

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

Annual Report, 2011-12

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) had a productive year with priority consideration given to a 1) the newly implemented Holistic Review admissions process, including defining tiebreak criteria (evaluation for Fall 2012 class), for 2) the Transfer Admission Guidelines authored by the Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS), 3) the non-resident student application timeline, with particular attention to the special needs of international students, and 4) general oversight of the revisions to the UCSC Honors program. In addition, the CAFA Data sub-committee has conducted a preliminary analysis of UCSC's recent admissions decisions and plans to evaluate the outcomes of Holistic Review in 2012-13 when admissions data are available.

I. Admissions and Financial Aid for Fall 2012

A. Admissions

Fall 2012 was a year of change in the area of undergraduate admissions. At a UC-systemwide level, several important policy changes were implemented, including the new 9x9 eligibility model and the establishment of the new Entitled to Review (ETR) pool of applicants. Both of these BOARS policy changes are significant:

- The 9x9 eligibility model increased the percentage of ELC (Eligible in the Local Context) students from 4% to 9%, based on the GPA in 'a-g' courses in their local high school context. However, it lessened the percentage of students that qualified in the statewide context to 9%. Due to the overlap between these two populations, the 9x9 eligibility model accounts for approximately 10.5% of the high school graduates that would be considered "eligible" to the University. These students have historically been guaranteed admission somewhere within the UC system.
- The ETR pool of applicants was established to send a positive message to California high school students that a comprehensive review of an application would be given provided a student had a minimum 3.0 grade point average and had completed 11 of the 15 'a-g' courses by the end of the junior year. The ETR pool of applicants is not guaranteed admission as is the case with the 9x9 cohort. It was estimated that the ETR cohort would make up approximately 2% of the high school graduates.
- Between the 9x9 cohort and the ETR cohort, the University would meet the mandate of serving the top 12.5% of California high school graduates.

Based in part on these UC-systemwide changes in freshman policies, UCSC saw a significant increase in frosh applications for fall 2012. UCSC received a total of 33,142 frosh applications, an increase of 4,906 (17.4%) over the previous year. Significant increases resulted in several important categories: African-American applications increased by 273 students (20.4%), American Indian applications increased by 4 (.25%), Hispanic applications increased by 1,718

(23%), Non-resident applications increased by 1,199 (66%), and first-generation applications increased by 2,486 (22.7%). These increases were due in large part to several factors, including the shift in UC-systemwide policy, California's changing demographics, and the ongoing outreach efforts by the Admissions Office and other UCSC constituents.

At the transfer level, after last year's 16.6% increase in applications, UCSC had a slight downturn in applications for fall 2012. UCSC received a total of 7,679 applications, 440 fewer (5.4%) than fall 2011. This decrease was noted at all UC campuses except UC Merced. UCSC did not accept applications from lower-division transfer students, resulting in a transfer applicant pool comprised entirely of junior-level students.

UCSC admitted 20,178 frosh for fall 2012, an increase over the previous year of 950 students. The frosh enrollment target for fall 2012 was 3,700, an increase of approximately 100 students from the enrollment target for fall 2011. The admission rate of frosh, however, decreased to 60.8% compared to 68% the previous year.

This was the first year that UCSC used a Holistic Review model for selecting frosh admits. This new method of comprehensive review (modeled after UC Berkeley and UC Los Angeles) involves no fixed weight or fixed points, as was the case in UCSC's previous Comprehensive Review model, and as such, involved a significant workload increase for the staff in the Office of Admissions. While there were some unanticipated complications resulting from the implementation of Holistic Review, they were overcome allowing UCSC to meet its goal of admitting frosh on March 15, 2012. The admission outcomes showed increases in underrepresented students, first-generation students, low-income students, students coming from low-performing high schools in California, as well as increases in non-residents (both domestic non-residents and international students). Academic quality of the admitted frosh cohort was on par with fall 2011. UCSC again offered some denied frosh an opportunity to be on a UCSC waitlist, but after the Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) numbers were known, no waitlisted frosh was offered admission to the campus.

