Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Friday, October 9, 2015
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary

Present: Rena Zieve (Chair), Nilesh Gaikwad, Carlos Jackson, Alissa Kendall, Jon Rossini, Catherine Puckering, Walter Robinson, Darlene Hunter, Sierra Feldmann (Analyst)

1. Introductions

Committee members introduced themselves.

2. Committee Priorities for 2015-2016

Chair Zieve reviewed the committee’s priorities for 2015-2016 and noted that there is interest in these priorities outside of CAE as well.

The first priority is to look at ways to enhance faculty involvement in admissions targets. While there are times when faculty members have input through their deans, this is not always the case.

The second priority is to look at transfer admissions and ways to increase departmental involvement in the evaluation of transfer applications through selective review and/or admission by major.

Currently selective majors are from departments that have officially declared impacted status. The goal would be to create a process for selective admissions to majors that do not want to go through the steps of gaining impacted status.

For impacted status, D. Hunter noted that currently if departments want to be declared impacted they must submit a proposal through their FEC, and if the proposal is approved, it is then sent to Undergraduate Admission (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.

W. Robinson recommended that any change to selective review and/or admission by major be a data informed decision. He also suggested an impact study be conducted before a decision is made to determine how this change could impact diversity, geo-demographics, etc.

D. Hunter also mentioned that pilot information on selective majors may be available for the committee to review.
**ACTION:** Sierra Feldmann will follow-up regarding potential information or data from the pilot program.

3. **Discussion of the 2015 Academic Athletics Performance Report** *(Supporting Materials on the Whiteboard in ASIS)*

Chair Zieve provided the committee with a brief synopsis as to why this report is sent to CAE. She also mentioned that both UGC and CAE are reviewing the report.

In the future, Chair Zieve would recommend that the Holistic Review (HR) information/data be included in the actual report and rather than as an appendix.

Chair Zieve also noted that the report indicated athletes with high HR scores do very well. This brought up the question of what can be done for student athletes that are admitted with low HR scores and do struggle. The conversation developed into what can be done to better support all students.

**ACTION:** CAE will work with UGC to submit a joint response regarding the 2015 Academic Athletics Performance Report.

4. **Discussion on the Request for Consultation regarding the Proposed Amendment of Senate Regulations 417 and 621** *(Supporting Materials on the Whiteboard in ASIS)*

Committee members discussed the proposed amendments and language clarifications for Senate Regulations 417 and 621. All members agreed that the proposed language was appropriate and represented the regulations’ intentions.

**ACTION:** Sierra Feldmann will draft a response to the RFC and will post the draft to the Whiteboard in ASIS for Committee Review.

5. **Discussion of the potential framing document sent to Dean’s regarding enrollment targets**

The committee will draft a potential framing document to send to Dean’s regarding enrollment targets and will confer with appropriate parties to discuss the questions.

The following points were brought up as potential questions or points to raise in the framing document:

- There is a real connection between enrollment growth and budget and resources. The difference is between the concepts of send all enrollees possible and send everyone to whom we can give them a quality education.

- If there were some limits on enrollment numbers, what would the limit be and what would the limit be based on?

- Are your students prepared as they enter UC Davis?

The committee also raised the question of as the university grows, how do we balance growth?
Next Meeting: Friday, November 13 from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in 410 Mrak Hall