The Admissions Committee worked throughout the summer break, meeting five times and reviewing over 130 applications containing student transcripts, ACT or SAT test scores, student essays, letters of reference, and summary information on core and high school GPAs. Committee members are emailed files of the applications days before the meeting and come prepared to discuss and vote on the applicants’ admissions. Minutes of the meetings included at the end of this report provide details including information on members’ participation.

The committee met three times in the fall. Although it continued to review applications, a major portion of the six plus hours of meetings was spent discussing major events and trends which significantly affect or are affected by the work of the committee. These included:

1) The declining enrollment trend that is likely to intensify in the short term due to the Board of Regents’ refusal to delay increased admission standards for the universities.
2) The potential effect of the above on future university budgets.
3) The Board of Regents intention to significantly increase alternative admissions in order to improve access to the state’s universities while regular admission standards are raised.
4) The administration’s request for everyone involved in admissions to take measures to reduce the time between an admission application’s arrival and student notification in order to ensure UNLV’s processes and services are welcoming, efficient, and helpful.
5) An increased commitment on the part of administration to collect data about the outcomes of decision criteria used, including information on the impact of admission standards on retention and success.
6) Establishment of an Admissions Review Committee composed of members from CCSD, UNLV (including the Admission Committee Chair), and other NSHE institutions and co-chaired by Christine Clark (new VP for Diversity and Inclusion) and Suzanne Espinoza (new Associate VP for Enrollment and Student Services) to discuss cognitive and non-cognitive admissions criteria and to make admissions process recommendations.

The committee spent most of its fall meeting time identifying and discussing ways to 1) increase the number of alternative admission applicants that can be reviewed while maintaining quality of alternative admits and 2) track student success rates and compare them to the standards used in accepting them. Committee members were emailed a considerable amount of information prior to each meeting, and it was clear to the chair that members had prepared well. Details are described in the minutes of those meetings at the end of this report.

---

1 Bryan Spangelo stepped down as chair of the committee in late spring in order to assume his responsibilities as Chair of the 2007/2008 Faculty Senate. Clint Richards became Admissions Committee Chair at that time.
Minutes for May 11, 2007

In Attendance: Terri Bernstein, Pamela Campbell, David Jackson, John Jacobs, Audrey McCool (by proxy), Michael Pravica, Clint Richards, Naoko Takemaru, Joel Wisner, and Nancy York (by proxy)

The Admissions Committee convened at 10:00 am in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (FDH 218) and adjourned at 11:30 after discussing and voting upon 43 applications and discussing measures which might be taken to improve success rates of those we admit. The committee members agreed to continue discussion of measures to improve alternative admits success rates. The chair thanked all of the experienced committee members for their guidance and patience during the meeting and thanked all members for their obvious preparation and thoughtful comments.

Minutes for June 15

Terri Bernstein, David Jackson, John Jacobs, Michael Pravica, and Clint Richards attended the meeting in person. Audrey McCool, Joel Wisner, Pam Campbell, and Nancy York voted electronically.

The Admissions Committee convened at 10:00 am in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (FDH 218) to discuss 46 applications.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 after review of all applications and discussion of required advising to be implemented as early as Spring 08 and future meeting dates. Terri Bernstein also explained eligibility requirements for Student Support Services.

The next review and vote on applications will be done electronically, with a deadline of June 29 in order to meet requirements for admission to Summer Session III. John Jacobs promised to send files by the 26th.

The next regular meeting will be Wednesday, August 8 at 10:00 a.m., with files promised by August 1.

The chair thanked all in attendance and all who voted electronically, many of whom included comments which were discussed in our meeting.

Minutes for June 27

The committee reviewed and voted upon 5 applications in this meeting. Committee members Terri Bernstein, Pam Campbell, David Jackson, Audrey McCool, Michael Pravica, Clint Richards, Naoko Takemaru, Joel Wisner, and Nancy York attended the meeting or voted by email.
**Minutes for July 27**

The committee was asked on July 17 by the Office of International Students and Scholars and Student-Athlete Academic Services to review applications for five students by July 27 so that they could be admitted to UNLV for the fall if approved. The committee agreed and members received the applications July 21. Terri Bernstein, Pam Campbell, David Jackson, Audrey McCool, Michael Pravica, Naoko Takemara, Joel Wisner, and Nancy York voted by email. The five students were approved for admission.

**Minutes for August 8**

David Jackson, John Jacobs, Clint Richards, and Nancy York attended the August 8 meeting in person. Michael Pravica, Audrey McCool, Joel Wisner, and Pam Campbell voted electronically.

The Admissions Committee convened at 10:00 am in the Faculty Senate Conference Room (FDH 218) and evaluated a total of 35 applications.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 after review of all applications and discussion of the recent impact study on the effects of increased admission standards on diversity enrollment at UNLV. Committee members directed Chair Richards to request a report on admission committee admits by race for 2005 and 2006 before the upcoming Board of Regent’s meeting August 16-17 so that Faculty Senate Chair Bryan Spangelo could report on results at that meeting if called upon.

