Faculty Senate

Tania Tetlow, Honorary President

John Drummond, President

Ralf Hepp, Vice President

Christopher GoGwilt, Secretary

Andrew Albin
Binta Alleyne-Green
Ida Bastiaens
Michael Baur
Thomas Beaudoin
Jeffrey Colon
Christopher Dietrich
Lauri Goldkind
Amir Idris
Judith Jones
Sharif Mowlabocus
Haim Mozes
Giorgio Pini
Tamique Ridgard
Berish Rubin
Aditya Saharia
Falguni Sen
Henry Schwalbenberg
Grace Shen
Grace M. Vernon
Ian Weinstein
Lori Wolff

Present: Senate President Drummond; Senators Bastiaens, Baur, Beaudoin, Colon, Dietrich, GoGwilt, Goldkind, Hepp, Idris, Mowlabocus, Saharia, Sen, Shen, Vernon, Weinstein, Wolff

Attending via Zoom: Senators Alleyne-Green, Jones, Mozes, Ridgard, Rubin

Excused: Senators Albin, Pini, Schwalbenberg

Guests: Dr. Jonathan Crystal, Vice Provost; Dr. Ji Seon Lee, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

Call to Order

Senate President Drummond called the meeting to order in O'Hare Special Collections, Walsh Library, at 11:35 a.m. He announced that the Provost Dennis Jacobs' mother had passed away, that condolences had been extended, and that the Vice Provost, Dr. Jonathan Crystal, would be representing him in his absence.

Invocation

Senator GoGwilt delivered the invocation at 11:36 a.m.

President's Report and Q&A

The President opened her presentation with a few updates, beginning with the news of a tentative agreement reached with SEIU (Service Employees International Union), the union representing adjunct faculty. The agreement would be for a 3-year contract retroactively applied to half a year ago; so, in effect, a 2-and-a-half-year contract. Union membership needs to approve the contract. The President briefly summarized what the tentative agreement achieves. It would raise full-time adjunct pay 3.5% next year and 3% the year after. For part-time adjuncts the raises per course vary highly according to discipline, but the focus has been to increase the pay of those who make the least. The question of healthcare was a challenge given the cost of the university's plan. There's a long-term plan to find a broader solution involving a provision of the Taft-Hartley Act that might enable the pooling of healthcare resources of institutions with whom we share adjunct teachers. In the short term, the tentative agreement involves a flexible savings account where the university deposits money for part-time employees.

The President also gave a brief update on the budget process, noting that the focus is still currently on estimating revenue. This has been especially challenging given the number of graduate programs involved and the fact that we continue to see slippage in graduate enrollments. That hard work of estimating revenue needs to be done before the process of budget planning which begins with the Budget Planning Committee. The committee's first meeting will be scheduled soon. The President is working with the Finance Office to ensure that meeting will be

as engaged as possible to enable a substantive deliberation on what to prioritize and how to navigate the trade-offs necessary given the constraints of the budget. The President mentioned that the survey she had sent out inviting input on strategy had generated hundreds of responses and she was thankful for all the many good ideas. She has read all the comments. She plans to give a report on the input already received and will solicit further input.

