Committee on Undergraduate Admissions  
Wednesday, December 2, 2015  
10:10 am – 12:10 pm  
219 University Office Building

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>I. Chair Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 10:15 am</td>
<td>• December 16 meeting cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>II. Approval of the minutes from the November 18, 2015 meeting</td>
<td>1 (pp. 2-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>III. Develop a more specific rubric for scoring of applications to assess the activities section of the application</td>
<td>2 (p. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:45</td>
<td>• Discussion of the results of the review of applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>IV. Review of Undergraduate Diversity and Enrollment</td>
<td>3 (p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:15</td>
<td>• Request from Senate Chair for the Committee to engage administration and draft a report to Executive Council on the issue of the decrease of African American and Native American Student populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information**  
V. New Business

_The Committee is scheduled to meet next on January 6 from 10:10AM to 12:10PM in Academic Senate Conference Room 219 University Office Building_

**AGENDA ENCLOSURES:**
1. Minutes from the November 18, 2015 Meeting  
2. Scoring Rubric from Office of Admissions Review of Applications in Summer 2015  
3. Request from Senate Chair Wudka to review decrease of enrollment in African American and Native American student populations
Chair Eddie Comeaux called the meeting to order at 10:10AM.

The Chair informed the Committee that all members should have received login information for Apply UC to review applications as part of the effort to become familiar with the process of application review that the Office of Admissions conducts. Several members responded that they had not received login information and the Chair informed the Committee that a request would be made so that the information is resent.

The Committee approved the minutes from the November 4, 2015 meeting.

Committee member Jingsong Zhang provided the Committee with an update from the November 6 Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) meeting that he attended as an alternate for the Chair as he was not able to attend. BOARS continued discussions on the consideration of accepting CLEP tests as college credit. The UC Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions office conducted a study on the utilization of the CLEP test by California students and found that very few students from California take the exams. Professor Zhang reported that the UC Senate Chair recommended that a broader review be conducted of the CLEP exam before the determination can be made if it can count for course credit. Further the BOARS subcommittee that was formed to review the issue recommended that a cap be utilized to limit how many CLEP tests can be accepted for credit if the UC does decide to accept the CLEP for credit. BOARS also continued discussions on the AP capstone course and whether or not it should be considered for course credit. BOARS is still gathering information and data to determine if the AP capstone is rigorous enough to count for UC course credit. In addition, BOARS continued discussions on the proposal to use the Course ID system (CID) to standardize UC courses with California Community Colleges and California State University courses. Professor Zhang reminded the Committee of the argument that CID would help to streamline the transfer process. The Committee questioned how CID differs from ASSIST and Professor Zhang shared that ASSIST is the UC guidelines for what courses transfer students need to take and that it does not match with the CID system. The UC Office of Undergraduate Admissions is to research the overlap of ASSIST and CID for BOARS review. At the meeting, BOARS also discussed the current audit by the state of funds utilized by campuses for the recruitment of out of state and international students. BOARS continued discussions on the proposal from UC Berkeley’s admissions policy to require letters of recommendation. Professor Zhang reminded the Committee that the proposal was changed so that the submittal of letters of recommendation was now an option for marginal students to augment the review of their application. Professor Zhang informed the Committee that BOARS opined that as long as the proposal does not violate UC policy, the campus can make the proposed changes. The Committee
questioned what UC Berkely is looking for in the letters and Professor Zhang replied that it was not addressed at the meeting, but did inform the Committee that the proposal was made to help increase diversity. Lastly, BOARS discussed the potential addition of 5,000 more students to the UC System, which will be voted on at an upcoming Regents meeting.

The Committee reviewed the requested data that documented the number of BCoE admits and non-admits that included their second choice majors. The Committee noted concern that students who did have the AIS score to be admitted in BCoE but had a high enough AIS for admission as a CHASS major declined admission to UCR. Additionally, the Committee commented that students who do not include a second choice major and do not make the AIS score for their primary major are declined admission from UCR when they could be admitted to another college. The Committee questioned why they are not offered admissions to a college that their AIS score does meet the requirement. Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Emily Engelschall, informed the Committee that BCoE adds students who do not make the AIS requirement but are at a set AIS cut off to a wait list for the major and that other colleges are not notified of who is on the wait list. The Committee questioned if a recommendation can be made to admit students to their second choice major and still be wait listed for their primary major. Director Engelschall commented that this recommendation might be confusing and calls to the question of who is responsible for the student, the College of the primary or secondary major. In addition, Director Engelschall stated that this recommendation could be a concern as students might be able to game the system by being admitted to their second choice major and then transferring their primary major later on in their career at UCR. The Committee recommended that students be notified of the average GPA and SAT score needed for their primary major request so that they can prepare as much as possible to meet the requirements. Director Engelschall informed the Committee that she would bring this recommendation to the College Associate Deans.

