Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Thursday, April 14, 2016
11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
408 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

Present: Rena Zieve (Chair), Alissa Kendall, Darlene Hunter, Carlos Jackson, Ebony Lewis, Brendan Livingston, Walter Robinson, Jon Rossini, Tayler Ward, Sierra Feldmann (Analyst)

Absent: Nilesh Gaikwad, Megan Guidi, Catherine Puckering, and Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 3-10-16 Meeting Summary (Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)

Committee members had no edits to the 3/10/16 meeting summary

Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 3/10/16 meeting summary

2. Update from BOARS meeting

- The recent BOARS meeting included discussion on the audit report.
- BOARS discussed a recent idea from UCOP to ask about legacy status of parents on applications. BOARS members were unsupportive of this idea.

3. Information from Undergraduate Admissions:
   a. Data from departments/colleges that are currently participating in selective review

Brendan Livingston presented data from departments/colleges that are currently participating in selective review. Data from the last four years were used. Brendan defined an "initial pool" of applicants who met the GPA cutoff for their major (e.g., 2.8 in L&S or 3.2 in CoE). He then selected those students who had also completed the required courses and met any applicable grade requirements for those courses. He compared the fraction of students who were women, first-generation, low-income and underrepresented minority between the two groups.

His review found no effect on the fraction of women, first-generation, or low-income students. Of the 23 majors that currently have SMR, the majority also showed no statistically significant effect for URMs. (While the effects were not statistically significant for individual majors, they may have been when the different majors were viewed together.) However, three majors did show a statistically significant drop in URMs, 7-9%, from the initial pool to the pool of students meeting the SMR requirements. There was consensus that, if there are ever these results, the process needs
to be reviewed to understand how the difference arises. Brendan noted that after controlling for the applicants' community colleges, the SMR criteria no longer altered the fraction of URMs in the pool. He has not found any single course that accounts for the bulk of the discrepancy. He also has no explanation for why SMR impacts URMs but not first-generation or low-income students, despite the large overlap in these three groups.

**FOLLOW-UP**: CAE would like to see further analysis:
- If the pool is large enough, subdivide URM students depending on whether they are also first-generation and/or low-income.
- Any information that would identify why this occurs in specific majors
  - Was there a change in policy over the years that caused an increase in the URM% rejection rate?
- Results from lowering the GPA cutoff to 2.8 for the engineering majors, since the higher GPA cutoff is itself part of the SMR criteria
- Similar analysis of TAG students
- Comparison to profile of the students actually admitted
- List of all SMR majors with brief summary information, even those where SMR did not have a statistically significant effect on the pool composition

**b. Review of the profile of the ELC/LCFF+ students**

Brendan Livingston presented information on the profile of the ELC/LCFF+ students. The conclusion was that including LCFF+ schools with an API of 6 or higher in the “low-API” tiebreak point would have no effect on the number of ELC-only admits from these schools. There were 276 ELC-only applicants from relevant schools, none of whom were close enough to the admissions cut that an extra tiebreak point would have changed the result. The tiebreak point would have slightly increased the number of non-ELC admits from LCFF+ schools, which would have slightly increased the number of low-income and first-generation students.

The committee discussed whether the tiebreaker should be adjusted. CAE agreed that no action should be taken at this time. However, future committees should monitor the LCFF+/ELC situation. UA notes that API data are becoming outdated, and at some point that part of the tiebreaker will need adjustment. Using LCFF information instead may be an option.

**Action**: Analyst include note in the Annual Report that CAE should monitor LCFF+/ELC in the future to determine if changing the current tiebreaker is necessary

**c. Review of number of students staying in their major for both Freshman and Transfer students**

As would be expected, more freshman than transfer students are transferring out of their majors. For the majors examined, typically about half of freshmen changed majors within
3 years and about 20% of transfer students changed majors within 1 year. Psychology stood out for unusually low transfer rates, 29% and 9% for its freshmen and transfers, respectively. The committee felt that the high transfer rates did not justify expansion of admission by major at the freshman level. Committee members were curious if transfer students who transfer into other majors are taking longer to graduate and what are they transferring into? Undergraduate Council did related work last year, focusing mainly on freshmen who entered in “undeclared” majors.

The committee also discussed the Four Year Degree Completion Report from 2014-2015,

ACTION: Analyst ask UGC Analyst about sharing the Four Year Degree Completion Report prepared BIA/Student Affairs from 2014-2015.

ACTION: Analyst post PowerPoint from Brendan’s presentation.

1. Continued discussion of departmental input on transfer admissions and the “selection” document (Supporting document posted to the whiteboard)

Chair Zieve notified the committee that she shared the document with the Council of Associate Deans, which brought up two points:
   i. How does this impact on-campus transfers?
   ii. Members were concerned about the statement that cutoff GPAs should not be allowed in Selective Major Review.

1. Chair Zieve is concerned that a GPA cutoff could prevent a major from meeting enrollment targets, and therefore falls outside the purview of the Academic Senate. Using GPA or specific course grades to rank students should be allowed.

The committee discussed the potential need for departments to justify why Selective Major Review is being implemented.

Action: Jon Rossini volunteered to send sample language to this effect.

During the discussion of the document, committee members noted:

- For Recommendation #1: It should be noted that:
  o The dean can deny the department chair’s request to subdivide the unit's overall enrollment target.
  o The FEC could bring up concerns in consultation with the department chair or dean.

- For Recommendation #3:
  o The statement needs to be changed to “departments ‘must’ waive specific course requirement for students.”
• For Recommendation #4:
  o Committee members voiced that, if this recommendation stays in the document, it would be important to make this expectation clear to applicants and be fully transparent of which course grades will be considered.
  ▪ Chair Zieve did not want to enumerate the courses and exact formula to give the departments flexibility.
  o Committee members were concerned that using grades in specific courses for all or part of the admissions ranking would disadvantage students whose Community Colleges did not offer the class.
  o Possible for recommendations 3 and/or 4 should be reworded to make clear that in such a situation the course must be waived for admissions purposes, and the student must be treated as having obtained a sufficiently high grade in the course.

Members will continue to discuss this document via email. Once a draft is agreed upon, it will be sent to Academic Senate Chair Knoesen.

Next Meeting: May 5, 2016 from 11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. in Mrak Hall (Exact Room TBD)