The President then turned to a presentation on tuition pricing. She shared a slide presentation used to explain to the Board of Trustees how pricing works in higher education. (Given the sensitive nature of the data, this slide show is not included in the minutes.) She first discussed the constraints on admissions strategies posed by headcount, explaining some of the trade-offs in deciding how large to set incoming classes. More students may provide more revenue, but increasing the number of students requires housing; and guaranteeing housing for four years on both campuses feels like a huge admissions advantage. Some of the variables include having students studying abroad, but headcount remains a constraint. She then discussed the question of yield, the number of admitted students who choose to come to Fordham. Since it is no longer a factor in US News rankings, the yield rate is less important than the end result of the class that is recruited. There are several variables in achieving the national profile we want, including the all-important question of diversity: racial, economic, and gender diversity (and she spoke to the importance of addressing the lopsided gender differentials across all of higher education). Turning to the question of the discount rate, she showed how the rate had been ratcheting up quite a bit; but that we had succeeded in reducing the numbers a bit. She then compared the "sticker" price of tuition at Fordham to other institutions noting how this price in the marketplace is very different from what we actually charge students, but noting, too, that if a tuition price looks low by comparison to other institutions this affects the way families regard the university's profile. She spent some time explaining, given the increasing disparity of wealth nationwide, how few applicants fit the profile of the full-paying student (as defined by FAFSA). She then also addressed the number of variables involved in finding ways to appeal to the students we want to accept into each entering class, including balancing the different but related trade-offs between merit-based and need-based financial aid. On the basis of the data presented she said that cutting the financial aid budget doesn't save us money. There are some details that still need to be examined – for example the question of legacy (a very small factor for Fordham) – but overall, the conclusion to be drawn from the figures is that our financial aid strategies need to be maintained to prevent the kind of drop in revenue that other institutions (such as Loyola) faced.

Q&A

In response to the President's report there was an extended discussion sometimes focusing on detailed data in the slide presentation.

One senator asked why PCS was not counted in the calculations of tuition revenue, to which the President responded that the student headcount is not capped in the same way in PCS and that our undergraduate enrollment operation is not recruiting for PCS.

Another senator asked how the university was able to factor in all the shifting variables involved in considering the potential larger-scale effect of smaller qualitative enticements to prospective students in addition to the psychological effect on the demand in the marketplace. The President acknowledged that this involves an extraordinarily complicated modeling process and noted that the university relies on a consulting company called EAB (eab.com). She also noted that, while admissions strategy remains attentive to such details, it's important to stay predictable and avoid any big changes (e.g., in raising or lower class size, or recalibrating financial aid).

One senator asked if the data might be presented in a different way so as to provide insight into the potential role of individual faculty and individual programs in helping lower the discount rate. What can faculty do to address the problem of revenue? Is there data on whether honors programs, for example, recruit candidates with lower, or higher discount rate needs? In response, the President noted first that what matters most is the overall collective response; and that it was hard to quantify the data at the individual program or faculty level. On the other hand, she affirmed the importance of what faculty do for students who then become recruiters, and the importance of faculty in creating cutting-edge programs that stand out. She noted there are constraints on such innovation, taking as an example the sciences. We have fallen behind in the sciences and it will be hard and very expensive to catch up. There are great strengths, but we don't currently have the strengths of our competitors, so we need to connect the sciences to our existing strengths in the humanities and in business and in law and do something exciting and interdisciplinary to create a cutting-edge program that you can't find at other schools. Faculty input, then, is absolutely important for addressing the overall question of revenue.

One senator asked, given the predictions for an upcoming recession, and given the stated desire to keep the discount rate more or less even, whether there were any major strategies being considered in the next few years, any changes to the way things have been done in the past. In response, the President emphasized that she is worried too much weight has been given to the discount rate in isolation. It is the collective net revenue that allows us to function. There are a number of things to be considered, such as whether to build new residence halls, whether to guarantee 3 years of housing, or other ways we might grow. There are also ongoing debates such as how to improve science and technology, particularly within an interdisciplinary context; and there is a focus on international recruiting. Improving marketing is also a priority.

One senator expressed extreme discomfort with the implications of following a pricing model that seems inimical to the university's mission of social justice. They emphasized, in particular, the negative impact on those with the least access to education, since when you're pricing for the elite, you're not pricing for the people at the bottom of the socio-economic spectrum. In response the President agreed that the pricing system of the market was indeed disconcerting. She spoke of an information gap in reaching families making college decisions: it takes some sophistication for the poorest families to know that the highest priced colleges might be the least expensive. She noted, though, that Fordham has a website that offers financial aid guidance to families. She also reiterated the point that we are soon going to hit the ceiling of what American families can afford. We can no longer sustain the model of increasing tuition 3-5% each year; so we need to find a different way forward.