At the transfer level, UCSC admitted 5,288 juniors, a slight increase of 28 students (.05%) from the previous year. The annual enrollment goal for transfers was set at 1,250-1,300 students, up by 50 over fall 2011. When SIR numbers were known, UCSC will again meet its annual target entirely with the fall cohort. UCSC will begin implementing some major-based admission decisions for fall 2013 (concordant with pending BOARS policy changes), with particular attention to those impacted areas in the biological sciences, economics, and psychology.

Frosh SIRs totaled 4,523, an increase of 247 students (5.7%). Non-resident SIRs increased by 51 students (132 vs. 81) from fall 2011. Transfer SIRs totaled 1,659, an increase of 149 students (9.9%) from the previous year. The Office of Admissions is again working with several academic departments in communicating with SIREd transfers that may benefit from additional major preparation, offering to defer their admission to winter 2013 or by guaranteeing their admission for fall 2013. UCSC is again not open to new applications for winter 2013.

CAFA is pleased with these outcomes and supports the continuation of Holistic Review, while recognizing that some adjustments are needed for fall 2013.

B. Financial Aid and Scholarships

The demand for financial aid is increasing and so is the cumulative loan debt that our students graduate with. About 70% of UC Santa Cruz students receive some type of financial aid (including grants, scholarships, loans and/or work-study assistance.) This year, support was provided to 11,640 undergraduate students.

Political and Budgetary Impacts

The world of financial aid funding is virtually never stable – subject to federal and state economies and to the will of legislators. The federal government has imposed a 6 year limit on the receipt of Federal Pell Grants – students over the limit will lose Pell Grant funding but, under the UC undergraduate student Education Finance Model, will receive UC return to aid grant funds to offset this loss. Fortunately, the number of students affected by the new rule is expected to be small – roughly 50 current students are impacted. But, diverting UC grant funds ultimately has an impact on the self-help component of student packages (the work/loan expectation).

Under the passage of the California Dream Acts (AB 130 and AB131), undocumented students who qualify for AB540 non-resident tuition exemptions are now eligible to receive UC/CSU and state funded aid. Beginning January 2011, students may receive scholarships that have been privately donated to the campus, beginning in January 2012, students may receive UC return to aid grant funds and beginning in fall 2013, they may receive state funded Cal Grants. The California Student Aid Commission created an online Dream Application for students to use in lieu of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) which may not be submitted if a student doesn't have a social security number. Dream Act students do not qualify to receive federally funded grants, loans or work-study.

Other factors influencing the work/loan expectation in our aid packages is the degree to which FAFSA data is verified. Because the Financial Aid and Scholarship office lost staff positions in recent rounds of budget reductions and because aid applications from UCSC students are increasing each year, we cannot effectively manage this degree of scrutiny while also ensuring timely offers of aid. . The U.S. Department of Education has attempted to improve the accuracy of FAFSA data by providing a link to the IRS through which families can download some of the required data from their tax return (after it is filed with the IRS) into their FAFSA. Although this is helpful, the timing of aid applications juxtaposed with the IRS deadline is problematic. In California, students must submit a FAFSA by March 2nd while the tax return filing deadline is April 15th.

All of the factors above result in shifting UC grant funds to students with more ability to pay and away from those with less ability to pay but it is worth highlighting that all students pay more in this scenario in in the form of a higher work/loan expectation.

For 2011-12, the state legislature passed laws to impose new rules for Cal Grant recipients. This program had income and asset ceiling tests that had to be met by the first year the student received a Cal Grant and thereafter, they had to demonstrate financial need. Beginning in 2011-12, the income and asset ceiling tests have to be applied each year. This has resulted in the loss

of about \$4 million in Cal Grant funds to UC Santa Cruz students in the current year. The consequence is the same as the loss of Federal Pell Grant dollars; affected students received UC return to aid grant funds to offset this loss and the work/loan expectation rose.