The Committee reviewed several information requests from the last meeting. The Committee had requested information on the manpower it takes to review applications and UCR and Director Engelschall replied that 12 admissions counselors review applications between November and February and stated that if the Committee proposes a different format for the review of applications that outside readers would need to be hired to support staff in the review of applications. In response to the request from the Committee for information on how UC Santa Barbara (UCSB) reviews applications and does not employ holistic review, the Committee reviewed several documents submitted by Director Engelschall that documented the process for the review of applications at UCSB. UCSB uses a 4 scale model while UCR employs a 3 scale model. The Committee discussed whether the same value should be placed on athletics as other activities and surmised that the amount of the value should depend on the quality of the activity. The Committee will revisit UCSB’s process after they have completed the sample review of applications.

The Committee continued discussions on reassessing the AIS to account for changes to the SAT and reviewed concordance tables for SAT and ACT scores. The Committee opined that for the next year the scores should be concorded for the AIS until the results of the new SAT scoring can be reviewed in more detail.

Director Engelschall gave the Committee an update from the October 19 Systemwide meeting of admissions directors. At the meeting the directors discussed a proposed technical redesign of the application to make the document more user friendly for students. Director Engelschall shared that the personal statement was reworked to require 4 separate questions and that one of the questions will ask students to describe the extracurricular activities they participated in. Director Engelschall clarified that
UCR does not consider personal statements on the application, however most campuses do and that the goal of the application revision was to capture what all campuses need. The proposal is to be presented to BOARS at their December meeting and is currently being vetted by high school counselors and students for their input. Director Engelschall shared that high school students are being asked how they would answer the proposed additional questions. The goal is to roll out the revised application by Fall 2017.

Director Engelschall provided a brief overview to the Committee on how to review the set of 20 sample applications in the ApplyUC application. The Chair informed the Committee that an email will be sent that will include the student IDs for the 20 applications to be reviewed and additional instructions for reviewing the applications.

With no other business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 12PM.
Evaluation of Applications-Identification of Holistic Review

The holistic review task force that formed last year as a subset of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee discussed various ways to implement holistic review at UCR. The committee felt that there was some need for a modification of the current comprehensive scoring process, as it did not adequately take into consideration non-cognitive factors, but was unable to pinpoint precise factors present on the standard application that could be easily used for large-scale review.

The task force did identify certain non-cognitive factors that are important to student success: leadership, dedication and perseverance, community service and pursuit of extracurricular activities (such as arts, music, sports, research, politics/government). We reviewed 40 applications from the 2013 admitted pool, scoring on a 3 point scale for these non-cognitive factors as follows:

1= no significant involvement in extra-curriculars, community service or leadership
2= average demonstration of leadership, dedication and
3= extreme dedication, leadership or community involvement

To assign these scores we used the following conditions (HS GPA and coursework were not considered):

A score of 1 was assigned if the student engaged in <2 years or <3 hours per week of any one activity.
A score of 2 was assigned for a minimum of 2 years, 3-8 hours a week, and a minimum of one semester (~12 weeks) per year.
A score of 3 was assigned for 4 years of an activity, for 3-8 hours per week OR 2-3 years of 9+ hours per week for more 12+ weeks per year.

We came up with the score in two ways a “computer” and a “Human” method. For the computer score, we assumed that some type of high throughput assessment of applications is necessary. Using the application form in which the student indicates activities, they indicate the number of years, weeks and hours spent on each. Anything that met the requirements above was tallied and the score was assigned.

For the human score, a more detailed read of the application was necessary. The score was raised if:

i) activities that were related (e.g. music or drama or tutoring or government) had been split into different categories on the application so that the total number of hours wouldn’t be caught by the computer;

ii) activities that demonstrated extreme dedication and academic commitment or leadership (e.g. student body officer, team captain, 1st chair in band/orchestra, debate captain, etc);

iii) community service or club activities that involved initiative (like starting and running a club or coordinating a food drive). The score was lowered if the only activity that racked up the hours was very passive (as determined by the applicants own description) like helping serve food, folding clothes, babysitting. The score was not lowered if the applicant indicated that such an activity was necessary to earn money to support college or the family during high school.
Dear Eddie,

As you know, one of UCR’s most remarkable achievements has been our being able to increase quality while maintaining our diversity. This however, will prove an ever increasing challenge as we grow and our rankings increase. Because of that it is important for the Senate to be vigilant and to engage our administration proactively in discussion on this topic.

Unfortunately, it appears that we have been losing ground in maintaining our African American and Native American student populations. I am therefore asking the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to look into this matter: engaging the campus administration as you see pertinent, and to make a report to Executive Council on the issue of UCR undergraduate diversity, possibly with recommendations.

Since the enrollment period is fast approaching, and since the UC agreement with the State requires the system to enroll 5,000 students more, many of which will come to UCR, this issue is pressing. I therefore request that this report be produced by the 5th week of the Winter quarter.

Please let me know if you have questions or comments; please also let me know if I can assist the Committee in completing this task.

Yours,

-Jose

Cherysa Cortez
Executive Director
Academic Senate
221 University Office Building
University of California - Riverside, 92521
951.827.6154
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