Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Friday, January 22, 2016
2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
408 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

Present: Rena Zieve (Chair), Alissa Kendall, Jon Rossini, Darlene Hunter, Brendan Livingston, Walter Robinson, Sierra Feldmann (Analyst)

Absent: Nilesh Gaikwad, Megan Guidi, Carlos Jackson, Catherine Puckering, Maxine Umeh, and Tayler Ward

1. Approval of the 12-11-15 Meeting Summary (Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)

Committee members had no edits to the 12/11/15 meeting summary

Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 12/11/15 meeting summary

2. Update from BOARS meeting
   • Honors

BOARS liked CAE’s suggestion that if a school proposes an honors class without an equivalent non-honors course, the school should explain why.

   • CID

The consensus of BOARS was that, as far as the committee could discern, it would be beneficial if UC had more input on transfer credit.

   • Statement on Calculus

A number of campuses were concerned that the statement went too far in the way of discouraging students from taking calculus. Also a few campuses specifically look for calculus for applicants to their Engineering programs. BOARS members are going to modify the language of the statement.

   • Conversation on Transfer Pathways

Some departments have concerns that courses currently required for admissions are not in the transfer pathways agreement. Departments have also voiced concerns that if UCs do not require certain classes then community colleges will stop offering that lower level
class. Undergraduate Admissions confirmed that there is a way to encourage applicants to take those classes even if they are not required.

The Committee discussed how are students selected when there are multiple students who have taken the transfer pathways courses and have met the minimum grade criteria. Members agreed that using additional specific major-related courses as a ranking mechanism among Transfer Pathway students would not be appropriate and would be unfair to students who thought that the transfer pathway included all courses necessary for admission. However, assessing the rigor of a student's coursework in a more general way might be acceptable. The committee discussed the possibility of comprehensive review for transfer students.

Members agreed that it would be helpful for Undergraduate Admissions to draft potential solutions to the ranking question or options for transfer comprehensive review.

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

Members discussed the term “impacted.”

As a campus, we have selective admissions, which means that not all applicants receive an admissions offer.

Every campus refers to certain majors as being “selective.” At UC Davis, the term “selective” is used externally, but the on-campus term for the same majors is “impacted,” probably because this was the term used in the College of Letters & Science’s “Impacted Majors: Guidelines for Restricting Student Access” initially approved in 1984. Any college or major with impacted status has selective review for transfer applications.

Impacted majors are required by L&S to demonstrate resource limitations. Other colleges often have no explicit rules on impacted majors but in some cases have in practice adopted those of L&S.

The committee discussed writing a recommendation with a campus wide definition of impacted majors. One committee member also suggested working with the Academic Senate Chair and other AS committees to work with those colleges and majors that have impacted status but no documentation. For example, the College of Engineering and the College of Biological Sciences are impacted at the college level. However, this there is a lack of documentation identifying these colleges as impacted.

Currently if majors or departments want to implement selective review for transfer applicants, they first need to go through the process of obtaining impacted status. It was agreed that there is a possible need for a pathway to implementing selective review and
selective criteria without having resource limitations, but rather for academic preparation reasons. This process may be able to be done through the Faculty Executive Committees.

Also under the present system, impacted majors do not necessarily have admission by major. Thus in L&S a major that demonstrates resource limitations does not have a separate admissions target for transfer students in that major; there remains a single overall admissions target number for the division. The major controls its enrollment numbers only indirectly by imposing academic criteria on its transfer students such as preparatory coursework or a high minimum transfer GPA, with a two-year time lag for implementation.

If CAE does write a recommendation with a campus wide definition of impacted majors, members suggested including language that advises colleges to monitor students that are entering the major and/or college and that the need of impacted status should be monitored. The committee also wants to differentiate between resource impacted and preparation impacted.

It needs to be made clear to departments that if they want to have selective criteria they will become a selective major review and will be expected to complete the review of the applications.

4. Continued discussion of departmental input on transfer admissions

   a. Update from January Council of Associate Deans meeting

Chair Zieve attended a portion of the January 4 CAD meeting where Transfer Pathways was discussed. UCOP has confirmed that a major with a Transfer Pathway cannot require classes outside the pathway for admission. Some of the Associate Deans had not realized this, and they have concerns about the implications for UC Davis majors that currently require courses outside their Transfer Pathway. Courses outside the pathway may be required for graduation.

   b. Update on the framing document

Chair Zieve reported that Provost Hexter had concerns about passing CAE’s framing document to department chairs. As a result, the committee continued to discuss ways to foster the departmental engagement in enrollment management. One method discussed was to invite the Deans to a meeting and inquire what their enrollment plans entail.

The committee also discussed the Enrollment Planning Taskforce that is currently underway. Members agreed that it is imperative that CAE is represented on this taskforce.
**Action Item:** The analyst will ask the Executive Director and Academic Senate Chair if the Senate was consulted about the Enrollment Planning Taskforce. The Analyst will also begin the process of requesting the committee’s representation on the Taskforce.

Undergraduate Admissions discussed how considerations for on-campus transfers overlap those for admission. Some departments may be able to control the size of their undergraduate population by limiting on-campus transfers. Also when a unit has widely disparate standards for admission and on-campus transfer, students are more likely to game the system by applying to one unit but planning to transfer after admission.

c. Consideration of specific types of department input

Chair Zieve hopes that by the end of the academic year CAE will have a document with recommended ways to facilitate departmental involvement. The document will need to make clear that if departments want to implement selective criteria or selective major review, they must be willing to put in time and effort to implement the review. Checks should also be done as to whether selective criteria impact diversity, gender, etc. Such checks should consider only whether selective review significantly changes the make-up of the department's transfer population. If selective review reduces the total number of transfer students in a major, then presumably additional students would be admitted elsewhere. Determining who these students would be is impossible. Furthermore, that new population of students could have a very different composition. For example, numbers from the previous meeting showed that “replacing” transfer students by freshmen increases the number of women in STEM fields, simply because women make up a larger fraction of the pool for STEM freshmen than for STEM transfer students.

Next Meeting: February 11, 2016 from 2-4 p.m. in 410 Mrak