In his recent budget proposal, the Governor has outlined a plan that would essentially decimate the current Cal Grant program in its current form. Cal Grant is a need and merit grant program from which UC students benefit tremendously. Brown's budget would make it a need only program modeled after the Federal Pell Grant program. It appears unlikely the legislature will adopt the proposed changes; however the risk is high that this program will suffer cuts in the future unless the state economy stabilizes. For comparison, UC Santa Cruz students are receiving about \$28 million in Pell Grants and \$65 million in Cal Grants for 2011-12. A change of the magnitude proposed by Governor Brown would result in the loss of viability of our current aid program for undergraduate students. Lacking an increase in gift aid to offset the loss, many students and families would find a UC education out of reach financially.

It is a fact that need analysis under the current federal methodology and using the current federal application – the FAFSA - is an inherently unfair process. This is the process all UC's are using. However, the application/methodology ignores the ability of non-custodial (divorced) parents to contribute, it ignores home equity, it ignores retirement investments (where savings can be sheltered), and it automatically classifies a student as independent at age 24 resulting in no reporting of the financial data for their parents. Savvy financial planners/parents are aware of the loopholes in this system.

UC has made the choice not to require students to submit an alternative/additional application available from the College Scholarship Service (CSS) – the Profile application. Like an admission application, CSS charges a fee for their service which increases depending on the number of schools to which a student is applying. (Note: CSS offers campuses the option to purchase application fee waivers for certain populations of students.) UC has been deterred from adopting the use of the Profile by the fees and the by the complexity/detailed nature of the application.

All of the changes implemented or proposed, result in higher indebtedness for our students. Recent UC Santa Cruz graduates have an average debt of nearly \$20,000 but the debt ranges up to \$31,000 – the federal cumulative maximum amount an undergraduate student may borrow. Each year, the U.S. Department of Education calculates loan default rates by campus. The rate for our campus has been exceptionally low in recent years but is beginning to climb. The latest data shows: 2008 Official Cohort Default Rate = 1.4, 2009 2 YR Official Cohort Default Rate = 2.5, 2009 3 YR Draft Cohort Default Rate = 4.1.

A final area of concern is the Federal Work-Study program. Our campus receives only \$750,000 in federal dollars for this program annually. Simply put, this can support \$1,000 of earnings for 750 students. For years, the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office has added UC grant dollars (return to aid) to supplement the federal funds and the campus has hired 1,500 to 1,700 students each year under this program. In 2011-12 however, earnings have increased - the grant supplement required to balance the fund is expected to be \$1 million by fiscal close this year. It

is possible the number of work-study jobs will have to be limited in the future if the trend of hiring more students using Federal Work-Study funds continues to increase.

Historically, we have included work-study in the aid package of every eligible student. This model created the expectation that a job would be available and has caused frustration for students unable to find employment. The UC Santa Cruz campus and community do not have jobs for 8,000 or more students. To better manage expectations, beginning in 2012-13 work-study will be offered to students who meet Federal Pell Grant program eligibility requirements and to students who have work-study positions in the current year. However, there are no funds to offset the lack of a work-study offer. Our only option is to offer nothing in its place or to offer the student's parent (if dependent) a Federal Parent Loan for Undergraduate Students.

Current Financial Aid Funding Model and Data

Under the UC Education Finance Model, undergraduate students who qualify for need-based assistance must pay approximately the first \$9,500 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 remainder of the total estimated total cost. The cost for a student living on campus in 2012-13 will be about \$33,300.

The Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan 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 to meet this commitment. However, under the Plan some students who would not normally receive gift aid (due to high asset equity) receive gift aid. The plan may work as a recruitment device but it diverts funds from students who need them more to students who need them less and causes an increase the work/loan expectation for all students.

In 2011-12 the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office administered over \$250 million in financial assistance to about 70% of UCSC's undergraduate students. Aid applications and recipients are increasing significantly each year.

