

**Council on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools
2009-2010 Annual Report**

To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The Council on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS) submits its report of activities for the academic year 2009-10.

I. Council Operations

Bruce Berg (Social Sciences) served as CUARS chair for AY2009-2010. The Council met twelve times during the year. The meetings were attended by nine elected members, the Acting Director and Associate Director (ex officio) of the Office of Admissions & Relations with Schools (OARS), the Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS) Representative, the Librarians' Association of the University of California, Irvine (LAUC-I) Representative, and the Associated Students of University of California, Irvine (ASUCI and AGS) representatives. Acting Director of Admissions & Relations with Schools, Brent Yunek, kept CUARS informed of the activities of the Admissions Office at UCI and solicited feedback on all policy modifications. Bruce, Berg, Chair, served as representatives to the Enrollment Council during their quarter long terms. Michael Clark, the Vice Provost for Academic Planning, kept CUARS informed about enrollment activities.

II. University wide Issues/Policies

A. CUARS' review of the Final Draft of Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), (October, 2009)

CUARS reviewed the final draft proposal of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. CUARS members did not find any inaccurate or incorrect statements, nor was any missing information discovered.

B. Non Resident Enrollment at UC (April, 2010)

CUARS members were supportive of increasing the number of non resident undergraduate students for the sake of improving diversity so long as growth of UCs by CA residents is not affected. CUARS members also believe that extra funding from non resident tuition should go to the campus which generated the funding, at least for the short term.

Eventually, however, UC may want to implement a budget program that taxes universities whose non resident undergraduate population exceeds a certain percentage

C. Differential Fees by Campus and Major (April, 2010)

CUARS was in favor of the proposal from CPB, which emphasizes that differential fees should not be charged for separate UC campuses or majors. CUARS agrees that the UC is one university; therefore, charging differential fees by major or by campus would negatively impact all other campuses by creating a tiered university system.

D. Adding Earth System and Space Science to the 'd' category of freshman applications (June, 2010)

CUARS voted unanimously in support of adding Earth, Environmental and Space Sciences (EESS) to UC's area 'd' laboratory science admissions requirement. The dominant factor in CUARS' decision is that resource depletion, environmental degradation, and climate change are increasingly becoming the hard "facts of life" in the 21st century. It should be obvious to all that there will be an increasing demand for scientists trained in EESS, as well as an educated population and a cadre of knowledgeable experts in teaching, media, government, etc.

Philosophically, it is difficult to disagree with the primacy of Physics, Chemistry, and Biology as the building blocks of integrative sciences, but it is less clear how this self-evident statement is pedagogically relevant. It is likely the case that rigorous instruction and exposure to an integrative science is as important for the development of scientific thought as instruction in the basics.

E. Registration and Tuition fees: name and approval changes (May, 2010)

In response to a request from Vice-Chair Daniel Simmons, CUARS reviewed the proposed revision of the registration fee policy revisions at its May 11 meeting. Revisions include a name change from *University Registration Fee* to *Student Services Fee*, greater transparency in reporting the use of these funds with campus-based websites, and greater clarification in the advisory role of students solicited by the Chancellors. A return-to-aid component has also been added to the policy. CUARS supports all of these revisions and additions. The only aspect for which there was some disagreement is that the responsibility for determining the appropriate fee level will be transferred from the President to the Regents. A suggestion was made at our meeting that the Chancellors determine the appropriate fee, but the possibility that this might lead to tiering across the campuses should be considered. Budget issues are beyond the purview of the Council and I feel that we lack the institutional knowledge needed to assess the proposed change in fee determination. I request that the policy be discussed at the Cabinet level and that CPB review the proposed budgetary changes. We also request that Vice-Chair Simmons postpone any action by the Regents until a more thorough review is presented.

III. UCI: Issues/Policies

A. Admissions Review of Non resident Applicants (January, 2010)

To establish a more equitable selection criteria for international and out of state applicants compared to California resident applicants, CUARS voted on some changes in the freshman application review process. Under the current system, because honors courses are not counted in the selection process for out of state and international students, their GPAs are not weighted for up to eight honors courses as is the case for California residents. In order to make the process fair for all incoming students,

CUARS members voted in favor of using the unweighted GPA rather than the weighted GPA of California residents as a cutoff point for the A-H cohort groupings of non-resident and international students.

Also, an additional point that will be added to the Profile A score (the academic portion of Comprehensive Review) to acknowledge the academically adventurous aspect of a student who is willing to attend a university in another country. This scoring would be equivalent to points given to US students who have studied abroad while in high school.

