

Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
Minutes
May 29, 2009

Present: Richard Hughey, Faye Crosby, Juan Poblete, Donald Wittman, Scott Oliver, Gabe Elkaim, Michael Morrissey (SUA), Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO)

Absent: Rob Coe, Bruce Cooperstein, Raoul Birnbaum, Maritoni Medrano (SUA), Michelle Romero (SUA), Amy Weaver (NSTF)

Guests: Associate Director Michael McCawley, AVC Michelle Whittingham

Announcements

Subcommittees will submit drafts for CAFA's annual report by the July 1.

The revised April 24 minutes were approved after the addition of a sentence.

Cal Grants may be eliminated due to the state budget crisis. Without these grants students would have to borrow \$16k per year making it not feasible for many students to come here. If the grants were eliminated this year, we would have to take away \$1,500 (a rough estimate) from about half of our students, most of whom are from the middle and lower middle-class. The state Cal Grants pay for registration and education fees. The elimination of the grants would force UC to allocate much more funding to the new Blue & Gold (financial aid) Opportunity Plan.

Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

CAFA discussed the BOARS position paper on non-resident enrollment. There is the perception that some campuses are using non-resident admits to shore up financial and budgetary considerations. UC Berkeley produced guidelines which were used as a basis for this document. It states the principle that this method should not be used as a budgetary tool and that UC should privilege state residents. This clarifies what capacity is and the nature of admits targets on undergraduate classes (at the graduate level, it is mostly international). Undergraduates cannot qualify for residency for three years.

Thinking about UCSC admissions, the policy will not significantly affect our campus, even though some members of CAFA support having a larger international and out-of-state community to bring additional perspectives to the campus. For these members, the central issue is one of diversity. The systemwide issue becomes a financial one depending on whether UC is considered a single system or a confederation of 10. If out-of-state tuition is held at the campus level there is no "kickback" to the system as with resident enrollments, there will be differential impacts for campuses according to how much they increase non-resident enrollment.

If campus or UC targets for non-residents grow, will this affect the ability for residents to access to the university? An argument was made that non-residents do bring in extra money. Financial aid is not available to non-residents so they must pay full tuition. The Office of the President (OP) considers the non-resident targets to be over-enrollments therefore bringing in additional funds to the campus. At UCSC, non-resident admits are only about two percent of our enrolled class. They are neither pursued nor discouraged.

CAFA agreed that the document was uncontroversial, and it was endorsed. CAFA also agreed that a systemwide effort to recruit non-residents, though recruiters represent the entire UC system, would be a positive change.

Comprehensive Review Straw Votes

A motion was made to hold the straw vote on the proposals after a specified period of. The motion was seconded and passed.

A second motion was made to not vote on any proposals today. This motion did not get a second.

A member felt that a good argument had not been made about the need to change the admissions policy, that there has been an assumption that the system needs to be fixed. Two of the proposed measures show that our existing admission policies have been very successful. Since there is only one meeting left after today, are members confident that the matter has been fully considered?

The Committee clarified that a straw vote is not binding and is intended to help the committee focus their discussion for the remaining time together.

Comprehensive Review Discussion

Feedback on the current admissions process and proposed changes included the following. The reading process does not increase first-year GPA or diversity, and in two separate years, analyses found that the process of reading resulted in having fewer, not more, first generation students at UCSC than would have been admitted had there been no reading. Thus, there may be a modified method that could improve the admissions process. GPA is too narrow of an outcome variable, there could be others. If the reading process were more efficient, these resources could be used in other ways to support student support.

The reading process is an evaluation of the record for ranking and to discern who is eligible. Most Many applications have "indeterminate" eligibility prior to the reading process. Some campuses do not review for eligibility (UCLA, UCB) since the cohort they capture are all eligible. For less selective campuses, eligibility is a concern.

Given our scarce resources, the reading component of Comprehensive Review is an expensive process in terms of workload. One possibility is the use of systemwide reading scores to develop a computer index, for example based on the UCLA reading process. OP may consider developing this over the next two years. What is the benefit of creating a new index now that is limited and clashes with the new Entitled to Review (ETR) admissions policy that will come online in 2012? An option would be to develop a formula that would include these various factors and additional criteria before reading the application confirmation and refinement. UC is moving toward giving Comprehensive Review more weight, even among the most selective campuses.

Until ETR is in place, do we continue with the existing process or implement changes? The UCOP idea of Shared Reviewed is compelling, but it's unlikely that the campuses will realize any of the savings. High school transcripts should be computerized. Arguments against the proposals are equally applicable to our current Comprehensive Review process.

Members discussed the purpose of selection the roll of the university immobility and how diversity is defined. Diversity takes many forms, not only out of concern for social justice, and a robust environment, but discussions have been about class and ethnicity. What happens to underrepresented minorities under the proposal? In a system using only GPA and test scores, the number of Hispanics and African Americans would be reduced by half. The consequences in terms of justice have not been discussed. It is not an insignificant change.

Straw Votes

It was emphasized that the straw votes were non-binding, indicating an inclination to develop policy, rather than a pre-agreement to support each policy once developed. Thus, Yes described as “Maybe Yes”, No as “Maybe No”, and Maybe as undecided. Two absent committee members provided their pre-discussion inclinations to the chair. As this was a straw vote, they are included but explicitly added.

1) No change to admissions criteria for Fall 2010: 1

Change to admissions criteria for Fall 2010: 5+2

The original wording and intent for second item in the agenda was determined to be unclear and was replaced with two different items.

2a) Use a score system for Fall 2010 based on GPA, Test Scores, and a weighting of First Generation status? Yes: 2, No: 2, Maybe: 2 +2

2b) Use a new indexing scheme considering all variables for Fall 2010?
Yes: 0, No: 3, Maybe: 2+2, Abstain: 1

There was a brief discussion of factors and weights assigned to existing ones, plus a review of the BOARS principles for Comprehensive Review. A suggestion was made to use a new index scheme that could include the GPA, test score, first generation and other existing variables.

3) Significant reduction in the reader component of the current system? That is, moving toward the CI- only option. (Based on discussion, the possibility of eliminating the reader component was removed from the original question.)
Yes: 4, No: 2, Maybe: 0+2

4) Revising AbyE to be an outcome of our campus scoring system. As discussed, this means using the Comprehensive Review scoring system to determine admission for all students (whether or not eligible). Students who were not eligible would be (by definition) admitted by exception.
Yes: 5, No: 1, Maybe: 0 + 2

5) Revise the GEO component.
Yes: 3 + 1, No: 0 + 1. Abstain: 3

Chair Hughey distributed a draft policy on AbyE for consideration.

Executive Session

CAFA held an executive session to discuss the draft post consultation memo to VC McGinty.