Source of Aid	Percent of Undergraduates	Amount Received	Average Award
Gift Aid (all sources)	64%	\$158,000,000	\$ 15,410
UC Santa Cruz Scholarships*	9.8%	\$ 3,700,000	\$ 2,358
Federal Pell Grants*	41%	\$28,250,000	\$ 4,262
Student and Parent Loans	57%	\$90,000,000	\$ 9,906
Federal Work-Study	12%	\$ 2,700,000	\$1,374
* 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 are data for major scholarship programs administered by the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office:

Scholarship Program	Recipients	Amount Received	Average Award
Regents Scholarships	151	\$ 723,134	\$4,789
Campus Merit Scholarships	384	\$ 570,149	\$1,485
Pister Leadership Opportunity Awards	25	\$ 222,432	\$8,897

Less than 10% of undergraduates receive scholarships each year and UC Santa Cruz has the lowest per capita scholarship support of all UC campuses – about \$230 per undergraduate student. 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 314 frosh appeals submitted for fall 2012, an increase of 91 over the previous year. The increase in frosh appeals was most likely due to the increased number students denied admission (nearly 4,000 more than fall 2011) which included the increased number of waitlist offers (nearly 1,000 more than fall 2011). Of the 314 frosh appeals that were submitted, only 42 were granted, all of which met our selection criteria. All 42 students were read under the new Holistic Review process and scored comparably with other frosh admits. Of the 42 frosh that were admitted, 29 of them submitted their SIR.

There were 86 transfer appeals submitted for fall 2012, a slight decrease (36) over fall 2011. Of the appeals that were submitted, 34 were granted, all of which met the same selection criteria that we used for all other transfer offers of admission. Of the 34 transfers that were admitted, 28 of them submitted their SIR.

II. Work of CAFA in 2011-2012

A. Campus Connections

The Committee interfaced with several campus and Senate processes:

1. BOARS Transfer Admission Policy

CAFA reviewed the revised BOARS Transfer Proposal (February 2012) and aside from some minor logistical concerns, is supportive of the planned changes. In many ways the proposal aligned with campus goals related to transfer student major preparation, and believes that the revisions make the transfer pathways more clear. CAFA pointed out the parallel critical need for an overhaul of the ASSIST system to become more user friendly for both prospective UC transfer students and advisors.

2. Major Preparation (transfers)

As previously mentioned, CAFA communicated with the departments asking them to identify a draft version of their transfer major requirements. CAFA's goal is to identify these courses, achievably articulated, for those majors which a) have the most need for major prep coursework due to lengthy major field requirements and, b) have the most interest in pursuing the articulation of major prep coursework. Overall, it is our hope that this initiative will streamline the 2012-13 implementation timeline with many, if not all, departments having already considered the impact of the proposed BOARS policy changes.

The requirements are intended to introduce the student to their chosen major field, ensure that they have a degree of competence for success, and begin them on their pathway for UC admissions. In addition, for the purposes of equity, we need to ensure that transfer students are not being expected to complete more credit hours for a major than native students.

3. International Admissions

Discussion of this issue was initiated in December 2010 between CAFA and the interim VPDUE Mark Cioc. Throughout the Spring of 2011 and all of 2011-12, CAFA has partnered with the VPDUE and Enrollment Management to implement several strategies which could help increase the campus yield of international students. The Chair of CAFA also sits on the International-student Yield Committee.

In January 2012, CAFA reviewed revised proposals from Enrollment Management and provided the following feedback:

- **Conditional Admission.** CAFA approved the proposed change to conditionally admit (pending their submission of the required documentation) qualified international students who have not yet completed their English language proficiency (TOEFL, etc.) with the requirement they submit the proof of proficiency, along with the SAT or ACT by the required deadline of July 15 in order to begin processing their I-20.
- **Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG).** CAFA approved the proposed change to allow Admissions to review UC TAG applicant students with prior international coursework (both domestic students and international students).

Lower-Division International Transfers. Discussion continues on whether both international and domestic applicants might be considered as lower division students if they fall outside of the freshman category but have not yet reached junior level standing.

