Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee
Minutes
Monday, November 5, 2018
3:00-4:30pm

I.   **Chair's Report – Catherine Keske**
   A. BOARS Update (11/2)
      Transfer Guarantee for the Transfer Pathways – BOARS members discussed the committee's charge to develop models for systemwide transfer admission guarantee policy for CA Community College students in any of the 21 UC Transfer Pathway majors. The proposed models meet the requirements of the MOU between UC and the CCC. Under the proposed policy, if a student applies to the UC, fulfills the admissions requirements, and has a TAG from one of the six UC undergraduate campuses that issue TAGs, the student is guaranteed admission (there are no TAG agreements at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD). In this tentatively proposed model, a student can choose the school that she/he seeks a TAG, and up to three other campuses, but pay only one application fee. This model, and other alternatives are still being discussed with the BOARS Committee.

      During this particular meeting, all Admissions Directors were invited to join BOARS the afternoon of Friday, November 2 to opine on the process. Some were concerned that the proposed policy is creating confusion. There are uncertainties for circumstances where students apply to campuses that are exempt from this agreement. Some Admissions Directors would prefer to avoid the referral pool. Others are concerned about the impact on the referral pool.

      AFAS members discussed the following:
         i.   Plans for students who apply for a TAG but are admitted to a major other than the one they select.
         ii.   Applicants are encouraged to apply to multiple campuses, not just one TAG campus, as it might be possible to be accepted at a TAG campus but not in the major of choice.
         iii. Students cannot apply for multiple TAGs.
         iv.   Biology students tagging to Campus X would be redirected to "Animal Sciences", for example, if there are no seats in the Biology program. The campus that has been tagged has an obligation to admit the student into the school, but not necessarily the program if there is not room in the program.
         v.   Why are some campuses exempt from this policy?
         vi.   A large number of students believe that they need to have a TAG in order to be considered.
         vii. Merced is not the only campus obligated to admit under the agreement.
         viii. Concern that some students will feel disenfranchised.
         ix.   Concern that CCs will be discouraged because the process is too complicated.
         x.   There must be a guarantee to the major or a related program of study
         xi.   While it has been proactive with BIO and CSE, UCM should consider being proactive with other majors with large enrollment. UGC needs to be aware of the issue. How do we articulate between pathways majors and the less "popular" majors?

      Actions:
         • Chair will write a summary that reflects today's discussion and circulate it. In the meantime, members are welcome to share their comments via email.
         • Chair Keske encouraged members to send their feedback on this topic in anticipation of the December BOARS meeting.

II.   **Consent Calendar**
A. Today's agenda and the October 15 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III.   **School of Engineering Computer Requirements**
Guest: Professor Sarah Kurtz (3:30-4:00pm)

Professor Kurtz presented her draft proposal that would require SOE students to own a laptop as part of a policy that is commensurate with University and School of Engineering textbook requirements. SOE would create guidelines that would suggest minimum computer specifications.

Discussion:

Per the Director of Financial Aid, Federal Student Aid regulations allow the campus to add the cost of rental or purchase of a personal computer to a student's Cost of Attendance (with proper documentation of the purchase or rental). This is done on an individual basis (up to $1,200) when students submit a Cost of Attendance Adjustment Form. [1] Each campus has the same process whereby students must request an increase on an individual basis with documentation, due to the fact that:

a) Students who arrive with an adequate computer do not need this COA adjustment.
b) If certain software is required, it may be presented to the Course Material Fee Committee, or made available to students for download through the help desk.
c) Adjusting the student's cost of attendance for computer purchase may result in additional student loan eligibility (not funded with grants).
d) Even if the school makes a laptop mandatory for their students, it does not change the COA Adjustment process for financial aid.

The Campus Bookstore has a Computer / Technology Purchase Agreement whereby a student may purchase a computer and/or software through the campus bookstore and have up to $1,500 charged directly to their university student account. This is a separate process.