Another senator, speaking of the efforts of departments at open houses, asked whether there might be a better way to connect department initiatives with recruitment strategies. The President responded positively to the suggestion indicating that this might extend beyond open houses.

One senator, acknowledging the difficulty in finding areas to increase revenue, asked if the President was thinking of areas that might be eliminated, comparable to the Law School's decision not to hire in the area of agency (another example offered hypothetically was Ancient Assyrian). The President responded that, of course, they were looking at areas of waste to cut, but noted that it is not easy to move quickly, in part because of tenure. Deliberations over areas of waste certainly belong to the budget process. Noting that we are not at the point of austerity at all, she said that Fordham has a lot to learn from schools that have been forced to be frugal, entrepreneurial, and creatively nimble.

Following further discussion of other possible ways to think creatively about offers outside the normal aid package, the Q&A concluded at approximately 12:38 p.m.

Vice Provost's Report and Q&A – Dr. Jonathan Crystal, reporting in the Provost's absence
Vice Provost Jonathan Crystal reiterated the happiness expressed by the President with the tentative agreement reached between the Administration and SEIU. He expressed appreciation of the union leadership as well as the Administration's team, including Ji Seon Lee.

On a less happy note, he reported that there was now some preliminary data on graduate enrollment for the Spring 2023. The Provost had reported at the November meeting, based on the Fall census, that registered credit hours for all of the graduate professional schools were falling behind targets (by 14.2%). The 2U-managed programs had been forecast to be 7.8% above budget. Overall, there was an anticipated $9.9 million shortfall in net revenue for AY 23. Undergraduate enrollment was higher, offsetting some of that. But with more data coming in with spring registration, we are seeing further erosion in the number of credit hours in the graduate and professional schools. We're now anticipating a $12.6 million shortfall in graduate net tuition for the current year. That's 2.7% more than we anticipated. This creates some challenges.

The Vice Provost then addressed some of the challenges posed by the Open Source AI program ChatGPT which has received so much coverage in the news lately. He referred to surveys of high school and college students that indicated 89% were aware of the program and 22% admitted to using it for classes. At Fordham there have been a couple of cases of plagiarism. He noted that a Princeton graduate student has developed an app meant to detect the use of ChatGPT, but it too can be fooled. The Law School has suggested drafting a policy. Academic integrity committees in other Schools have also been asked by their respective Deans to study this. There is a new wave of articles that suggest we should not fear ChatGPT.

The Vice Provost concluded with an update on the shared governance working group. Faculty composition had already been set (the Executive Committee members plus Senator Sen). Representatives for the Administration will be the President Tania Tetlow, the Provost Dennis Jacobs, the Vice Provost Jonathan Crystal, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Ji Seon Lee, Chief Financial Officer Martha Hirst, and Vice President for Human Resources Kay Turner, Esq.

Q&A
There was extensive discussion of ChatGPT. Several senators referred to the conversations initiated by Anne Fernald (Special Advisor to the Provost on Faculty Development) and Steve D'Agustino (Director of Online Learning). In response to a question about plans for the Center of Educational Innovation to address the issue, the Vice Provost noted that we are planning to search for a director, but in the meantime Anne Fernald and Steve D'Agustino are leading faculty development efforts. Another senator suggested that, given the university's investment in Blackboard, Blackboard should really come up with solutions to AI plagiarism problems. Others noted that this is a larger problem than plagiarism and ought to be approached with the same kind of concerted effort expended on the challenges of online learning.

On another topic, one senator asked the Provost's Office to look into the problems of equity concerning the compensation structure for chairs, associate chairs and program directors. The Vice Provost said he would convey this request to the Provost.

Senate President Drummond noted that there has been a series of retirements in the Office of Research and asked the Vice Provost what plans were in place for filling those positions. The Vice Provost noted that the first step is to replace the director of the Office of Sponsored Programs.

