Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Thursday, February 11, 2016
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

Present: Rena Zieve (Chair), Alissa Kendall, Nilesh Gaikwad, Megan Guidi, Carlos Jackson, Catherine Puckering, Brendan Livingston, Walter Robinson, Tayler Ward, Sierra Feldmann (Analyst)

Absent: Jon Rossini, Darlene Hunter, and Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 1-22-16 Meeting Summary (Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)

Committee members had no edits to the 1/22/16 meeting summary

Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 1/22/16 meeting summary

2. Update from BOARS meeting

The recent BOARS meeting included discussion on the request from the 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 (i.e., not index eligible through the statewide index that includes both GPA and SAT scores). The request appears to be motivated by the relatively high percentage of low-income, underrepresented minority, and first-generation college students among the ELC-only applicants.

For UC Davis, it is not clear if there will be much immediate impact. Currently there were 2,146 applicants from ELC and LCFF schools. In order to meet the 4% target, UC Davis would need to admit 720 of those students. If no changes were made to the admissions procedures, our campus would likely still meet that number.

UA and BIA agreed that once more information is received they would confirm with the committee if UC Davis would meet that number without making changes. If so, the committee agreed to make no mid-stream changes to admissions procedure, but to consider whether changes would be desirable for future years. If UA and BIA find any currently unforeseen problems with the numbers for this year, they will discuss that with CAE.
The possibility of having LCFF schools as a tiebreaker was discussed. Chair Zieve requested more information on how strong the potential overlap could be with currently used tiebreak criteria, including the breakdown of LCFF schools in terms of API scores.

**Action:** B. Livingston will report back to the committee with this information.

Apart from admission rates, other concerns are applicant numbers from the ELC-only group and yield of admitted students. W. Robinson brought up a report on admissions and yield for African American students that provides testimony on yield. Chair Zieve noted that the number of applicants UC-wide who are ELC-only is almost a factor of three smaller than the number who are eligible by index only, even though the index-only pool would be expected to be only slightly larger. The difference in pool size is because private schools are not included in ELC, but their students can become eligible through the statewide index.

**Action:** W. Robinson will pass the yield information to Chair Zieve so that it can be posted to ASIS for the committee’s review and information.

3. **Update from Department Chairs Luncheon**

UC Davis has a low four year graduation rate compared to many other UC campuses. Some suggest that this could be due to the number of STEM students enrolled.

A committee member mentioned that a number of students enroll in STEM fields and then transition to the non-STEM majors and that this could potentially cause students to not be able to graduate in four years.

The committee also discussed that the increased time to graduation could be caused if students miss a quarter of a course series and then have to wait a year to either start or complete that series.

The larger question is: is it the overall student population or STEM students taking longer to graduate? How should it be addressed?

Departments at all UC campuses have been asked to look at reducing the number of upper division requirements, to 45 units if possible.

At the luncheon, Chair Knoesen also asked the chairs if they have input on enrollment targets. Responses from chairs were uniformly that they had no input. Several chairs said that even their deans had no input, although in some cases the deans were at least aware of enrollment decisions and kept their chairs informed.

4. **Continued discussion of departmental input on transfer admissions**
a. Update on the Enrollment Planning Taskforce

W. Robinson believes that there are no faculty members acting as Academic Senate representatives on the Group.

*ACTION: Sierra will update the memo to Chair Knoesen.*

b. Updated Draft of Admissions and Enrollment Terms and Definitions
   *(Supporting document posted to the whiteboard)*

Committee had no comments or other concerns regarding the Terms and Definitions document.

c. Consideration of specific types of department input
   
   i. Discussion on admissions input at transfer level

The committee reviewed and discussed the “Admissions Input” document from Chair Zieve.

Point 1: No Clarifications

Point 2: Committee members agreed that UA should conduct periodic analysis to check for effects of selective admissions requirements on diversity. Nonetheless, departments would need to be involved in the matters that require case by case review of course equivalency.

The committee discussed using “extra” transfer pathways courses as a tiebreaker, if a department does not require all its transfer pathways courses in its minimum admissions criteria. The consensus was that simplicity in requirements has significant value. Courses in a transfer pathway can be required for admission at UC Davis or not required, and any which are not required should play no role in the admissions decision.

Point 3: What if a department's selective admissions criteria have significant impact on diversity? Committee members agreed that CAE should review diversity data periodically, perhaps every two years at first. CAE could choose to alert departments if their selection criteria have disparate effects on different groups.

Some committee members wanted to know if there was a way to look at this prior to moving forward. This was done earlier this year for the three departments in the selective review trial program, but it has not been carried out for the larger number of departments that already have selective admissions criteria.
Point 4: The committee favored controlling resource limitations within majors by changing numerical targets for those majors, rather than by adjusting prerequisite and GPA cutoffs. The latter method is currently used within L&S. UA personnel pointed out that the campus-wide targets are already very complicated with mainly college- and division-level targets. The deans' knowledge of their individual departments' needs and limitations should factor into how the campus-wide targets are set, but it does not address uneven demand for majors within a unit. It may make the most sense if after the college- or division-level targets are known, the deans can subdivide their targets into targets for particular departments.

**Action:** Sierra will update and format the “Admissions Input” document for the committee’s review.

Next Meeting: March 10, 2016 from 2-4 p.m. in 410 Mrak