

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF JUNE 30, 2004

(As approved by the Academic Assembly on November 10, 2004)

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met in a special session on Wednesday June 30, 2004 by teleconference. Academic Senate Chair Lawrence Pitts presided. Chair Pitts called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and Academic Senate Director Maria Bertero-Barceló called the roll of members of the Assembly. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Announcements by the President, Robert C. Dynes

Provost M.R.C. Greenwood and Senior Vice President Bruce Darling also joined President Dynes on the call. President Dynes thanked the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and BOARS Chair Barbara Sawrey for their leadership and thoughtful work in developing recommended adjustments to UC freshman eligibility requirements being put before the Assembly. The President expressed his support for the proposal. He noted in particular its emphasis on academic achievement and how successfully it avoids negative impacts on any one group. He added that it will continue to be important for UC to emphasize and adhere to the California Master Plan for Education.

III. Chair's Announcements, Lawrence Pitts

Chair Pitts reviewed the order of business and procedures for discussion. A recent report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) indicated that UC is accepting as eligible 14.4% of California public high school graduates. In an effort to return to the 12.5% eligibility pool outlined in the Master Plan, BOARS has proposed several adjustments to UC's eligibility criteria. The Assembly is asked to review and approve BOARS' proposal, which was endorsed by Academic Council the previous week. Each division will be given the opportunity to speak, comment or propose amendments. Any Senate member may speak, but only Assembly members can vote. Assembly's recommendation will be forwarded to the Regents in time for their July meeting

IV. Report from the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

Meeting UC's eligibility criteria guarantees in-state high school graduates entry to a UC campus. The last CPEC study was conducted in 1996 and indicated that UC was making eligible those students from the top 11.1% of the public high schools. This prompted BOARS to make changes allowing a higher percentage of graduates to become eligible, including the institution of Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Now with a 14.4% pool, BOARS has had to study ways to tighten eligibility. They have projected how many students and which groups would be affected by different combinations of changes to

various eligibility criteria, including minimum GPA achieved in A-G courses, scores on standardized tests, the ELC program, and the eligibility index.

First, BOARS is proposing procedural adjustments to the way eligibility is calculated, which are projected to reduce the pool to 13%. A-G grades in a statewide context will be calculated in a way that is consistent with ELC. This includes elimination of the “best of pattern” practice, which has allowed campuses to consider GPA from only the best grades from the minimum required number of A-G courses. Additionally, ELC students will now be considered and counted as only conditionally eligible, contingent on their fulfillment of testing and other eligibility requirements. These procedural adjustments can be made immediately.

Second, BOARS is proposing that the minimum high school GPA for UC eligibility in both the statewide context and ELC be raised from 2.8 to 3.1. GPA is the best predictor of student success at UC and is also something the student can control. Raising the minimum GPA also raises academic excellence at the university without disproportionately impacting any one group, although tighter standards will hurt students in all groups to some extent. The new GPA requirements would affect students arriving at UC in fall 2007, giving sophomores an appropriate two years warning.

Discussion

Several Assembly members commended BOARS for its hard work in finding an effective, compassionate and scholarly solution to a difficult problem. However, a couple of members expressed concern about recommendation #3 (See Final Assembly Report) to raise the minimum GPA to 3.1. One member called it premature to impose such a standard without knowing first what impact the procedural adjustments might have. Lowering the number of eligible students even more may give the university bad publicity, and moreover, it is ethically wrong to institute standards that hurt minority students at a time when the minority population of California is growing.

