

**Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
Minutes
January 30, 2009**

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

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

Guests: Associate Director Michael McCawley, Advisor Cheryl Perazzo, Director Ann Draper, Advisor Kori Calubaquib

Announcements

Senate Executive Committee January 27 meeting: The Senate will continue its discussion of High Level Indicators for the campus. AVC Barry Shiller gave an update on the development of UCSC's web presence and services program. CAFA will also meet with Shiller and Director Jim Burns in February.

The January 16 minutes were amended and approved.

February 20 Consultation with Student Affairs VC McGinty

The Committee discussed topics to cover at the quarterly consultation with VC Felicia McGinty on February 20. Professor Crosby will draft the talking points memo.

Comprehensive Review Data Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Donald Wittman reviewed the plan for review of UCSC's Comprehensive Review (CR) criteria and led a discussion on various data sets provided by Enrollment Analyst Mary Masters. CAFA will determine the best predictors of success in determining selectivity and will look at other criteria for balancing CR indexing.

Many studies measure success by the first year GPA. Total course load in high school has the weakest impact. SAT data is only available for the past couple of years due to changes in the test. Subject test scores will be used until 2012 and are used in data sets.

Students' high school GPA and first year GPA match, but then drop off over time. Total course load in high school has the weakest affect. What other criteria can be used to predict success beyond the first year? One third of all frosh have not declared a major and others change their majors in the first two years making it hard to track the intended major at entry and degrees earned. Courses taken may not match up.

UCSC calculates the high school GPA on a-g courses completed in the sophomore and junior years with an extra point for honors classes (with a C grade or higher) for a maximum GPA of 4.4. This could be less at low API schools where honors courses are only available in the senior year. Separate from the GPA, selection criteria gives up to 200 points for honors courses completed in the senior year. Is success just GPA or whether students become better citizens? A different analysis of retention rates could show the GPA and other variables for the students we do retain.

Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) was in the regression, but had little effect. If you're successful in other areas, such as GPA, this is not a meaningful measure.

Points are awarded to students from low-performing high schools based on the State's Academic Performance Index (API) of 1-10 (10 is the best). The Committee discussed a continuous variable for API scores.

More students are saying cost is a factor in their decision on where to go and more are not getting their first choice. UCSC is losing students in the \$60,000-\$90,000 income bracket.

Students from underrepresented regions of the state had little effect on diversity. The geographic location criteria could be changed to encourage students from Santa Cruz and surrounding counties to attend UCSC who may not be able to attend another UC (live away from home).

The Subcommittee will collect data on a broad spectrum of groups such as the first generation to attend college and socio economic factors for CAFA's consideration next month in determining a new formula for selectivity. Data should include what the student body would look like if we changed nothing. When CR started there were no grades and no historical CR data for our campus. The first year we denied a couple of hundred students and now it's a couple of thousand. CAFA will look at philosophical goals and whether the current CR system is meeting these goals.

Financial Aid

Changes to the frosh merit scholarship program this year include the creation of a single application process for all undergraduate merit scholarships and awarding each student who returned an essay a scholarship. A cap was also added to Regents Scholarships (was up to \$10,000, now \$4,000) and fewer scholarships were awarded. Starting with the awards of 2009 on, each Regents scholar will be guaranteed \$20,000 to be paid out over four years. Now that campus merit scholarships are renewable, we will also be looking at GPAs at the end of the year.

Data presented showed a drastic reduction in the scholarships awarded from one year to the next. By 2011-12 all commitments will be met and renewable (we are currently overdrawn).

CAFA reviewed the timeline for selecting scholarship recipients and the new essay prompt. Essays are read in one week from March 2-9. The score sheet is electronic. It will take less time this year because faculty will only be reading essays (last year applications were read too). Appeals will be handled again by the CAFA chair.

An email message recruiting essay readers will go out to all Senators next week (only four responses were received last year) and CAFA members were asked to recruit a reader volunteer. The message will include information on essay length, the number of essays read in an hour and the goal – to select scholars from the pool of eligible students (GPA not included).

The Honors and Merit Scholars Subcommittee will develop criteria and instructions for the readers and CAFA discussed the reconciliation process for discrepancies between two readers.

In past years CAFA sent an email asking if students would like a personal email contact with faculty. Although this has been a successful program, we are making so few offers that it's not worth the time required.

BOARS

The Office of the President is working on a public relations campaign for the new eligibility program that was just approved by the Regents.

Admissions Update

Data on F09 frosh and transfer students was provided. Since there is little money for outreach, UC Admissions Directors discussed web and recruitment consolidation opportunities. Enrollment planning and state goals were also discussed.

There is no way to report on the new ethnic categories which in the past have been based on the U.S. census. Next year the Federal government will change categories for the 2010 census - adding a multi/mixed ethnicity. A student can check off as many categories as they want, but UC only captures one - the first category, alphabetically, that is based on our underrepresented data. Changing categories will also change data sets and tracking efforts.