Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Friday, December 11, 2015
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

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

Absent: Megan Guidi, Nilesh Gaikwad, Carlos Jackson, and Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 11-13-15 Meeting Summary

Committee members had no edits to the 11/13/15 meeting summary
Action: the committee voted unanimously to approve the 11/13/15 meeting summary

2. Update from BOARS meeting

a. Freshman application

The freshman application is currently being redesigned. The goal is to eliminate augmented review, in which campuses solicit additional information from some students, by including the desired information in the original application. Under the present augmented review system some students are asked to answer very similar extra questions for multiple campuses.

BOARS requested that the representatives report back to their committees for feedback on the proposed redesign. CAE supported the proposal and had no concerns.

b. C-ID (Supporting Materials on the Whiteboard in ASIS)

C-ID (Course Identification Number System) is a common course numbering system for CA higher education that allows for intersegmental curriculum alignment based on course “descriptors.” The goal is to assist community colleges (CC) in identifying courses and labeling them with the same C-ID number, allowing CSUs and UCs to make uniform decisions on transfer credit.

This is a two-step process. The first is to determine if a CC course is approved for UC credit. The second-step is to determine if the course corresponds to particular course at each UC. Currently, this is done on a course by course basis.
A committee member brought up the question of transferability versus articulation through C-ID.

**Action:** Members can review the documents further and submit any comments or questions via ASIS prior to the January BOARS meetings.

**Action:** Chair Zieve will bring up the committee’s question of transferability versus articulation and any other questions members submit at the BOARS meeting.

c. **Role of calculus in admissions (Supporting Materials on the Whiteboard in ASIS)**

BOARS has been asked to make a statement on the impact of Calculus on UC Admissions. BOARS members were asked to consult with their Divisional committees.

CAE members voiced concerns regarding the last sentence of the fourth paragraph and agreed that, at the very least, this statement should be moved to the fifth paragraph following this statement: “Every UC campus admits a significant fraction of its applicants with only the minimum mathematics background.”

The committee also suggested that BOARS consider changing the statement to read something to the effect of, “While the rigor of coursework is considered, poor performance in an advanced classes may demonstrate weakened application.”

**Action:** Chair Zieve will bring the committee’s recommendations up at the next BOARS meeting.

d. **Honor A-G Guidelines (Supporting Materials on the Whiteboard in ASIS)**

Changes were made recently so that courses taken in 10th grade could be taken as honors. However, there were some subject areas where it was impossible to designate the course as honors, e.g. English and Foreign language, because of subject guidelines written to match the previous rule that only 11th and 12th grade classes could have an honors designation. BOARS proposes revising the honors A-G guidelines to remedy this situation.

Another proposed revision is to update the current guideline so that when a school offers an honors course it is highly recommended but not required that the school offer an equivalent non-honors course at the same frequency.

The committee agrees that the previous rule, which required schools to offer equivalent non-honors courses, could cause hardship for schools that do not have the resources to offer two classes. However, the committee is concerned that by not recommending that
the equivalent non-honors course be offered a revision could disadvantage students who would not take the honors class but would take a parallel non-honors course.

The committee agrees with the proposed revision stating that it is highly recommended for schools to offer an equivalent non-honors course. The committee also suggests that a provision be included in the guidelines to require schools to justify why a parallel course is not offered.

**Action:** Chair Zieve will make this suggestion at the next BOARS meeting.

3. Continued discussion of departmental input on admissions

Brendan Livingston presented different data from “trial run” of departmental selective review and/or admission by major to review the impact on gender. Selective review would not affect the gender ratio among transfer students in the departments that participated in the trial. If selective review led to a decrease in transfer admits and a corresponding increase in freshman admits in similar fields, the result would be a higher fraction of entering female students. This is in keeping with the national trend that STEM attrition is higher for women than for men; women are a larger fraction of STEM majors at the freshman level than at the junior level.

a. Update from Council of Associate Deans meeting

The Council of Associate Deans had invited the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment to attend their December meeting to discuss enrollment management. Chair Zieve and J. Rossini attended the meeting.

Engineering Associate Dean stated COE accepts 15% of transfer applicants and that they are content with transfer students.

It was reported that students have been known to “game the system” by applying to one major and then pursuing an on-campus transfer into another department.

The College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences currently has two selective majors.

During the meeting, some individuals voiced concerns that Selective Major Review is a time commitment that cannot currently be managed in some departments.

b. Continued discussion of specifics means of departmental engagement

(Supporting Materials under “Proposals for Department Engagement” folder on the Whiteboard in ASIS)

Selective Major Reviews allows departments to review applications and flag each as:
1. Yes
2. Maybe – e.g. took course but got c instead of b
3. No (The department must explain why they do not accept an applicant.)

Undergraduate Admissions then reviews all of the applications to determine if they meet the University requirements and could potentially be accepted into the applicant’s second major choice.

Committee members agreed that departments that require completion of particular lower-level classes or a minimum GPA in such classes for transfer admission must be willing to provide the extra labor for reviewing the applications. They also agreed that, with the approval of the division/college dean, a department with more qualified applicants than their admissions target could be allowed to select ranking criteria other than overall GPA. If the criteria require significant extra work in evaluation, then the department must be willing to contribute the necessary effort. Some check on how criteria selected affect diversity should be included; for example, prioritizing students who have completed a class that is offered at only a few community colleges could unfairly disadvantage other applicants.

**Action:** in future meetings, the committee will continue discussion of the balance between department, division/college, and University needs and interests in transfer admissions

Next Meeting: January 2016 – Exact Date To Be Determined