

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID
2016-17 Annual Report

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) continued its annual work evaluating the outcomes of the prior (2016) admissions cycle and adapting its consistent priorities to changing circumstances in shaping the class entering in fall 2017. As always, we worked closely with Undergraduate Education, Enrollment Management, and Admissions, whose energy and creativity provided us with both information and options for setting policy.

I.
WORK OF CAFA IN 2016-2017

A. Committee Foci

1. Holistic Review of frosh applicants

This year CAFA continued in its efforts to refine the Holistic Review (HR) policy that has served as the primary admissions policy for the campus since it instituted its own holistic review process in 2012. CAFA eliminated two of the HR scoring bands (4.25 and 4.75, leaving a scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, 4.5, 5), those small variations were difficult to discern for the readers and the differences were too small to significantly influence final selection. Changes were also made to the criteria language in several bands to provide clarity and consistency.

- a. **Priorities:** CAFA's priorities in shaping the class were consistent with last year's: ensuring first that every student offered admission is sufficiently prepared to succeed at UCSC, and among that population shaping a diverse class, both as a way to make sure we provide opportunity to all Californians and as a goal in itself for the intellectual, social and cultural benefit of the whole student body. We placed particular emphasis, within the constraints of Proposition 209, on increasing representation of African American and Native American students, since those groups need greater representation on campus to constitute a "critical mass" for mutual support.

- b. **Final Selection Criteria:** During the winter quarter the committee deliberated a set of admission scenarios provided by Enrollment Management and reviewed a set of diversity-promoting recommendations introduced by Michelle Whittingham, Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management (AVCEM). These recommendations proposed varying combinations of minimum Holistic Review Scores (HRS), student success indicator scores (SSI), combined with other academic and diversity indicators such as eligibility in the state context, (top 9% of all high school seniors), eligibility in the local context (top 9% of a participating high school's graduating class), first generation college student status, and others, to forecast how the incoming cohort might look. After deliberating over the scenarios and their hypothetical outcomes, CAFA arrived at a decision that members agreed would meet our campus goals of selecting a frosh cohort of both strong academic preparedness and economic, racial/ethnic, and geographical diversity.

- c. **Waitlist:** In the spring, CAFA reviewed the campus waitlist strategy implemented by Enrollment Management. AVCEM Whittingham provided an overview of the strategy being used to populate the waitlist. Members agreed that the waitlist strategy should augment and complement the goals established for the final selection criteria and established a set of principles for admitting students from the waitlist.

2. *Transfer students and “2:1”*

New this year was a requirement established by the Governor and UCOP that each campus in the UC system admit one transfer student for every two admitted frosh, referred to as the 2:1 transfer ratio. As part of his May budget revision, Gov. Jerry Brown requested that \$50 million be sequestered from University of California funding until recommendations from an April 25 California State Auditor’s report, and other state commitments are implemented by the University. One of the stipulations is that the University must provide sufficient evidence that all university campuses, except UC Merced and UCSF, are on track to meet an enrollment ratio of 2 new incoming freshman for every 1 new incoming transfer by the 2018-19 academic year. UCSC currently has a frosh to transfer ratio of approximately 2.6 to 1.

The committee took several steps to help UCSC approach the 2:1 ratio without jeopardizing student success. We approved an administration request to offer admission to transfer students with a college GPA of 2.4 or higher (down from 2.6 in previous years and equal to the systemwide minimum), having reviewed evidence provided by Richard Hughey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE), that students with this entering GPA in earlier years were as successful as their peers in the 2.6-2.8 band. CAFA also voted to allow offers of admission to transfer students who applied to other campuses but who met the UCSC admissions criteria, in the spirit of the UC wide transfer referral pool already established for frosh applicants. The subject of establishing a transfer waitlist from UCSC applicants also arose as the result of a discussion regarding curricular issues that could result in a denial of admission for a transfer student. It is the committee’s understanding that a majority of these issues have to do with either a missing course from the 7-course pattern required for transfer, or a missing course required for major preparation in those departments that have such a requirement. Having a waitlist for transfer students would allow time for students, who otherwise meet the transfer admissions criteria established by this committee, to be considered for admission once they have addressed the issue that lead to their initial denial of admission. Normally these cases are handled through an appeals process which places more burden on the student. The administration may wish to consider sending a notice to these students describing the issue to be resolved along with an invitation to be on the transfer wait list.

