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To be received and placed on file:

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UAC) met 8 times from September to April during the 2012-2013 academic year and has meetings scheduled for May 17, June 7 and June 14.

The Riverside Division of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee was represented on the University-wide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) by Mindy Marks, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. BOARS held 10 day long meetings during the 2012-2013 academic year and Chair Marks updated the Committee members at each meeting as to the issues being discussed at the statewide level. In addition, Chair Marks represented UAC on the Executive Council (bi-weekly meeting) and as a member of the Enrollment Management Council (3 meetings). Chair Marks also attended smaller meetings to discuss admission policy with the Acting Admissions Director, the head of the Academic Preparation Program (APP) program, and the Director of Evaluations for Undergraduate Education.

Actions undertaken by the Committee were the following:

- College of Natural and Agriculture Sciences (CNAS) Associate Dean Mike McKibben proposed to the Committee that changes be made to CNAS transfer requirements as CNAS upper division courses were over enrolled. The changes proposed by CNAS would help to keep transfer numbers under control. The Committee discussed the proposal and requested additional data from CNAS to review before they approved the proposal. The revised data submitted by CNAS showed that the proposed changes will improve two year graduation rates in the College and the Committee voted to approve the CNAS changes to transfer student criteria to be made effective for the Fall 2014 admission cycle.

- The Committee had previously approved a proposal for international students that offered a conditional admission guarantee to any student in the Academic Preparation Program (APP). However, BOARS ruled that conditional admission cannot be offered to any student other than a California resident. Letters offering conditional admission to these students had already been issued prior to the BOARS mandate and therefore clarification was needed from the Admissions Office. The Committee recommended adding the average SAT score to a letter as it would give international students a goal to aim for and show that UCR is trying to compare the APP students favorably to California residents. The Committee also recommended that the Admissions Office state that they will consider performance in classes that require both quantitative and qualitative skills to encourage APP students to take a range of courses. This letter was sent to all APP students.

- The Committee also discussed how to handle APP students who fail UCR courses, post admission offer, while still in the APP program. The Committee voted and approved to
change the APP program’s policy so that students enrolled in the program must maintain
a UCR cumulative GPA of 2.0 in UCR coursework taken prior to official matriculation
to the campus or forfeit their offer of admissions.

- The Committee discussed the Systemwide Review of the Open Access Policy and
  supported the goals of the policy. The Committee opined to the Division that the
  consequences involved in the various opt-out choices were not addressed. In addition,
  concern was expressed about increased publishing costs that may be associated with
  open access journals.

- The Committee discussed the Systemwide Proposal for Rebenching and opted to support
  the policy and opined that the proposal equalizes funding to all UC Campuses.

- In light of the increased use of Admissions by Exception (A x E), the Committee
  reviewed and revised the A x E guidelines. The Committee discussed what exceptions
  should be in the A x E pool and what criteria should be used to decide to admit students.
  A set of compiled data was presented that documented the performance of each student
  admitted by A x E in the past few years. This data suggested that students with low SAT
  scores do not perform well at UCR as measured by UCR GPA and likelihood of
  dismissal. Chair Marks recommended to the Committee that the GPA score should be
  raised to 3.0 and the required SAT score be set for 420 in math and the same in one of
  the two English components. The Committee voted and approved these changes. These
  changes were approved by the Academic Senate.

- The Committee also discussed which students have the rights to be included in the
  Special Review Committee (SRC) in the A x E guidelines and if the home scholars
  program should be eligible to be included in the SRC. Chair Marks proposed that the
  process for reviewing home scholar applicants be combined with the SRC and that the
  current language in the A x E guidelines incorporate the change and clarify that a UCR
  faculty, staff or department may support an applicant for review by the SRC. The
  Committee voted and approved the changes made to the current language of the SRC in
  the A x E guidelines and to move the home scholar programs to the SRC. These changes
  were approved by the Academic Senate.

- Chair Marks proposed a change to the Committee’s bylaws so that the Chair of the
  Committee does not also have to be the designated representative for BOARS as both
duties are time consuming. It was proposed that a statement be added to the bylaws that
would designate one member of the Committee as Chair and one member as the BOARS
representative with the caveat that the Chair could serve as the BOARS representative if
so desired. The Committee discussed this proposal and opined that if approved the
BOARS representative must have experience and prior knowledge of admissions and a
thorough line of communication would need to be established between the Chair and
representative. The Committee voted to approve the bylaw change, which were
subsequently approved by the Executive Council.
The Committee discussed and reviewed data in regards to major preparatory requirements for transfer students, which served to illustrate departments who were having problems with transfer students not graduating in two years. Chair Marks recommended that a memo be drafted and sent by the Committee to identified departments that do not currently have major preparatory requirements in place. This memo will inform department chairs that they have the right to establish major preparatory requirements for transfer students, provided the requirements will help ensure student success. The memo included data on student success and an offer of assistance. The Committee reviewed and voted to approve a memo to be sent to the departments. After consultation with the Academic Senate Chair, the memo was sent on behalf of the Committee by Chair Marks.

The Committee discussed and reviewed the Systemwide issue of UC Undergraduate Financial Funding Options and voted to support the efforts to refine the expected parent contribution. However, the Committee did not support the Blue and Gold “light” plan as it will require increased tuition. The Committee opined to support Option B as it will require the smallest increase in tuition and it is reasonable to expect students to pay student loans for 15 years.

The Committee reviewed and discussed the Systemwide issue of proposed amendments to Senate regulations, including SR478 to accommodate “Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) for STEM Majors. The Committee voted to support the endeavor. However, they did question the Division as to if the Campuses will have the autonomy to change the timelines of when the IGETC must be completed.

The Committee discussed TOEFL scores and the possibility of implementing a higher minimum TOEFL score for UCR. After viewing data collected by BOARS as well as an analysis conducted by the Director of Evaluations for Undergraduate Education, the Committee decided not to raise the TOEFL score as the scores have proved to not always be useful in identifying the success of international students.

The Committee reviewed and discussed change of major criteria documents for math and statistics. The Committee provided feedback to the Committee on Educational Policy that the proposed standards were inconsistent as the requirements are harder for current UCR students then transfer students. The Committee noted that the Statistics Change of Major Criteria required more major preparation than any other department on campus requires and recommended that the requirements be toned down.

The Committee reviewed the preliminary Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) success numbers, which includes the top 9% of California high school graduates in terms of first year grades to determine if the ELC data should be added back to the admissions formula. The Committee decided not to add the ELC back to the Academic Index Score (AIS) model at UCR but would encourage a review of the data including retention rates in several years time by the Committee.
• The Committee discussed applicants who had stellar backgrounds but lacked one A-G requirement. The Committee voted to recommend that California resident applicants missing one A-G requirement with an advocate can be eligible to be provisionally admitted if they meet the college’s AIS minimum score and pending the successful completion of the missing A-G requirement.

• The Committee submitted a report to BOARS documenting that UCR had met the compare favorably guidelines with regards to non-resident students.

• The Committee will submit a report to BOARS about major prep requirements for transfer students.

• Given the freshman admission rate is nearing the 50% threshold, which requires holistic review; the Committee will write a document showing that UCR has a “best practice”. The document will contain the results of last year’s analysis of the holistic review scores.
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