Faculty Composition Report Follow-up and Q&A: Dr. Ji Seon Lee, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
At approximately 1:00 p.m. Senate President Drummond closed discussion and invited Dr. Ji Seon Lee to address a follow-up to the report she gave at the last senate meeting. Noting that senators will have had time to

review the data provided at the last meeting, and commenting on the large drop in the number of tenure/tenure-track positions over the 5 – 7-year period tracked by the data, he said that his first question would be: are there targets being set for the kind of balance we want to reach with percentages of tenure/tenure-track, full-time, part-time, non-tenure track, etc.

Dr. Lee said she is happy to facilitate dialogue on the question of what the ideal composition of faculty should be at the university. She said she had heard over and over again the desire to move away from a reliance on adjunct faculty. Senate President Drummond then asked if the latest agreement with SEIU might motivate a move toward more full-time non-tenure-track instructors, by closing the gap between the compensation for part-time and full-time non-tenure-track instructors. Dr. Lee indicated that what the union agreement signaled, more than a question of the levels of compensation, was the desire to have our students taught by fully committed faculty members. The Vice Provost suggested that the agreement does indicate a desire to move toward more full-time instructors.

One senator asked whether there was any implicit or explicit policy to fill unfilled tenure-track lines, or to convert them into non-tenure-track positions. In response, the Vice Provost noted that when he first joined the Provost's Office there was a shift to the principle that tenure-track lines do not live in departments, or Schools. The senator clarified they were asking about the university-level. To this the Vice Provost said there is no written policy on this. He said the administration has been committed to maintaining the tenure-track faculty (and indicated that this was reflected in the data presented by Dr. Lee).

One senator asked whether we could get data on all the different categories of instructors teaching all the different kinds of courses across the university. Dr. Lee responded by noting the difficulty of getting such data, given the lack of a single common definition for the courses faculty offer. At this stage, she indicated, we're not able to have the data to allow us to compare apples to apples.

Returning to an earlier question, one senator asked both Dr. Lee and the Vice Provost if there was a policy on converting contingent faculty or clinical positions (back) into tenure-track lines. The Vice Provost responded by noting that it is the tenure-track faculty who are responsible for the curriculum; and that, given the research component that is core to the university's mission and reputation, there's the intention or hope to increase, or at least retain the size of tenure-track faculty. The Vice Provost nonetheless felt compelled to point out that to convert a Clinical or Lecturer position into a tenure-track position means you move from a 4/4 load to a 3/2; so you need to cover those additional courses. Although there is no explicit policy on this, he indicated that the Administration is commited to enhancing the tenure-track lines.

At approximately 1:14 p.m. Senate President Drummond invited the Enrollment Group to address the Senate.

Enrollment Group: Implications of the Supreme Court's Impending Ruling on Race Conscious Admission:

John Buckley, VP for Enrollment introduced his colleagues Dr. Patricia Peek, AVP and Dean of Admission and Brian Ghanoo, AVP for Student Financial Services. Before handing things to the Dean of Admission to present on the topic of the upcoming Supreme Court decision regarding race conscious admission, the VP noted that despite the very high number of applications, the enrollment team has been able to preserve a high level of personal attention in assessing candidates. Especially given whatever may unfold in the Supreme Court's ruling, he said it was important to know that all candidates' applications are given a holistic review.

The Dean of Admission, Patricia Peek, presented a review of the challenges posed by the upcoming decision in a Supreme Court case concerning the consideration of race in college admissions. (For the complete slide show see Appendix I.) She began with a brief history and current timeline of the cases that have been heard by the

court, with a decision to be passed down by June of 2023. Posing the general question – "Will diversity efforts be impacted?" – and noting that the answer will almost certainly be yes, she then turned to discuss Fordham's current, holistic approach to admissions, which combines academic and qualitative reviews in a dual rating system. Testing is considered if a student presents test scores during the current optional testing pilot period. For the most recent cycle, approximately 64% of applicants did not present test scores. In the qualitative review the admission committee looks for a variety of personal characteristics that will vary from student to student. The committee values students' commitment and ethos in terms of diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice as one of many factors in the qualitative review. This one factor represents how students manifest that ethos in their lived experience, not in their identity. This long standing practice of giving weight to a broader set of student characteristics than racial identity may help mitigate the impact of the Supreme Court decision. Dr. Peek presented data demonstrating the 10-year progress in admissions in terms of racial diversity and she addressed some of the persistent outreach efforts that led to this progress. She outlined some "race neutral strategies" that have been used and may continue to be considered should the upcoming Supreme Court decision place limitations on current admissions efforts. She then turned to several areas of the work of admissions that might be affected including the application review; recruitment and yield activities; financial aid; and other considerations (see Appendix I). She concluded the presentation with a few recommendations on what the university might do by way of planning ahead.