3. *Nonresident Admissions*

- a. **Compare Favorably:** On an annual basis the systemwide Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) sends out a request to divisional admissions committees to assess the extent to which their campus has met “*compare favorably*” standards. This standard, established in 2011, requires that nonresident (domestic and international) students should *compare favorably* to admitted California residents. While the policy does not specify the way the comparison should be made, high school GPA and SAT scores are collected by UCOP annually and used to report compliance with the

policy. As a campus that has only recently begun to build a significant nonresident cohort, UCSC must build both a general national and international reputation as an undergraduate destination and specific pipelines to high schools worldwide. Balancing this need, which is specific to the early stages of nonresident admission, with the compare favorably standard is difficult, and puts UCSC in a particularly difficult position with regard to this standard compared to other campuses.

- b. **CAFA's Campus Specific Perspective:** CAFA's first priority in this situation, as we seek that balance and work with the Administration, is to assure that wherever the balance is struck, we always enroll students who have a high probability of success here. CAFA's other primary goal is to admit and enroll students who make up a diverse population – diverse in socioeconomic condition, race, ethnicity, geography, and life experience. While the tuition brought by nonresident students supports campus services that benefit California students as well, nonresident students also contribute a cultural and intellectual diversity that benefits their fellow students in other ways. Viewing nonresident admissions from a diversity perspective invites a comparison to how we approach our other diversity goals (see final selection criteria); this can lead us to a point of clarity and consistency in our policy. Specifically, CAFA's position has been that:

- Every group of students we admit, resident or nonresident, should be expected to have a good probability of success here;
- This should be enabled by an absolute floor in academic preparation, most likely a specific minimum SSI score, since that is the best predictor we have at the moment; and
- The floor should be no lower for nonresident students than for those specific populations of resident students that we are most actively trying to enroll.

This local policy is in addition to BOARS's *compare favorably* policy, and, like *compare favorably*, can be thought of as having its roots in the 1988 Master Plan language for nonresidents being “held to at least equivalent levels of preparation” as residents, which in fact seems to suggest a floor rather than an average. Nonetheless, UCSC remains committed to improving its performance on *compare favorably* as normally measured (average GPA and SAT) from year to year. The magnitudes of the shortfalls are already very small (the reader is referred to CAFA's annual *compare favorably* report to BOARS and UCOP's annual report on the subject for details).

- c. **Systemwide cap on nonresident enrollment:** In May of this year the UC Regents voted to cap nonresident undergraduate enrollment to 18% at UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, UC Santa Cruz, UC Riverside and UC Merced. Four campuses that already exceed that level — UCLA, UC Berkeley, UC San Diego and UC Irvine — will be allowed to keep but not increase the higher percentage they enroll in 2017-18. UCSC is not likely to approach this cap within the next few years.

4. *Early notification*

At the long-standing request of Athletics, and considering the interests of other academic and extracurricular units on campus, CAFA approved a pilot process for early admissions notification for prospective students who are recruited for their “special talents.” This process is intended to be applicable to Athletics, as well as to academic units, and performing arts groups, to name a few. Under the new policy nominators, who are approved by the nominating unit, can submit a short list of names of recruited students whom they would like to receive early consideration and notification for admission. These lists will be vetted for conflicts of interest by the office of the VPDUE, then sent to Admissions. As soon as all holistic review reads are completed, the previous year’s final selection criteria will be applied to these students’ applications, and if they would have been chosen by that criterion (or chosen automatically if their HR score is $>x^1$) then they will be admitted and notified as soon as possible.

B. Sub-Committee Efforts

1. *Appeals Subcommittee*

The Appeals Subcommittee, as of this writing, is performing its function of serving on the Cancellation Appeals Review Committee (CARC), and ruling on the appeals of students whose admission was canceled, usually because of senior year grades or failure to report official test scores, transcripts, etc. Because certain common conditions that don’t bode too badly for the student’s success (a single bad grade not in a required English course, for example, or a test score that came in only slightly late) were automatically treated with leniency this year, there are relatively few cases.

2. *Data Subcommittee*

The primary project of the Data Subcommittee was to spend extra time reviewing particular selection scenarios for the frosh class with Enrollment Management, so that a small and clearly described set of options could be presented for discussion with the committee as a whole.

