To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Senate Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid submits the following report for 2000-2001.

I. ADMISSIONS

As in past years, the Committee devoted most of its attention to admissions. At the beginning of the year there were five major pathways for admission to the University: eligibility in the statewide context, eligibility in the local context, and admission by transfer, examination or exception. A brief summary of these pathways has been posted on the CAFA website (www.senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/). Interested faculty may also wish to consult Stanley Williamson’s informative “Primer on Admissions Terminology and Practice” at www.senate.ucsc.edu/cafa/Admin.TerminologyJuly01.htm.

A. Dual Admissions

The committee provided feedback to the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) concerning their proposal for a new pathway for admission to UC, Dual Admissions (www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2001/dualadmissions.pdf). This program was designed to complement the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program, which grants UC eligibility to the top 4 percent of each high school class. To be eligible for Dual Admissions, a student must be in the top 4 to 12.5 percent of their high school class at the end of their junior year. These students will be offered admission at a specific UC campus, provided that they enroll in a community college and successfully complete the requirements for transfer to UC.

The Dual Admissions Program has two major goals. The first is to increase the diversity of the student body by encouraging applications from high schools that send relatively few students to UC. The second is to increase the number of students that transfer from community colleges to UC as required by the Partnership Agreement with Gov. Davis. CAFA supported these goals.
and noted that UCSC has administered a similar program (albeit on a much smaller scale) since the fall of 2000.

CAFA identified several potential problems associated the Dual Admissions Program. Of greatest concern, dual admissions mandates additional counseling for students before they transfer to UC, leading CAFA to question whether sufficient resources will be available to administer this program. The committee also felt that students eligible for Dual Admissions might devote less time to their studies in their senior year of high school, rather than striving to become UC-eligible via traditional pathways. Finally, the committee was concerned that Dual Admissions might lead to the inequities in the treatment of community college students who plan to transfer to UC.

The Dual Admissions plan formulated by BOARS was approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in May. The Regents approved the plan in July, with the understanding that the faculty would reconsider the minimum grade point average required for transfer as well as the resources necessary to support the program.

**B. High School Honors**

CAFA also considered changes to the eligibility requirements for the High School Honors Program. This program allows qualified local high school seniors to take UCSC academic courses and earn up to ten credits per quarter. To qualify for this program, a student must have a grade point average of at least 3.7 in A-F subjects and earn a minimum of 1110 on the SAT1 or composite score of 24 on the ACT. Students who chose to remain at UCSC following after high school graduation need not reapply for admission. CAFA was concerned that the SAT1/ACT requirement forced students to take these exams much earlier than their peers, which could adversely affect subsequent applications to other schools. To correct this problem, CAFA decided to allow minimum scores of 60 on both the verbal and math portions of the PSAT/NMSQT to satisfy the examination requirement for this program. CAFA also concluded that it would not require the SAT II examination results as a qualification for this program.

**C. Admission by exception**
During the past year, several faculty members expressed concern that the admissions office does not give sufficient consideration to exceptional students who are not UC-eligible, including “home-schooled” students. In response to these concerns, CAFA solicited input from Associate Vice Chancellor Michael Thompson and Associate Director of Admissions Michael McCawley. They do not believe that significant numbers of highly qualified students are denied admission to our campus. They stressed that home-schooled students with high SAT scores can be admitted by examination alone, while other qualified but UC-ineligible students can be admitted by exception. They also expressed willingness to pay closer attention to files brought to their attention by faculty members, with the understanding that they would follow guidelines established by CAFA regarding admission by exception.

D. SP-1 and tiered admissions

On May 16, the Regents adopted a resolution rescinding SP-1 (RE-28; for complete text, see www.ucop.edu/ucophome/commserv/access/propres.htm). In addition to banning the consideration of race, gender and ethnicity in the admission of students to the University of California, a result of SP-1 was the establishment of an admissions policy that mandated each UC campus to admit between 50 and 75% of students based solely on specified academic criteria. This group of students is commonly referred to as "tier 1". The remaining "tier 2" students are admitted based on academic criteria and other factors, including disadvantaged circumstances, special talents and extracurricular accomplishments. The use of tiered admissions has been controversial. Some faculty favor the use of simple admissions criteria that can be readily quantified, while others believe that the system of tiered admissions mandated by SP-1 forces more selective UC campuses to choose between highly qualified applicants based on trivial differences in their grade point averages and SAT scores.

Although affirmative action is still prohibited by Proposition 209, the Regents decision to rescind SP-1 provided an opportunity to reconsider the use of "tiers" in admissions. In their resolution, the Regents noted that "on February 15, 2001, President Atkinson requested that the Academic Senate conduct a comprehensive review of the University’s admissions policies, including, among other issues, the use of quantitative formulas, and provide recommendations to the Regents." The Regents also "reaffirmed that the Academic Senate shall determine the conditions
for admission to the University" and "anticipated that the admissions review initiated by President Atkinson, and currently underway by the Academic Senate, will be completed in calendar year 2001."

In response to the Regent’s request, Academic Council Chair Michael Cowan asked each campus to conduct an accelerated review of admissions policies, including the "tier1/tier2" system, during the summer of 2001. CAFA had serious reservations about considering this important issue during the summer, when most faculty are engaged in research and other scholarly activities and opportunities for consultation with other Senate members are limited. Indeed, the majority of CAFA members were unable to meet over the summer due to prior commitments. Exacerbating this situation, Zack Schlesinger suffered injuries in a bicycle accident that prevented him from continuing as the UCSC representative to BOARS. CAFA therefore asked COC Chair Shelly Errington to identify a faculty member who would be able and willing to represent our campus on BOARS during the summer. Karen McNally generously agreed to serve in this capacity; a brief summary of her work immediately follows this report.

II. FINANCIAL AID

No issues pertaining to financial aid were brought to the attention of the Committee.

III. RECRUITING

CAFA discussed a variety of options for increasing the quality and diversity of our student body, and concluded that the campus needs to improve its recruiting efforts. Although the committee was impressed with the quality of brochures provided by the Admissions Office, an informal review of the Admissions web page (www.admissions.ucsc.edu) revealed numerous problems with the information provided to prospective students and their families. Much of the information on the campus web pages is confusing, incomplete or out of date. The Admissions Office relies on divisional and departmental web pages to inform students about the educational opportunities available at UCSC, even though the majority of these pages were not designed to appeal to high school students. As a result, our web-based recruiting material does not provide a
compelling reason for students to choose UCSC over other institutions. To solve this problem it will be necessary to improve communication between the faculty, who are responsible for our academic programs, and the Admissions Office, which knows how to market these programs to prospective students. CAFA expressed its willingness to work with Associate Vice Chancellor Michael Thompson to improve communication with faculty and improve our efforts to recruit students via the campus website.

Respectfully submitted.
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