**Minutes for Sept. 28**

Committee members Pam Campbell, Michael Pravica, Joel Wisner, John Jacobs, and Clint Richards were present. Suzanne Espanoza (Associate Vice President for Enrollment & Student Services) and Suzanne Carlson (Executive Director, Enrollment Management) were also asked to attend the meeting to provide input, and they did.

The meeting was convened at 1:30 pm. to discuss ways to respond to the Regent’s desire for an increase in the number of students admitted at the universities through their alternative admission programs. Committee members were given a considerable amount of relevant information before and during the meeting. They learned that the requirements for admission under the alternative admission criteria will remain the same but that the Board will increase the number who may be admitted to 15 percent of the previous year’s admissions. It was previously 10 percent of the previous year’s freshmen enrollment. Since UNLV admitted 8,807 students for Fall of 2007; it appears we could admit up to 1,321 students through alternate criteria. The regents and President Ashley have asked that the time between an admission application’s arrival and student notification be reduced as much as possible to ensure that processes and services are welcoming, efficient, and helpful.
The committee discussed the positive impact a major increase in alternative admissions could have on the current negative enrollment trend (likely to be amplified in the short term by the increased admissions standards for Fall 2008) and the goal of maintaining or increasing the diversity of the student body. The committee recognized the need to develop more efficient ways of reviewing at least some applicants if the pool is to grow much larger. Other points of emphasis in the discussion included the need to maintain quality of admits and to track their success rates in order to learn what criteria better predict success. The establishment of some objective standards for approval was seen as a way to efficiently process some applications and thereby leave more time for comprehensive review of the remainder. Discussion centered on the use of relatively high standards for test scores, the use of combinations of test scores and grades, and the use of objective standards regarding improvement or otherwise indicating a significant reason to believe in a high probability of success (objective measures of a strong support system, for example). All committee members present were in favor of accepting students for fall 2008 who meet the following objective standards on the condition that the admissions staff keeps the committee informed of the numbers admitted and the progress of these students. Committee members Terri Bernstein, David Jackson, Audrey McCool, Steve Parker, Shizhi Qian, and Nancy York were not present at the meeting but later indicated their agreement with the standards via email after reviewing them.

1. Students who have a 1040 on the reading and math portions of the SAT or a 22 composite ACT.
Rationale: The committee currently admits most students who meet the NCAA sliding grade. An SAT 1040 would allow admission with a 2.0 on the NCAA sliding scale. That scale doesn’t use the composite ACT, but a 22 is a comparably high test score. These scores were originally proposed by UNLV with the faculty’s concurrence as an alternative to the 2.75 on the core courses and subsequently approved by the regents with the assumption that students would have the core. In Fall 2006, we had 99 students who had one of these test scores but did not have the GPA on the core. In Fall 2007, we had 209 students who fit this category. Many of these students had high GPAs but did not have the required core. Facilitating the admission of students with an SAT 1040 or ACT 22 is therefore likely to have a substantial impact on admissions.

2. Students who have at least a 2.5 overall GPA and at least a 17 in English on the ACT or a 400 verbal SAT.
Rationale: Difficulty with English appears to be the biggest reason for student failure. These test scores suggest a reasonable proficiency and are those required by faculty for admission to English 101E (the first option as a non-remedial English course). Enrollment Management believes this test score and a minimum 2.5 overall GPA in combination should lead to success rates comparable to or better than other alternative admits.

3. Participants in the UNLV Center for Academic Enrichment and Outreach programs who have a GPA of at least 2.5 on the required core courses.
Rationale: The Center for Academic Enrichment and Outreach administers TRIO and GEAR UP programs.\(^2\) Students mirror the diversity of our society, but the majority of them are low income. They participate in what is often years of services designed to enhance their readiness for college-level work. They are also eligible for Student Support Services through CAEO when they arrive on campus. The added support they have previously and will continue to receive appear to bode well for their success.

4. Students who have completed high school and are fully admissible per their high school record but who have taken six or fewer college credits while in high school and/or since completing high school that don’t allow them to be fully admitted as transfer students. 
Rationale: The committee has previously considered these students’ high school record more predictive of their success than their record in such a limited number of college credits.

5. Transfer students who have earned at least a 2.3 GPA on 24 or more college credits and a 2.5 in their last semester.
Rationale: The 2.3 satisfies current regular admission requirements, but not the Fall 2008 requirement of a 2.5 over all the college credits. Requiring the 2.5 in the last semester is consistent with the alternative admission criteria of improvement.

Those present at the meeting also again discussed whether students who are admitted under alternate criteria should be required to see an academic advisor before their enrollment. The committee has previously expressed it support of this. However, Suzanne Espanoza expressed concern that the requirement might place too great a burden on advisors before the semester began. Alternatives ranging from simply encouraging students to see an advisor to requiring them to sometime during their first semester were debated. The committee decided to return to the topic at a later meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 pm.

