

**Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee**

**Meeting Notes**  
**Monday, September 30, 2019**  
**3:00pm – 4:00pm**  
**KL 326**

**I. Welcome and Introductions – Chair Hibbing**

Chair Hibbing welcomed new and returning members.

**II. AFAS Resources**

Members are encouraged to review the following AFAS resources.

**A. Duties**

- i. Considers matters related to admissions such as eligibility requirements, enrollment, financial aid, relations with schools, and sets campus admissions policy;
- ii. Considers the weighting of academic and non-academic criteria for the admissions process and appeals to eligibility, admissions, and financial aid decisions;
- iii. Determines criteria for undergraduate admissions;
- iv. Advises the Undergraduate Council, the Merced Division and the administration regarding policy and practices related to admissions, access, enrollment, and outreach;
- v. Requests the development of and analyzes institutional data needed to fully inform decisions;
- vi. Maintains liaison with the Campus Enrollment Management Council and administrative units which implement and manage admissions-related policies;
- vii. Reports at least monthly to the Undergraduate Council on matters under consideration.

A complete description of the subcommittee's charge is available on the [Senate website](#).

**B. [Membership](#), Meeting [Schedule](#), and [Box Site](#)****III. Consent Calendar****A. Today's Agenda****B. Approval of the [AFAS Master Calendar](#)**

The consent calendar was approved as presented. Both documents will be published on the Senate website.

**IV. Review of [Proposed Revisions to Regents' Scholars Selection Criteria](#) – Director of Financial Aid Rodney**

Director Rodney's reported that the review of the Regents' Scholars Selection Criteria is a function that pertains to the duties of the Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee. The current criteria was approved by UGC several years ago. Following discussions among staff in the Admissions and Financial Aid Offices, it was agreed that the criteria and scoring rubric needed to be revised as they are not applicable to both freshman and transfer students, and the criteria is outdated. Generally, the goal of the proposal attempts to:

- Better align the selection criteria with the latest research on predictive modeling of persistence in order to increase the campus retention/graduation rates;
- Eliminate outdated criteria;
- Develop separate rubrics for Freshman and Transfer students;
- Add criteria to better align the rubric with the university's strategic mission.

Proposed revisions are the following:

#### Freshman rubric

- Increase *GPA* weight (research shows it is one of the strongest predictive variables of persistence);
- Reduce *Test Score* weight (research shows Test Scores by themselves are a weak predictor of persistence; however, when combined with a high GPA, for every 50 points in SAT scores retention increases by 5.7%);
- Remove *API* (the state has not updated school APIs in more than 6 years);
- Remove *ELC* (*ELC* is highly correlated to GPA and does not provide any value for this selection);
- Add *Completed Any HS Honors, AP and/or IB Courses* (number of courses offered at high schools varies. To not disadvantage rural high schools, this variable will be dichotomous);
- Add *Central Valley Resident* to the non-academic criteria (supports our university mission). This will require identifying zip code boundaries;

#### Transfer rubric

- Give more weight to *GPA* (research shows GPA is one of the strongest predictive variables of persistence);
- Remove *ELC* (this score is not populated for transfer students);
- Remove *API* (this score is not populated for transfer students);
- Add *Central Valley Resident* to the non-academic criteria (supports our university mission). This will require identifying zip code boundaries;

In order to implement any changes to Regents' Scholars selection methodology for the next 2020/21 award cycle, a response is needed by AFAS and UGC by January 2020. Once approved, the proposal will be implemented in February 2020.

AFAS members discussed the proposal and recommended the following:

- In the Proposed Scoring Rubric for Transfers, the proposed maximum GPA is listed as 4.5 and should be 4.0. Director Radney will revise this section (page 3, last table).
- The proposal should indicate that previous consultation with relevant campus constituents has taken place (e.g. AVC for Enrollment Management, Director of Admissions)

#### **Action:**

- Director Radney will send a revised proposal that reflects today's recommendations
- Once members receive the revised proposal, Fatima Paul will invite them to review it via email.
- The approved proposal will be sent to UGC for review and approval.

