admissions and the “selection” document (Supporting document posted to the whiteboard)

Alissa, Jon, and Rena attended the recent Council of Associate Deans (CAD) meeting. Members of the Council misunderstood that the policy or guidelines would create campus wide, uniform policies preventing departments from being able to implement departmental selective criteria.

Another concern centered on how far into the applicant pool admissions needs to go in order to meet enrollment numbers. Dar Hunter specified that in the College of Engineering that has Selective Major criteria and Undergraduate Admissions never goes into the third tier or applicants identified as “no” by the reviewer. Generally starts enrolling the applicants identified as “yes.” If the enrollment targets are not met, UA goes back to the college to discuss the college regarding admitting the applicants marked as “maybe.” If it appears that the department will not meet enrollment targets, UA will go to the dean and ask if they want to over enroll another department to make up the numbers. The dean will make that decision, and UA will notify BIA.
Dar Hunter mentioned when selective major review criteria is implemented, even though new criteria requires a two year notification to Community Colleges, there is generally a drop in enrollment for four years.

The committee discussed that if every college operated with selective major review like the College of Engineering, the university could be in jeopardy of not meeting overall, campus wide enrollments targets. However, it is unlikely that all departments will use SMR, because it will be deemed as either unnecessary or too much work. This policy will provide SMR as an option not a requirement for departments.

The committee also discussed on-campus transfers and the potential lack of regulation of those transfer. UA has no control or jurisdiction over on-campus transfers. It is not uncommon for students to be admitted into one major and transfer on-campus to their more desirable choice. Committee members would like to be cognizant that there is a culture of flexibility to move around but that it should not be a “backdoor” for transfer students.

The committee believes that it is important to highlight on-campus transferring as an issue. If department choose to implement selective major criteria, there need a cohesiveness of on-campus transfers into that major. Language could include:

- “Any department who implements SMR would be expected to review and correlate the expectations of on-campus transfers.”

Likely, it will be UGC not CAE who needs to be involved in regulating on-campus transfers. Some committee members considered that there should not be limitations of on-campus transfers for freshman and sophomore students. However, perhaps more scrutiny should be given to students who try to transfer after their junior year.

The goal of these guideline is to more clearly articulate what the requirements are for selective major review and to give the departments a way to implement academic criteria without having to do so because of resource limitations.

The committee discussed making the following points clearer:

1. The purpose of the guidelines is to give a clear pathways to implementing selective major criteria. Currently, some departments are operating without written policies or old polices which makes it difficult to discuss or review SMR and transfer admissions.
2. There are numerical reasons/resource limitations and academic reasons for wanting impacted review.
3. It should be made clear that as long as departments are doing work for SMR they should have ability to have input in ranking criteria.
4. It needs to be clear that that reason for these guidelines is to ensure admitted students have academic success and impediments to timely graduation are removed. The committee wants to ensure that students do not have to prolong their
time to graduation but, within reason, do not want to force a student to leave if they are still learning and interested in taking class.

5. Comments were made about implementing numerical caps and ensuring target setting is manageable at the campus level. There can be pressure to increase revenue and numbers which can augment space or resource issues.
   a. Language for Recommendation 1: “Resource or enrollment concerns can be brought up to the department chair or the dean. These decisions need to be made with clear consideration of resources.”
   b. Request should not be made by the Dean

Committee members discussed that there needs to consideration of URMs. A comment should be included in the document that states, “the intent of this policy is not to impact accessibility or diversity, and if there is such an impact, the process needs to be reviewed.”

Jon will to draft background information that explains why the policy and guidelines are being suggested.

Dar Hunter suggested that departmental websites could more clearly specify what students needs to do for them to be successful on campus. UA will look at who is driving the link from the UA page to the majors’ information. UA will also look at their website to see if there is anything that can be clearer in regards to transfer admissions.

**Action:** Rena will edit the Admissions Input Documents. Jon will do draft the background information on the policy.

Rena/Sierra will post the document as soon as possible. One week will be allowed for comments or concerns to be submitted through ASIS. A ballot will be conducted the following week.

**Next Meeting:** June 2, 2016 from 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in Mrak Hall (Exact Room TBD)