Chair Pete Sadler called the meeting to order at 10:10 AM.

The Chair informed the Committee that as Chair he is a member of Executive Council and is unable to attend meetings of Council in the Fall Quarter due to a conflict in his schedule. The Chair asked if any members were available to serve as the Committee’s representative to Executive Council in his absence. All members reported that their teaching schedules will not allow for them to attend Executive Council meetings. The Chair informed the Committee that a member of the Committee is charged with being a member and Chair of the Special Review Committee (SRC), which is a Committee that meets to review admissions applications of students who do not meet the Admissions by Exception guidelines and are supported by a UCR faculty, staff, or department. Committee member Khaleel Abdulrazak expressed interest and will consult with Director Engelschall for additional information and report back as to if he is available to serve on the SRC. The Chair informed the Committee that he is meeting with Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Research Allison Cantwell to discuss how her office interacts with BOARS and the data she provides to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions.

The Committee approved the minutes from the October 5, 2016 meeting with a correction to the list of attendees of the meeting.

The Chair gave the Committee an update from the October 7, 2016 Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). Data from the last 3 years of admissions cycles was shared at BOARS and the Chair provided the Committee with a copy of the data for their reference. BOARS discussed the issue of impacted majors on campuses and the Chair informed BOARS of the recommendation that the Committee made last year to encourage students to list second choice majors on the application. The Committee discussed the change of major process and how impacted majors are tracked. BOARS discussed the Regents concern with the goal to admit one transfer student for every two freshmen as not all campuses have met the objective. The Chair informed the Committee that BOARS will continue discussions this academic year on the proposal to include Computer Science and Earth Science course work in the A-G requirements. The Chair shared with the Committee that UC Berkeley uses the term co-curricular and psychosocial instead of non-cognitive. The Chair also informed the Committee that BOARS voted against UCOP’s recommendation to allow parental questions on applications and UCOP has withdrawn the idea.

BOARS requested that each campus provide feedback on admissions through the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) and Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) pools of students. The Chair reminded the Committee of UC President Napolitano’s recommendation last year that campuses admit more students from the ELC pool. The Chair informed the Committee that because of UCR’s high admission rate of students from the ELC, the campus was awarded 2.6 million dollars in funding. Associate Vice
Chancellor for Enrollment LaRae Lundgren informed the Committee that 2 million has been allocated to the area of student success and 600,000 has been allocated for the area of admissions. UCOP is currently reviewing UCR’s proposal for utilizing the funding but AVC Lundgren expects to have approval of the proposal soon as the campus has one year to use the funds. The Committee questioned who determines if a school is eligible for LCFF and Director of Undergraduate Admissions Emily Engelschall informed the Committee that the state makes the designation. Director Engelschall shared with the Committee that UCR focuses on 15 LCFF schools for recruitment. The Committee questioned if admitting students from deeper in the applicant pool and additional funding for outreach will yield more diversity. Director Engelschall informed the Committee that last year LCFF was added as a designated factor and that the new student information system will be allow for LCFF students to be flagged so that their success rates can be tracked.

BOARS requested that each campus provide feedback the UC Berkeley (UCB) pilot study to request letters of recommendation as part of the application process. The Chair informed the Committee that other changes were made to the application process at UCB at the same time as the request for letters of recommendation was implemented, which made the results of the pilot harder to determine. BOARS has requested that UCB conduct a revised pilot study to continue for the next year and has requested campus committees to suggest protocols that will strengthen the analysis of the results. UCB has already decided to have two readers for each applicant; one will read the letters; the other will not. One BOARS member suggested including some fake applications with letters designed to test for whatever reader failings concern us. UAC members were troubled about where this might lead. The Chair asked the Committee what concerns members had about requesting letters of recommendation as part of the application process. In addition, the Chair questioned what campuses should ask for in the letters. The Committee expressed concern with the inclusion of fake letters of recommendation in the pilot study as there is the potential for them to disadvantage students that do meet with the admissions criteria and they have the potential to indirectly harm diverse students from being admitted. The Chair shared that BOARS recommendation to include fake applications is to test the consistency of the review process by readers and ensure that the process is working. The Committee questioned how many letters of recommendation are requested by UC Berkeley and Director Engelschall shared that a minimum of two letters are requested and that one letter must come from a teacher. The Committee opined concern that letters of recommendation do not always provide the best source. Director Engelschall informed the Committee that not all applicants to UC Berkeley are asked to submit letters of recommendation and that only students whose applications are part of an augmented review or are marginal are asked to submit letters. The Committee recommended that letters be reviewed based on SAT scores to determine if the request for letters of recommendation has value.

Lastly, BOARS requested that each campus provide feedback on the issue of compare favorably. The Chair reminded the Committee of the results of the state conducted audit on UC admissions last academic year and their argument that nonresident students are being admitted to the detriment of California residents in the UC System. The Committee questioned if nonresident students are admitted for revenue and AVC Lundgren responded that there is 10% cap on nonresident admission at all campuses to prevent the issue of them being admitted for revenue.

Director Engelschall presented to the Committee a power point presentation on transfer pathways and how transfer students are admitted to UCR. Director Engelschall informed the Committee that UCR is working to increase transfer admissions to work towards meeting the goal of admitting one transfer student for every 2 freshmen. Director Engelschall shared with the Committee that the completion of major preparation helps provide a pathway for admission of transfer students.
questioned if the mandate from the state to admit more students was only for freshmen and Director Engelschall replied that the mandate did include increased admission of transfer students. The Committee questioned why the yield rate for transfer students at UCB and UC Los Angeles is higher than UCR and Director Engelschall replied that both campuses have a bigger brand than UCR, which attracts more students. Director Engelschall reviewed IGETC, which is a pathway of courses that satisfy the general education requirement at UCR and shared that it is not recommended for students interested in majors in CNAS and BCoE. Director Engelschall informed the Committee of the articulation tool ASSISST and shared that a new version of the program will be implemented soon. The Committee discussed the transfer pathways initiative which serves as a road map to the 21 most popular majors in the UC System. Director Engelschall shared that the goal of the initiative was to align major preparation pathways across the System. The System is working now to close articulation gaps for the programs and there is no current plan to extend the review past the 21 majors. The Committee questioned how many lower division transfers UCR had last academic year and Director Engelschall replied that she will report back with that data. Director Engelschall noted that lower division transfer students are still required to take major preparation courses. The Committee questioned if the Office of Undergraduate Admissions recruits outside of the Riverside Community College and Director Engelschall replied that that outreach is conducted at community colleges across the campuses. The Committee questioned if UCR recruits for students at community colleges in rural counties and Director Engelschall replied that the Office of Admissions generally focuses on recruitment in populous areas. The Committee discussed the minimum GPA requirement and if lowering the GPA threshold has the potential to attract more students. The Committee questioned what the consequence is of UCR not meeting the goal of admitting one transfer student for every 2 freshmen and Director Engelschall replied that there is not a consequence at this time.

With no other business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12PM.

Approved: November 2, 2016

Prepared by: Beth Beatty