Admissions Committee
Chaired by Janet Runge, Spring 05
Chaired by Bryan Spangelo, Fall 05

Spring 05 Report

The committee met six times during the spring semester and early summer, reviewing numerous applications for special admittance and discussing additional issues as described below:

2/11/05 - Discussion of situation with student athletes admitted over break. Documents from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the use of a sliding scale reviewed. It was determined that we needed more information regarding the admissions process at UNR and use of sliding scales at other institutions. The need to clearly communicate submission deadlines to all departments across campus was brought out.

3/11/05 - Reviewed information on the admissions process at UNR. It was reported that they follow the same procedure as we do, with the addition of a non-voting athletics representative on the admissions committee. The role of a sliding scale and its implications was discussed. A preliminary draft of the committee’s view of the NCAA sliding scale and its role in the admissions process will be circulated among members for input in refining the document.

4/8/05 - Clint Richards, incoming chair of the Faculty Senate, met with the committee to discuss the sliding scale policy. Dr. Richards outlined the executive’s committee’s perspective and desires and gained valuable insight into the committee’s view. The critical issue for the committee is not the adoption of the sliding scale, but rather its role in conjunction with the other alternative admissions criteria established by the Board of Regents. Members will review and vote on two alternate proposals. Based on the majority view, a policy recommendation will be drafted and forwarded to the Executive Committee. The options are as follows:

OPTION A: The sliding scale is applied automatically to those who appeal their admissions decision. If the student meets the minimum requirement set forth by the scale, then the file is never brought to committee, simply "rubber stamped" by the chair and the student gets into UNLV. If they don't meet the minimum required by the scale, the already existing factors (alternative criteria stated in the general catalog) will be considered by the whole committee.

OPTION B: The sliding scale is applied with the same weight as the other factors already set forth in the general catalog, all applied holistically. Every file then, is considered by the committee.

The change in admissions policies and the impact on the committee workload next fall was also discussed.
5/13/05
Discussed summer meeting schedule. Talked about the development of a statement on the committee’s position on the use of a sliding scale. The chair will summarize comments and present a statement for approval at the next meeting. Files were considered.

6/14/05
Files were considered. A statement on the committee’s position on the use of a sliding scale was submitted to the committee and approved. The Statement follows:

The Admissions Committee recommends the adoption of a standardized sliding scale, for use in determining admission by alternate criteria. We believe the sliding scale currently utilized by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is a satisfactory alternative for the present because it is likely to have credibility among regents and others. While there is documentation supporting it as an indicator/predictor of academic success, this committee strongly suspects the myriad of support services student athletes are required to use (that are not available to the broader student population) plays a greater role in the academic success of these students. It may be that other established sliding scales can better serve prospective students at UNLV. The Admissions Committee will begin an examination of alternative sliding scales in use. There may be state universities with a population similar to ours that use a sliding scale in the admissions process that targets the larger student body, not simply athletes. If we find a scale that we believe is more effective as an admission criteria, we will then forward a recommendation to replace the NCAA scale.

In order to be considered for admission by alternative criteria, the applicant must submit final transcripts, ACT or SAT scores, two recommendation letters, and a statement of appeal. The Board of Regents specifically states that the Admissions Committee will consider:

- A combination of test score and GPA (through a sliding scale)
- Special talents
- Evidence of potential for success
- Improvement in high school record,
- Overcoming adversity and hardship
- Other special circumstances

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has proposed creating a tiered system of alternative admission:

“We believe that satisfactory performance on the scale should result in admission whether or not the student has ‘special talents’, has ‘overcome adversity’, etc. Use of a sliding scale in this way would expedite alternative admission of candidates who met the scale, and would allow the Admissions Committee additional time to evaluate the others using the subjective alternate criteria approved by the Board of Regents.”

The Executive Committee goes on to suggest that:
“By specifying multiple criteria, the regents clearly did not intend for any one to be a required hurdle – not a “sliding scale” or “special talents”, not “overcoming adversity” or even showing an “improvement in high school record”. Since the regents clearly didn’t intend to require satisfactory performance on all criteria, we don’t believe they intended or expected evaluation of all candidates on all criteria.”

However, by proposing the tiered system, they are in effect creating a hurdle. Although we have been strongly encouraged to adopt the scale as an automatic admissions criterion, we have reservations about its implementation as it would have substantially more weight than all of the other six alternative items stated by the Regents. The Admission Committee believes the Regents did, in fact, intend all the criteria to be weighed in the decision to admit students through the alternative process. If, on the other hand, a tiered system is to be enacted, why must the sliding scale be the first criterion used as a hurdle? Why not special talent or hardship? That would make the admission decision even easier.

