

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

Annual Report, 2010-11

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) had a productive year resulting in several revised and proposed policies working collaboratively with the Offices of Admissions and of Financial Aid. The subcommittee structure for CAFA (formed in 2008-09) continued to work well and allowed CAFA to meet its planned routine business objectives as well as conceive and implement several complex special projects. Notably, on January 20, 2011 the Regents took up a resolution calling for the use of single-score, individualized holistic review of each applicant as the expected admissions method at all UC campuses. CAFA had been aware of Holistic Review related correspondence initiated by President Yudof as early as summer 2010, which eventually led to the passage of this resolution by the Regents, and the committee had taken a potential move to Holistic Review from Santa Cruz's current quantitative system under advisement in mid-fall. This early review made the consideration of this important shift in scoring structure far more palatable, and the committee finalized a UCSC specific Holistic Review plan which was presented to the Senate in May 2011. While the work of the committee was not limited to working on the Holistic Review Policy, this issue was central to committee discussions throughout the year and will be of critical importance to the 2011-12 CAFA as they refine various review measures, including tiebreaker criteria.

I. Admissions and Financial Aid for Fall 2011

A. Admissions

For fall 2011, UCSC received a total of 36,556 applications, an increase of 1,747 applications (5%) over fall 2010. The frosh applications totaled 28,236, a slight rise of 577 applications (2%) from fall 2010. A substantial increase in applications occurred again with transfer applications as the campus received 8,119 applications compared to 6,964 applications the previous year, an increase of 1,155 students (16.6%). This increase is particularly noteworthy as our campus did not accept applications from lower-division transfer students which had accounted for over 400 applications for fall 2010. Our campus also received 62 applications from students seeking their second baccalaureate degree, as well as 139 applications from international students participating in the UC Education Abroad Program, both numbers representing increases over the previous year. There were 1,805 non-resident frosh applications (1,332 domestic and 473 international). There were also 137 non-resident transfer applications (101 domestic and 36 international).

UCSC admitted 19,228 frosh for fall 2011, an increase over the previous year of 1,384 students. The increase in frosh admission offers was indicative of an increased enrollment target. This revised target was set to offset the large number of UCSC graduating seniors (one of the largest cohorts in the history of the campus). The frosh enrollment target for fall 2011 was 3,500, an increase of 300 students from the enrollment target for fall 2010. The admission rate of frosh, therefore, increased slightly to 68% compared to 64.5% the previous year. There were 1157 non-resident frosh admits (1014 domestic and 143 international) from which we received 82 SIRs (74 and 8, respectively).

For the second year in a row UCSC offered denied-frosh an opportunity to be placed on a waiting list. Once again, 7 of the 9 UC general campuses offered waitlist opportunities, with only UC Los Angeles and UC Merced not participating. UCSC offered 2,010 frosh the opportunity to be placed on the wait list, with just over half accepting that opportunity. Due to the number of frosh that accepted their offer of admission with a “Statement of Intent to Register” (SIRed frosh), none of the waitlisted frosh were offered admission to the campus. The number of SIRed frosh increased for fall 2011 based on the increase in admits offers. UCSC received 4,276 SIRs for fall 2011 compared to 3,853 in fall 2010 (22.2% SIR rate compared with 21.6% the previous year). The increase of frosh SIRs should result in an incoming class of 3,600 – 3,675 new frosh (in fall 2010 UCSC enrolled 3,299 frosh).

Among frosh SIRs, there were no significant shifts in the percentages for students in their planned majors and fields. For fall 2011, the percentage of frosh SIRs for majors in the arts was 5.5%, in engineering 6.9%, in humanities 8.4%, in physical and biological sciences 26%, and in social sciences 23.7%. Nearly 29% of the SIRed frosh were undecided/undeclared majors.