4. VPDUE Class-Slots Proposal

CAFA reviewed the revised proposal from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to update the current class time slots to add additional slots as well as shift the current schedule. The CAFA membership was comfortable with going ahead with the implementation

of the proposed changes and feels they are aligned with the EVC's stated goal of creating enhanced academic pathways to allow students to graduate in four years or less.

Additionally, it should be noted the CAFA student representative related that the student body is supportive of the proposed changes; really any changes, which would improve overall student access to courses.

B. Sub-Committee Efforts

A great deal of CAFA's work in 2011-12 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

Over the course of the year we met to review policies on appeals for admission denial and cancellations, and made conformance adjustments. These documents were created in the previous two academic years to improve clarity and transparency in the admission process and to ensure equitable treatment across students and applicants. The multiple documents reflect the many varied circumstances under which appeals are filed. Specifically, we provide guidelines for the Office of Admissions to address appeals for admission denial for both (a) first-year and (b) transfer students. We also consider appeals filed for admission cancellation when (c) admits miss a deadline for submitting critical information to the Office of Admissions, (d) present a shortfall in their academic performance, and when falsification of records is discovered by either (e) UCSC Office of Admissions or (f) system-wide through the UC Verification Process. Finally, we include (g) guidelines for addressing miscellaneous appeals falling outside these explicit circumstances.

Except for when falsification is discovered through UC Verification, appeals must be filed with the UCSC Office of Admissions. Appeals sent to other offices or individuals within UCSC must be forwarded to the Office of Admissions for review following our guidelines. Generally, three levels of appeal are offered, first with Office of Admissions, second with the Associate Vice Chancellor/Director of Admissions, and third with the CAFA chair (or their designee). 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. When cancellation results from falsification through UC verification, an appeal must be filed directly with UCOP. The relevant guidelines and flowcharts visualizing the appeals process are posted on the [CAFA website](#).

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

In the 2011-12 year, the CAFA Data subcommittee initiated a data collection and analysis project in an effort to assess the state of applications, admissions, and enrollment of first year students (frosh) at UCSC, and to establish a baseline of information that might allow understanding of the impact of holistic review on admissions decisions and the UCSC student population more broadly. The subcommittee crafted and submitted a request for information that formed the basis of this analysis, received the first set of information, completed initial analyses, and prepared a report which will be finalized in fall 2012.

The initial data request included information on the pools of applicants, admittees, and those who eventually enrolled at UCSC as part of the fall 2011 entering Frosh class. Additional information is to be provided in the future on the performance of these students during the 2011-12 academic year while attending UCSC, and on applicants for admission as part of the fall 2012 entering Frosh class. The latter was the first class for whom admission was based on holistic review.

The focus of the initial analysis was on the Computed Index (CI), a metric used to capture a range of information on academic and social factors, including grades and test scores, numbers and kinds of high school senior courses attempted, local context and high school API score, geographic setting, and whether applicant has a parent who has finished a four year college/university degree.

Analyses of initial data (from before the use of holistic review criteria) suggests that, although UCSC is increasingly selective in admissions (~68% admitted for fall 2011 entering frosh class), our yield of students with the highest CI scores is low. Our yield overall is ~18% for all students admitted, but is ~6% for the top 4000 CI scores. We see a similar pattern when looking at only students admitted who do not have a parent who has finished a four year degree. These findings have implications for how effort is expended to attract better prepared and more diverse students to attend UCSC. Trying to expand the applicant pool might be a relatively inefficient approach compared to working on increasing the yield of excellent applicants who are already considering attending UCSC. In addition, the data suggest that students choosing to attend UCSC have relatively low reported family income compared to similarly prepared students who were admitted but choose not to attend. The family income of attending students is also low when compared to applicants having similar academic and social records and high school API scores.