No weighting of the criteria is given by the Regents, thus the committee must consider the entirety of the applicant’s file. We interpret the Board’s position to be that no one criterion creates a sufficient condition for admission. That is, meeting a sliding scale qualification is not in and of itself sufficient for admission. While there is a convenience in establishing a sliding scale as a stand alone standard, such that the committee would only consider files from applicants who do not meet the sliding scale requirement, the committee firmly believes that such a move establishes a different admission standard than that clearly laid down by the Board of Regents. Further, we believe that alternate admission based on a tiered system, first meeting a sliding scale criterion and failing that, consideration of the applicant’s full file, is not in the best interests of prospective students.

Because each standard is considered, first individually and then as a whole, in the alternative criteria admission process, the Admission Committee makes a decision based on specific factors for the individual student. We believe the strength of our process lies in this holistic approach, considering each individual with their particular contexts and circumstances. Our approach serves both the needs of prospective students and the interests of a growing university.

7/12/05

Files were considered. The committee’s statement on the sliding scale’s use was forwarded to senate president Clint Richards on 7/6/05.

**Meeting Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2/11</th>
<th>3/2</th>
<th>4/8</th>
<th>5/14</th>
<th>6/14</th>
<th>7/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Aldridge - FA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Kaseko - ENGR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall 05 Report

Record of Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>8-8-05</th>
<th>8-15-05</th>
<th>9-22-05</th>
<th>12-8-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Aldridge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Barrash</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Berkheiser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Bernstein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proxy</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Boutot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Fuller</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Jackson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Kaseko</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Oakes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Runge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Simmons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Spangelo (C)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naoko Takemura</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Tillotson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting of 8-8-05

The Admissions Committee convened at 1:00 PM in the Lied Board Room (LLB 3281).

First meeting with Bryan Spangelo as Chair. Vice President for Student Life Rebecca Mills addressed the Committee. Dr. Mills asked the Committee to reconsider a denied appeal for special admission by a student athlete. Following her departure the Committee reviewed three student files and admitted the student athlete.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.
Meeting of 8-15-05

The Admissions Committee convened at 1:00 PM in the Lied Board Room (LLB 3281).

Committee members discussed their schedules for the fall semester. The Chair presented the Committee with memorandum detailing the charge for the Committee by the Faculty Senate. The Committee engaged in lengthy discussion regarding the use of a sliding scale. Because admission standards will change in 2006 (2.75 GPA in a 13 credit core), the NCAA sliding scale was selected by the Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:45 PM.

Meeting of 9-22-05

The Admissions Committee convened at 10:00 AM in the Lied Board Room (LLB 3281).

One file was evaluated (GPA did not meet minimum requirement).

Craig Fuller provided the Committee with data regarding outcomes of applicants which were denied or accepted by the Committee. The data reviewed were from 1998-2004.

The Committee briefly discussed the ramifications of the new GPA for admission to the university (i.e., 2.75 in core courses) which takes effect in January 2006. Specifically, will the Committee evaluate routinely appeals with high overall GPAs but with modestly deficient core GPAs? It was decided to monitor the number of such cases prior to formulating any policy statement.

Members in attendance signed and dated the Faculty Senate Statement of Confidentiality, which will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate office by the Chair.

The Chair admitted six students ad hoc with minor credit deficiencies (0.5 to 1 credit) but with cumulative high school GPAs higher than 2.5.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:30 AM.

Meeting of 12-8-05

The Admissions Committee convened at 10:00 AM in the Lied Board Room (LLB 3281).

Three files were evaluated for admission to the spring semester of 2006 (overall GPAs did not meet minimum requirement of 2.5).

The Committee briefly discussed the ramifications of the new GPA for admission to the university (i.e., 2.75 in 13 credits of core courses) for the fall semester of 2006. At least four types of student appeals will occur:
• student with overall GPA greater than 3.0, but less than 2.75 in core courses
• student with overall and core GPAs greater than 3.0, but deficient by one or two credits in the 13 credit core
• student with overall GPA greater than 3.0, but less than 2.75 in core courses and deficient by one or two credits in the 13 credit core
• student with overall and core GPAs greater than 3.0, but 13 credit core does not include appropriate classes in English or mathematics

It is important to note that in each of these cases a student would qualify for a Millennium scholarship, which requires a 3.1 weighted GPA. Core courses include 4 credits of English, 3 credits in mathematics, 3 credits in social science, and 3 credits in natural science. Requirements for graduation from high school in Clark County include each of the above with the exception of only two credits in natural science.

The Committee determined that use of the NCAA sliding scale would be useful in evaluation of student appeals. The Committee will monitor the type and volume of files beginning in January of 2006. If necessary, a strategy will be adopted to allow automatic admission for students deficient by one-half or one credit in the core courses. A similar procedure is currently in use whereby the Chair admits a student with one credit deficiency but an overall GPA between 2.5 and 3.0.

The Committee discussed suitable meeting times for the spring semester of 2006. Committee meetings will be scheduled tentatively on Thursdays at 9:00 AM.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:45 AM.