B. Admission Review Change: Single Score (August, 2010)

CUARS voted unanimously to adopt a single score review process for freshman and transfer applications to UC, Irvine to be implemented in Fall, 2010. Under the previous system, three scores are given to applicants, two of which reflect an academic achievement score and one of which reflects non academic attributes of the candidate such as leadership and extracurricular activity participation. As is, this process double weights academics, particularly SAT and GPA scores. CUARS members agreed that UCI should adopt a system that more closely examines the individual and considers both academic and non academic achievement within the specific context of each individual. UCLA and Berkeley are already using a similar single score method (also known as “holistic” review). As UC Irvine becomes increasingly selective (as did UCLA and Berkeley in previous years), it is incumbent upon the UCI campus to bring in a student body who is not only academically high achieving but also more accurately mirrors *all* California high school student populations with regard to income level, geographic, and ethnic diversity, and first generation college seekers.

C. Establishing Enrollment Target based on Available Resources in Schools, input from Schools (August, 2010)

CUARS would like a broader consideration of a proposal that schools become involved in setting freshman and transfer enrollment targets. While academic units are regularly involved in setting targets for the admission of graduate students, this does not regularly happen at the undergraduate level. There, the number of students who are admitted to a major or school is largely decoupled from the resources in the school. Thus, schools and majors can be negatively impacted if the number of admitted and enrolled students is high relative to the teaching resources, particularly for majors that require small classes to meet student learning objectives or have laboratories or studios that have only a limited number of setups. Unevenness of enrollments from year-to-year often makes it difficult for some schools to use available resources effectively, particularly during this period of reduced budgets. [Discuss specific examples?].

Much of the year-to-year unevenness in enrollments across schools is attributable to variance at the application stage.. Applications in Physical

Sciences , Biological Sciences, and Engineering showed respective increases of 38%, 31%, and 35% for the 2010-11 admissions cycle, whereas applications in Humanities, Social Ecology, and Social Sciences increased by 17%, 21%, and -1% respectively. Changes in enrollment rates follow the same trends. For the fall of 2010, enrollments increased by 47%, 36%, and 31% in Physics, Biology and Engineering, respectively, whereas enrollments increased by 21%, 2% and 4% in Humanities, Social Ecology, and Social Sciences, respectively. Admission rates, on the other hand, are relatively constant for most schools. For example, the admission rates for Biological Sciences were 47% and 44% in 2009 and 2010, respectively. In Social Sciences, the admission rates were 66% and 60% in 2009 and 2010, respectively.

When applications increase and admission rates remain constant, then the number of enrollments will trend with the number of applications. An unexpected spike in the number of applicants to Physical Sciences, for instance, will produce a similar spike in the number of enrollments. Enrollments are thus largely controlled by the vagaries of external factors reflected in the distribution of applications. Rather than defaulting to a common acceptance rate across all schools, targeting the number enrollments within each school would produce better internal control over the admissions process. That is, targeted enrollments place the locus of control at the admission stage rather than at the application stage.

The operative term here is enrollment “targets”, rather than enrollment “caps”. Individual schools should be consulted about the estimated number of students that can be adequately taught with existing resources. Long term trends in the distribution of applications across schools could be a factor in setting targeted enrollments and also guide the distribution of resources. Any increasing or decreasing demand for certain majors could be accommodated gradually through planning, rather than following the yearly vicissitudes of the academic market.

An alternative to targeted enrollments is to develop greater flexibility in the distribution of resources across schools. Such a tactic may be difficult to implement, however, because it may be difficult to synchronize budgetary decisions with the enrollment cycle. Enrollment numbers become available in the late spring, leaving little time to make budget adjustments across the schools.

IV. Continuing Issues

- A. Finalize details regarding how to score freshman applications using the one score system.**
- B. Vote on Guiding Principles for UCI Admission**

- C. Determine the extent of faculty involvement in the application review process**
- D. Use of Subject SAT in Admissions into some Schools/Departments.**
- E. Enrollment Targets in Schools based on School resources (see III, C above)**

V. Guests

- Sylvia Hurtado, Chair, BOARS
- Bill Jacobs, Vice Chair, BOARS (by conference call)
- Ellen Druffel, Professor, Earth System Science
- Judy Stepan Norris Chair, Irvine Academic Senate

Members

Bruce Berg, Chair, Social Sciences
Christine Beckman, Business
Rahul Warrior, Biological Sciences
John LaRue, Engineering
Rainer Reinscheid, Health Sciences
Richard Pattis, ICS
Gregory Weiss, Physical Sciences
John Whiteley, Social Ecology
Bruce Berg, Spring Chair, Social Sciences

Ex Officio:

Brent Yunek, Acting Director, OARS
Steven Tucker, BOARS Representative
Deborah Decker, Associate Director, Admissions

Representatives

Jeffra Bussman, Librarians' Association University of California, Irvine
Trishia Chavez, Associated Students University of California, Irvine
Anamarie Auger, Associated Graduated Students

Analyst: Michelle AuCoin