John Buckley added that over the last few years some adjustments have been made as to how financial aid is awarded, more closely linking aid to admission assessments. Diversity on many levels is of interest to our donors, and many value the diversity of scholarship recipients. At one point in time academic and qualitative elements were looked at uniformly as opposed to independently. Being holistic has served us well and should continue to serve us well. This approach will be evaluated as necessary following the issuance of the Supreme Court's decision.

In the Q&A there was a question about testing and Dr. Peek noted that, although we are still in the trial period of optional testing, the results have not indicated any significant difference. She noted that a longer window is needed to assess optional testing. John Buckley noted that there is someone in the office of Enrollment Research, Michael Tavas, who is partnering with Jeannine Pinto of Institutional Research to take a very close look at optional testing during this current admissions cycle.

One senator asked how a strong emphasis on recruiting students from lower income groups would factor into any changes resulting from the Supreme Court ruling. John Buckley responded by saying we face the same trade offs each year and this will become even more acute in the face of any changes that need to be made. He outlined the process, beginning in the early summer, that involves a series of meetings, some internal, some with the outside consultant (Educational Advisory Board), and entails some two to three dozen simulations of trade-offs. All of our institutional priorities are considered, and diversity is certainly one of those; but Fordham is an institution that is dependent upon revenue; so net revenues are critical. The first-year class for this year generated 74 million dollars in tuition revenue.

In response to a question about the distinction between merit-based and need-based financial aid, Dr. Peek clarified that this distinction in her presentation was an internal distinction. John Buckley added that there are programs where merit and need are blended (e.g., the Dean's scholarship, based on merit, to which need-based funds can be added). There's always an effort to find the sweet spot between merit and need for our students. Brian Ghanoo added that from a family's perspective there tends to be more assurance of continuity with merit rather than need-based aid, since need is assessed each year and can change.

There were a number of further questions about the impact of the impending Supreme Court decisions. In response to a question about whether Fordham will be more or less adversely affected than other universities, Dr.

Peek noted that likely all privately selective universities will be affected and recommended a recent article from the New York Times (Jan 15, 2023). Both Dr. Peek and John Buckley said that the gains recently made in diversity recruitment might be impacted.

One senator asked whether the Admission office had sufficient support and funding to face the upcoming challenges. Dr. Peek said they would always welcome additional staff resources, and that to continue the quality of review the office might indeed need more resources. John Buckley echoed Dr. Peek's response. When another senator asked whether the office might take steps to streamline their operation by turning to automated processing for parts of the review process, both John Buckley and Dr. Peek spoke of the pros and cons of automated forms of filtering, noting the number of students one can overlook in that process. Dr. Peek noted that they do draw on a team of part time professional readers to help, but it is much smaller than NYU's. John Buckley said that he preferred to keep the personal touch for the kind of holistic review discussed in the presentation; but that if the workload became overwhelming, they would need to evaluate options and strategies.

The Q&A ended at 2:05 p.m.

Diane George, Co-Chair, Fordham Faculty United

Senate President Drummond welcomed Diane George, co-chair of Fordham Faculty United, to address the current status of negotiations with the Administration.