UCSC admitted 5,260 transfers for fall 2011, an increase of 459 students (9.5%). There were 46 non-resident transfer admits (43 domestic and 3 international) from which we received 7 SIRs (7 and 0, respectively). Students selected for admission as a transfer needed a minimum grade point average of 2.80 this year, as compared to 2.40 for several decades, representing a significant increase in selectivity at the transfer level.

The annual enrollment target for transfer students was slightly increased from 1,200 transfer admits to 1250. UCSC again planned to meet its enrollment goal solely with fall 2011 transfer students, a strategy that was widely accepted by the campus the previous year. The total SIR count for transfers was 1,511, an all-time high for UCSC, and slightly up (40) over the previous year. The transfer SIRs should result in an incoming class that meets the 1,250 transfer student enrollment goal. UCSC again did not accept any new transfer applicants for winter quarter 2012.

B. Financial Aid and Scholarships

The UC undergraduate student Education Finance Model requires students who qualify for need-based gift assistance to pay the first \$9,000 of their need from loan and/or work resources. After subtracting the loan/work expectation and the family contribution (from FAFSA data) gift assistance is offered to help pay the estimated total cost. The cost for a student living on campus in 2010-11 was about \$30,700.

Numbers are higher for 2011-12: the cost to live on-campus is \$33,033 and the work/loan expectation for students is \$9,900. Many students and families struggle to meet the loan/work and family contribution expectations. Scholarships help to offset this cost for a small percentage of students.

The Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan (a system-wide program) guarantees that students from families with incomes under \$80,000 will receive enough gift aid (from all sources) to pay UC tuition and fees. Virtually all students in this category receive enough gift aid regardless of this

commitment. However, under the Blue and Gold Plan some students who would not otherwise receive such support (due to substantial family wealth and assets) nonetheless receive the assistance. There is concern that this diverts funds from students with articulated needs and whose continued enrollment may be tenuous due to financial pressure to students less needy.

In 2010-11 the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office administered about \$240 million in financial assistance for 67% of undergraduate students. The percentage of aid recipients has increased significantly in the last 2 years.

Source of Aid	Percent of Undergraduates	Amount Received	Average Award
Gift Aid (all sources)	57%	\$133,000,000	\$15,390
UC Santa Cruz Scholarships*	7%	\$2,400,000	\$2,243
Federal Pell Grants*	38%	\$25,400,000	\$4,466
Student and Parent Loans	41%	\$79,200,000	\$9,654
Federal Work-Study	10%	\$2,200,000	\$1,004
* Included in gift aid			

Campus undergraduate scholarship programs are administered by various campus departments as well as by the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office. Listed below is data for major scholarship programs administered by the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office:

Scholarship Program	Recipients	Amount Received	Average Award
Regents Scholarships	141	\$736,165	\$5,221
Campus Merit Scholarships	319	\$449,518	\$1,409
Pister Leadership Opportunity Awards	25	\$222,386	\$8,895

Demand for scholarship support far exceeds available funds. Less than 10% of undergraduates receive scholarships each year. It is vital that scholarship fund raising be a major component of the comprehensive capital campaign the campus is undertaking to ensure that UC Santa Cruz is an affordable as well as attractive alternative for undergraduate students who aspire to attend.

C. Appeals

There were 223 frosh appeals submitted for fall 2011, a reduction of 145 over the previous year. The reduction of frosh appeals was most likely due to the increased number of offers of admission (1,384 more than fall 2010) and also the increased number of waitlist offers (926 more than fall 2010). Of the 223 frosh appeals that were submitted, only 18 were granted, all of which met our selection criteria and comprehensive review score cutoff. Of the 18 frosh that were admitted, 16 of them submitted their Statement of Intent to Register (SIR).

There were 122 transfer appeals submitted for fall 2011, a slight increase (23) over fall 2010. Of the appeals that were submitted, 39 were granted, all of which met our same selection criteria that we had used for all other transfer offers of admission. Of the 39 transfers that were admitted, 33 of them submitted their SIR.

