

**Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
Minutes
June 8, 2009**

Present: Richard Hughey, Gabe Elkaim, Amy Weaver (NSTF), Scott Oliver, Bruce Cooperstein, Juan Poblete, Rob Coe, Faye Crosby, Raoul Birnbaum, Donald Wittman, Pamela Edwards (ASO)

Absent: Michael Morrissey (SUA), Maritoni Medrano (SUA), Michelle Romero (SUA)

Guests: Associate Director Michael McCawley, AVC Michelle Whittingham, Director Ann Draper

Chair's Announcements

California legislators have rejected the call for cuts to Cal Grants and UCB's Hasting Law School.

UCSC is currently overenrolled 700 students this year; money will not be coming from OP for over-enrollments.

One of CAFA's SUA reps, Michelle Romero, will serve as the student rep to BOARS in 2009-10.

Chair Hughey provided a brief summary of the Senate Executive Committee's June 2 meeting.

The May 8 minutes were approved with changes.

The Publications Subcommittee has submitted their summary for CAFA's annual report. The Appeals, Web Presence and Honors and Merits and Comprehensive Review Data Subcommittees will submit their summaries by July 1. Director Ann Draper will also contribute a section on Financial Aid for the report.

BOARS June 5 Meeting

Professor Juan Poblete reported that the June 5 meeting of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) was very productive and included annual consultation with CSU, CCC, and the Office of the President.

CSU is being lobbied to accept all high school courses, including for example skill courses such as auto mechanics, in their admissions; they currently accept the same a-g subject areas approved by UC.

BOARS is finalizing their white paper on standardized tests.

Comprehensive Review

Based on the straw votes at the May 29 meeting, CAFA is considering three proposals (a) revising Admission by Exception to be an outcome of the selection process rather than having a separate selection process, (b) reducing the weighting of the reader components in comprehensive review scoring, and (c) modifying the geographic component of the comprehensive review score.

Admission by Exception

The Committee was provided updated data on the affects of admitting Fall 2009 students, eligible and ineligible, based on the Computed Index Score (CIS).

The comprehensive read score cutoff for admission to UCSC this year was 5425. With the current system if you are missing one course you are ineligible. The proposed CIS-only system would look at all applications – eligible and ineligible. The CIS-only system applied to Fall 2009 would have admitted 80 ineligible students that were in fact admitted in Fall 2009, and 316 ineligible students who were not in fact admitted in Fall 2009. (This number does not include the 79 withdrawals, which are marked as ineligible in the database.) The top two categories for non-AbyE ineligibles are missing a subject or missing English.

The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) cohort would be determined by the major components that we use now – low family income, first generation college student and taking part in academic programs. The committee looked closely at the characteristics of the 821 students that were admitted in Fall 2009 but would not be admitted in the CIS-only option and the 821 students that would be admitted in the CIS-only option but were not admitted fact. Comparing actual to CI-only, there is an increase from 40.1% to 46.4% in first-generation students, 36.8% to 38.2% in EOP students, 3.34 to 3.50 in high school GPA, and 2.88 to 2.98 in predicted first year GPA. Also, the median family income of this group would drop from \$60,000 to \$51,000. Overall, these changes among 821 admits would have a small affect on the frosh class, for which 12209 applicants were admitted

Comprehensive Review originally was used to look for leadership and talent. The goal and purpose of what we are looking at may be different now. We want to have an excellent and diverse class, but reader scoring is an expensive component that some members see as not adding value because it both reduces diversity and actual first-year GPA. Others would rather keep the readers and change the. Any change for 2010 will likely need to be changed again for Fall 2012 to implement the new Entitled to Review admissions policy.

Concern was expressed that proposed changes may diversify our student body in ways we cannot predict since CAFA has not looked at data on the backgrounds of our EOP students or the Bridge cohort, and did not meet this year with EOP Director Michelle Handy.

A vote (1) on whether or not to change admissions criteria for Fall 2010 was taken, with 9 Yes and 0 No.

One member expressed reservations that without a specific formula we would not be able to take a chance with particular applications next year. Another member suggested the Committee continue the discussion and consultations in the fall.

A vote (2) was then taken on whether or not to continue the high-level policy discussion, or to instead begin working on the specific policies under consideration. The committee decided to continue the policy discussion with a vote of 6 Yes and 3 No.

During the policy discussion, it was unclear if all members realized that changing the Fall 2010 admissions criteria (vote 1) would need to be accomplished by the 2008-9 CAFA. CAFA began a policy in 2007-8 of only considering admissions changes for the next admissions cycle, rather than the current one, to enable full??? It was determined that a revote of the first question was appropriate.

Two voting members left and an objection was made to votes being taken in the fourth hour of meeting with fewer voting members (a quorum was still present).

The revote (3) on changing admissions criteria for Fall 2010 was approved, Change Yes: 7, No: 0

A member questions whether or not comments about the policies could be made prior to considering the next vote. A short comment was agreed to, and the member indicated support for changing AbyE was conditioned on that changes not restricted the Office of Admissions' ability to form bridge cohorts or otherwise experiment. The committee agreed that including a 1% allocation for bridge and other such items would be appropriate.

A vote (4) was taken on whether or not Admission by Exception should be changed for Fall 2010, with Yes: 7, No: 0

A vote (5) was taken on whether or not to modify the number of points that can be assigned to the reader's component, with Yes: 7, No: 0

A third voting member left (a quorum was still present).

The committee briefly discussed the geographic component, with comments including a desire to admit more local (especially low-income) students, the value of students from the northernmost counties, which the current GEO criteria helps, and that CAFA had studied this matter the least of the three remaining issues.

A vote (6) was taken on shifting more weight in the GEO component to local students, with Yes: 2, No: 4

Considering the time and length of the meeting, the remaining members voted (7) three possibilities: (a) making no changes due to lack of time; (b) scheduling an additional meeting for Thursday; and (c) requesting that the committee continue discussion by electronic mail followed by an electronic mail vote.

Those that were able and interested were asked to finalized details on two proposals, one concerning AbyE and the other concerning read scores and to consult with Admissions on the proposals. Professors Coe, Cooperstein, Hughey, and Wittman indicated that they would remain to develop the proposals, and the meeting was adjourned.