Diane George began by thanking the Senate for the invitation and for the faculty support in the form of letters from departments and in helping sway the administration. She offered a brief overview as follow-up to what had been presented in the November meeting. The negotiations begun in March had three goals: 1) better compensation; 2) health insurance for part-time adjuncts; and 3) pay parity across the Schools. At the beginning of negotiations, the Administration offered minimal pay increases (2.5%); they offered no health insurance; and they refused to consider the issue of parity. It was only when FFU began to organize a strike that the Administration came forward and offered more. They came up a tiny bit on compensation for those teaching in Social Services and Religion and Religious Education; and they still offered nothing on health insurance. So the union turned to a vote, which was 90% in favor of going on strike. There was tremendous support from faculty and from students, and this was uplifting to know that our relationship with students was being reciprocated. At the request of the Administration, we met with a federal mediator, but there was no progress, so we went ahead with organizing the strike. She described the steps leading up to the current agreement and briefly outlined the terms of the agreement which was disappointing, but better than what was being offered before the threat of the strike. For the top tier (those with the most longevity), the final year of the 3-year contract involves an increase to 10,000; for the middle tier 9,000 and 8,500 for the bottom tier. The Administration offered a flexible spending account (for health care). On parity, the Administration did agree to a much larger pay increase for GSS and GSRRE. But there is disappointment that the Administration did not recognize the moral and social justice argument about the need to reach pay equity. Her presentation concluded with some reflections on what she learned from the process, emphasizing how demoralizing it was to find that the Administration was focused on the bottom line and did not seem to be swayed by the social justice arguments.

Q&A

One senator asked whether there was anything in the CBA about transitioning part-timers into full-time positions. In response, Diane George read out a statement that appears in the contract agreement: "Where consistent with the University's projected enrollment and teaching needs, the University will review the number of part-time bargaining unit faculty members and consider creating additional full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions to meet those teaching needs" with additional language that states this is "not subject to grievance and arbitration."

Another senator asked if there was any discussion about the demands of all the various technologies instructors use, or are required to use and adapt to (e.g. the rolling out of the new Ultra Blackboard). Diane George noted in response that she is aware of many cases where part-time adjunct faculty have spent many uncompensated hours transferring to Blackboard Ultra. She said that in the beginning of the negotiations, when they tried to bring related issues up (such as mandatory training courses, the development of syllabi), they were immediately shut down.
One senator noted that, if the Administrator's negotiating team didn't take seriously the moral arguments FFU was making, perhaps the example of Catholic social teaching may have been evidenced in the faculty and department letters of support and the student expressions of support. Diane George responded affirmatively to note that she had been talking about the bargaining table, but could indeed see the effects of social justice teaching in the forms of support they had received outside the bargaining process.

Discussion ended at approximately 2:26 p.m.

Approval of minutes
On a motion from Senator Vernon, seconded by Senator Shen, the Senate approved the minutes from the December 2 meeting by a vote of 21 – 0 – 2.

On a motion from Senator Saharia, seconded by Senator Shen, the Senate voted unanimously to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.

New Business
A senator asked the Senate to consider 2 new items of business:

1) What is the Senate's position on the rights of faculty in curricular decisions over the modality (online or in-person) for teaching courses? If a department or School has approved that an individual faculty member may teach a particular course online, does the Administration have the right to overturn that decision?

In response to this question, one senator said that the issue has come before the Core Curriculum Committee in the context of a request to move an EP course online. The EP committee, and the Core Curriculum Committee confirmed that it is in fact the faculty and not the Administration that has control over the modality of teaching; and that any such changes should be run through faculty-governed committees. There was some discussion as to whether this Core Curriculum Committee precedence applies. One senator argued that in one case the issue is decisions passing through academic councils, whereas in the other case it's a matter of the Administration overruling a department's decision. Following inconclusive discussion about whether the Senate was able to decide this issue, it was proposed that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for further deliberation.

2) The 2nd topic concerned the charter of the OHLC (Online Hybrid Learning Committee). The Committee has been repeatedly asked by the Provost's Office to rubber-stamp decisions made by the Provost on matters of online teaching policy. Is it possible to reevaluate or refine the OHLC's charge?

Discussion concluded that the only way forward is to work with the Provost to try to resolve the issues.

Senate President Drummond called for an end to discussion at 2:48 p.m.

