

Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA)**Minutes****November 5, 2014****Kerr 307**

Present: Minghui Hu (Chair), Mark Carr, Jean E. Foxtree, Joy Hagen, David Helmbold, Ted Warburton, Deanna Shemek, David Smith, Yi Zhang,), Justin McClendon (Undergraduate Rep), Esthela Bañuelos (Senate Analyst), Matthew Mednick (Senate Analyst)

Absent: Lila Blackney (Undergraduate Rep), Victor Garcia-Zepeda (Undergraduate Rep)

Guests: Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Michael McCawley, Director Office of Admissions, Michelle Whittingham, Associate Vice Chancellor Enrollment Management

Member's Items

The committee followed up on its response to the Brazil Scientific Mobility Program. The committee recommended that TOEFL score be re-evaluated after first year, and if needed, consider raising to 570/89 with the rationale that these students are expected to spend a quarter here taking upper-division courses.

Update on Holistic Review Implementation – Data Subcommittee

Chair Hu and member Helmbold updated the committee on the efforts of the Office of Admissions to implement CAFA's Holistic Review Policy in the UC Davis tool. Our campus chose to use the UC Davis tool after CAFA revised the admission policy to include an adjudication review using SSI. This review was intended to flag applicant files for a second read by a human reader. The issue now is that the UC Davis tool cannot effect the policy as written. The data subcommittee has been working with Director McCawley to modify the implementation to best mirror the intended effect: to normalize the reading process for accuracy.

The committee questioned why UCSC does not have its own tool which can implement our policy as written. The response was a matter of cost, and that using established tools for a fee has been our standard since transitioning to holistic review.

Consultation with Michael McCawley, Director Office of Admissions

Director McCawley gave the committee a presentation of the new UCD tool, which appears to be quite a bit more sophisticated and user-friendly than the UCB tool which we had been using for the past two cycles. We have loaded in several test cases and are attempting to test-drive the system prior to reading, starting in December.

One of the biggest changes is that we will no longer be using UCB or UCLA scores, which lacked the required accuracy in applicant scoring, particularly in the scores of 3 and 4. UCSC readers will read all applicants. Director McCawley responded to several specific member questions related to admissions by exception, a-g course requirements, honors course counting, math and English requirements, and the cohort analysis provided to readers which is calculated using an applicant's scores/performance in comparison to last cycle's applicant cohorts.

In response to the fact that the UCD tool cannot conduct the ‘adjudication’ review as written in policy, the tool has been augmented to map SSI scores into a limited number of “computer read” scores, and compare the computer read scores with the holistic read score to determine if an adjudication review is needed. The committee agreed to use last year’s SSI distribution to assign adjudication holistic review scores to each applicant based on last year’s distribution of SSI scores by HRS. With this assignment of computer read scores, an adjudication review would be required when either: a) the holistic review score is strictly better 4 (i.e. 1.0 to 3.99) and the computer read score is 4.5, or b) the holistic review score is worse than 4.0 (i.e. 4.01 to 5-reject) and the computer read score is 2.

Two weaknesses of this implementation are that the ‘adjudication’ check only occurs now around the score or 4 (where most of tiebreak should be happening using SSI) rather than across all scores, and the weighting is assigned based on last year’s distribution rather than against the current cohort. This could create variance as student data changes for example, based on changes to honors course counting or availability.

CAFA was also asked if we should institute an SSI floor for frosh applicants. This issue was not discussed at length but was tabled for a future meeting.