\(^2\) According to the Council for Opportunity in Education, “Students enrolled in today’s TRIO programs mirror our nation’s multicultural and multiethnic society. Thirty-seven percent of TRIO students are White, 35% are African American, 19% are Hispanic, 4% are Native American, and 1% is multiethnic. Twenty-two thousand TRIO students are disabled. There are more than 22,000 U.S. Veterans currently enrolled in the TRO Programs. . . TRIO and GEAR UP programs must be expanded to give more than 11 million Americans from low-income families the realistic chance to enter college and graduate.”
(http://www.coenet.us/ecm/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Directory_of_TRIO_GEAR_UP&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=4432)
Minutes for October 25

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm and adjourned a little after 3:00 pm. In attendance were John Jacobs, David Jackson, Audrey McCool, Steve Parker, Michael Pravica, Shizhi Qian, Clint Richards, and Joel Wisner.

After introductions of new members, the committee briefly went over the application review process, including use of the “sliding scale”, letters, demonstration of special talents and overcoming hardship, and evidence of improvement. John Jacobs promised to email the sliding scale to all. The committee then reviewed the one application it had pending. Terri Bernstein voted by email.

The committee next reaffirmed its support of the requirement for all those admitted through full committee review to see an advisor before enrollment and for the encouragement of all other alternative admits for Fall 2008 to get academic advising before enrolling.

The committee discussed but rejected the idea of requiring a college preparatory course such as UNS 100 because of the expense to the student, the fact it might add to the number of hours needed for graduation, concerns about staffing the course if all alternate admits were required to take it, and uncertainty about its effect.

The chair reported on the Admissions Review Committee co-chaired by Christine Clark (VP for Diversity and Inclusion) and Suzanne Espinoza (Associate VP for Enrollment and Student Services) and currently meeting to discuss cognitive and non-cognitive admissions criteria and to make recommendations about the admission and transfer processes at UNLV and within the Nevada System of Higher Education. Some of the non-cognitive criteria being discussed may be of use to our committee, and the recommendations made by the Admissions Review Committee are likely to directly or indirectly address our role in the admissions process.

Registrar Cem Sunata and Executive Director for Enrollment Management Suzanne Carlson joined the meeting at 2:00 as requested by the committee to discuss several items.

1. We were promised information on admissions compared to the alternate admission cap before spring meetings.

2. A report will be generated for committee members using past data and comparing GPA and retention rates of regularly admitted students to those admitted through the alternative admissions process.

3. The committee was asked if it would consider applicants for alternative admission who have over 48 transfer credits. The committee saw no reason to exclude those with over 48 hours, and agreed to accept and review their applications.
Minutes for November 29

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm and adjourned at 3:00 pm. Attending were Terri Bernstein, David Jackson, John Jacobs, Amanda Lange, Audrey McCool, Steve Parker, Michael Pravica, Clint Richards, Joel Wisner, and Nancy York.

John Jacobs announced that he would be leaving the committee to take on another assignment and introduced Amanda Brewer as the new liaison Admission and Enrollment Counselor from Enrollment and Student Services. The chair thanked John for his excellent work organizing and providing student applications and responding to other committee requests.

The committee discussed and voted upon eight applications.

At the request of administration, the committee also discussed the possibility of removing the requirement that all alternative admission applicants submit SAT or ACT test scores. The committee discussed possible pros and cons, which included the arguments below, before voting against recommending the requirement’s elimination to the UNLV Faculty Senate.

Arguments cited for continuing the test score requirement
1. Test scores are useful when combined with other information about the applicant.
2. Allowing test scores, but not requiring them, would reduce their usefulness.

Arguments in favor of removing the test requirement:

1. We have removed the restriction against students with over 48 hours applying through the alternative admissions process. SAT or ACT scores may be dated for some older applicants and may be less valid as predictors of their future success.
2. Test scores may be less predictive of the future success of some minority groups.
3. It is unfair to require test scores for alternative admission applicants but not others.

The chair of the committee next referred to and reviewed information sent out to committee members about further work and discussions by the Admission Review Committee and its emphasis on the importance of non-cognitive factors in admission. It was noted that we currently rely heavily on non-cognitive factors in our deliberations. Discussion ensued about the importance of maintaining the Admission Committees’ role in alternative admissions as 1) those admissions become increasingly important in the admission strategy of the university and the Board of Regents and 2) pressure consequently builds to significantly increase the numbers of students admitted through the alternative admissions process while maintaining or increasing these admits’ success rates. The chair noted that the Admission Committee was complimented by a variety of members of the Admission Review Committee despite some expressed concerns about the committee’s ability to respond rapidly when necessary. It was noted that the Admissions Committee had on more than one occasion voted on an emergency issue within a few days.

The next meeting date was set for January 11 during semester break.