New Business
A motion to adjourn (from Senator Saharia, seconded by Senator Mowlabocus) was unanimously approved.

The Senate adjourned at 2:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Christopher GoGwilt, Secretary

Appendix I

Supreme Court Case: Race Conscious Admission

Presentation to the Faculty Senate

Office of Undergraduate Admission

January 20, 2023

Brief History and Current Timeline

45 years of precedent in question

- 1954 Brown vs Board of Education
- 1978 Regents of U of California vs Bakke Case ”race as one of many factors in a holistic review”
- 2003 Grutter vs Bollinger and Gratz vs Bollinger (Michigan case)
- Fisher I (2013) and Fischer II (2016) vs UT Austin

Current Consolidated Case: Harvard and UNC

- Oral Arguments heard on Oct. 31, 2022
- Decision or opinion by end of June 2023 (could come sooner)
- 61 amicus briefs from ~3,000 institutions

Will diversity efforts be impacted?

- Diversity efforts will be impacted if the ruling is absolute in its removal of race conscious elements.
  "Institutions that have faced this in states where race conscious admission is already not permitted have taken many years to rebuild their diverse communities." *NY Times*
- California:
  "The California takeaway: Nothing can fully substitute for affirmative action practices that allow universities to admit a diverse student body, including using income and parent educational levels as proxies for race. But after passage of Proposition 209 touched off UC's 25-year slog of trial and error — plus a massive investment of more than a half-billion dollars on diversity measures — a meaningful difference can be made." *LA Times*
- Socio-economic and other proxies are not necessarily linked directly to diversity.

Current Admission Holistic Review

Academic Review

- High school performance
- Trend in grades within discipline and over time
- Progressive academic rigor in college prep courses
- Strength of curriculum
- Context of what was available to the student at a given high school
- GPA Recalculation when needed
- Consideration of rank when available
- Consideration of standardized testing when available (test optional)

**Elements of application: high school transcript, testing when presented, other transcripts (dual enrollment, etc)*

Qualitative Review

- Student's potential contribution to our community via leadership, service, commitment, impact and interests
- Intellectual curiosity
- Understanding of and commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, social justice
- Resilience
- Written expression
- Understanding above characteristics within the context of the student experience.

**Elements of application: essay, optional question, letters of recommendation, co-curriculars, work, etc.*

10 Year Progress on Racial Diversity

Progress over 10 years:

Class of 2017 **29.9%** Students of Color vs Class of 2026 **46.6%** Student of Color

Class Of	NonRes Alien	NonRes Alien Share	Black/ Afr-Amer	Black/Afr Am Share	AmerInd/ AK Native	AmerInd/ AK Share	Asian	Asian Share	Native HI/ Pac Isl	Nat HI/Pac Isl Share	Hispanic	Hispanic Share
2026	192	7.4%	146	5.6%	2	0.1%	396	15.3%	5	0.2%	536	20.7%
2025	175	6.1%	192	6.7%			395	13.7%	2	0.1%	525	18.2%
2024	111	5.3%	81	3.9%	1	0.0%	304	14.6%	2	0.1%	335	16.1%
2023	167	7.4%	83	3.7%	1	0.0%	282	12.4%	2	0.1%	374	16.5%
2022	208	9.0%	92	4.0%	2	0.1%	319	13.9%	2	0.1%	331	14.4%
2021	228	10.0%	61	2.7%			241	10.6%	3	0.1%	308	13.5%
2020	193	8.8%	71	3.2%	1	0.0%	227	10.3%			293	13.3%
2019	169	7.6%	77	3.5%	2	0.1%	245	11.1%	3	0.1%	310	14.0%
2018	162	7.2%	78	3.5%	5	0.2%	230	10.2%	1	0.0%	300	13.3%
2017	121	6.1%	69	3.5%	4	0.2%	193	9.8%	2	0.1%	253	12.8%