II. ISSUES FOR THE NEAR FUTURE

A. Early Notification

Work with the VPDUE’s office to ensure that the early notification process approved last year is implemented for this admissions cycle, in a way that is consistent with the approved policy.

B. Major Impaction

There will possibly be one or more approved cases of major impaction this year, and CAFA will need to meet with the relevant parties to design major-specific admissions policies that support diversity as well as preparation within the entering class, possibly using the same sort of policies we normally use for the frosh class as a whole. As departments and divisions are probably not

¹ X being equal to the minimum HR score required for automatic admission as determined by CAFA.

familiar with these methods, care will have to be taken in explaining them, and it may be appropriate to bring CAAD into the conversation.

C. 2:1

CAFA will need to follow up with the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Policy Studies (IRAPS) on the performance of transfer students admitted with college GPAs in the 2.4-2.6 band to verify that their progress is acceptable. This will also be the case for students in programs with major preparation requirements that have recently been revised. There may be further steps proposed by the administration toward reaching 2:1 that will need CAFA's careful consideration. Relatedly, the committee may wish to consider the admissions requirements of the Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG) program which tend to be more stringent.

D. Compare Favorably

CAFA should also monitor the first-year performance of the most recent cohort of nonresident students as a metric for the *compare favorably* standard, particularly any admitted in the last cycle with incomplete test scores. In addition, we should explore, with the administration, the utility of stressing the new SAT specifically as the best standard of comparison, which it should be, considering that it is both universal and less subject to rote over-preparation, having not been around as long as the older test.

E. Admissions Deadlines for Submission of Required Documentation

At the end of the 2016-17 year CAFA engaged in conversations with the Office of Admissions regarding the use of unofficial scores in admissions and the test score deadline. AVCEM Whittingham polled colleagues systemwide on these topics. Four of the sister campuses indicated that they do not require official test scores for admission, and all of them are flexible on the July 15th test score deadline in a similar fashion to what they are for transcripts.

The AVCEM would like to work with CAFA on this next year as there may be continued benefits to being flexible on the admission side regarding the unofficial scores and allowing flexibility, like the transcripts, for the test score deadline to better align with other campuses regarding the cancellation aspect. The campus appeals policy would still remain, it would just be the extended deadline that would be new. The AVCEM suggests that this change could really help students and on-campus programming for Orientation, advising, enrollment, etc.

III.

ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID FOR FALL 2017

A. Admissions

A brief summary of UCSC admissions outcome data provided by UCSC Office of Enrollment Management (OEM) is outlined below. These data are reflective of reports based on a fixed point

in time at the end of each cycle. Data is dynamic and changes up until the full cycle has been completed.

It was a very successful year in terms of submitted applications. A total of 63,078 applications were received. Frosh applications totaled 52,975 (CA = 42,698, out of state = 3,809, and international = 6,468) and transfer applications totaled 10,103 (CA = 8,922, out of state = 187, and international = 994). Once again, we opened for winter transfer applications in selected majors in order to achieve our transfer enrollment goals. As of the writing of this report, we have received 224 winter applications for 2018.

A total of 33,242 undergraduate students were admitted for fall 2017. A total of 27,235 frosh, including 19,260 California, 3,160 out of state and 4,815 international. The total admission rate for all frosh was 51.4%. The average high school GPA of admitted frosh was 3.89 (on a 4.4 weighted scale), representing a 1% increase from fall 2016. The average SAT score taken under the old test system is 1910, representing a 5% increase from last year. The average SAT score taken under the new test system is 1276. The waitlist was utilized heavily to ensure we could manage up to the target enrollment for California. Of the California admit offers, 2,290 were from the waitlist. A total of 6,007 transfers were admitted, including 5,373 California, 68 out of state and 566 international. The admission rate for all transfers was 59.5%. In addition, 581 transfer students who had not finished their major preparation requirements were offered admission for winter 2018, allowing them time to complete the requirements. To date, 73 have accepted the winter offer.

Frosh Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) numbers total 4,753, including 3,829 California, 335 out of state and 589 international students. Of particular interest given the priorities outlined for the year, we report African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF+)² SIRs. California frosh African American SIRs reached 5.0%, increasing from 3.4% in fall 2015 and 4.1% in fall 2016; 29.0% are Hispanic/ Latino, increasing from 28.8% in fall 2015 and 26.7% in fall 2016. For out of state frosh SIRs, 6.6% are African American, increasing from 6.1% in fall 2015, yet down from 10.4% from fall 2016. There were 451 students from LCFF+ schools who accepted our offer of admission, representing 11.8% of the California SIRs, compared to 11.1% last year.

