

**Committee on Admission and Financial Aid
Minutes
December 5, 2008**

Present: Richard Hughey, Bruce Cooperstein, Faye Crosby, Raoul Birnbaum, Amy Weaver (NSTF), Gabe Elkaim, Scott Oliver, Michelle Romero (SUA), Pamela Edwards (ASO)

Absent: Juan Poblete, Maritoni Medrano (SUA), Donald Wittman, Michael Morrissey (SUA)

Guests: AVC Michelle Whittingham, Associate Director Michael McCawley

Announcements

CAFA will discuss the High Level Indicators, which are intended to be used as a measure of progress with respect to the campus Academic Plan. In addition to commenting on the proposed indicators, Senate committees will also recommend new indicators.

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) continued their discussion on faculty salaries and the Joint Senate Administrative Task Force report and recommendations.

Spelman and Johnson, the search firm for Director of Admissions recruitment, will be on campus December 9. CAFA members Scott Oliver, Michelle Romero and Richard Hughey will meet with them.

Subcommittee Updates

Publications: The subcommittee completed a line by line comparison of campus documents with Publications Coordinator Jennifer Wright and discussed how to give input to the right person in the right way. Who, for example, would feedback on design or content go to?

Some felt there was a disparity between Financial Aid and Admissions documents. On some documents the visual piece conflicts with the message. Often the same pictures are used for all publications and there are no pictures of classrooms. If a prospective student is receiving five different documents we want to capture the opportunity to send a variety of messages.

The campus has no photographer and very few pictures on file to use. Suggestions included creating a web site for faculty, students and departments to download their pictures, a photo project for art students and a joint colleges-Student Affairs project to provide feedback on options for cross campus communication (the Campus Calendar is not used much by students). New pictures could show students around the campus (not just posed) and students involved in various aspects of campus life.

Although the campus has less of a voice for providing feedback to the Office of the President, a review of systemwide documents will be completed later.

Comprehensive Review Data: Data was presented on the Fall 2006 and 2007 cohorts. The subcommittee will run a math split to compare those who took math in the first year versus those who did not and the impact on GPA.

Weighted GPAs are a better predictor of success because they take into account difficult courses that parallel college level courses. The weighted versus un-weighted GPA is a public relations issue (for eligibility a 3.0 weighted GPA is needed vs. a lower un-weighted GPA).

During winter quarter CAFA will look at how different systems of Comprehensive Review scoring would affect the offer and acceptance pools.

High Level Indicators

Comments on the current document for measuring our progress include the following.

- There are no CAFA oriented measures such undergrad affordability, access and diversity, experiences and proficiencies.
- The measures do not include anything about campus diversity.
- The measures, which are primarily based on the sciences, need to be normalized.
- Measure awards by division and field, not just dollar amount.
- Grants, awards and citations vary by division. Awards are not a measure in the Humanities and Education is now evaluated by its utility value.
- Students come here for the value of a comprehensive education. How do you measure reasoning and critical thinking by division?
- How do you measure the affect education has had on the students over a four year period?
- Normalize citations, which also vary by division.
- Planning metrics should be based on where we want the campus to go and not just based on joining AAU.
- Compared to the UC Accountability document, this one has less on undergraduate students.
- Retention is already in there, but who is retained. Need to consider profile of retaining students.
- Measures on retention and graduation rates are under the Committee on Educational Policy's purview, but CAFA will also comment.
- How do you capture the breadth of students taking double majors or minors? Some students have limited ability to pursue double majors due to external reasons (financial).
- When looking at the number of applications, is the yield rate is more important than the admit rate? You may not get the data you need from admit rates when you are growing the campus. The admit to SIR data is reputation based.
- The number of Pell grant is a good measure of access and diversity.
- Look at the net cost of attending and scholarship funding.
- Look at the number of underrepresented students who apply and then attend to determine where problems arise.
- Geographic distribution brings diversity to the campus.
- Transfer and reentry numbers also increase diversity.

Chair Hughey will draft the Committee's response which includes a reordering of the proposed and new measures. The draft will be circulated by email for feedback prior to the December 12 deadline.