II. Work of CAFA in 2010-2011

A. Campus Connections

The Committee interfaced with several campus and Senate processes:

1. Transfer Admission Criteria

In June 2010, the PBSci department chairs addressed a memo to CAFA requesting advice on how to establish standards for transfer students who indicate interest in majoring in their area(s). This memo prompted discussion between CAFA and the PBSci Division, as well as on the Senate floor. While CAFA was receptive to discussing this multifaceted issue, the admission to major component crosses committee lines. While CAFA is responsible for setting admissions policy, it is clear that CEP has primary authority over any admission to major standards, and articulating courses with and from transfer institutions.

While there was no closure of this issue in 2010-11, CAFA made progress discussing the ramifications of changing the policy to accommodate impacted majors. CAFA also consulted with CEP, which has undertaken an effort to transition from the current disqualification policies for majors to a regime of entrance requirements. This re-alignment is a key step for the consideration of formalizing strict transfer admissions requirements, as these requirements would have to closely match those in place for native frosh students. CAFA and CEP plan to coordinate efforts on this issue in 2011-12.

The Office of Admissions did work with the PBSci Division to devise e-mail messaging directed at the admitted transfer student population for fall 2011. This messaging stressed the importance of completion of major preparatory courses prior to enrolling at UC Santa Cruz. Admissions also worked with undergraduate advising within the biological sciences to access SIRed students' evaluated academic records so students could be advised earlier of critical shortfalls in their preparatory course work. These efforts were met with positive results and will continue for fall 2012.

2. Honors Program

After a tumultuous history of diligent and committed efforts by previous CAFA members which the committee acknowledges, the honors sub-committee did a superb job consulting with campus stakeholders (VPDUE, College Provosts, senate colleagues) and getting a pilot honors program authorized and implemented at Cowell College beginning in fall 2011. This lower-division program addresses long-standing concerns about attracting high-achieving frosh within a competitive admissions environment. The pilot program provides these students with the intensive academic work that they seek, beginning in their first quarter of residence at UCSC.

The aim extends beyond admissions to retention of these students through to timely graduation. Taking advantage of the unique features of the UCSC college system, many fundamental aspects of the program are based within the colleges.

The pilot program provides:

- an opportunity for interested colleges to define enriched first-year experiences by designing approaches that resonate with their respective communities
- student contact with Senate faculty in small classes and at special events from the entering quarter through the full first year
- placement of students in at least one class per quarter with high-achieving peers, without general separation from the larger UCSC environment
- social and intellectual events for program participants (in some cases open also to the general UCSC student population)

The overall program targets the top 5% of each year's entering class, based on the numerical ranking accorded through the UCSC admissions process. Since UCSC utilizes comprehensive admissions review (moving to holistic review in the future), this ranking takes into account a wide range of factors in addition to GPA and SAT/ACT scores. Additionally, students must have passed both their basic first-level writing requirement (ELWR) and the C1 composition requirements. (Given that roughly 20% of Fall 2010 entering frosh arrived having passed their C1 requirements, we expect that the overwhelming majority of the top 5% cohort also will have done so.) The top 5% of an incoming class ordinarily will include approximately 160 students.

The pilot at Cowell College is shaping up to have one Core section filled with between 25-30 students. There are currently 30 enrollments, but some melt is expected. It is CAFA's hope that this pilot class will show both college and academic administrators how the proposed honors program can be run effectively and imaginatively, keeping in mind that the first year will be the most costly of the program. With proper support on the front-end, the program has the potential to be successful and equally important, cost efficient for students and UCSC.

3. SEC Re-Alignment Proposal

The Senate Executive Committee asked several committees to consult with various administrative personnel regarding the proposed reporting structure re-alignment of Enrollment Management and Retention units. CAFA met with Student Affairs Vice Chancellor Felicia McGinty on June 1, 2011. The tone and substance of the consultation was consistent with the committee's expectations and for the most part, the Vice Chancellor's talking points avoided the critical issues referenced in our pre-consultation memo, and were highlights from her response to the SEC re-alignment proposal (5/31/11).

