

Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA)
Minutes
January 28, 2015
Kerr 307

Present: Minghui Hu (Chair), Mark Carr, Jean E. Fox Tree, David Helmbold, Deanna Shemek, David Smith, Ted Warburton, Joy Hagen (NSTF), Lila Blackney (Undergraduate Rep), Matthew Mednick (Senate Analyst), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst)

Absent: Yi Zhang, Justin McClendon (Undergraduate Rep)

Guests: VPDUE Richard Hughey, AVC Enrollment Management Michelle Whittingham, Admissions Director Michael McCawley, Institutional Research and Policy Studies Director Julian Fernald

Member's Items

Chair Hu provided a brief overview of today's agenda and announced that tie-break adjudication will happen in mid-March. He also noted that CAFA's data request plan is new this year, and intended to institute a more systematic process for accessing data without having the committee make individual requests every year.

Publications Committee Update

Members Shemek and Moodie provided an update on the work of the subcommittee. Most publications will be completed during March-May. Most of the work of the committee has been done remotely and not in person.

Chair Hu notes that brochures are now separately issued for California residents, International students, and out of state students. The publications committee has only reviewed transfer and frosh brochures so far.

One issue raised by the subcommittee members was the issue of capturing diversity in brochures materials. Subcommittee members have been reviewing text and photos in admit brochure drafts. The biggest challenge has been considering the subliminal messaging of photos. Members noted that the representation of the student body is more diverse in photos than in the student body as a whole. On the one hand, the brochures are a valuable way to communicate the campus's interest in diversity, but may represent a diversity that the campus has not yet achieved. Members also raised that because this is the campus's 50th year, there are many "then" and "now" photos. The sub-committee is reviewing these materials in context of the targeted audience.

Nonresident Compare Favorably Report to BOARS & Tiebreak Consideration

Chair Hu reported that CAFA's memo on the Nonresident Compare Favorably Report to the Administration was reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee and they will comment on the issues there. SEC was interested in the Administration's plan to address the nonresident compare favorably gap.

The committee reviewed the tiebreak memo and Holistic Review Policy descriptions of the tiebreak selection process. Members expressed interest in the kind of distribution that occurs in the tiebreak bin, and if the distinctions are meaningless, then perhaps the committee might want to think about measures that might increase diversity. The committee discussed that last year, it wanted to take the very top of the SSI based on academic indicators and not double count "social factors." A couple of discussion points emerged from this. One member noted objection to the premise that disadvantaged students in some way would receive double counting (advantaged) by considering a wider range of factors in tiebreak; and members

expressed interest in having the committee review what practices are acceptable under California law, about what admissions can consider in selecting a diverse pool. Members were also interested in how diversity is defined—and asked if this includes the demographics of socioeconomic status, and racial/ethnic status and whether Eligibility within the Local Context (ELC) covers all diversity considerations. Chair Hu clarified that diversity is considered under ELC, and that other diversity indicators also include first generation to college status. Members would like more information on how diversity can be considered. Second, members expressed both the urgency of the upcoming tiebreak (mid-March) and the possible need to review tiebreak process based on data. One member noted that any changes to tiebreak process should be made with the benefit of relevant data.

The analyst clarified that before implementation of SSI tiebreak, the committee used several factors for tiebreak. CAFA then decided that since they already used Holistic Review, tiebreak would use academic factors only. The committee can further revise tiebreak criteria and if it determines changes to the implementation of tiebreak are needed.

CAFA Data Request Plan

The committee reviewed a data request plan drafted by the Data subcommittee, and discussed what additional data would be useful to review on an annual basis to help the committee in its consideration of admission criteria and selection decisions. The discussion was led by a data subcommittee member. Members raised the importance of having data going back five years, but that the administration is pushing back on this request. One members suggested that one strategy would be to request all data to answer any question the committee might have in the next five years, and that the committee should consider approaching a five year request by stating the exact reasons this older data is needed, based on analysis of the data going back three years. Another member raised that 2007 is a key year, especially for diversity in the UC, because 2008 was a big turning. Point. The committee discussed that there is data for 2010 and 2011 already based on requests made by previous CAFA committee work.

