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The Undergraduate Admissions (UGA) Committee met 9 times from September to May during the 2011-2012 academic year.

1. The Conflict of Interest Statement was discussed and readopted for 2011-2012.

2. The UGA Committee discussed the Transfer Student Admissions Proposal that was approved by the UGA committee last Spring and at the May 2011 Division meeting. This discussion was prompted by a concern that if the number of transfer student applications continues to increase at the current rate (applications have increased 58% since Fall 2008) the number of students admitted for Fall 2012 could exceed the capacity of many majors.

   The committee voted to move the transfer proposal implementation date forward from Fall 2013 to Fall 2012 provided that students are given as much information and notice as possible. The proposal was approved at the November 29, 2011 Division meeting.

3. The committee discussed the BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal – Targeted Review Request. The committee felt that specific problems needed to be identified; and for some departments, this proposal could create a large amount of work for a very small number of transfer students. The committee would also raised a question regarding the data to support this proposal from UCOP. Specifically, the committee did not know of any data to suggest that there was a problem that needed to be fixed.

4. The committee discussed the University’s initiative to increase enrollment of international students at UCR in light of the BOARS resolutions that were passed in December 2011. In particular, BOARS reaffirmed its policy that admission guarantees could not be extended to non-residents. A central issue in this discussion was whether the Admissions Preparation Program, through UNEX, was in compliance with the BOARS resolutions.

5. The committee focused heavily on holistic review for freshman and the consideration of including other factors in the application for review. The committee’s goal was to determine if and how holistic review adds value relative to the current comprehensive review process. The committee discussed issues related to holistic review such as what our campus is looking for, what is valuable to UCR, how to define it, how to weigh it, and how much of a predictor of success it is. The UGA committee proposed to do a pilot study to compare holistic review to our campus’ current process of comprehensive review with fixed weights. As a first step in this process, Merlyn Campos, Director of Admissions, obtained holistic review scores from all campuses except Merced and Santa Barbara. The committee will analyze data pertaining to applicants that overlap with UCR including the holistic review score they were given from each campus, what their Academic Index Score (AIS) was, and whether or not they were admitted. The committee is also interested to see how the distributions of Holistic Review scores
vary across campuses. Most important, the UGA has begun to analyze these Holistic Review scores to assess how admissions at UCR would change if holistic review were implemented in place of the current comprehensive review process.

6. The committee discussed the Admission by Exception (AxE) guidelines specifically in regards to international students. Some of the colleges were concerned about the students whose GPAs fall between the 2.7 and 3.0 range. It was suggested that the faculty of the colleges in which these particular students apply might review the applications of these students. Their main concerns were quality control, success, and the capability of these students to succeed. Last year, the criteria and guidelines created by the UGA committee determined which students were admitted. The committee agreed to leave the criteria flexible and wants to review data pertaining to Fall 2011 grades before making decisions and changes to the AxE guidelines.

7. The committee discussed the BOARS resolutions that have implications for the admissions of international students. UCR is the only campus in the UC system that communicates a conditional admission to UCR for international students – the Academic Preparation Program (APP). The word “guarantee” is not in UCR’s APP letter to students, however, “conditional admission” is. Anticipating a resolution from BOARS, the UGA committee approved a statement regarding the communication of admission to Extension students. The statement is as follows: For prospective students who are admitted to university extension programs, the distinction between admission to extension versus admission to the campus should be clearly communicated. Toward that goal, notification to students of their admission to university extension programs (a) should not be signed by campus admissions directors, and (b) should not communicate or imply any guarantee or conditional admission to the campus.

8. The committee reviewed and discussed the SoBA Proposal to change the GPA cutoff from 2.5 to 2.7 and change Economics course requirement (from ECON 003 to Econ 004). The UGA committee conditionally approved (3 approved, 1 abstained) the proposal based on an implementation date of 2014 so that the Admissions Office has time to communicate the change to community college students.

9. The committee reviewed the revision of the BOARS proposal for Major-Based Transfer Admission to the University of California. The proposal was in response to Senate Bill 1440 and Assembly Bill 2302. Senate bill 1440 required California Community Colleges (CCC) and the California State University to develop Associate of Arts and Associate of Science for Transfer degrees that guarantee CCC students’ admission to CSU. Assembly Bill 2302 requests UC’s participation in a similar pathway for transfer admission. The proposal was designed to clarify UC’s expectations for transfer students in the context of these legislative changes.

The committee had various concerns about this proposal. One primary concern was that the proposal would impose a “one size fits all” approach, requiring UC campuses to develop common core curricula that would impose nearly identical transfer requirements across UC campuses. The committee felt that the revised BOARS proposal addressed this important concern. The revised proposal notes that it, “maintains department autonomy and flexibility to list courses and set admission criteria.” The UGA committee was favorable toward the proposal
given that it preserves the autonomy of campuses and that it does not impose a “one size fits all” approach.

10. The committee discussed the request from University Extension (UNEX) to allow Academic Preparation Program (APP) students to take more than 30 units and still be considered freshmen. After reviewing similar programs at other UC campuses, taking into consideration the performance of APP students who had matriculated to UCR, the committee unanimously voted to not approve the request to allow APP students to take more than 30 units. The committee approved a an alternative proposal that would allow that no more than 24 units can be taken unless the student’s TOEFL exceeds the admission requirements for UCR, at which point they can take up to 36 units.
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