## **V. Consultation with UGC Chair Sharping**

### **A. [Policy for Impacted Majors](#)**

This policy emerged as a result of discussions with leads of CSE, PSY, BIO, the AFAS Chair, and the School Deans on June 25, 2019. The intent is to serve as a supporting document to the discussions and recommendations that stemmed from the meeting. UGC felt it might be important to have definitions for terms that are used frequently within the admissions community. The essence of the proposal is that normal admissions eligibility criteria do not change for established programs. To be approved as an impacted program, the policy states the following:

UGC/AFAS as well as CAPRA are the lead committees in reviewing impacted status requests. The following process must be followed in order for a program to be approved as an impacted program:

- 1) Representatives from the program should contact DivCo with their intent to seek impacted status.
- 2) The program faculty must document the rationale for their request which should include:
  - A summary of the problem which addresses both student and faculty perspectives, and also discusses infrastructure limitations if they exist.
  - Current and anticipated unit-18 lecturer participation in the program.
  - Anticipated faculty recruitment which may address the problem over the coming years.
  - The current enrollment including contributions from freshman and transfer students.
  - An estimate of the ideal enrollment target as well as the maximum capacity of the program.
  - Recommendation of members of a liaison team comprised of the program chair (or designate), a faculty representative from the school curriculum committee and the school dean (or designate).
- 1) The program faculty must vote on the document.
- 2) The school executive committee must vote on the document.
- 3) The dean of the school must provide a memo discussing the request.
- 4) The Enrollment Strategy committee must provide a memo discussing the request.
- 5) DivCo will forward the request to UGC and CAPRA.
- 6) UGC and CAPRA will review the request, seek feedback from the program in the event of questions and approve or deny the designation.

AFAS members were encouraged to share their thoughts on the proposed policy.

#### Comments/Questions:

- Is there some logic for the number of students x program(s) would like to cap?
  - o The UGC chair responded that he was envisioning the programs telling the Senate what their constraints are and what the faculty felt is a reasonable cap. The process will be a collective exercise.

The UGC chair hopes that this policy will help faculty be aware of enrollment limitations. The consequences of not being cognizant of limitations cannot be understated.

- An Admissions staff noted that the Admissions Office would welcome a timeline associated with the policy, as it might be helpful for admissions to be aware of triggers that may affect admissions decisions.

AFAS comments/recommendations:

- The policy should clarify whether it address transfer students
- It is not clear how the maximum enrollments are determined by programs
- What guarantees do programs have that enrollments will not go beyond the proposed caps?  
The concern is that this policy could add a bureaucratic layer.
- It is not clear how many seats will be allocated for freshmen vs. transfers.
- How do we manage undeclared populations? What do they tend to declare?

B. [Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee as a stand-alone committee](#)

The previous AFAS chair endorsed the concept of a stand-alone AFAS.

A member asked for pros vs. cons of a stand-alone AFAS. A member noted that one of the cons is increased faculty service.

A motion was made, seconded and carried to send this proposal to UGC for consideration.

If the proposal is approved, the Bylaws will need to be amended and approved by the Academic Senate, at the Meeting of the Division.

**VI. Training Sessions on How to Use Tableau (proposed by IRDS)**

Members expressed interest in participating in a session.

**Action:** Fatima Paul will organize a session for AFAS members.

**VII. Informational Items/Discussion Items**

**A. Enrollment Strategy committee (ESC)**

Discussion:

- It is not clear how this committee will interface with AFAS; how responsibilities will be delineated; how workloads will be distributed.
- Will this committee be in charge of making decisions regarding enrollment? AFAS hopes that the ESC will reach out to members of AFAS to make sure responsibilities are clear. Based on the charge of the ESC, it is not entirely clear where AFAS responsibilities end and where the ESC responsibilities begin.
- Will the ESC be responsible for selection?
- The idea would be that AFAS would operate under parameters established by the ESC.
- It seems that AFAS's role would be more tactical whereas the ESC, more strategic
- It is difficult to visualize operations until the ESC convenes.
- AFAS needs more clarity related to the responsibilities of ESC vs. AFAS's (e.g. selection by major).
- The role of the BOARS/Admissions lead is not clear.
- The meeting schedule needs to be communicated to AFAS to ensure communication is clear and maintained.

**B. Admissions Audit**

The AFAS Chair reported that the Senate Chair had reached out to him and to the UGC chair to make sure both committees are prepared to take the necessary steps regarding deliverables. Some are due by November 1.

**Action:**

- Fatima Paul will follow up with the Office of Admissions to inquire about the status of the November 1 deliverables.
- AFAS requests a report from the Admissions leads.