CAFA is looking forward to its continued close working relationship with the Enrollment Management units of Admissions and Financial Aid. The committee feels very strongly that the reorganization of these units under the VPDUE, as requested by the SEC proposal, will be a positive step toward increasing the synergy and responsiveness between admissions-related campus stakeholders. This will be critically important, especially as the campus transitions to the

new Holistic Review policy. The effort to implement, administer, and track the results of this transition will be a focal issue for CAFA for the next several years. The committee will also be committed to supporting the reorganized Enrollment Management units as they situate themselves in their new division.

B. Sub-Committee Efforts

A great deal of CAFA's work in 2010-11 was coordinated and accomplished within the sub-committees. These sub-committees focus on both routine business or reviews and special projects which require specialized work prior to full committee review and/or approval.

1. Appeals subcommittee

The CAFA sub-committee on Appeals consisted of Chris Edwards (Chair), Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Wittingham, and Associate Director Michael McCawley, and met multiple times over the year to complete our agenda.

The sub-committee reviewed established policies on appeals for admission denial and expanded its set of guidelines for the Office of Admissions to include cancellations and their appeals under the many circumstances in which they are filed. The goals were to improve clarity and transparency in the admission process and to ensure equitable treatment across students and applicants. Previously, CAFA had developed separate appeals guidelines for first-year and transfer students whose admission is denied. This year, we created additional guidelines for (a) students whose admission is cancelled due to a missed deadline or an academic performance shortfall and (b) students whose admission is cancelled due to falsification of records found either at the system-wide level or through UCSC review. Finally, we established guidelines for student appeals that do not fall into either the admission denial or cancellation categories. In all cases, we documented the procedure that must be followed by the applicant or student and by the Office of Admissions and CAFA.

In almost all circumstances, a student or applicant must file an appeal with the UCSC Office of Admissions. All appeals that are directed by the applicant to other offices within UCSC must be forwarded to the Office of Admissions for review following our guidelines. If the appeal fails and the student or applicant files a second appeal, the Associate Vice Chancellor/Director of Admissions will review the file. If that appeal fails and the student files a third appeal, the Office of Admissions will bring the file to the CAFA chair (or their designee) for review. There is no further appeal option. We upheld that CAFA remains the final adjudicator of appeals as a consequence of the faculty's authority over undergraduate admission to the campus.

The one significant exception to the sequence described above occurs when cancellation results from falsification of records discovered through system-wide verification; in this case, the appeal must be filed directly with UCOP.

To further clarify the appeal process, we created separate flowcharts for each of these circumstances to schematically illustrate the appropriate sequence of events during an appeal. These flowcharts are appended to the relevant guidelines and are also posted on the CAFA

website: (<http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cafa-committee-on-admissions-and-financial-aid/appeals/index.html>).

As in previous years, CAFA directed the Office of Admissions to enforce an admitted student's "Conditions of Admission," up to and including the cancellation of a student's admission. CAFA articulated its tolerance for exceptions to the "Conditions of Admission," both for first-year and transfer students.

2. Comprehensive Review Data subcommittee

Sub-committee members included CAFA members Bruce Cooperstein, Juan Poblete, June Gordon, Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Whittingham, Associate Director Michael McCawley and NSTF Candace Calsoyas.

This year, the work of this sub-committee focused on discussing the merits of holistic review, specifically for the UCSC campus. Once it became clear that UCSC's student body would not be negatively impacted by changing the admissions policy and that UCSC would have access to the read-scores from UCB and UCLA, the sub-committee began planning a UCSC specific version of a Holistic Review Policy planned for implementation in fall 2012.