The CAFA Data subcommittee plans to continue this study in 2012-13, gathering performance data on the 2011 frosh class during their first year at UCSC, and looking at CI and holistic review scores of the 2012 frosh class, to analyze how admissions outcomes may have changed as a result of implementing holistic review.

3. Honors and Merit Scholarships Subcommittee

Merit Scholarships

The subcommittee reviewed the two essay prompts used in 2010-11, and made minor changes to one of them. From the 1008 students who were invited to submit essays, we received essays from 282 students. After CAFA members evaluated and ranked the essays, 230 students were

invited to be Regents Scholars. To encourage their acceptance, several CAFA faculty participated in the Chancellor's Reception for Regents Scholars, meeting with prospective students and their families. The final yield was 25 Regents Scholars.

Honors Program

Overview: During the 2010-11 academic year, Raoul Birnbaum and the CAFA Honors Subcommittee, in consultation with the VPDUE, College Provosts, and Senate colleagues, developed and proposed a pilot first-year honors program. It was approved and implemented in fall 2011 in Cowell College. It will be offered through 3 colleges, Cowell, Crown, and Kresge, in fall 2012.

Goals: This pilot program was designed to provide high-achieving students at their earliest stage at UCSC with an intensive and challenging academic experience, opportunities to forge social links with intellectual peers, and direct connections to committed Senate faculty. Our hope is that this first-year experience will attract more high-achieving students to UCSC and encourage them to continue their studies here through to timely graduation.

Invitations to join the honors program were extended to all Regents Scholars, as well as students who received a holistic review score of 1, and students who were in the top 1% of California high schools. From the 1385 invitations extended, we recruited an honors cohort of 47, a lower yield than anticipated. This number drove the decision to offer honors in only 3 colleges (Cowell, Crown, and Kresge) instead of the originally targeted 4 colleges (Cowell, Crown, Kresge, and Stevenson). Kresge has the smallest fall honors cohort and may experiment with bringing a few new students into the program in Winter quarter. As the reputation of the honors program grows and as more colleges become involved, we expect the fall honors cohorts will grow in future years.

Cowell and Crown will each house their honors students together in one of the college dormitories. Kresge will not.

We initially aimed to require that students have satisfied the C1 writing requirement. This requirement was dropped, as many students cannot know if they are C1-satisfied until well after the SIR deadline, and some students' decision about whether or not to attend UCSC hinged on joining the honors program.

The details of the 2012-13 honors program, including criteria for inviting students and curricular and residential issues, were developed in collaboration with VPDUE Richard Hughey, the newly appointed Director of Honors Raoul Birnbaum, and the Provosts of Cowell, Crown, Kresge, and Stevenson Colleges.

In the Fall, honors students will take a 5-credit honors core course that engages with the college's core theme, and offers a more challenging, academically intensive focus than the standard core courses. For many students, Fall core will satisfy C2. In the Winter, each participating college will organize and sponsor a 5-credit seminar led by one of that college's Senate faculty members on a topic appropriate for first-year general education, at an intellectual level appropriate for high-achieving first-year students. All students in the honors program will

be free to choose from among the honors seminars offered across the colleges, so long as the students have fulfilled the prerequisites for the course and space is available. In the Spring, all honors students will be brought together for a 2-credit Faculty Research Talks seminar. Each week's presentation will be followed by a discussion period during which the students can actively interact with the presenter. Guest speakers will join the hosting college's honors students for a meal, to provide more opportunity for discussion and interaction.

III. Issues for the Near Future

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

1. Increasing non-resident & international student populations

Understanding the desire for UCSC to increase perspectives from around the globe as well as increase revenue that would support native students' ability to attend UCSC, CAFA supports the Admissions Office and other campus units in an attempt to not only recruit and identify strong non-resident students who could be well served by UCSC but also create policies and practices which would ensure their retention and engagement with the UCSC community.

