Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Thursday, March 10, 2016
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

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

Absent: Catherine Puckering and Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 2-11-16 Meeting Summary (Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)

Committee members had no edits to the 2/10/16 meeting summary
Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 2/10/16 meeting summary

2. Update from BOARS meeting

The recent BOARS meeting included continued discussion of the previous request from UCOP to specify that 4% of the California residents offered admission at each campus should be students from LCFF schools who are ELC eligible only. Concerns were raised on how the whole process had driven. Of note, BOARS is not aware of how the 4% was determined or the degree to which it is a firm numerical requirement.

BOARS also discussed implementing a statement of consultation that will be incorporated in meetings. Campus faculty representatives will be asked to provide updates on admissions from their campus each meeting and should include any planned changes to their admissions process.

3. Continued Discussion on ELC only and LCFF+

Brendan Livingston provided the committee with information on the breakdown of applications and the admittance of students by ELC, LCFF, LCFF+.

To participate in ELC, high schools have to submit representative student records. This can be a burden, especially for under-resourced high schools. Even if a student is ranked in the top 9% of graduating seniors at such schools, their application would not be evaluated to determine that they were ELC eligible. The committee was also concerned on hearing that a student's parents must approve the submission of the student's record for
ELC; this could penalize students with uninvolved parents. However, Brendan Livingston confirmed that the approval is only needed for the data determining the high school’s eligibility. Each student from a participating high school is evaluated for ELC status based on their application, with no additional parental consent necessary.

In addition, the committee discussed possible changes in the tiebreaker to take into account the LCFF+ schools. The tiebreaker already awards one point to all ELC students. Chair Zieve pointed out that the tiebreaker should not award points specifically to the ELC-only plus LCFF+ group targeted by UCOP, since this would rank ELC-only students above students from identical schools and backgrounds who achieved higher grades and test scores and were both ELC and statewide eligible. The tiebreaker also awards one point to students from low API schools. Brandon Livingston's data show that 80% of LCFF+ schools are also low API. One suggestion is to award one tiebreaker point to a student whose school is low API and/or LCFF+. Before making a decision, the committee will be reviewing:

- Students in the 20% of LCFF+ schools that don’t have low API
- Additional breakdown of the connections between low API and LCFF+ schools

**ACTION:** Brendan Livingston will provide more information on the overlap of LCFF+ and low API schools and who would benefit from LCFF+ tiebreaker.

4. Continued discussion of departmental input on transfer admissions
   
   a. Consideration of specific types of department input (*Supporting document posted to the whiteboard*)

This admissions input document will likely be sent with the document of the admissions terms to Chair Knoesen for his review and input.

One goal of this admissions input document is to identify ways departments can restrict admissions. As previously discussed, possible reasons for suspended or restricted admissions include:

- Resource Limitations – teaching facilities, professors, etc.
- Academic Limitations – selective criteria

One member voiced concerns that requiring completion of particular classes before transfer would limit students' freedom to explore many possible majors. However, transfer students already have limited freedom because of prerequisites for upper-level courses, the lack of an undeclared major option for transfer students, and the cap on total units taken before graduation.

Members agreed that there should be significant barriers to implementing limitations on majors to ensure that this action is taken seriously and with a well-thought out plan.
Chair Zieve welcomes all input on this document prior to it being sent to Chair Knoesen. The conversation will continue on ASIS and through email.

Next Meeting: To Be Determined