Additional issues raised by members included the appropriateness of using first year GPA as a measure of success, and that five year graduation rates are the gold standard for examination of academic success, particularly for underrepresented students and the possible need for the junior transfer data for committee review.

Updates from VPDUE and UE Staff

Guests arrive.

VPDUE Hughey noted that the administration's enrollment planning team has been meeting. He presented a set of updates for the committee: next year internal numbers for California residents are expected to be at 2800 and nonresidents at 550. The California admit rate is expected to drop. Nonresidents admit rate is expected to be around 70%. For the next few years, the campus is expecting to grow nonresidents by 10 per hear, putting the campus at 18.6% nonresidents by 2022-23. The campus expects to have good news for transfer student admits, but growing those rapidly will be difficult.

The committee discussed that the campus anticipates being overenrolled for California students by 1300 this year, and the expectation is to reduce that to zero in two years. Members discussed that there will be a decrease of 7000 students for all UC, a significant amount. The committee discussed the mandate from Office of the President not to overenroll California students.

At the same time, the committee discussed that Governor Brown has publicly called for a reduction of nonresidents and increase in California admits. The preliminary assessment from admissions is that we may need to "dig deeper" into the nonresident pools to achieve the enrollment targets this year. VPDUE Hughey

noted that the campus need for nonresident tuition has grown over the last few years, and as long as we keep increasing the pool the campus should be able to become more selective.

Tiebreak Discussion (with guests)

Admissions Director McCawley provided an orientation to the tiebreak process. He provided the committee a handout outlining steps in the tiebreak process. He noted that initial admit targets for each population of frosh (California residents, domestic nonresidents, and international) are determined, then read score cut offs are generated for each population based on admit targets. When a read score band contains more students than can be offered admission, tie break criteria will be employed. For California residents tie break is determined by eligibility and the Student Success Indicator (SSI). All students within the scoring band will first be sorted on UC-eligibility and then from within that group highest to lowest SSI. For domestic nonresident and international students, only SSI is used to sort. A certain number of waitlist offers will be extended to students that are not offered admission, drawn from those students that are just below the reading score/tiebreak cutoffs.

One member raised that the process does not mention adjudication review, and this may need to be revisited if the thresholds change. Director McCawley noted that this year, admission is doing more adjudication reviews than with last year's model, approximately 3000, and these are being incorporated into the workload and not at the end of the process, as was the case last year. Senior readers review those files. The committee discussed that there is no indicator for eligibility for nonresidents, and this may create issue when examining nonresident and California students under compare favorably review next year.

Admissions Data and Reporting (with guests)

AVC Whittingham provided context on the feasibility of CAFA's data request plan, including how to best institutionalize data reporting on an annual cycle. She began by posing a question for consideration by CAFA: what exactly are we trying to measure and how can we best achieve that? She noted that Enrollment Management has provided a lot of data to CAFA over the years, and she wants increased strategy about how to institutionalize the committee's request.

AVC Whittingham noted there is data on all those students that have decided to come to UCSC in Data Warehouse, and IARPS Director Fernald can help with that. She also suggested CAFA think about what data is nice to have vs. what data is critical. She suggested it might not be valuable to examine data pre 2012. The committee responded that it would like data that is sufficiently broad to be able to draw on so that the committee does not have to make annual piecemeal requests. One member noted it will take time for the data subcommittee to work through three years of data and once that data is reviewed the subcommittee will review a plan for what additional data is needed. Members noted the committee is trying to establish broad baselines of data. AVC Whittingham noted data requests may need to be split between IARPS and Enrollment Management. Director Fernald noted he would like to be involved with analysis of data requests coming to IARPS. The committee will continue to consider the issue of data requests at future meetings.