

## **Council on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools 2012-2013 Annual Report**

### **To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:**

The Council on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS) respectfully submits its report of activities for the academic year 2012-13.

### **I. Council Operations**

Lee Bardwell, Professor of Developmental and Cell Biology, chaired the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS) in 2012-13. The Committee met seven times during the year. The meetings were attended by ten elected members, the Interim Director (ex officio) of the Office of Admissions & Relations with Schools (OARS), the Associate Director of Evaluation, Opprs and System (ex officio), the Librarians Association of the University of California, Irvine (LAUC-I) Representative, and the Associated Students of University of California, Irvine (ASUCI) Representative. Throughout the year, Interim Director of Admissions & Relations with Schools Brent Yunek kept CUARS well-informed of the activities of OARS and the Committee provided comments and advice when requested.

The CUARS Chair is an *ex officio* member of the Enrollment Council, and contributed to Council meetings as appropriate. The CUARS Chair is also a member of UCI's Senate Cabinet, and served as the UCI representative to the system-wide Board of Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS). In addition, the CUARS Chair served on three other local committees: the Academic Planning Group, the Task Force on International Student Recruitment and Retention, and the SAT/Student Success workgroup.

### **II. Divisional Issues/Policies**

#### **A. UCI Abroad**

Vice Provost Michael Clark presented a proposal for the Cabinet's support. "UCI Abroad White Paper" was proposed as a branch campus in a location outside the United States. The purpose of UCI Abroad was to establish a global presence and extend the international scope of UCI's research, educational, and creative activities; while providing as a significant source of on-going revenue. The campus would have 4 majors, and all curriculum would be modeled after current classes.

The Council was very wary to support "UCI Abroad" as there seemed to be too many unaccounted for variables and costs. Some of the major concerns that were brought up at the meeting were: UCI brand dilution with the UCI name, not recovering the startup funds as well as a divergence of donor funds, that there might be an underestimation of startup costs, licensing restrictions and a negative effect on the Self Sustaining Online Degree program. If "UCI Abroad" were to proceed to the next step, the council suggested that there should be no change in the admissions process for international students. There is already a mechanism in place for comparing international applications to UCI standards. The council recommended the same standards be used when determining admissions for "UCI Abroad". In addition, assuming there will be around 5,000 applications to this annex university the Admissions staff would need to hire 5 to 8 new full time employees to handle those applications as the international conversion is more labor intensive.

**B. Admissions Selection Criteria**

The Office of Admissions and Relations with Schools asked the council to help design the selection models for the incoming classes. The selection models are made by inputting specific selection criteria into a program that uses tested algorithms to predict the enrollment class. By using these models Admissions can test selection criteria to get desired results. Some of selection criteria can also be thought of as, 'tiebreakers', because they are used to select from a pool of students that have similar, mid-range holistic review scores. The involvement of CUARS in the design of selection criteria (for the first time in recent memory) was seen by members to be a positive change that should be continued in future years.

**C. Trial Major Requirements**

The council was asked to approve a trial program of major-based requirements. Biology, Engineering and Physics all requested a minimum score of 590 on the math portion of the SAT, as well as approval from a corresponding school reader.

The council members voted to approve the trial major-based requirements with the stipulation that there would be one year and two year review to assess the effectiveness of the proposals.

**D. SAT Minimums**

The council discussed whether to require an SAT minimum for certain tie-breaking selection criteria, and if there were to be a minimum, what those restrictions would look like. The options were:

- No SAT minimum: predicts a higher yield of underrepresented minorities (URM), but lowest average SAT scores of admitted class
- SAT minimum of 450 in any one category or better: predicts the lowest yield of URM, but highest average SAT score of admitted class
- SAT minimum of 1450 combined, and no score lower than a 400; predicts a middle ground of both URM attendance and average SAT score

The council members voted for an SAT restriction on both California Residents and Out-of-State students. The restriction was set as a minimum score of 1450 combined on the SAT, with no individual score to lower than a 400. The SAT restrictions were applied as tie-breaking selection criteria in that it only applied to those applicants who were holistically scored in the lowest UC eligible tiers; the SAT restrictions did not apply to those students who obtained a holistic score better than a 3.5.

**III. System-wide Issues/Policies****A. Rebenching**

The Systemwide Senate requested comments by the divisional committees related to the proposed rebenching project. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across the campuses. The Rebenching Budget Committee found that not all campuses were being awarded an equal funding per student. It was the recommendation of the committee that all campuses should be awarded the same funding per student. The entire document is posted on the Systemwide Senate website:

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/Rebenchingreviewpacket.pdf>

The Council was very supportive of the rebenching plan and thought that it was long overdue. It noted that UCI is one of the campuses that have historically received the least funding per student. This was thought to be grossly unfair and completely unjustified. The members expressed the opinion that UCI's relatively low per student funding might impact our student's educational experience, which would then feedback on the quality of applicants. There was concern that the Admissions Office may have relatively less resources than other, better-funded UC's, which could impact recruitment and yield. Given the significance of the issues on the admissions process, the Council felt strongly that those campuses that were the furthest away from the rebenching targets should be brought up the first.