UCSC will continue to review frosh applicants based on their qualifications and accomplishments using the 14 UC faculty-approved criteria; however, these criteria will no longer carry individual fixed weights. The holistic approach employs a thorough review of each application by professionally trained readers who determine a single score that is reflective of an applicant's full spectrum of achievement, viewed in the context of his/her academic and personal opportunities. The consideration of additional profile information for each applicant will provide a greater opportunity for readers to consider a more complete set of indicators of academic excellence and promise, and to account for outstanding achievement in particular areas. The proposed policy roughly maintains the weight of the GPA and completion of 'a-g' courses as is currently used in UCSC's frosh selection process.

The UCSC holistic score will be guided by two broad areas of evaluation. Approximately half of the score will be determined by GPA and 'a-g' courses completed, planned, and in-progress and the other half of the score will be determined by other factors, including but not limited to: test score performance, personal qualities, potential for positive contributions, achievement in educational preparatory programs, and accomplishments within life experiences. The scoring scheme adopted is modeled after UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles. Each applicant will receive a score between 1-5, with a 1 being the highest (best) score possible. Readers will all be required to undergo intensive training, and norming of score outcomes will be ongoing throughout the reading phase of the Admissions process to eliminate any variances.

CAFA approved the use of UCB and UCLA reading scores to be used in the UCSC selection process. Data provided by the UC Office of President showed that the holistic scores from these two campuses already aligned with UCSC's admissions decisions, and by adopting this strategy, CAFA has sought a more cost-effective approach to implementing a comprehensive review

model, namely Holistic Review. CAFA is open to the possibility of using other UC campus's holistic scores in the future, if the data from OP proves similar to that of UCB and UCLA.

One of the scenarios which CAFA has spent a great deal of time considering is how to select from within the cohort of applicants who have similar scores (at our current level of selectivity, between 3.5-4.25), when the entire cohort with that score cannot be admitted because it is too large. Holistic scoring will not align evenly at this "break point," so tie-break criteria have been established. Since the holistic review has already been conducted on these students, the tie-break criteria are not a rescoring of applicants. Instead, tie-break criteria are meant to give Admissions staff the best possible tools to produce a frosh class which closely reflects the expectations and values of the faculty. Tie-break criteria were discussed by CAFA, and addressed in the first version of the UCSC Holistic Review Policy. This feature will likely be adapted by CAFA next year and in future years as the plan is implemented and becomes routine, because the selection of students with similar scores near the cut-off will dynamically change depending on each year's cohort and UCSC's changing selectivity level. It may be that CAFA needs to provide direction to the Office of Admissions each year as to how the pre-approved tie-breaker criteria are weighted depending on the campus' enrollment needs. CAFA plans to continue to refine and report on the plan and its outcomes to the Senate on a regular schedule.

3. Honors and Merit Scholarships subcommittee

Sub-committee members included CAFA members Raoul Birnbaum (chair), Jonathan Fox, Hiroshi Fukurai, Susan Strome and James Ramsay (SUA Rep).

1. Merit Scholarships

The sub-committee reviewed and edited the questions used as the essay prompts in 2009-10. The questions were updated to increase the cultural accessibility and to increase creativity from respondents. CAFA unanimously approved their changes, and member feedback regarding the prompted responses was favorable.

Many CAFA faculty also participated in the Chancellor's Reception for Regents Scholars, meeting with prospective students and their families. The high quality event contributed to a higher than expected yield for our Regents Scholars for 2011.

2. Honors. As discussed in section II.A.2, the committee developed and implemented a pilot honors program that will be based at Cowell College in fall 2011. Based on the results of this pilot, the honors program may be hosted at more Colleges the following year and follow-up year programming implemented.

III. Issues for the Near Future

There are at least two admissions policy issues that CAFA will continue to address in the near future.