Transfer SIRs total 1,543, including 1,458 California, 16 out of state and 69 international students. California transfer SIRs reflect 5.9% are African American, increasing from 4.0% in fall 2015 and 5.0% in fall 2016; 31.6% are Hispanic/ Latino, increasing from 28.2% in fall 2015 and 31.1% in fall 2016. For out of state transfer SIRs, 12.5% are African American, increasing from 4.2% in fall 2015 and 4.6% in fall 2016. Efforts were made to maximize the admit offers for qualified transfer students in order to make progress on enrolling two California frosh for every one California transfer student, commonly referred to as 2:1. We expect to end up at 2.7:1

² The local control funding formula (LCFF) was enacted in 2013–14, and it replaced the previous kindergarten through grade 12 (K–12) finance system which had been in existence for roughly 40 years. For school districts and charter schools, the LCFF establishes base, supplemental, and concentration grants in place of the myriad of previously existing K–12 funding streams. LCFF+ refers to those schools that receive the supplemental and concentration grants due to the percentage of targeted disadvantaged pupils, defined as those who are classified as English learners (EL), meet income requirements to receive a free or reduced-price meal (FRPM), foster youth, or any combination of these factors.

this year, compared to 3.3:1 for fall 2016, in large part because of strategies to increase applications and admits, as well as the decrease in California frosh enrollment target.

Estimated enrollment vis a vis enrollment targets based on current active SIRs and expected melt:

Frosh	Fall 2017 Target Enrollment	Estimated Enrollments by Tuition Residency
California	3,300	3,401
Non-resident	600	610
Total	3,900	4,011

Transfers	Fall 2017 Target Enrollment	Estimated Enrollments by Tuition Residency
California	1,175	1,185
Non-resident	60	55
Total	1,255	1,240

We are also expecting approximately 80 transfer students in the winter of 2018 for a total of 1,265 of our 1,275 enrollment target.

B. Financial Aid and Scholarships

The demand for financial aid continues to increase, with about 78% of UC Santa Cruz students receiving some type of financial aid in 2016-17 (including grants, scholarships, fellowships, loans and/or work-study assistance.) In 2016-17, support has been provided to 13,027 undergraduate students and 1,635 graduate students.

1. Political and Budgetary Impacts

There continues to be increasing scrutiny of the state and federal budgets for higher education. Although the issues surrounding the cost of higher education are complex, limiting financial aid access to students is often the most readily accessible tool legislators have for controlling the education budgets. The limits to access imposed in the past 5 years include reduced eligibility for continuing students to Cal Grants, Federal Pell Grants, and Federal Loans, and most recently the reduced eligibility for state aid to non-resident students.

2016-17 year was the third year of awards for the state Middle Class Scholarship program, which will not be fully funded until 2017-18. This program is similar to the UC Blue & Gold Opportunity plan, providing up to 40% of tuition and fees for families earning under \$100,000 a year and 10% for families earning under \$160,000. 2015-16 saw an additional eligibility criterion added, a limit of \$160,000 in family assets, greatly reducing the number of eligible students at UCSC. In 2016-17, with the new criteria, the campus had 709 students receive an average award of \$2,046, with a total disbursed amount of \$1.45M.

2016-17 was the second year of eligibility for the newly created CA Dream Loan. This loan program is being funded 50% by the state and 50% by university aid funds, and allows for a maximum annual award of \$4,000 to CA Dream Applicants. Due to funding constraints, there is actually less than \$2,000 available per eligible student annually, but not all students will participate in the program. The program was first made available in the 2016 spring term, so less than \$100,000 was borrowed in the first year. In 2016-17, a total of \$350,000 was loaned to 138 students, an average of \$2,046 per student.

2017-18 will be the first year for the re-established University Loan Program, which has been dormant since 1999. This program is intended to provide partial replacement of the Federal Perkins Loan program, which sunsets at the end of June 2018. In fall 2018, more than 1000 first years students are being offered \$1,200 each to cover the gap created by the absence of Perkins.

2017-18 is the first year for the “Early” FAFSA and “Early” Dream App (often referred to as Prior-Prior-Year). Rather than looking at the most recent (prior) year of financial data for a family, the FAFSA and Dream App will begin looking at the financial records from the “prior-prior” year. Beginning in October 2016, students were able to file their FAFSA/Dream App for the 2017-18 aid year, using tax information from 2015.