#### **B. Compares Favorably**

Systemwide BOARS Chair George Johnson requested that the Admissions Councils from each UC work with their local admissions office to provide an "assessment of the extent to which the compare favorably rule is being met." The Academic Council, in June 2012, adopted a Resolution that stated the enrollment targets for nonresident undergraduates should take into account the academic qualifications of both the resident and nonresident applicant pools, such that the admitted nonresidents will "compare favorably" to admitted California residents.

The Council decided that unweighted GPA and standardized test scores were the best metrics to compare admitted resident and nonresident applicants. The Office of Admissions and Relations with Schools (OARS) had an issue with the data presented in the UCOP Student Affairs Institutional Research Data Comparison report as the report shows numbers that are clearly off from actual admissions data. The Council decided to use information provided by OARS for their report, as UCOP's information as it was inaccurate. With the corrected data provided by OARS the Council found that as a whole the non-resident students compared favorably to the resident students, with out-of-state domestics comparing favorably and international students found comparable.

#### **C. Financial Aid Funding**

The council was asked to comment on the appropriate systemwide funding level for UC's undergraduate financial aid commitment because the University needs a fiscally sustainable roadmap for determining UC's systemwide funding commitment and the tuition levels that are needed to achieve it. All three options that were provided were predicated on revenue from tuition increases for meeting UC's financial accessibility goals; a tuition freeze would require suspending whatever funding option is adopted until needed tuition increases are reinstated.

The council was supportive of option A but was concerned that the high increase in costs for upper-income families could drive some families to private institutions where they may well be eligible for financial aid and scholarships. The council was less supportive of option B, as it may create too much of a burden on students who come from low-income families, and found option C to be non-sustainable. The council also voiced concern over the possibility of tuition increases being driven by the need to provide increasingly large amounts of financial aid. The council strongly believed that the best way to meet the goal of financial accessibility for all eligible students, that addresses the entire cost of attendance without overly relying on student/parent borrowing, would be for UC and the California Legislature to work

together to return to the Master Plan principle of affordable, high-quality education to residents of the state.

**D. Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations 478**

BOARS proposed the introduction of a new “IGETC for STEM Majors” option in SR 478, and eliminating the existing “SciGETC” option. The IGETC for STEM Majors sequence is needed to implement the new transfer admissions policy in SR 476 that the Assembly approved in June 2012. Because IGETC for STEM Majors, unlike “partial IGETC,” would be a variant of IGETC, it would conform to the provision in the state legislation, SB 1440, mandating that the new Transfer AA/AS degrees from California Community Colleges include IGETC or CSU Breadth.

The council voted unanimously to approve the amendments as the members found the changes to not only reasonable but favorable as it could lead to earlier graduation times, and offers flexibility for the students

**E. Proposed Early Online Application**

BOARS reviewed a proposal move the online UC application “go live” from October 1 to August 1. Students would be able to access the application and work on it, but the turn in date would remain the same. The idea behind the proposal is that the students could work on multiple applications at the same time, as the common application is made available in August. High school counselors have been requesting this change as they think it will be helpful. The two perceivable issues with the proposal was that it would change the deadline of new majors and classes to July instead of September, but most campuses do not see this as an issues as they have an internal deadlines in the spring. The other is that it would cost about \$50,000 more to have the systemwide help desk open for the longer period of time.

The council had no objections and echoed the sentiment of how helpful this could be for students as well as possibly alleviating some of the congestion on the site.

**IV. Guests**

**Office of Institution Research**

Director of Data Management and Analysis, Gina Roque, and Assistant Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research & Decision Support, Ryan Cherland

**V. Council Membership**

**Members**

Lee Bardwell, Biological Sciences, Chair

Belinda Campos, Social Sciences

Cynthia Claxton, Humanities

Raul Lejano, Social Ecology (replaced by Joanne Zimmerman, 2013)

Zhiqin Lu

Andrej Luptak, Health Sciences

Jeff Russell, Arts

William Sirignano, Engineering

Yaming Yu, ICS

Lu Zheng, Business (replaced by John Turner, Fall 2013)

**Ex Officio:**

Brent Yunek, Interim Director, OARS

**Consultants:**

Deborah Brandon, Sr. Assoc. Director, Evaluations, Operations & Systems- OARS

Brent Yunek, Assistant VC, Enrollment Services - OARS

**Representatives**

Annette Buckley, Associated Librarians University of California, Irvine

Daniel La, Associated Students University of California, Irvine

Lee Bardwell, BOARS