Class Of	Two+ Race	Two+ Share	Students of Color	Students of Color Share	White	White Share	Unknown	Unk Share	Enrolled	Enrolled Share
2026	124	4.8%	1,209	46.6%	1,170	45.1%	23	0.9%	2,594	100.0%
2025	160	5.6%	1,274	44.3%	1,408	48.9%	22	0.8%	2,879	100.0%
2024	88	4.2%	811	38.9%	1,148	55.0%	16	0.8%	2,086	100.0%
2023	97	4.3%	839	37.0%	1,249	55.0%	15	0.7%	2,270	100.0%
2022	115	5.0%	861	37.5%	1,218	53.0%	12	0.5%	2,299	100.0%
2021	108	4.7%	721	31.6%	1,304	57.1%	30	1.3%	2,283	100.0%
2020	62	2.8%	654	29.7%	1,303	59.3%	49	2.2%	2,199	100.0%
2019	59	2.7%	696	31.5%	1,279	57.8%	67	3.0%	2,211	100.0%
2018	58	2.6%	672	29.8%	1,403	62.1%	21	0.9%	2,258	100.0%
2017	67	3.4%	588	29.9%	1,203	61.1%	57	2.9%	1,969	100.0%

Race Neutral Strategies

- Continue Test Optional Policy: Testing can create barriers in recruitment of a diverse class
- Widening the top of the funnel to a greater extent
  - Increased targeting of diverse populations in direct marketing outreach and augmenting travel to high schools in diverse communities
- Employ socio-economic proxies; focus on low income and first generation recruitment. Including:
  - forging relationships with more CBOs;
  - Continue to partner with STEP/CSTEP; HEOP,
  - Continue to strengthen relationships with local high schools
  - Partnering with networks such as Cristo Rey
  - Creating more pipeline and pathways to Fordham
- Explore tools such as **College Board Landscape**
- Continue to increase international efforts
- Continue to build stronger transfer student pipelines, notably from community colleges
- Continue to message the University mission, commitment to diversity–lean into our Jesuit and Ignatian traditions and position in New York City

What could be impacted in term of our current practices?

Application Review

- Will the Common Application be permitted to ask a student's race?
- How will admission offices be able to incorporate what a student may choose to share in an essay, short answer or other prompts that contextualizes their experience via the lens of their racial identity?
- What will high school counselors be able to share in letters of recommendation?
- Will we have to further refine our qualitative assessment that values an appreciation of and support for a diversity and fostering a just and inclusive campus community?

Recruitment and Yield Activities

- Will outside scholarship designations such as the National Hispanic, African American and Indigenous People Recognition programs be able to continue?
- What, if any, modification will we need to make to programming for students of color and allies?

What could be impacted in term of our current practices?

Financial Aid

- Continued shift in more financial aid from merit to need based awards.
- Develop new awards to potentially replace Recognition program scholarships (if they are no longer available)
- Discount Rate/Net Revenue
  - analysis will be needed to determine impact

Other Considerations

- Review our University Diversity Statements and plans.
- Extend to graduate and professional schools as well.

Recommended Steps:

UG Admission and Beyond

University Wide Measures

- Establish a university-wide leadership team tasked with guiding all institutional plans regarding possible Court outcomes and addressing these issues:
  - Vision, direction, and action planning
  - Impact and investment
  - Compliance
  - Communications and stakeholder engagement

Specific Tasks

- Establish a baseline by documenting a full inventory of all relevant policies and program descriptions associated with diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI)
- Focus on policies and programs conscious of race, ethnicity, sex, and gender.
- Review each program or policy and consider adding/strengthening race-neutral strategies. Measure and evaluate their efficacy.
- Implement the above steps to help streamline evaluations in light of any consequential Court action.
- "There is no guarantee that the Supreme Court's decisions will not also complicate approaches that depend on proxies of race."

Source of Recommended Steps: ***College Board Access and Diversity Collaborative:*** ***https://professionals.collegeboard.org/2023-scotus-race-admissions***

Source for Quote: EAB*-The Supreme Court affirmative action hearings: a guide for the overwhelmed-Nov. 11, 2022*

Discussion