2. Current Financial Aid Funding Model and Data

The UC Education Finance Model (EFM), which utilizes a 33% return-to-aid (RTA) from tuition and fees to support low income students, continues to be closely reviewed by the system-wide EFM committee. In 2015, a change to the EFM model was approved, allowing the usage of current year (fall) data as a part of the formula governing the distribution of centrally held funds. This has benefited UCSC, as the campus experiences rapid growth in need based aid recipients. The campus was behind the curve with the previous model, which relied solely on 3 prior years of data for determination of funding.

For the first time since fall 2011, the system-wide in-state tuition was increased, an increase from \$11,220 to \$11,502. When combined with other elements of the student budget, such as housing/dining and health care, the average cost for a student living on campus in 2017-18 will be \$36,192. Under EFM, 2017-18 UCSC undergraduate students who qualify for need-based assistance must pay approximately the first \$9,600 of their need from loan and/or work resources. After subtracting the loan/work expectation and the family contribution (from FAFSA/DREAM App data), grant aid is offered to help pay the remainder of the total estimated total cost.

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 already 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.

In 2016-17 the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office administered \$278 million in financial assistance to about 77% of UCSC's undergraduate students, as compared to \$276 million / 80% in 2015-16.

2016-17 Source of Aid	Percent of Undergraduates	Amount Received	Average Award
Gift Aid (all sources)	70.5%	\$197,676,792	\$ 16,542
UCSC Scholarships*	14.9%	\$ 8,263,080	\$ 3,261
Federal Pell Grants*	41.1%	\$30,969,287	\$ 4,445
Student/Parent Loans	50.6%	\$77,202,099	\$ 9,000
Federal Work-Study	8.6%	\$ 2,707,972	\$1,855
* Included in gift aid			

Of the UCSC students receiving bachelor's degrees in 2015-16, 67.5% of those who originally enrolled as first-time frosh borrowed student loans while attending. Those students have an average debt of \$22,582. However, the debt can be as high as \$57,500 on an individual basis, which is the federal cumulative maximum amount an undergraduate student may borrow. Nationally, 68% of seniors graduated in 2015 had student loan debt, with an average of \$30,100 per borrower.³

Each year, the U.S. Department of Education calculates cohort default rates for loans by campus. The national 3-Year average was 11.3% for 2013 (per Dept. of Ed.). The rate for the campus has been exceptionally low in recent years but did spike in 2010-2011, possibly due to the recession.

UCSC Year	3-Year Draft Default Rate	3-Year Official Default Rate
2010	4.3%	4.2%
2011	5.6%	5.7%
2012	3.5%	3.4%
2013	3.1%	3.1%

³ This data can be found at <http://projectonstudentdebt.org>

2014	3.1%	Not Yet Available
------	------	-------------------

Campus undergraduate scholarship programs are administered by various campus departments as well as by the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office. University Relations and the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office have collaborated to ensure that scholarship fundraising is a component of the comprehensive capital campaign the campus is undertaking to ensure UC Santa Cruz is an affordable as well as attractive alternative for undergraduate students who aspire to attend. Listed below are data for major scholarship programs administered by the Financial Aid and Scholarship Office:

2016-17 Scholarship Program	Recipients	Amount Received	Average Award
Regents Scholarships	153	\$ 724,373	\$4,734
Campus Merit Scholarships	277	\$ 311,294	\$1,124
Pister Leadership Opportunity Awards	15	\$ 146,099	\$7,689

For additional information, please note that the Office of the President maintains numerous reports regarding student financial support.⁴

Acknowledgements

CAFA collaborated closely on key issues with the Undergraduate Education Division, and the committee's work was enhanced by data provided by Enrollment Management and the Office of Admissions.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID

David Cuthbert

Lisbeth Haas (S)

Alan Kawamoto

Charlie McDowell (F, W)

Rita Mehta

Jose Renau

David Smith, Chair

Joy Hagen, NSTF

Davon Thomas, Undergraduate Representative

Paola Barreto, Undergraduate Representative

August 31, 2017

⁴ The reports can be found at <http://www.ucop.edu/student-affairs/data-and-reporting/reports-to-the-regents-on-student-financial-support/index.html>