Director Radney suggested that if students have software expenses, the school may consider reaching out to the fee committee or having the software available through IT.

All UCs have a process similar as the one used by UCM, so regardless of whether the SOE mandates the requirement for computers, UCM would not necessarily change its process.

A recommendation was made and endorsed with no objections to reconsider the language in the following section of the proposal.
> *UC Merced encourages students to apply, including filing the financial aid package with the reassurance that, if accepted, they will be given adequate financial aid. Given that our proposal is to include the cost of a computer in the financial aid package, the perception of the student should be left unchanged.*

➢   The wording in the proposal implies that Financial Aid will pay for it, which is not necessarily the case.

Discussion:
i.   At the meeting with the SOE Executive Committee, the issue of the software for Mac vs. PC was discussed as one particular software was not compatible with both Mac and PCs.
ii.   Laptops should be set up to allow for usage of basics (MSWord etc.). Under the library textbook policy, owning a computer is a requirement.

---

[1] This is a one-time COA adjustment as an undergraduate student

    iii.   97% of the SOE students responded that they need a laptop, in a survey conducted in Dean Matsumoto's class. If we identify their specific needs, we could direct them to purchase a computer that fits their needs.

    iv.   Admissions' main concerns are about students potentially opting out of Engineering because they cannot afford a computer. Chair Keske will follow-up with Associate Dean Kupo about this issue.

    v.   Currently, the school has emergency funds (provided by Student Affairs) if a student needs a laptop (for special circumstances, e.g. if the student's laptop is not functioning).

    vi.   If this requirement becomes a rule, who will police it and what are the penalties for not abiding by it?

    vii.   Has the SOE considered any partnerships with corporations?

- As a first step, consider encouraging students to own a computer.
- Include some language stating that the Financial Aid Office should be the contact for additional information.
- Consider potential negative impacts of this proposal.
- It was agreed that the language in the proposal will use the term "expectation" instead of "requirement".

Next steps:
- Director Radney will help SOE craft some of the language in the proposal.
- UCR's policy will be used as boilerplate.

- AFAS is in support of pursuing this policy campus wide.

Action: Add this item to the UGC agenda once a revised proposal has been considered by AFAS. The proposal should be accompanied with data.

IV.   Strategic Enrollment Planning for Transfer Students and CSE Updates– Catherine Keske

Chair Keske met with Dr. Angelo Kyrilov. CSE changed their pre-requisites in order to better prepare their students for upper division computer programming courses. The changes to the curriculum were approved by UGC at the beginning of Fall semester.

CSE 100 is a good predictor of students' ability to be successful in computer programing. A study done by the instructor showed that 75% of students received a D or F in the mid-term exam. For transfer students, data showed that transfer students who have greater than 3.5 GPA do not necessarily do well in CSE 100. The instructor is exploring ways to identify early indicators for students' success for CSE 100. This exercise would help guide students and if needed, direct them to another major. As a campus, we need to think about other majors where that would be a valuable exercise.

BIO 110 is experiencing a situation similar to CSE's. The BIO faculty will discuss this issue with AVC Orcutt.

The Admissions Office will be analyzing discrepancies between transfer vs. native students and students' ability to be successful.

    i.   Additional questions from the membership included:

    ii.   What are the profiles of students who are academically successful vs. those who are not?

    iii.   What are the expectations for a freshman?

    iv.   Are there any correlations between grades and classes?

    v.   Admissions volunteered to work on data models/analyses and share with AFAS at a future meeting.

    vi.   Personal students' experiences are also predictors of success.

V.   BIO Updates

Director Ruiz met with the SNS Executive Committee. At the meeting, faculty discussed the selection process. Director Ruiz offered to share with AFAS the selection process.

Vice Chair Cleary indicated that the BIO faculty is interested in discussing selection process, articulation, management of students' trajectories.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Minutes prepared by F. Paul
Attest: Catherine Keske, Chair