In an effort to increase the number of fall 2012 nonresident frosh and transfer enrollments, the Admissions Office initiated a number of recruitment and yield efforts that focused on encouraging nonresidents to apply and eventually enroll and graduate from UCSC. The campus invested funds for the hire of both out of state and international admissions representatives. An additional position was hired in the International Education Office and some funds remained for recruitment expenditures. Key strategies included: name purchases from the College Board, attendance at several national college fairs, collaborative recruitment efforts with other UCs, online fairs and chats (CollegeWeekLive/Zinch/EducationUSA), a revamped international web page, new international communication, collaboration with Education Abroad Programs and targeted mailings to high schools and EducationUSA advising centers around the world. In addition, a great amount of time has been spent understanding the various definitions surrounding nonresident coding throughout the cycle to ensure accurate comparisons and projections focused on the nonresident tuition status.

Nonresident frosh applicants totaled 3,302 (1,817 domestic/ 1,485 int'l) compared to 1,962 (1,199 domestic/ 763 international) in fall 2011. Nonresident frosh SIRs totaled 142 (113 domestic/29 international) compared to 84 (74 domestic/10 international) of the fall 2011. Projections suggest approximately 105 (92 domestic/ 13 international) new nonresident tuition-paying frosh will be enrolling. This is an increase in nonresident tuition-paying frosh of 37 over the fall 2011 nonresident tuition-paying frosh of 68 (63 domestic/ 5 international). Nonresident transfer applicants totaled 550 (105 domestic/445 international) compared to 582 (95 domestic/487 international) in fall 2011. Nonresident transfer SIRs totaled 23 (8 domestic/ 15 international) compared to 16 (6 domestic/ 10 international) in fall 2011. Projections suggest approximately 24 (19 domestic/ 5 international) new nonresident tuition paying transfers will be enrolling. This is an increase in nonresident tuition-paying transfers of 8 over the fall 2011 nonresident tuition-paying transfers of 16 (13 domestic/ 3 international). If our nonresident

enrollment projections are correct, for frosh we will need 80 more to reach the Office of the president mandated goal of 185; for transfers we would need 44 more to reach the goal of 68 and then maintain that level in order to reach a total undergraduate nonresident level of 5%. We will likely reach the 5% goal by 2016, rather than 2015, unless we significantly exceed the 185 and 68 for fall 2013, 2014 and 2015. It is critical we spend equal time focusing on both retention and recruitment to achieve intended results.

2. Data Analysis

The Comprehensive Review Data subcommittee plans to continue working on its analysis of UCSC's admissions outcomes compared across the last several years. This data, in concert with the information supplied by the Admissions Office and Institutional Research, should assist the campus community in better understanding the true profile of UCSC's current students. It will also assist CAFA in planning for, and reacting to, changes in the demographics of our applicants and increases/decreases in the academic success (grades, retention, graduation) of our students overall.

3. Consideration of Exceptions to Normal Admissions Timeline

Considering the many requests for early review of specific applicant cohorts (international, music, athletes), CAFA found it important to not introduce procedural changes for any one group in isolation, but rather investigate broadly the potential benefits associated with early review and early notification overall. It is CAFA's hope that with adequate opportunity to conduct a more thorough analysis, and after completing Holistic Review cycles at least one more time, it can revisit this issue.

4. New Transfer policy and major preparation

CAFA looks forward to collaborating with CEP in continuing our work with departments towards insuring transfer students enter UCSC with the best possible preparation in order for their timely completion.

Acknowledgements and Appreciation

This has been an extremely effective year owing to the quality of the membership, the collaboration the committee enjoys with the Enrollment Management and Admissions units, and the support of Senate staffing.

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 Admissions Director Michael McCawley. Likewise, the committee could not function without the important contributions and collaboration of its Senate staff analyst, Matthew Mednick.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

Chris Edwards

Andy Fisher

Hiroshi Fukurai

Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani

L.S. Kim

Tracy Larabee

Renya Ramirez

Susan Strome

June Gordon, BOARS Rep., Chair

Candace Calsoyas, NSTF

Chad Oliver, SUA

James Ramsay, SUA

August 31, 2012