Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Friday, November 13, 2015
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

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

Absent: Catherine Puckering, Walter Robinson, Maxine Umeh

1. Approval of the 10-12-15 Meeting Summary *(Draft Meeting Summary is under the Meetings Tab in ASIS)*

D. Hunter had the following clarification to the 10-12-15 meeting summary: ‘For impacted status… if the proposal is approved, it is then sent to Undergraduate Admissions (UA) “with the stipulated selective major lower division criteria (course(s) and/or course series, course(s) or course series GPA, overall transferable GPA, etc.). UA then implements a two-year notification process to CA Community Colleges and the general public of the major’s “selective” status, and provides the specific selective major criteria. The impacted status of a major can be immediately implemented for continuing undergraduate students.”’

The committee unanimously approved the meeting summary with the above change.

2. Introductions

Committee members introduced themselves.

3. Update on UC Admissions from Undergraduate Admissions

The University is becoming more selective, admitting a smaller fraction of applicants at both freshman and transfer levels. Nonetheless, SATs scores of admitted students decreased in 2015, which may be related to the national trend of decreasing SAT scores. The Yield Rate (22%) has been fairly stable for last five years. For transfer students, there are more applications being submitted, but the number of admitted students has stayed consistent. This has resulted in a lower admittance rate. The number of enrolled California freshman and transfer students decreased.

This year BIA geocoded admitted and enrolled students and is considering how to use this information in the aggregate i.e. targeted outreach to the areas where a large number of admitted students chose not to enroll at UC Davis.
4. Update on UC system growth

The University of California will be enrolling 5000 additional students in the future. Enrollment targets are currently being divided among all of the campuses.

This means that UC Davis’s 2020 initiative growth is going to be accelerated and that there will be an increased need for professors and staff to support the increase in students. In the short term, the growth will be transfer students. BIA is working on scenarios on how this growth will occur.

One CAE member voiced that more access to the UC System is good but could become complex. There will need to be a strong voice to hold everyone accountable as to what is best for the students.

5. Discussion of the drafted framing document sent to Dean’s regarding enrollment targets
(Supporting Materials under “Framing Document” folder on the Whiteboard in ASIS)

Chair Zieve reported to the committee that she sent the draft framing document to Sue Ebeler from the Council of Associate Deans.

The committee agreed the document was clear and gives a way for department to record information on enrollment targets and any concerns that may come up. The committee also agreed that the committee would like to see the resulting reports for informational purposes only.

**Action:** Sierra will draft memo to Andre to be forwarded to the Vice Provost & Dean for Undergraduate Education requesting that the framing document be sent to the departments when the request for enrollment targets are sent.

6. Update on departmental input on admissions

   a. Review of the data from “trial run” of departmental selective review and/or admission by major (Supporting Materials under “Selective Review Information” folder on the Whiteboard in ASIS)

The committee reviewed the data from “trial run” of departmental selective review and/or admission by major.

D. Hunter posed the question if the departments’ goals had been met in this trial process and for those who went through the process would they actually want to implement it.

One member questioned if the data from the “trial run” showed that student diversity would be affected with departmental selective review and/or admission by major. B. Livingston indicated that it could be affected by a small amount in either direction, but that it would really depend on the admittance pool of the year. The diversity of 100-student bands of freshman admits has large oscillations. Hence, if poorly prepared transfer students were replaced by freshman admits, the effect on diversity would depend strongly on the exact location of the admissions cut line.
CAE members also agreed that there should be consideration on the gender implications selective review and/or admission by major could have, especially in STEM majors. Brendan Livingston reported that he could run the data to determine this information.

The committee stated that there would need to be further discussion as to if this process could be implemented for all departments that want it or if it could only be implemented for impacted majors.

One CAE member questioned if the transfer student taskforce is still in effect? There is work being done at the OCP Student Affairs level, but D. Hunter will ask W. Robinson about the status of the taskforce.

**Action:** The committee will look for further data on the gender implications of selective review/admissions by major.

b. Invitation to attend upcoming Council of Associate Deans meeting

Chair Zieve extended an invitation to whole committee to attend the Council of Associate Deans meeting on December 7 at 8:30.

**Action:** Sierra will send the committee more information as it becomes available.

c. Discussion of specifics means of departmental engagement (*Supporting Materials under “Proposals for Department Engagement” folder on the Whiteboard in ASIS*)

The committee reviewed the proposal for departmental engagement identifying how departments would go about the implementation if they choose and if departments cannot implement these ideas now, how does that change?

Item 1.a.: To updated information on ASSIST, they should work through the representative in the department. Updating information on ASSIST can be done at the department level and does not to be approved at the college level. Cynthia Bevec works with the faculty representatives in each department.

Items 2 a-d: We are the only UC who doesn’t not require all undergrad pre-requisites before enrolling and no other campus is doing TAGs like UC Davis. One UC campus has a requirement that if transfers do not have the necessary prerequisites they are admitted to a pre-major. D. Hunter mentioned that UC Davis has had pre-majors and found that if students are admitted to “pre-major” they would go to the school where they were admitted into a major rather than being admitted as a “pre-major” at UC Davis. The committee agreed not to pursue a pre-major option. There is also a policy that does not permit transfers to be admitted undeclared.

Items 3 a-g: D. Hunter recommended a potential sub-committee to discuss these potential charges to the TAG agreements.
One committee member mentioned that there are many historical practices that are not necessarily documented. The question is if FECs are the ones who make those decisions on admissions/enrollment. Should CAE these decisions be made by the FECs, steering committees, or CAE? How much autonomy does the department get, and what checks should be at the college and university levels.

**Action:** Sierra to research the status of the enrollment management taskforce and who gave FEC the author to make decision on impacted majors, etc.

Next Meeting: Friday, December 11 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in 410 Mrak Hall