Professor Sawrey talked about the fine line UC has to walk between Proposition 209, constraining the university’s ability to look specifically at race or ethnicity, and federal guidelines against discrimination. She said BOARS has been very sensitive to the impact of its recommendations on diversity and disadvantaged students. There is still the possibility of admission to the university “by exception,” and BOARS supports efforts by campuses to maximize to 6% their enrollment within this category. The admissions study group convened by the President last year also made a strong recommendation that campuses fully utilize admission by exception. Finally, the 3.1 GPA probably is a maximum level. The proposal allows for flexibility after data gauging the effects of the procedural adjustments and the new SAT/ACT tests becomes known. CPEC’s study was the best under the circumstances and UC should adhere to the data. There is a risk to the University of not abiding by the Master Plan. For instance, CSU may continue to seek the authority to grant the doctoral degree. Finally, the Senate has been charged with bringing a plan to the Regents for how to return to 12.5%, and must do so. This is the best possible solution.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike recommendation #3 from the proposal. First, on the basis that the statistical uncertainties were too great and there needed to be more research and assurance that the change would produce the intended effect without

overcorrecting; and second, that raising GPA would be an unwise move politically. Therefore, UC should wait until after implementation of procedural adjustments #1 and #2 to move forward with recommendation #3. The motion was seconded, but was later withdrawn after the member received clarification to his satisfaction that #3 will not go into effect until 2007, giving ample notice to students, and that there is sufficient flexibility present in the proposal to allow for adjustments as solid data become available about the impact of #1, #2 and the new SAT and ACT tests.

Action: An amendment was introduced to strike the numeral “5.” from recommendation #5, so that the recommendation reads as part of the body of text, not as a separate recommendation for the Regents to approve. The recommendation is not in the Regents’ purview. The motion passed unanimously.

Action: A motion was introduced and seconded for Assembly to endorse the BOARS report. Assembly members voted to approve BOARS’ proposed eligibility criteria, with one abstention.

Chair Pitts thanked Assembly members for their hard work. He noted that the teleconference can be an effective medium for discussion of substantial topics, and in the future may allow the Assembly to meet more often.

Meeting adjourned, 10:50 a.m.
Attest: Lawrence Pitts
Academic Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by
Michael LaBriola
Senate Analyst

Appendix A

2003-2004 Assembly Attendance Record, Special Meeting of June 30, 2004

<p>President of the University: Robert C. Dynes</p> <p>Academic Council Members: Lawrence Pitts, Chair George Blumenthal, Vice Chair Ronald Gronsky, Chair, UCB Bruce Madewell, Chair, UCD Abel Klein, Chair, UCI Cliff Brunk, Chair, UCLA Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR Jan Talbot, Chair, UCSD Leonard Zegans, Chair, UCSF (absent) Walter Yuen, Chair, UCSB Alison Galloway, Chair, UCSC Barbara Sawrey, Chair, BOARS Quentin Williams, Vice Chair CCGA (alt. for Kent Erickson, Chair, CCGA) Ramon Gutierrez, Chair, UCAP Lisa Alvarez-Cohen, Chair, UCEP (absent) Ross Starr, Chair, UCFW Janis Ingham, Chair, UCORP Michael Parrish, Chair, UCPB (absent)</p> <p>Berkeley (6) Richard Abrams (absent) Michael Hanemann (absent) Dorit Hochbaum (absent) David Hollinger (absent) Donald Mastronarde Raymond Wolfinger</p> <p>Davis (5) William Casey Peter Hays Gyongy Laky Brian Morrissey Philip Yager</p> <p>Irvine (4) Linda Georgianna (absent) Ross Conner (absent) Calvin McLaughlin Thomas Poulos (absent)</p>	<p>Los Angeles (9) Kathryn Atchison Charles Berst Richard Weiss (alt. for Yoram Cohen) Harold Fetterman Vickie Mays (absent) Jose Moya Owen Smith Jane Valentine (absent) Jaime Villablanca</p> <p>Riverside (2) Mary Gauvain Joseph Childers (alt. for Linda Tomko)</p> <p>San Diego (4) LeRoy Dorman (alt. for Stuart Brody) Gerald Doppelt (absent) Barney Rickett (absent) Nicholas Spitzer</p> <p>San Francisco (3) Philip Darney (absent) Francisco Ramos-Gomez Peter Wright</p> <p>Santa Barbara (3) Ann Jensen Adams Susan Koshy (absent) Nelson Lichtenstein (absent)</p> <p>Santa Cruz (2) Tony Fink (alt. for Faye Crosby) Theodore Holman</p> <p>Secretary/Parliamentarian Peter Berck</p>
---	---