1. Increasing non-resident student population

Discussion of this issue was initiated in December 2010 between CAFA and the interim VPDUE Mark Cioc. Throughout the spring quarter CAFA considered partnering with the VPDUE to implement several strategies which could help increase the campus yield of international students. These included:

A Flexible Application Timeline: CAFA is mindful that international applications take a great deal more effort to review, and has discussed increasing “conditional acceptance” which might lessen the administrative burden. One potential pitfall of early acceptance is that many international students can and do attend schools domestically, and their UCSC admittance in advance of their schoolmates could be problematic from a public relations point of view.

Early Notice: Conditional acceptance is one potential strategy for lessening the time constraints on this population, and also could build in flexibility for English language proficiencies which may not yet be complete. For fall 2011, the Office of Admissions did pilot an early admission notification timeline for international students in February 2011, approximately one month prior to the normal notification period beginning. This early notification included information about the Undergraduate Dean’s Award, a new scholarship opportunity directed toward non-resident students which offered awards equivalent to the Regent's Scholarships toward their non-resident tuition and a four-year housing guarantee in order to maximize our yield efforts.

Admission by Exception (AbyE): Both the broad range of recruitment successes at our sister campuses and the dire budget implications for our campus made this issue central to CAFA consideration this year. As the target for population increase is modest, CAFA is supportive of streamlining the AbyE process to consider more international student applications which may lack required data due to a variety of reasons. CAFA feels that these students can be targeted for admission if their applications indicate they are on par with our current academic standards. These admits of international or non-resident students serve both the campus’ educational and diversity goals and UCOP enrollment targets.

Priority for Lower-Division International Transfers: If a targeted number of international students are considered as a subset of AbyE, with the number of required non-resident student enrollments so low, this makes our admissions targets much easier to achieve.

The committee hopes that there can be a concerted effort to recruit both non-resident domestic students and international students. Though the enrollment of international students is important for a variety of reasons, CAFA has some concern that by focusing on this cohort of potential students, we may be diverting resources away from the recruitment of domestic non-resident students, which could have a larger yield and a greater financial impact for our campus in the short term. With the VPDUE position filled, CAFA is looking forward to reinvesting time and effort to this critical issue, which has major impacts on both campus diversity and community goals as well as budget implications due to the financial penalty imposed on UCSC by the Office of the President for not meeting our non-resident enrollment target(s).

2. Data Collection

CAFA and the Office of Admissions will conduct annual assessments of UCSC's selection process and holistic scoring method. Traditional outcomes such as GPA, test scores, total 'a-g' courses, etc. will be compared to previous admitted/enrolled frosh cohorts, ensuring that UCSC continues to admit excellent students who will succeed and graduate in a timely fashion. Ongoing analyses will ensure that UCSC's selection criteria and implementation of this holistic approach will not negatively impact specific populations of students.

Acknowledgements and Appreciation

This has been an extremely effective year owing to the quality of the membership, the SUA representatives, the collaboration the committee enjoys with the Enrollment Management unit and the support of Senate staff.

As always, CAFA enjoyed a close working relationship with the Enrollment Management unit, in particular the Offices of Admission and of Financial Aid. The committee could not function without advice from and extensive collaboration of Associate Vice Chancellor Michelle Whittingham, Financial Aid Director Ann Draper, and Associate Admissions Director Michael McCawley. Likewise, the committee could not function without its Senate staff, in particular, the new analyst Matthew Mednick who was assigned to CAFA in the wake of the move of long-time staffer Pam Edwards. Matthew did an exceptional job by quickly becoming informed about the committee's responsibilities, history and policies and following through with outstanding support from the time of his appointment and throughout the year.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

Raoul Birnbaum
Chris Edwards
Andy Fisher
Jonathan Fox
Hiroshi Fukurai
June Gordon
Juan Poblete, BOARS Rep
Susan Strome
Bruce Cooperstein, Chair

Candace Calsoyas, NSFT Rep
Jessica Greenstreet SUA Rep
James Ramsay, SUA Rep
Cameron Wales (F,W), SUA Rep

August 31, 2011